

Entropy of absorbed Markov chains

Servet Martínez

March 4, 2022

Abstract

We consider a strictly substochastic matrix or an stochastic matrix with absorbing states. By using quasi-stationary distributions one shows there is a canonical associated stationary Markov chain. Based upon 2-stringing representation of the resurrected chain we supply a stationary representation of the killed and the absorbed chains. The entropies of these representations has a clear meaning when one identifies the probability measure of natural factors. The balance between the entropies of these representations and the canonical chain, serves to check the suitability of the whole construction.

Keywords: Markov chains; entropy; quasi-stationary distributions.

AMS Subject Classification: 60J10.

1 Introduction

Our starting point is an irreducible strictly substochastic matrix P_I matrix on a countable set I . It defines a killed Markov chain when adding a cemetery that is an absorbing state. One of our purposes is to explore how one can study the entropy of this chain.

The problem can be set for a Markov chain that is absorbed in a class of states, which is not necessarily a singleton. It is in this enlarged setting that we study the entropy. In this study we use the following concepts:

- the quasi-stationary distribution (q.s.d.) of the matrix P_I . It exists and it is unique when I is finite and in the general case we assume there exists some q.s.d.;
- the Markov chain defined by resurrecting the absorbed chain with the q.s.d.;

- the 2-stringing of the resurrected Markov chain.

In Proposition 3.1 we show that every q.s.d. defines a canonical stationary distribution associated to an absorbed chain. A construction of this associated stationary chain is given in Proposition 4.3 showing that it can be retrieved from the resurrected chain with some additional random elements: the killing on the orbit, the hitting of the absorbing states, and a walk on the absorbing states.

The 2-stringing of the resurrected Markov chain is used to supply stationary Markov representations of the killed and the absorbed Markov chains in a proper way, to compute their entropies and give a clear meaning to them. This is done in Sections 5.1 and 5.2 and in Propositions 5.2 and 5.5. The entropies are interpreted by identifying the probability measure on the fibers of some natural factors. The entropy of the killed chain is the entropy of the resurrected chain plus the entropy of being alive or killed, and in the absorbed case one must add the entropy of the states where they are absorbed. These additional terms are given by the Abramov-Rokhlin formula on some factors.

Finally, in Proposition 5.7 the entropy of the associated stationary chain is decomposed into the entropies of the absorbed chain and of the walk on the absorbing states. This is an element which serves to the understanding of the stationary representation of the absorbed chain.

We note that since the killed and the absorbed trajectory are finites, then almost all the orbits of the stationary representations of the killed and the absorbed Markov chains contain all the killed or absorbed trajectories.

As usual one uses the capital letter H for the entropy of a finite random variable and h is the entropy of an stationary chain.

Even if it is not usual, we use trajectory to refer to a visit of a finite sequence of states; and orbit for a bilateral sequence of states, that is for a point in a bilateral product space.

2 Killed and Absorbed chains

Let $P_I = (P(i, j) : i, j \in I)$ be an irreducible strictly substochastic matrix on a countable set I . As usual one adds a state $\partial \notin I$ called a cemetery and the extension of P_I to $I \cup \{\partial\}$ is noted by P , it satisfies $P(i, \partial) = 1 - \sum_{j \in I} P(i, j)$ for $i \in I$, and $P(\partial, \partial) = 1$. Strictly substochasticity is equivalent to $\sum_{i \in I} P(i, \partial) > 0$. By irreducibility the states in I are transient

and ∂ is absorbing. The process defined by P_I is identified with the chain absorbed at a unique cemetery ∂ .

The existence of a unique cemetery models the killing when this is a phenomenon common to all states, for instance in extinction where a unique ∂ has a clear meaning. But there can be several ways of being killed or hitting a boundary, and this is expressed by the existence of a set of absorbing states which is not necessary a singleton.

So, we consider a more general situation. Let $P = (P(a, b) : a, b \in I \cup \mathcal{E})$ be a stochastic matrix on the countable set $I \cup \mathcal{E}$ such that its restriction to I is $P_I = (P(i, j) : i, j \in I)$, all the states in \mathcal{E} are absorbing, $P(\epsilon, \epsilon) = 1$ for $\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}$, and \mathcal{E} is attained from I , that is $\sum_{i \in I} P(i, \mathcal{E}) > 0$. We retrieve the one point absorption when $\mathcal{E} = \{\partial\}$.

Let $\mathcal{X} = (\mathcal{X}_n)$ be a Markov chain with transition matrix P , it will be called absorbed chain. By \mathbb{P}_a we mean the law of this chain when starting from $a \in I \cup \mathcal{E}$ and \mathbb{E}_a denotes the associated mean expected value. Let

$$\tau_{\mathcal{E}} = \inf\{n \geq 1 : \mathcal{X}_n \in \mathcal{E}\}$$

be the first return time to \mathcal{E} . If I is finite the hypotheses made on the chain imply $\mathbb{P}_i(\tau_{\mathcal{E}} < \infty) = 1$ for all $i \in I$. In the countable case one assumes $\mathbb{P}_i(\tau_{\mathcal{E}} < \infty) = 1$ for all $i \in I$.

We call $\mathcal{X}^{(k)} = (\mathcal{X}_n : 0 \leq n < \tau_{\mathcal{E}})$ the killed trajectory and $\mathcal{X}^{(a)} = (\mathcal{X}_n : 0 \leq n \leq \tau_{\mathcal{E}})$ the absorbed trajectory, both starting from \mathcal{X}_0 . The first one finishes when it is killed and the second one in the state where it is absorbed.

2.1 Quasi-stationary distributions

A quasi-stationary distribution (q.s.d.) $\mu = (\mu(i) : i \in I)$ associated to P_I is a probability measure μ on I such that

$$\forall i \in I : \quad \mathbb{P}_{\mu}(\mathcal{X}_n = i \mid \tau_{\mathcal{E}} > n) = \mu(i).$$

By writing this equality for $n = 1$, one checks that the row vector μ^t is a strictly positive left eigenvector of P_I properly normalized (summing up-to 1), with eigenvalue $\gamma = \mathbb{P}_{\mu}(\tau_{\mathcal{E}} > 1) \in (0, 1)$, that is

$$\mu^t P_I = \gamma \mu^t \text{ with } \gamma = \sum_{i, j \in I} \mu(i) P(i, j) = \mathbb{P}_{\mu}(\tau_{\mathcal{E}} > 1). \quad (1)$$

It follows that $\mathbb{P}_{\mu}(\tau_{\mathcal{E}} > k) = \gamma^k$ for all $k \geq 0$. So, if μ is a q.s.d. then the survival time is Geometric($1 - \gamma$), see Lemma 2.2 in [7]. In the finite case there

is a unique q.s.d. (see [4]) and it corresponds to the normalized left Perron-Frobenius eigenvector and γ is the associated eigenvalue. The properties of q.s.d. depend on the killed trajectory $\mathcal{X}^{(k)} = (\mathcal{X}_n : 0 \leq n < \tau_{\mathcal{E}})$. In the infinite case q.s.d.'s can exist or not (because the positive left eigenvectors can be of infinite mass), and when they exist there can be several q.s.d. In the sequel we fix some q.s.d. μ which, as just discussed, exists in the finite case and in the infinite case one assumes its existence.

