

IEOR 6711, HMWK 4, Professor Sigman

1. Consider an irreducible Markov chain with transition matrix $P = (P_{i,j})$ and state space \mathcal{S} . Prove that if you can find both a probability distribution π on \mathcal{S} and a Markov transition matrix $Q = (Q_{i,j})$ such that

$$\pi_i P_{i,j} = \pi_j Q_{j,i},$$

then the chain is positive recurrent with stationary distribution π , and $Q = P(r)$, the transition matrix for the time-reversed chain.

SOLUTION: Assuming the hypothesis, $\sum_i Q_{j,i} = 1$, so by summing up both sides over i we get, for each j ,

$$\sum_i \pi_i P_{i,j} = \pi_j,$$

which is $\pi = \pi P$. Thus the chain is positive recurrent with stationary distribution π . Moreover, $Q_{j,i} = \pi_i P_{i,j} / \pi_j = P_{i,j}(r)$.

2. Let X be any non-negative rv.

(a) Derive

$$E(XI\{X > x\}) = xP(X > x) + \int_x^\infty P(X > y)dy.$$

SOLUTION: $Y = XI\{X > x\}$ is a non-negative rv, so we can obtain its expected value by integrating the tail:

$$\begin{aligned} E(Y) &= \int_0^\infty P(Y > y)dy \\ &= \int_0^x P(X > x)dy + \int_x^\infty P(X > y)dy \\ &= xP(X > x) + \int_x^\infty P(X > y)dy. \end{aligned}$$

- (b) Use (directly) the dominated convergence theorem to prove that that if $E(X) < \infty$, then $E(XI\{X > x\}) \rightarrow 0$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$.

SOLUTION: wp1, $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} XI\{X > x\} = 0$, and $\sup_{x \geq 0} XI\{X > x\} \leq X$ and $E(X) < \infty$; the result follows.

- (c) Conclude that $xP(|X| > x) \rightarrow 0$ for any non-negative rv with $E(|X|) < \infty$.

SOLUTION: From the above,

$$E(|X|I\{|X| > x\}) = xP(|X| > x) + \int_x^\infty P(|X| > y)dy,$$

and $E(|X|I\{|X| > x\}) \rightarrow 0$; the result follows.

3. Consider two non-negative rvs, X and Y . We say that X is *stochastically smaller* than Y , denoted by

$$X \leq_{st} Y,$$

if $P(X > x) \leq P(Y > x)$, $x \geq 0$.

- (a) Show that if $X \leq Y$ wp1, then $X \leq_{st} Y$.

SOLUTION: Immediate: If $X \leq Y$ wp1, then $I\{X > x\} \leq I\{Y > x\}$, $x \geq 0$, wp1. Taking expected values yields the result.

- (b) Give a counterexample of two rvs X and Y on the same probability space such that $X \leq_{st} Y$ but it does not hold that $X \leq Y$ wp1.

SOLUTION: Let U have a uniform distribution on $(0, 1)$. Define $X = U$ and $Y = 1 - U$. Then both X and Y are uniform distribution on $(0, 1)$, so $P(X > x) = P(Y > x)$, $x \geq 0$; in particular $P(X > x) \leq P(Y > x)$, $x \geq 0$. But if for example $U = 0.80$, then $X = 0.80$ while $Y = 0.20$.

- (c) Given a rv U having a uniform distribution on $(0, 1)$, show (by using U somehow) that if $X \leq_{st} Y$, then there exists rvs X' and Y' on the same probability space such that X' is distributed as X , and Y' is distributed as Y and $X' \leq Y'$ wp1.

SOLUTION: Let $F(x) = P(X \leq x)$ and $G(x) = P(Y \leq x)$ be the cdfs, and let $F^{-1}(u)$, $G^{-1}(u)$ denote the generalized inverses;

$$F^{-1}(u) = \min\{x : F(x) \geq u\}, \quad u \in [0, 1].$$

$$G^{-1}(u) = \min\{x : G(x) \geq u\}, \quad u \in [0, 1].$$

$X \leq_{st} Y$ is equivalent to $F(x) \geq G(x)$, $x \geq 0$ which thus implies (looking at the definition of the generalized inverses) that $F^{-1}(u) \leq G^{-1}(u)$, $u \in [0, 1]$.