Let us give some independence properties between the time of killing and the absorption state. In Theorem 2.6 in [3] it was stated the independence relation $\mathbb{P}_{\mu}(\mathcal{X}_n = i, \tau_{\mathcal{E}} > n) = \mu(i)\gamma^n$ for all $i \in I$ and $n \geq 0$. Let us prove that when starting from μ then the pair $(\mathcal{X}_{\tau_{\mathcal{E}}-1}, \mathcal{X}_{\tau_{\mathcal{E}}})$ consisting in the last visited state before absorption and the absorption state, is independent of the random time $\tau_{\mathcal{E}}$. For $n \geq 1$, $i \in I$, $\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\mu}(\mathcal{X}_{\tau_{\mathcal{E}}-1} = i, \mathcal{X}_{\tau_{\mathcal{E}}} = \epsilon, \tau_{\mathcal{E}} = n) &= \mathbb{P}_{\mu}(\mathcal{X}_{n-1} = i, \mathcal{X}_n = \epsilon, \tau_{\mathcal{E}} = n) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_{\mu}(\mathcal{X}_n = \epsilon \mid \mathcal{X}_{n-1} = i) \mathbb{P}_{\mu}(\mathcal{X}_{n-1} = i, \tau_{\mathcal{E}} > n-1) \\ &= P(i, \epsilon) \mu(i) \mathbb{P}_{\mu}(\tau_{\mathcal{E}} > n-1) = P(i, \epsilon) \mu(i) \gamma^{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the independence relation follows. We can be more precise, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mu}(\mathcal{X}_{\tau_{\mathcal{E}}-1} = i, \mathcal{X}_{\tau_{\mathcal{E}}} = \epsilon) = P(i, \epsilon) \mu(i) \left(\sum_{l \geq 1} \gamma^{l-1} \right) = P(i, \epsilon) \mu(i) (1 - \gamma)^{-1}.$$

Since $\mathbb{P}_{\mu}(\tau_{\mathcal{E}} = n) = (1 - \gamma)\gamma^{n-1}$, then the desired relation holds

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mu}(\mathcal{X}_{\tau_{\mathcal{E}}-1} = i, \mathcal{X}_{\tau_{\mathcal{E}}} = \epsilon, \tau_{\mathcal{E}} = n) = \mathbb{P}_{\mu}(\mathcal{X}_{\tau_{\mathcal{E}}-1} = i, \mathcal{X}_{\tau_{\mathcal{E}}} = \epsilon) \mathbb{P}_{\mu}(\tau_{\mathcal{E}} = n).$$

The above computations also show that the exit law of I when starting from μ satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mu}(\mathcal{X}_{\tau_{\mathcal{E}}} = \epsilon) = (1 - \gamma)^{-1} \left(\sum_{i \in I} \mu(i) P(i, \epsilon) \right), \quad \mathbb{P}_{\mu}(\mathcal{X}_{\tau_{\mathcal{E}}} = \epsilon, \tau_{\mathcal{E}} = n) = \left(\sum_{i \in I} \mu(i) P(i, \epsilon) \right) \gamma^{n-1}. \quad (2)$$

These properties depend on the absorbed trajectory $\mathcal{X}^{(a)} = (\mathcal{X}_n : 0 \leq n \leq \tau_{\mathcal{E}})$.

3 Associated stationary chain

We are considering the matrix $P(a, b) = (P(a, b) : a, b \in I \cup \mathcal{E})$. Let $\rho = (\rho(a) : a \in I \cup \mathcal{E})$ be a probability vector. One defines the matrix $P^{\rho} = (P^{\rho}(a, b) : a, b \in I \cup \mathcal{E})$ by

$$P^{\rho}(i, b) = P(i, b) \text{ if } i \in I, b \in I \cup \mathcal{E}, \quad P^{\rho}(\epsilon, b) = \rho(b) \text{ if } \epsilon \in \mathcal{E}, b \in I \cup \mathcal{E}.$$

So, in P^ρ the ϵ -row is $P^\rho(\epsilon, \bullet) = \rho^t$ for all $\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}$.

Proposition 3.1. *Every q.s.d. μ of P_I determines a probability distribution $\pi = (\pi(a) : a \in I \cup \mathcal{E})$ given by*

$$\forall \epsilon \in \mathcal{E}, \pi(\epsilon) = \sum_{i \in I} \mu(i)P(i, \epsilon), \text{ and } \forall i \in I, \pi(i) = \gamma\mu(i). \quad (3)$$

which is a stationary distribution of the matrix $P^\pi = (P^\pi(a, b) : a, b \in I \cup \mathcal{E})$. In a reciprocal way, every distribution $\tilde{\pi}$ that satisfies $\tilde{\pi}^t = \tilde{\pi}^t P^\pi$ is defined by a q.s.d. μ as in (3). So, if P_I has a unique q.s.d. (as in the finite case) then there is a unique distribution π that satisfies $\pi^t = \pi^t P^\pi$.

Proof. The q.s.d. μ satisfies $\mu^t P_I = \gamma\mu^t$ with $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and $\sum_{i \in I} \mu(i) = 1$. The vector π is a probability distribution because from (3) and (1) one gets that $\pi(I) = \sum_{i \in I} \pi(i)$ and $\pi(\mathcal{E}) = \sum_{\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}} \pi(\epsilon)$ satisfy

$$\pi(I) = \sum_{i \in I} \mu(i)P(i, \epsilon) = \gamma \text{ and } \pi(\mathcal{E}) = \sum_{i \in I} \mu(i)P(i, \mathcal{E}) = 1 - \gamma. \quad (4)$$

Let us check that π is stationary for P^π . For $\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}$ and $j \in I$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\pi^t P^\pi)(\epsilon) &= \pi(\epsilon) \sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{E}} \pi(\delta) + \sum_{i \in I} \pi(i)P(i, \epsilon) = \pi(\epsilon)(1 - \gamma) + \gamma\pi(\epsilon) = \pi(\epsilon) \\ (\pi^t P^\pi)(j) &= \pi(j) \sum_{\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}} \pi(\epsilon) + \sum_{i \in I} \pi(i)P(i, j) = \pi(j)(1 - \gamma) + \gamma\pi(j) = \pi(j). \end{aligned}$$

Then $\pi^t = \pi^t P^\pi$ holds.

Now, we check that $\tilde{\pi}$ is a probability distribution that satisfies $\tilde{\pi}^t = \tilde{\pi}^t P^\pi$, then it is defined by a q.s.d. μ as in (3). For $j \in I$ one has,

$$\tilde{\pi}(j) = (\tilde{\pi}^t P^\pi)(j) = \tilde{\pi}(j) \sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{E}} \tilde{\pi}(\delta) + \sum_{i \in I} \tilde{\pi}(i)P(i, j).$$

and so $\tilde{\pi}(j)(1 - \sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{E}} \tilde{\pi}(\delta)) = \sum_{i \in I} \tilde{\pi}(i)P(i, j)$. Then, the restriction $\tilde{\pi}_I = (\tilde{\pi}(i) : i \in I)$ satisfies $\gamma\tilde{\pi}_I^t = \tilde{\pi}_I^t P_I$ for some γ . So, $\tilde{\pi}_I$ is an strictly positive left eigenvector with finite mass, then $\mu = \alpha^{-1}\tilde{\pi}_I$ is a q.s.d. when one takes $\alpha = \sum_{i \in I} \tilde{\pi}(i)$ and its eigenvalue is γ . So $\tilde{\pi}_I = \gamma\mu = (\pi(i) : i \in I)$ given by the second term in (3). On the other hand one gets

$$\tilde{\pi}(\epsilon) = (\tilde{\pi}^t P^\pi)(\epsilon) = \tilde{\pi}(\epsilon) \sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{E}} \tilde{\pi}(\delta) + \sum_{i \in I} \tilde{\pi}(i)P(i, \epsilon).$$

Then, $\tilde{\pi}(\epsilon)(1 - \sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{E}} \tilde{\pi}(\delta)) = \sum_{i \in I} \tilde{\pi}(i)P(i, \epsilon)$, so $\tilde{\pi}(\epsilon)\alpha = \alpha \sum_{i \in I} \mu(i)P(i, \epsilon)$ giving the equality $\tilde{\pi}(\epsilon) = \sum_{i \in I} \mu(i)P(i, \epsilon)$, so $\tilde{\pi} = \pi$ which finishes the proof. \square

Observe that (2) is written

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathcal{X}_{\tau_\mathcal{E}} = \epsilon) = \frac{\pi(\epsilon)}{\pi(\mathcal{E})} = \pi(\epsilon | \mathcal{E}) \text{ and } \mathbb{P}_\mu(\mathcal{X}_{\tau_\mathcal{E}} = \epsilon, \tau_\mathcal{E} = n) = \pi(\epsilon | \mathcal{E})(1-\gamma)\gamma^{n-1}.$$

We note by $\mathbb{X} = (X_n)$ the Markov chain evolving with the transition kernel P^π and call it the associated stationary chain. Since P^π extends P , by abuse of notation we also note it by P . All the concepts developed in the absorbed case depended only on the trajectory $\mathcal{X}^{(a)} = (\mathcal{X}_n : n \leq \tau_\mathcal{E})$ which is equally distributed as $(X_n : n \leq \tau_\mathcal{E})$ when starting from $X_0 = \mathcal{X}_0 \in I$. Hence, there is no confusion if one continues noting by \mathbb{P}_a the law of the chain \mathbb{X} starting from $a \in I \cup \mathcal{E}$ and by \mathbb{E}_a its associated mean expected value.

Since $\mathbb{X} = (X_n)$ has transition probability kernel P and stationary distribution π , its entropy is

$$\begin{aligned} h(\mathbb{X}) &= - \sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{E}} \pi(\delta) \sum_{a \in I \cup \mathcal{E}} \pi(a) \log \pi(a) - \sum_{i \in I} \pi(i) \sum_{b \in I \cup \mathcal{E}} P(i, b) \log P(i, b) \\ &= -\pi(\mathcal{E}) \sum_{i \in I} \pi(i) \log \pi(i) - \pi(\mathcal{E}) \sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{E}} \pi(\delta) \log \pi(\delta) \\ &\quad - \sum_{i, j \in I} \pi(i) P(i, j) \log P(i, j) - \sum_{i \in I, \delta \in \mathcal{E}} \pi(i) P(i, \delta) \log P(i, \delta). \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Further, we will compare this entropy to the entropies of some random sequences appearing in the chain.

4 Elements of the associated stationary chain

The object of this section is to show how one can retrieve the chain \mathbb{X} from the absorbed trajectories and some walks on the absorbing states. In this purpose, the behavior of chain \mathbb{X} is firstly decomposed along its visits to I and to \mathcal{E} in a separated way.

4.1 Decoupling the stationary chain

Let

$$\tau_I = \inf\{n \geq 1 : X_n \in I\}$$

be the first return time of \mathbb{X} to I . Now, consider the stochastic matrix $Q = (Q(i, j) : i, j \in I)$ given by

$$Q(i, j) = P_i(X_{\tau_I} = j).$$

By using that $\mathbb{P}_\epsilon(X_{\tau_I} = j) = \pi(j | I) = \mu(j)$ for all $\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}, j \in I$, one gets

$$\begin{aligned} Q(i, j) &= \mathbb{E}_i(\mathbf{1}_{\{X_{\tau_I}=j, \tau_I=1\}}) + \mathbb{E}_i(\mathbf{1}_{\{X_{\tau_I}=j, \tau_I>1\}}) \\ &= P(i, j) + \mathbb{P}_i(\tau_I > 1) \mathbb{P}_i(X_{\tau_I} = j | X_{\tau_I-1}, \tau_I > 1) \\ &= P(i, j) + P(i, \mathcal{E})\mu(j). \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Let $\mathbb{Y} = (Y_n : n \in \mathbb{Z})$ be a Markov chain with transition matrix Q . It is straightforwardly checked that μ is a stationary measure for \mathbb{Y} .

Remark 4.1. For a substochastic matrix P_I the matrix $Q = (Q(i, j) = P(i, j) + P(i, \mathcal{E})\mu(j) : i, j \in I)$ was defined in [8] and called the resurrected matrix from P_I with distribution μ . It was a key concept used in [8] to prove the existence of q.s.d. for geometrically absorbed Markov chains taking values in an infinite countable set. \square

The chain \mathbb{Y} can be constructed as follows. Let $\Xi = \{\xi_l : l \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ be the ordered sequence given by

$$\{\xi_l : l \in \mathbb{Z}\} = \{n \in \mathbb{Z} : X_n \in I\} \text{ with } \xi_{l-1} < \xi_l, \xi_{-1} < 0 \leq \xi_0.$$

Then, $(\xi_l - \xi_{l-1} : l \in \mathbb{Z})$ is a renewal stationary sequence with interarrival times distributed as $\mathbb{P}(\xi_l - \xi_{l-1} = \bullet) = \mathbb{P}_\mu(\tau_I = \bullet)$, $l \neq 0$. By definition $(X_{\xi_l} : l \in \mathbb{Z})$ is a stationary sequence distributed as $\mathbb{Y} = (Y_n : n \in \mathbb{Z})$, so $(X_{\xi_l} : l \in \mathbb{Z})$ is a copy of \mathbb{Y} .

The random sequence $\mathbf{b} = (b_l : l \in \mathbb{Z}, l \neq 0)$ defined by $b_l = 1$ if $\xi_l - \xi_{l-1} = 1$ and $b_l = 0$ if $\xi_l - \xi_{l-1} > 1$, is a collection of i.i.d. random variables, with

$$\mathbb{P}(b_l = 1) = \pi(I) \text{ and } \mathbb{P}(b_l = 0) = \sum_{i \in I} \mu(i) P(i, \mathcal{E}) = \pi(\mathcal{E}).$$

When $X_0 \in I$, one finds $\tau_{\mathcal{E}} = \inf\{l \geq 1 : b_l = 0\}$.

Remark 4.2. Every irreducible matrix stochastic matrix Q with stationary distribution μ can be written as in (6). In fact, let $\chi = (\chi(i) : i \in I)$ be a non-null vector, $\chi \neq \vec{0}$, that satisfies

$$\forall i \in I : \quad 0 \leq \chi(i) < 1 \text{ and } \chi(i) \leq \min\{Q(i, j)\mu(j)^{-1} : j \in I\}.$$

This can be achieved because μ is strictly positive. Define $P_I = Q - \chi\mu^t$, so

$$\forall i, j \in I : \quad P(i, j) = Q(i, j) - \chi(i)\mu(j). \tag{7}$$

To avoid trivial situation one can take χ also satisfying that for every $i \in I$ and for some (or for all) $j \in I$ for which $Q(i, j) > 0$ one has $P(i, j) >$

0. This allows to take χ ensuring P_I is irreducible. From the construction $P(i, j) \in [0, 1)$ and since $\chi \neq 0$ we get

$$\sum_{j \in I} P(i, j) = 1 - \chi(i) \in (0, 1] \text{ and } \sum_{i, j \in I} (1 - P(i, j)) > 0.$$

Hence P is strictly substochastic, it is not trivial, and when adding the cemetery ∂ one has $\chi(i) = P(i, \partial)$. So,

$$\mu^t P = \mu^t (Q - \chi \mu^t) = (1 - \sum_{i \in I} \mu(i) P(i, \partial)) \mu^t,$$

that is μ^t is the Perron-Frobenius left eigenvector of P with eigenvalue $\gamma = \sum_{i, j \in I} \mu(i) P(i, j)$, see (1). From (7) it follows $Q(i, j) = P(i, j) + P(i, \partial) \mu(j)$, so (6) is satisfied. \square