Using the inverse transform method with the one U given, we set $X' = F^{-1}(U)$ and $Y' = G^{-1}(U)$ yielding the result.

4. You plan to retire at deterministic time R years in the future, and you wish to buy a summer home right before you retire (e.g., as close to retirement as possible). Suppose that over time you receive offers to buy a summer home at times $\{t_n : n \geq 1\}$ that form a Poisson process at rate μ such that $R > \mu^{-1}$. Your objective is to accept the last offer before time R , but such a “last” time strategy is not a stopping time; if you were to choose $t_n < R$ (say), then if you waited a little bit more, maybe $t_{n+1} < R$ also. Thus you decide upon the following strategy: fix a time $0 < t < R$, and accept the first offer (if any) received after time t but before time R . If no such offer occurs, then you fail at your objective (as you do if more than one offer occurs after t but before R); otherwise you succeed. What is the optimal value of t to use (e.g., what value of t maximizes the probability that you succeed)?

SOLUTION: You succeed if and only if there is exactly one Poisson event during $(t, R]$. That happens with probability $P(N(R) - N(t) = 1)$ which by stationary increments is the same as $P(N(R - t) = 1) = \mu(R - t)e^{-\mu(R - t)}$. Changing variables $x = \mu(R - t)$, we must maximize the function $f(x) = xe^{-x}$ on the interval $(0, R\mu)$ via calculus: $\frac{d(xe^{-x})}{dx} = -xe^{-x} + e^{-x} := 0$.

Hence, $x = 1$ and $f(1) = e^{-1}$.

So the probability is maximized when $\mu(R - t) = 1$; $t = R - 1/\mu$. (That our solution is a maximum as opposed to minimum is easily seen since since $f(x)$ is increasing on $[0, 1]$ then decreasing on $(1, R\mu]$.)

5. A straight road of length L miles connects two points A and B . There is a gas station located at A , and then additional stations are located along the road according to a Poisson process with rate λ (per unit mile). At a fixed location y miles along the road ($0 < y < L$), John's car runs out of gas. Compute the expected distance from John's car to the nearest gas station.

SOLUTION: Let D_1 denote the distance to the nearest station to the left of y , and let D_2 denote the the distance to the nearest station to the right of y , where we set $D_2 = \infty$ if there are no stations to the right of y . Let $D = \min\{D_1, D_2\}$. We need to compute $E(D)$. We will do so via $E(D) = \int_0^\infty P(D > x)dx$.

Let X_1 and X_2 denote iid exponentials at rate λ ,

Then (in distribution) $D_2 = X_2$ if $X_2 \leq L - y$; $D_2 = \infty$ if $X_2 > L - y$.

$D_1 = \min\{X_1, y\}$. Thus

$$P(D_1 > x) = \begin{cases} e^{-\lambda x} & \text{if } 0 \leq x < y, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \geq y. \end{cases}$$

$$P(D_2 > x) = \begin{cases} e^{-\lambda x} & \text{if } 0 \leq x < L - y, \\ P(D_2 = \infty) = e^{-\lambda(L-y)} & \text{if } x \geq L - y. \end{cases}$$

Thus $P(D > x) = P(D_1 > x, D_2 > x) = P(D_1 > x)P(D_2 > x)$ yielding

$$P(D > x) = \begin{cases} e^{-2\lambda x} & \text{if } 0 \leq x < \min\{y, L - y\}, \\ e^{-\lambda(L-y)}e^{-\lambda x} & \text{if } L - y \leq x < y, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \geq y. \end{cases}$$

We need to consider the two cases: $\min\{y, L - y\} = y$ and $\min\{y, L - y\} = L - y$; or equivalently $y \leq L/2$ and $y > L/2$.