The restriction of $P = P^\pi$ to the absorption states \mathcal{E} satisfies,

$$\forall \epsilon, \delta \in \mathcal{E} : P(\epsilon, \delta) = \pi(\delta), \text{ so } \mathbb{P}(X_1 = \epsilon \mid X_0 = \delta, X_1 \in E) = \pi(\delta \mid \mathcal{E}).$$

The transition law to an absorbing point after being in $X_{t-1} = i \in I$, is given by

$$\forall \delta \in \mathcal{E} : \mathbb{P}(X_t = \delta \mid X_t \in \mathcal{E}, X_{t-1} = i) = P(i, \delta) / P(i, \mathcal{E}).$$

So, if $X_{-1} \in I$ and $X_0 \in \mathcal{E}$, the total sojourn time at \mathcal{E} is τ_I satisfies $\tau_I \sim \text{Geometric}(\gamma)$. Then, immediately after the entrance to \mathcal{E} the chain X makes a walk on \mathcal{E} of length $\tau_I - 1$ (quantity that could vanish). To describe it take $\mathbb{G} = (G_n : n \in \mathbb{Z})$ be a Bernoulli chain with probability vector $\pi(\bullet \mid \mathcal{E})$. Let us consider an independent time $V \sim \text{Geometric}(\gamma) - 1$ (that is $V + 1 \sim \text{Geometric}(\gamma)$) and define a finite sequence $V = (G_l : 1 \leq l < \tau_I)$ which is distributed as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(V = \emptyset) &= \mathbb{P}(\tau_I = 1) = \pi(I); \\ \mathbb{P}(V = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{k-1})) &= \mathbb{P}(G_1 = \delta_1, \dots, G_{k-1} = \delta_{k-1}, \tau_I = k) \\ &= \left(\prod_{l=1}^{k-1} \pi(\delta_l) / \pi(\mathcal{E}) \right) \pi(\mathcal{E})^{k-1} \pi(I) = \left(\prod_{l=1}^{k-1} \pi(\delta_l) \right) \pi(I) \\ &\quad \text{for } k \geq 2, (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{k-1}) \in \mathcal{E}^{k-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Notice that last equality also holds when $\tau_I = k = 1$ because an empty product satisfies $\prod_{l=1}^{k-1} 1 = 1$. One has,

$$(X_t, 1 \leq t < \tau_I \mid X_{-1} \in I, X_0 \in \mathcal{E}) \sim V,$$

and V is called a walk on \mathcal{E} . Note that $\tau_I - 1 \mid \tau_I > 1$ is equally distributed as τ_I . The exit law from \mathcal{E} is $\mathbb{P}(X_{\tau_I} \in \bullet) \sim \mu$. In fact, for all $\delta \in E$ it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\delta(X_{\tau_I} = i) &= \sum_{\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}} \mathbb{P}_\delta(X_{\tau_I} = i, (X_{\tau_I-1} = \epsilon)) = \sum_{\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}} \mathbb{P}_\delta(X_{\tau_I-1} = \epsilon) \frac{P_\epsilon(X_1 = i)}{P_\epsilon(X_1 \in I)} \\ &= \pi(i \mid I) = \mu(i). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that

$$\forall \delta \in \mathcal{E} : \quad \mathbb{E}_\delta(\tau_I) = \pi(I)^{-1}. \quad (9)$$

We consider a sequence of i.i.d. random variables $\mathcal{T} = (\mathcal{T}_n : n \in \mathbb{Z})$ which are $\text{Geometric}(\gamma) - 1$ distributed, that is $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}_n = l) = \gamma(1-\gamma)^l$ for $l \geq 0$. The construction of i.i.d. walks on \mathcal{E} is made as follows. One takes an increasing sequence of times $(t_n : n \in \mathbb{Z})$ with $t_{n+1} - t_n = \mathcal{T}_n$ and such that $t_n \rightarrow \infty$ if $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $t_n \rightarrow -\infty$ if $n \rightarrow -\infty$. One defines

$$V^n = (G_{t_n}, \dots, G_{t_{n+1}-1}) = (V_1^n, \dots, V_{\mathcal{T}_n}^n).$$

So, $\mathbb{V} = (V^n : n \geq \mathbb{Z})$ is an i.i.d. sequence of walks on \mathcal{E} . The walk V^n is empty when $\mathcal{T}_n = 0$.

4.2 Retrieving the stationary chain

Let $\mathbb{Y} = (Y_n : n \in \mathbb{Z})$ be a stationary Markov chain with transition matrix Q . Our purpose is to construct a copy of \mathbb{X} from \mathbb{Y} by adding a series of random operations.

Let \mathbb{P} be a probability measure governing the law of \mathbb{Y} when it starts from the stationary distribution μ , the sequences \mathbb{G} , \mathcal{T} and so \mathbb{V} , and also the random element $\mathbb{B}^{I,I}$ and \mathbb{D}^I defined below.

Let $\mathbb{B}^{I,I} = ((B_l^{i,j} : l \in \mathbb{Z}); i, j \in I)$ be an independent array of Bernoulli random variables such that $B_l^{i,j} \sim B^{i,j}$ for $l \in \mathbb{Z}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(B^{i,j} = 1) &= \theta_{i,j}, \quad \mathbb{P}(B^{i,j} = 0) = \bar{\theta}_{i,j} = 1 - \theta_{i,j} \text{ with} \\ \theta_{i,j} &= \frac{P(i,j)}{P(i,j) + P(i,\mathcal{E})\mu(j)} = \frac{P(i,j)}{Q(i,j)}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Let

$$\tau_\partial = \inf\{l \geq 1 : B_l^{Y_{l-1}, Y_l} = 0\}. \quad (11)$$

For $k \geq 1$, $i_0, \dots, i_{k-1} \in I$ one has,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(Y_0 = i_0, Y_1 = i_1, \dots, Y_{k-1} = i_{k-1}, \tau_\partial = k) \\ = \mu(i_0) \left(\prod_{l=1}^{k-1} P(i_{l-1}, i_l) \right) \left(\sum_{j \in I} P(i_{k-1}, \mathcal{E}) \mu(j) \right) = \mu(i_0) \left(\prod_{l=1}^{k-1} P(i_{l-1}, i_l) \right) P(i_{k-1}, \mathcal{E}). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Hence, the distribution of the sequence $Y^{(k)} = (Y_l : 0 \leq l < \partial)$ is the one of the killed chain $\mathcal{X}^{(k)}$ starting from μ .

Now take an independent array $\mathbb{D}^I = ((D_l^i : l \in \mathbb{Z}); i \in I)$ of random variables with values in \mathcal{E} and law

$$\forall \delta \in \mathcal{E} : \quad \mathbb{P}(D_l^i = \delta) = P(i, \delta)/P(i, \mathcal{E}). \quad (13)$$

For $k \geq 1$, $i_0, \dots, i_{k-1} \in I$, $\delta \in \mathcal{E}$ we set,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(Y_0 = i_0, Y_1 = i_1, \dots, Y_{k-1} = i_{k-1}, D_k^{i_{k-1}} = \delta, \tau_\partial = k) \\ &= \mu(i_0) \left(\prod_{l=1}^{k-1} P(i_{l-1}, i_l) \right) P(i_{k-1}, \mathcal{E}) (P(i_{k-1}, \delta)/P(i_{k-1}, \mathcal{E})) \\ &= \mu(i_0) \left(\prod_{l=1}^{k-1} P(i_{l-1}, i_l) \right) P(i_{k-1}, \delta). \end{aligned}$$

Then, the distribution of the sequence $Y^{(a)} = (Y_0, \dots, Y_{\tau_\partial-1}, D_{\tau_\partial}^{Y_{\tau_\partial-1}})$ is the one of a the absorbed chain $\mathcal{X}^{(a)}$ starting from μ .

Let us construct a chain $\mathbb{S}^s = (\mathbb{S}_t^s : t \in \mathbb{Z})$ from \mathbb{Y} , $\mathbb{B}^{I,I}$, \mathbb{D}^Y , \mathbb{G} and \mathcal{T} (and so also \mathbb{V}), having the same distribution as \mathbb{X} . Firstly, define a random sequence $\mathbb{S} = (\mathbb{S}_t : t \in \mathbb{Z})$ as follows. We set $T_0 = 0$, $\mathbb{S}_0 = Y_0$ and,

I. In a sequential way on $n \geq 0$, one makes the following construction. Assume at step n , T_n has been defined then one puts $\mathbb{S}_{T_n} = Y_n$ and goes to step $n + 1$;

I.a. If $B_{n+1}^{Y_n, Y_{n+1}} = 1$ put $T_{n+1} = T_n + 1$, $\mathbb{S}_{T_{n+1}} = Y_{n+1}$ and go to step $n + 2$;

I.b. If $B_{n+1}^{Y_n, Y_{n+1}} = 0$ put $T_{n+1} = T_n + \mathcal{T}_n + 2$, define $\mathbb{S}_{T_{n+1}} = D_{n+1}^{Y_n}$, $\mathbb{S}_{T_{n+1}+l} = V_l^n$ for $1 \leq l < \mathcal{T}_n$ (it is empty when $\mathcal{T}_n = 0$) and $\mathbb{S}_{T_{n+1}} = Y_{n+1}$. After one continues with step $n + 2$.

II. Similarly, in a sequential way on $n < 0$ one makes the following construction for step n ;

IIa. If $B_{n+1}^{Y_n, Y_{n+1}} = 1$ put $T_n = T_{n+1} - 1$, $\mathbb{S}_{T_n} = Y_n$ and continue with step $n - 1$;

IIb. If $B_{n+1}^{Y_n, Y_{n+1}} = 0$ put $T_n = T_{n+1} - (\mathcal{T}_n + 2)$, $\mathbb{S}_{T_{n+1}} = D_{n+1}^{Y_n}$, $\mathbb{S}_{T_{n+1}+l} = V_l^n$ for $1 \leq l < \mathcal{T}_n$ and $\mathbb{S}_{T_n} = Y_n$. After one continues with step $n - 1$.

Let $\mathbb{S} = (\mathbb{S}_t : t \in \mathbb{Z})$ be the random sequence resulting from this construction.

Let $\mathbb{T} = (T_n : n \in \mathbb{Z})$, recall that $T_0 = 0$. By abuse of notation we also note by $\mathbb{T} = \{T_n : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ the set of these values. By definition $\mathbb{T} =$

$\{t \in \mathbb{Z} : \mathbb{S}_t \in I\}$ is the set of random points where \mathbb{S} is in I . We have that (\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}) is a regenerative process, see [2] p. 169-170, that is for all T_n one has that $(\mathbb{S}_{\bullet+T_l} : \bullet \geq 0; T_n - T_l, n \geq l)$ has the same distribution as $(\mathbb{S}_{\bullet} : \bullet \geq 0; T_n, n \geq 0)$ and it is independent of $(T_n : n \leq l)$.

We have that a cycle of this regenerative process is the sequence of states $(\mathbb{S}_0, \dots, \mathbb{S}_{T_l-1})$, in fact this is the common distribution for $(\mathbb{S}_{T_n}, \dots, \mathbb{S}_{T_{n+1}-1})$. By shifting the process $\mathbb{S}^s = (\mathbb{S}_t^s : t \in \mathbb{Z})$ in a random time chosen uniformly in $\{T_0, \dots, T_1-1\}$, one gets a stationary process $\mathbb{S}^s = (\mathbb{S}_t^s : t \in \mathbb{Z})$ (see Theorem 6.4 in [2]).

Proposition 4.3. *The processes \mathbb{S}^s and \mathbb{X} are equally distributed.*

The proof is done in the Appendix.

So, if $\mathbb{S}_0^s \in I$, for $\tau_{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathbb{S}^s} = \inf\{l \geq 1 : B_l^{\mathbb{S}_{l-1}^s, \mathbb{S}_l^s} = 0\}$ one has that $(\mathbb{S}^s)^{(a)} = (\mathbb{S}_n^s : n \leq \tau_{\mathcal{E}}^{\mathbb{S}^s})$ is a copy of the absorbed chain, see (11) and (12).

5 Stationary representation of killed and absorbed chains

The stationary Markov chain $\mathbb{Y} = (Y_n)$ with transition matrix Q and stationary distribution μ has entropy

$$h(\mathbb{Y}) = - \sum_{i \in I} \mu(i) \sum_{j \in I} Q(i, j) \log Q(i, j). \quad (14)$$

For the stationary representation of the killed and absorbed chains we use the 2-stringing form of \mathbb{Y} . Let us recall this notion. Consider the stochastic matrix $Q^{[2]}$ with set of indexes I^2 given by,

$$Q^{[2]}((i, j), (l, k)) = Q(j, l) \mathbf{1}(j = l).$$

Its stationary distribution satisfies $\nu((i, j)) = \mu(i)Q(i, j)$ for $(i, j) \in I^2$. In fact, by using $\sum_{i \in I} \mu(i)Q(i, j) = \mu(j)$ one gets

$$\sum_{(i, j) \in I^2} \nu((i, j)) Q^{[2]}((i, j), (l, k)) = \sum_{i \in I} \mu(i) Q(i, l) Q(l, k) = \mu(l) Q(l, k) = \nu((l, k)).$$

The stationary chain $\mathbb{Y}^{[2]} = ((Y_n^1, Y_n^2) : Y_{n-1}^2 = Y_n^1, n \in \mathbb{Z})$ evolving with $Q^{[2]}$ is the 2-stringing of \mathbb{Y} . We write it by $\mathbb{Y}^{[2]} = ((Y_{n-1}, Y_n) : n \in \mathbb{Z})$. It is well-known that it is conjugated to \mathbb{Y} by the (1-coordinate) mapping

$$\Upsilon(((Y_{n-1}, Y_n) : n \in \mathbb{Z})) = (Y_n : n \in \mathbb{Z}).$$

(This is stated in a general form in Lemma 1 in [9]). Let us check it is measure preserving. Take $(i_l : l = 0, \dots, k) \in I^{k+1}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}((Y_{n-1}, Y_n) \in \mathbb{Y}^{[2]} : (Y_{l-1}, Y_l) = (i_{l-1}, i_l) : l = 1, \dots, k) \\ &= \mu(i_0)Q(i_0, i_1) \prod_{l=1}^{k-1} Q(i_l, i_{l+1}) = \mathbb{P}(Y_l = i_l : l=0, \dots, k). \end{aligned}$$

So, the orbits $((Y_{n-1}, Y_n) : n \in \mathbb{Z}) \in \mathbb{Y}^{[2]}$ can be identified with the orbits $(Y_n : n \in \mathbb{Z}) \in \mathbb{Y}$.