The first case yields

$$P(D > x) \begin{cases} e^{-2\lambda x} & \text{if } 0 \leq x < y, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \geq y, \end{cases}$$

in which case

$$E(D) = \int_0^y e^{-2\lambda x} dx = (1/2\lambda)(1 - e^{-2\lambda y}).$$

The second case yields

$$P(D > x) = \begin{cases} e^{-2\lambda x} & \text{if } 0 \leq x < L - y, \\ e^{-\lambda(L-y)}e^{-\lambda x} & \text{if } L - y \leq x < y, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \geq y, \end{cases}$$

in which case

$$\begin{aligned} E(D) &= \int_0^{L-y} e^{-2\lambda x} dx + e^{-\lambda(L-y)} \int_{L-y}^y e^{-\lambda x} dx \\ &= (1/2\lambda)(1 - e^{-2\lambda(L-y)}) + (1/\lambda)e^{-\lambda(L-y)}(e^{-\lambda(L-y)} - e^{-\lambda y}) \\ &= (1/2\lambda)(1 - e^{-2\lambda(L-y)}) + (1/\lambda)(e^{-2\lambda(L-y)} - e^{-\lambda L}) \\ &= (1/2\lambda)(1 + e^{-2\lambda(L-y)}) - (1/\lambda)e^{-\lambda L}. \end{aligned}$$

6. Cars pass a certain street location according to a Poisson process at rate λ . Mary is standing at that location and will wait to cross the street until she sees that no cars will pass in the next T time units. Let W denote Mary's waiting time.

- (a) Compute $P(W = 0)$.
(b) Compute $E(W)$.

SOLUTION:

$$P(W = 0) = P(X_1 > T) = e^{-\lambda T} \text{ and}$$

$$E(W) = e^{\lambda T}(1/\lambda) - T - (1/\lambda)$$

derived as follows:

We can use the method of conditioning on the length of the first interarrival time X_1 . Observe that if $X_1 > T$, then $W = 0$, whereas if $X_1 \leq T$, then (in distribution) $W = (X_1 | X_1 \leq T) + W$ since if $X_1 \leq T$, then we start waiting again at time X_1 as if things started all over. Thus $E(W) = E(W | X_1 > T)P(X_1 > T) + E(W | X_1 \leq T)P(X_1 \leq T) = E(W | X_1 \leq T)P(X_1 \leq T) = (E(X_1 | X_1 \leq T) + E(W))P(X_1 \leq T)$. Thus we can solve for $E(W)$: $E(W) = E(X_1 | X_1 \leq T)(1 - p)/p$, where $p = e^{-\lambda T} = P(X_1 > T)$. We can re-write this as $E(W) = E(X_1; X_1 \leq T)/p$, and can compute $E(X_1; X_1 \leq T) = \int_0^T x\lambda e^{-\lambda x} = (1/\lambda)(1 - p) - Tp$.

7. Consider a Poisson process ψ at rate λ with counting process $\{N(t)\}$. Let Y be a rv that is independent of ψ with mean $E(Y)$ second moment $E(Y^2)$ and variance $\sigma^2 = Var(Y)$. Compute $E(N(Y))$ and $Cov(Y, N(Y))$ and $Var(N(Y))$.

SOLUTION: Conditioning on $Y = y$ yields $E(N(Y) | Y = y) = \lambda y$ and so $E(N(Y) | Y) = \lambda Y$. Thus $E(N(Y)) = E[E(N(Y) | Y)] = \lambda E(Y)$. $Cov(Y, N(Y)) = E(YN(Y)) - E(Y)E(N(Y))$, so we need to compute $E(YN(Y))$. Once again by conditioning on $Y = y$ we get $E(YN(Y) | Y = y) = \lambda y^2$ hence $E(YN(Y) | Y) =$

λY^2 . So $E(YN(Y)) = E[E(YN(Y) | Y)] = \lambda E(Y^2)$. To compute $Var(N(Y))$, we can use the conditional variance formula:

$$Var(N(Y)) = E(Var(N(Y) | Y)) + Var(E(N(Y) | Y)),$$

where here $Var(N(Y) | Y = y) = Var(N(y)) = \lambda y$, so $Var(N(Y) | Y) = \lambda Y$.

Finally $Var(N(Y)) = E(\lambda Y) + Var(\lambda Y) = \lambda E(Y) + \lambda^2 Var(Y)$.

8. Let $X \sim exp(\lambda_1)$ and $Y \sim exp(\lambda_2)$ be independent, representing the first arrival time from Express and Local trains respectively. $\lambda_1 = 4$, $\lambda_2 = 7$.

(a) $P(X < Y) = \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} = \frac{4}{11}$.

(b) Let $Z = \min\{X, Y\}$. $E(Z) = \frac{1}{\lambda} = \frac{1}{11}$. Here $\lambda = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = 11$, and $Z \sim exp(\lambda)$.

(c) $E(Z|Z = X) = E(Z) = \frac{1}{11}$. The point here is that conditioning on which of the two r.v.s. is the minimum does not change the fact that the minimum has an exponential distribution with parameter $\lambda = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = 11$.

(d) Let $N(t) = N_1(t) + N_2(t)$ denote the counting process for the superposition of both types (forms a Poisson process at rate $\lambda = 11$). 12 minutes is $1/5$ of an hour; $P(N(1/5) = 0) = e^{-\frac{\lambda}{5}} = e^{-\frac{11}{5}}$. One can also do this directly: $P(N(1/5) = 0) = P(N_1(1/5) = 0, N_2(1/5) = 0) = P(N_1(1/5) = 0)P(N_2(1/5) = 0)$ by the assumed independence of the two Poisson processes we got $e^{-\frac{4}{5}}e^{-\frac{7}{5}} = e^{-\frac{11}{5}}$.

(e) $t_3 \sim gamma(3, \lambda)$ (*Erlang* with 3 phases, each at rate λ) because it is the third arrival time from a Poisson process at rate $\lambda = 11$. It has representation $t_3 = X_1 + X_2 + X_3$, where $X_i \sim exp(11)$. Thus $E(t_3) = 3E(X) = 3/11$ and from independence

$$\begin{aligned} Var(t_3) &= Var(X_1) + Var(X_2) + Var(X_3) \\ &= 3Var(X_1) \\ &= 3 \times \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \\ &= 3 \times \frac{1}{121}. \end{aligned}$$

(f) Let $U \sim Uniform(0, 0.5)$ be a rv independent of $X \sim exp(7)$.

$$\text{We want } P(X > U) = (0.5)^{-1} \int_0^{0.5} P(X > u) du = (0.5)^{-1} \int_0^{0.5} (e^{-7u}) du = \frac{2}{7}(1 - e^{-3.5}).$$

9. Two ATM machines work in parallel (and have one common queue/line for both). You arrive and find both in use but no one waiting in line. (So you are the only one in line now and will begin whenever a machine becomes free.) Suppose each user of an ATM spends an iid exponential amount of time (called a *service time*) at rate λ using the machine before departing.

- (a) What is the expected length of time until you depart?

SOLUTION: Let W denote this *sojourn* time. Let S_1 and S_2 denote the remaining service times of the two in service. By the memoryless property, they are iid exponentials at rate λ . You will enter service after an amount of time $D = \min\{S_1, S_2\} \sim \text{exp}(2\lambda)$ (your *delay in queue*), and then will spend S_3 (your service time) in service. So $W = D + S_3$ and $E(W) = E(D) + E(S_3) = 1/(2\lambda) + 1/\lambda = 3/(2\lambda)$.

- (b) What is the expected length of time until both users (the two you found) have departed?

SOLUTION: Denote this time by T ; $T = \max\{S_1, S_2\} = S_1 + S_2 - \min\{S_1, S_2\} = S_1 + S_2 - D$. Thus $E(T) = 2E(S) - E(D) = 2/\lambda - 1/(2\lambda)$.

- (c) Repeat in the case when ATM machine 1 has iid exponential service times at rate λ_1 and ATM machine 2 has iid exponential service times at rate λ_2 .

SOLUTION: We now need to know which of the two were first to depart. Let $S_i \sim \text{exp}(\lambda_i)$, $i = 1, 2$.

Let $p = P(S_1 < S_2) = \lambda_1/(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)$ and let $q = 1 - p$.

Given that $S_1 < S_2$, or given $S_2 < S_1$, the rv D has the same distribution, namely $D = \min\{S_1, S_2\}$ (recall that for $Z = \min\{X_1, X_2\}$ of two independent exponentials, the conditional distribution of Z given that $Z = X_1$ (or similarly if $Z = X_2$) is still the same as Z itself.) Now let $S_3(i)$ denote an independent exponential service at rate λ_i , $i = 1, 2$. Then

$$W = D + S_3(1)|\{S_1 < S_2\} + S_3(2)|\{S_2 < S_1\}.$$

$$\begin{aligned} E(W) &= E(D) + p(1/\lambda_1) + q(1/\lambda_2) \\ &= 3/(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2). \end{aligned}$$

As for T : once again, $T = \max\{S_1, S_2\} = S_1 + S_2 - \min\{S_1, S_2\}$; $E(T) = 1/\lambda_1 + 1/\lambda_2 - 1/(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)$.