5.1 The killed chain

The stationary representation of the killed chain is a stationary Markov chain with set of states $I^2 \times \{0, 1\} = \{(i, j, a) : (i, j) \in I^2, a \in \{0, 1\}\}$. To introduce its transition matrix \mathcal{K} define,

$$\varphi(i, j, a) = (\theta_{i,j}\mathbf{1}(a=1) + \bar{\theta}_{i,j}\mathbf{1}(a=0)), \quad (i, j, a) \in I^2 \times \{0, 1\}.$$

The matrix $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{K}((i, j, a), (l, k, b)) : (i, j, a), (l, k, b) \in I^2 \times \{0, 1\})$ is given by

$$\mathcal{K}((i, j, a), (l, k, b)) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } l \neq j; \\ Q(j, k)\varphi(j, k, b) = P(j, k)\mathbf{1}(b=1) + P(j, \mathcal{E})\mu(k)\mathbf{1}(b=0) & \text{if } l = j. \end{cases}$$

It is a stochastic matrix: We claim its stationary distribution $\zeta = (\zeta(i, j, a) : (i, j, a) \in I^2 \times \{0, 1\})$ is given by

$$\zeta(i, j, a) = \mu(i)Q(i, j)\varphi(i, j, a) = \mu(i)P(i, j)\mathbf{1}(a=1) + \mu(i)P(i, \mathcal{E})\mu(j)\mathbf{1}(a=0). \quad (15)$$

By using $\sum_{i \in I} \mu(i)Q(i, l) = \mu(l)$ one gets the desired property,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{(i,j,a) \in I^2 \times \{0,1\}} \zeta(i, j, a)\mathcal{K}((i, j, a), (l, k, b)) = \left(\sum_{i \in I} \mu(i)Q(i, l) \right) Q(l, k)\varphi(l, k, b) \\ &= \mu(l)Q(l, k)\varphi(l, k, b) = \zeta(l, k, b), \end{aligned}$$

so the claim follows.

The killed Markov chain presented in its stationary form is noted $\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})} = ((Y_{n-1}, Y_n, B_n) : n \in \mathbb{Z})$, it takes values in $I^2 \times \{0, 1\}$ and has transition matrix \mathcal{K} . Below the component B_n is called the label at n . By hypothesis P_I is irreducible so also \mathcal{K} is an irreducible matrix. Then the Markov shift $\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})}$ is ergodic (see Proposition 8.12 in [5]).

It is straightforward to check that the mapping,

$$\Upsilon^{(\mathcal{K})} : \mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})} \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}, (((Y_{n-1}, Y_n, B_n) : n \in \mathbb{Z})) \rightarrow (Y_n : n \in \mathbb{Z}), \quad (16)$$

is a measure preserving factor.

The orbit $((Y_{n-1}, Y_n, B_n) : n \in \mathbb{Z})$ in $\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})}$ is noted in the simpler form $((Y_n, B_n) : n \in \mathbb{Z})$.

Remark 5.1. Let us see $\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})}$ models the killed Markov chain. Let $\mathcal{N} = \{n \in \mathbb{Z} : B_n = 0\}$ and write it as $\mathcal{N} = \{n_l : l \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ with n_l increasing in l and $n_{-1} < 0 \leq n_0$. Note that $\mathbb{P}(0 \in \mathcal{N}) = \pi(\mathcal{E})$.

We divide an orbit in $\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})}$ into the disjoint connected pieces

$$(Y, B)_l^{(k)} = ((Y_{n_l}, 1), \dots, (Y_{n_{l+1}-2}, 1), (Y_{n_{l+1}-1}, 0)), \quad l \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

The component Y_{n_l} is distributed with law μ for all l , and one can identify $(Y, B)_l^{(k)}$ with $Y_l^{(k)} = (Y_{n_l}, \dots, Y_{n_{l+1}-1})$ a piece of the orbit $Y = (Y_n : n \in \mathbb{Z})$ starting from μ at n_l and killed at $n_{l+1} - 1$. One gets,

$$\forall l \neq 0 : \quad Y_l^{(k)} \sim \mathcal{X}^{(k)}.$$

when $\mathcal{X}^{(k)}$ starts from μ . In fact, for $s \geq 0$, $i_0, \dots, i_s \in I$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X}^{(k)} = (i_0, \dots, i_s)) &= \mu(i_0) \prod_{r=0}^{s-1} P(i_r, i_{r+1}) P(i_s, \partial) \\ &= \mu(i_0) \left(\prod_{r=0}^{s-1} Q(i_r, i_{r+1}) \theta_{i_r, i_{r+1}} \right) \left(\sum_{m \in I} Q(i_s, m) \bar{\theta}_{i_s, m} \right) = \mathbb{P}(Y_l^{(k)} = (i_0, \dots, i_s)). \end{aligned}$$

Let $s \geq 0$, $(i_0, \dots, i_s) \in I^{s+1}$. For almost all the orbits $Y \in \mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})}$ and for all $l \in \mathbb{Z}$, $l \neq 0$, one has

$$\mathbb{P}(n_0 = 0, Y_0^{(k)} = (i_0, \dots, i_s)) = \pi(\mathcal{E}) \mu(i_0) \prod_{r=0}^{s-1} P(i_r, i_{r+1}) P(i_s, \partial) > 0.$$

Since each killed trajectory is finite, the class of killed trajectories is countable. Therefore, from the Ergodic Theorem and since $\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})}$ is ergodic, we get that \mathbb{P} -a.e. the orbits of $\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})}$ contain all the killed trajectories of the chain. \square

The entropy of the killed chain is

$$\begin{aligned} h(\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})}) &= - \sum_{(i,j) \in I^2} \mu(i) Q(i, j) \sum_{k \in I} Q(j, k) (\theta_{j,k} \log(Q(j, k) \theta_{j,k}) + \bar{\theta}_{j,k} \log(Q(j, k) \bar{\theta}_{j,k})) \\ &= - \sum_{(j,k) \in I^2} \mu(j) Q(j, k) \log Q(j, k) - \sum_{(j,k) \in I^2} \mu(j) Q(j, k) H(B^{j,k}) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$H(B^{j,k}) = \theta_{j,k} \log \theta_{j,k} + \bar{\theta}_{j,k} \log \bar{\theta}_{j,k}$$

is the entropy of the Bernoulli random variable $B^{j,k}$. Hence

$$h(\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})}) = h(\mathbb{Y}) + \Delta(B) \text{ with } \Delta(B) = - \sum_{(j,k) \in I^2} \mu(j) Q(j,k) H(B^{j,k}). \quad (17)$$

The quantity $\Delta(B) = h(\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})}) - h(\mathbb{Y})$ is the conditional entropy of $\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})}$ given the factor \mathbb{Y} , see Lemma 2 and Definition 3 in [6]. To be more precise, given an orbit $Y = (Y_n : n \in \mathbb{Z})$ of \mathbb{Y} , the fiber given by (16) satisfies $(\Upsilon^{(\mathcal{K})})^{-1}\{Y\} = \{(B_n^{Y_{n-1}, Y_n} : n \in \mathbb{Z}) \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}\}$, and it is distributed as a sequence of independent Bernoulli variables given by (10), we note it by \mathbf{P}_Y . We have

$$H_{\mathbf{P}_Y}(B_1^{Y_0, Y_1}) = -(\theta_{Y_0, Y_1} \log \theta_{Y_0, Y_1} + \bar{\theta}_{Y_0, Y_1} \log \bar{\theta}_{Y_0, Y_1}). \quad (18)$$

Let us summarize the results on the entropy of $\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})}$.

Proposition 5.2. *The entropy of the stationary representation $\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})}$ of the killed chain satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} h(\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})}) &= h(\mathbb{Y}) + \Delta(B) \text{ with} \\ \Delta(B) &= \int H_{\mathbf{P}_Y}(B_1^{Y_0, Y_1}) d\mathbb{P}(Y) = - \sum_{(i,j) \in I^2} \mu(i) Q(i,j) H(B^{i,j}); \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} h(\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})}) &= - \sum_{i \in I} \mu(i) P(i, \mathcal{E}) \log P(i, \mathcal{E}) - (1 - \gamma) \sum_{j \in I} \mu(j) \log \mu(j) \\ &\quad - \sum_{i,j \in I} \mu(i) P(i,j) \log P(i,j). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Proof. From (17) and (18), and by using the Markov property, ones retrieves the Abramov-Rokhlin formula, see [1] and [6],

$$\Delta(B) = h(\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})}) - h(\mathbb{Y}) = \int H_{\mathbf{P}_Y}(B_1^{Y_0, Y_1}) d\mathbb{P}(Y) = \sum_{i,j \in I} \mu(i) Q(i,j) H(B^{i,j}).$$

This gives (19). The only thing left to prove is (20). By using

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{E}} \mu(i) P(i, \mathcal{E}) = 1 - \gamma, \quad \sum_{j \in I} P(i, j) = 1 - P(i, \mathcal{E}), \quad \sum_{i \in I} \mu(i) P(i, j) = \gamma \mu(j),$$

and (14) one gets,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta(B) &= - \sum_{i,j \in I} \mu(i) (P(i, \mathcal{E})\mu(j) \log(P(i, \mathcal{E})\mu(j)) + P(i, j) \log P(i, j)) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i,j \in I} \mu(i) Q(i, j) \log Q(i, j) \\
&= - \sum_{i \in I} \mu(i) P(i, \mathcal{E}) \log P(i, \mathcal{E}) - (1 - \gamma) \sum_{j \in I} \mu(j) \log \mu(j) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i,j \in I} \mu(i) P(i, j) \log P(i, j) - h(\mathbb{Y}).
\end{aligned}$$

This shows (20). \square

Remark 5.3. From (15) we get that there are in mean $\sum_{i \in I} \mu(i) P(i, j) = \gamma$ sites in \mathbb{Z} where $\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})}$ makes a transition with label 0, and a mean $\sum_{i \in I} \mu(i) P(i, \mathcal{E}) = 1 - \gamma$ of sites in \mathbb{Z} where $\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})}$ makes a transition with label 1. \square

5.2 The absorbed chain

Let us construct a stationary representation of the absorbed chain in a similar way as we did for the killed chain. Define $\mathcal{E}^* = \mathcal{E} \cup \{o\}$ with $o \notin \mathcal{E} \cup I$. The absorbed chain will take values on the set of states $I^2 \times \mathcal{E}^* = \{(i, j, \delta) : i \in I, j \in I, \delta \in \mathcal{E}^*\}$. The matrix $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}((i, j, \delta), (l, k, \epsilon)) : (i, j, \delta), (l, k, \epsilon)) \in I^2 \times \mathcal{E}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{A}((i, j, \delta), (l, k, \epsilon)) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } l \neq j; \\ Q(j, k) \theta_{j,k} = P(j, k) & \text{if } l = j, \epsilon = o; \\ Q(j, k) \bar{\theta}_{j,k} P(j, \epsilon) / P(j, \mathcal{E}) = P(j, \epsilon) \mu(k) & \text{if } l = j, \epsilon \in \mathcal{E}; \end{cases}$$

is an stochastic matrix whose stationary distribution $\eta = (\eta(i, j, \delta) : (i, j, r) \in I^2 \times \mathcal{E}^*)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta(i, j, \delta) &= \mu(i) Q(i, j) (\theta_{i,j} \mathbf{1}(\delta = o) + \bar{\theta}_{i,j} P(i, \delta) / P(i, \mathcal{E}) \mathbf{1}(\delta \in \mathcal{E})) \\
&= \mu(i) P(i, j) \mathbf{1}(\delta = o) + \mu(i) P(i, \delta) \mu(j) \mathbf{1}(\delta \in \mathcal{E}).
\end{aligned}$$

In fact, since $\sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{E}^*} (\theta_{i,l} \mathbf{1}(\delta = o) + \bar{\theta}_{i,l} P(i, \delta) / P(i, \mathcal{E}) \mathbf{1}(\delta \in \mathcal{E})) = 1$ one gets the stationarity property,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{(i,j,\delta) \in I^2 \times \mathcal{E}^*} \eta(i, j, \delta) \mathcal{A}((i, j, \delta), (l, k, \epsilon)) \\
&= \left(\sum_{i \in I} \mu(i) Q(i, l) \right) Q(l, k) (\theta_{l,k} \mathbf{1}(\epsilon = o) + \bar{\theta}_{l,k} P(l, \epsilon) / P(l, \mathcal{E}) \mathbf{1}(\epsilon \in \mathcal{E})) \\
&= \mu(l) Q(l, k) (\theta_{l,k} \mathbf{1}(\epsilon = o) + \bar{\theta}_{l,k} P(l, \epsilon) / P(l, \mathcal{E}) \mathbf{1}(\epsilon \in \mathcal{E})) = \eta(l, k, \epsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

We note by $\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{A})} = ((Y_{n-1}, Y_n, D_n^*) : n \in \mathbb{Z})$ the absorbed Markov chain presented in its stationary form, and taking values in $I^2 \times \mathcal{E}^*$ with transition matrix \mathcal{A} . Since \mathcal{A} is irreducible the Markov shift $\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{A})}$ is ergodic.

It is straightforward to check that the mapping

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon^{(\mathcal{A})} : \mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{A})} &\rightarrow \mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})}, ((Y_{n-1}, Y_n, D_n^*) : n \in \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow (Y_{n-1}, Y_n, B_n) : n \in \mathbb{Z} \\ \text{with } B_n &= \mathbf{1}(D_n^* = o), \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

is a measure preserving factor between $\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{A})}$ and $\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})}$.

The orbit $((Y_{n-1}, Y_n, D_n^*) : n \in \mathbb{Z})$ in $\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{A})}$ can be written by $((Y_n, D_n^*) : n \in \mathbb{Z})$.

Remark 5.4. *Let us see the stationary chain $\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{A})}$ models the absorbed Markov chain. First note $\mathcal{N}^* = \{n \in \mathbb{Z} : D_n^* \in \mathcal{E}\}$ and write it by $\mathcal{N}^* = \{n_l : l \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ with n_l is increasing in l and $n_{-1} < 0 \leq n_0$. We have $\mathbb{P}(0 \in \mathcal{N}^*) = \pi(\mathcal{E})$.*

Similarly as we proceed in Remark 5.1, an orbit $((Y_n, D_n^) : n \in \mathbb{Z}) \in \mathbb{Y}^{\mathcal{A}}$ is partitioned into the disjoint connected pieces*

$$(Y, D^*)_l^{(a)} = ((Y_{n_l}, o), \dots, (Y_{n_{l+1}-2}, o), (Y_{n_{l+1}-1}, D_{n_{l+1}-1}^*)) \text{ with } l \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

The component Y_{n_l} is distributed with law μ for all l , and one can identify $(Y, D^)_l^{(a)}$ with $Y_l^{(a)} = (Y_{n_l}, \dots, Y_{n_{l+1}-2}, D_{n_{l+1}-1}^*)$ starting from μ . Since the events $\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : D_n^* \in \mathcal{E}\}$ has the same distribution as $\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : B_n = 0\}$ in $\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})}$, one checks that*

$$\forall l \neq 0 : Y_l^{(a)} \sim \mathcal{X}^{(a)},$$

where $\mathcal{X}^{(a)}$ starts from μ . In fact, for $s \geq 0$, $i_0, \dots, i_s \in I$, $\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}$, one has,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X}^{(a)} = (i_0, \dots, i_s, \epsilon)) = \mu(i_0) \left(\prod_{r=0}^{s-1} P(i_r, i_{r+1}) \right) P(i_s, \epsilon) = \mathbb{P}(Y_l^{(a)} = (i_0, \dots, i_s, \epsilon)).$$