10. Consider an infinite sequence of independent Poisson processes at rates λ_i , $i \geq 1$, where it is assumed that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i < \infty.$$

Let ψ denote the superposition of all of them together. Is ψ a Poisson process (prove that it is or explain why it is not)?

SOLUTION: Yes; a Poisson process at rate $\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i$.

First note that the superposition counting process $N(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} N_i(t)$ is a well defined finite for each t integer valued process:

$$\begin{aligned} E(N(t)) &= E\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} N_i(t)\right\} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} E(N_i(t)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i t \\ &= \lambda t < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used non-negativity of all the rvs to justify the interchange of expected value and sum. (This implies in particular that $P(N(t) < \infty) = 1$ for each t .) The resulting point process is also simple because the probability that any number (finite or countable infinite) of continuous rvs are equal is zero.

It is next easily verified that ψ has both stationary and independent increments (because each of the individual Poisson processes does), so it must be a Poisson process. The rate of a Poisson process is always given by $\lambda = E(N(1))$.

11. Consider a Poisson process at rate λ , define $t_0 = 0$, and for fixed $t > 0$, let $B(t)$ denote the amount of time since the last arrival before time t : $t_{N(t)} \leq t < t_{N(t)+1}$, $B(t) = t - t_{N(t)}$. Find $P(B(t) \leq x)$, $x \geq 0$. What happens as $t \rightarrow \infty$?

SOLUTION: Let $X \sim \text{exp}(\lambda)$. Then by the memoryless property (think in reverse time) $B(t)$ can be expressed (in distribution) as $B(t) = \min\{X, t\}$ because the last arrival can occur at most t time units ago (where the origin is). $P(B(t) \leq x) = 1 - e^{-\lambda x}$, $x < t$, $P(B(t) \leq x) = 1$, $x \geq t$. Note how as $t \rightarrow \infty$ we do obtain the $\text{exp}(\lambda)$ distribution.

On the other hand, $A(t) = t_{N(t)+1} - t$, the time until the next arrival, always has the $\text{exp}(\lambda)$ distribution since there is no upper bound; no limit is required to get there.

12. Consider a point process ψ defined as follows: Flip a fair coin. If it lands heads, then ψ is a Poisson process at rate 1, otherwise it is a Poisson process at rate 2.
- (a) Is ψ a Poisson process (prove that it is or explain why it is not)?
 - (b) Does ψ have stationary increments?
 - (c) Does ψ have independent increments?
 - (d) Is ψ a renewal process?

SOLUTION:

ψ is not Poisson. Consider the first arrival time t_1 ; its distribution is $P(t_1 > t) = (1/2)e^{-t} + (1/2)e^{-2t}$ a mixture of two distinct exponential distributions which is not exponential. We can write that $t_1 \sim (0.5)\text{exp}(1) + (0.5)\text{exp}(2)$.

$\{N(t)\}$ does, however, have stationary increments: The distribution of $N(t+h) - N(t)$ only depends on h ; it is a mixture of two distinct Poisson distributions, $\sim (0.5)\text{Poisson}(h) + (0.5)\text{Poisson}(2h)$.

$\{N(t)\}$ does not have independent increments: Knowing $N(t)$ for t large would give you a fine estimate of the value of λ , either 1 or 2, via the elementary renewal theorem, $N(t)/t \approx \lambda$, which thus would tell you which way the coin landed and hence which distribution, $\text{Poisson}(h)$ or $\text{Poisson}(2h)$, the future increment $N(t+h) - N(t)$ is from; $N(t+h) - N(t)$ is not independent of $N(t)$.

ψ a not renewal process for similar reasons as to why it does not have independent increments. Whereas the interarrival times are all identically distributed as t_1 , $P(X_i > t) = P(t_1 > t) = (1/2)e^{-t} + (1/2)e^{-2t}$, $i \geq 1$, they are not independent. Knowing (say) the first n values (n large) X_1, \dots, X_n gives us information to estimate λ , and hence to predict X_{n+1} .