Let $s \geq 0$, $(i_0, \dots, i_s) \in I^{s+1}$, $\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}$. For almost all the orbits $Y \in \mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{A})}$ and for all $l \in \mathbb{Z}$, $l \neq 0$, one has

$$\mathbb{P}(0 \in \mathcal{N}^*, Y_l^{(a)} = (i_0, \dots, i_l, \epsilon)) = \mu(i_0) \prod_{r=0}^l P(i_r, i_{r+1}) P(i_l, \epsilon) > 0.$$

Since each absorbed trajectory is finite, the class of absorbed trajectories is countable. Then, from the Ergodic Theorem and since $\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{A})}$ is ergodic we get that \mathbb{P} -a.e. the orbits of $\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{A})}$ contain all the absorbed trajectories of the chain. \square

The entropy of the absorbed chain is

$$\begin{aligned}
& h(\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{A})}) \\
&= - \sum_{(i,j) \in I^2} \mu(i) Q(i,j) \sum_{k \in I} Q(j,k) \theta_{j,k} \log(Q(j,k) \theta_{j,k}) \\
&\quad - \sum_{(i,j) \in I^2} \mu(i) Q(i,j) \sum_{k \in I, \epsilon \in \mathcal{E}} Q(j,k) \bar{\theta}_{j,k} P(j,\epsilon)/P(j,\mathcal{E}) \log(Q(j,k) \bar{\theta}_{j,k} P(j,\epsilon)/P(j,\mathcal{E})) \\
&= - \sum_{(j,k) \in I^2} \mu(j) Q(j,k) \log Q(j,k) - \sum_{j \in I} \mu(j) Q(j,k) (\theta_{j,k} \log \theta_{j,k} + \bar{\theta}_{j,k} \log \bar{\theta}_{j,k}) \\
&\quad - \sum_{(j,k) \in I^2} \mu(j) Q(j,k) \bar{\theta}_{j,k} \sum_{\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}} P(j,\epsilon)/P(j,\mathcal{E}) \log(P(j,\epsilon)/P(j,\mathcal{E})).
\end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
h(\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{A})}) &= h(\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})}) + \sum_{i \in I} \mu(i) P(i, \mathcal{E}) H(D^i), \text{ where} \\
H(D^i) &= - \sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{E}} P(i, \delta)/P(i, \mathcal{E}) \log(P(i, \delta)/P(i, \mathcal{E})) \quad (22)
\end{aligned}$$

is the entropy of a random variable in \mathcal{E} distributed as the transition probability from $i \in I$ to an state conditioned to be in \mathcal{E} . Note that the above expression can be also written

$$h(\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{A})}) = h(\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})}) + \sum_{i \in I} \mu(i) (P(i, \mathcal{E}) H(D^i) + P(i, \mathcal{I}) H(o)),$$

being $H(o) = 0$ the entropy of a constant.

Define

$$\Delta(D) = h(\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{A})}) - h(\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})}) = \sum_{i \in I} \mu(i) P(i, \mathcal{E}) H(D^i).$$

This is the conditional entropy of $\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{A})}$ given the factor $\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})}$. Let $Y^{(\mathcal{K})} = ((Y_{n-1}, Y_n, B_n) : n \in \mathbb{Z})$ be an orbit of $\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})}$. The fiber given by (21) satisfies $(\Upsilon^{(\mathcal{A})})^{-1}\{Y^{(\mathcal{K})}\} = \{(D_n^{Y_n, B_n} : n \in \mathbb{Z}) \in (\mathcal{E}^*)^{\mathbb{Z}}\}$ with $D_n^{Y_n, B_n} \in \mathcal{E}$ when $B_n = 0$ and $D_n^{Y_n, B_n} = o$ when $B_n = 1$. These variables are independent distributed as a Bernoulli $D_n^{Y_n}$ given in (13) if $B_n = 0$ and the constant variable o if $B_n = 1$. This probability measure is noted by $\mathbf{P}_{Y^{(\mathcal{K})}}$. Thus,

$$H_{\mathbf{P}_{Y^{(\mathcal{K})}}}(D_0^{Y_0, B_0}) = \begin{cases} - \sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{E}} P(Y_0, \delta)/P(Y_0, \mathcal{E}) \log(P(Y_0, \delta)/P(Y_0, \mathcal{E})) & \text{if } B_0 = 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } B_0 = 1. \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

Proposition 5.5. *The entropy of the stationary representation $\mathbb{Y}^{\mathcal{A}}$ of the absorbed chain satisfies*

$$h(\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{A})}) = h(\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{K})}) + \Delta(D) \text{ with}$$

$$\Delta(D) = \int H_{\mathbf{P}_Y}(D_0^{Y_0, B_0}) d\mathbb{P}(Y^{(\mathcal{K})}) = - \sum_{i \in I} \mu(i) P(i, \mathcal{E}) H(D^i);$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} h(\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{A})}) &= -(1 - \gamma) \sum_{j \in I} \mu(j) \log \mu(j) - \sum_{i, j \in I} \mu(i) P(i, j) \log P(i, j) \\ &\quad - \sum_{i \in I, \delta \in \mathcal{E}} \mu(i) P(i, \delta) \log P(i, \delta). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Proof. From (22) and (23) and by using the Markov property one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(D) &= \int H_{\mathbf{P}_{Y^{(\mathcal{A})}}}(D_0^{Y_0, B_0}) d\mathbb{P}(Y^{(\mathcal{K})}) \\ &= - \sum_{i \in I} \mu(i) P(i, \mathcal{E}) \sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{E}} P(i, \delta) / P(i, \mathcal{E}) \log(P(i, \delta) / P(i, \mathcal{E})) \\ &= - \sum_{i \in I, \delta \in \mathcal{E}} \mu(i) P(i, \delta) \log P(i, \delta) + \sum_{i \in I} \mu(i) P(i, \mathcal{E}) \log P(i, \mathcal{E}). \end{aligned}$$

Now, one uses (20) to get expression (24). \square

Remark 5.6. *Let $\mathcal{X}^{(a)}$ be a trajectory of an absorbed chain, starting from distribution μ in I and finishing after it hits \mathcal{E} . It has length $\tau_{\mathcal{E}}$ and it corresponds to an absorbed trajectory of length $\tau_{\mathcal{E}} - 1$ in the chain $\mathbb{Y}^{\mathcal{A}}$ with alphabet $I^2 \times \mathcal{E}^*$. In fact if $\mathcal{X}^{(a)} = (X_1, \dots, X_l, \epsilon)$ with $X_1, \dots, X_l \in I$, $\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}$, is an absorbed trajectory of length $l + 1$, then the associated trajectory in $\mathbb{Y}^{\mathcal{A}}$ is given by the trajectories $Y^{(a)} = ((X_r, X_{r+1}, o), r = 1, \dots, l - 1; (X_l, j^*, \epsilon))$ of length l . Here $j^* \in I$ is an element chosen with distribution μ and it is the starting state of the next absorbed trajectory. \square*

5.3 Entropy balance

The associated stationary chain \mathbb{X} with transition kernel $P = P^\pi$ is retrieved from the stationary chain \mathbb{Y} with transition kernel Q , a collection of Bernoulli variables $\mathbb{B}^{I, I}$ that assign 0 or 1 between the connections of \mathbb{Y} , a set of Bernoulli variables \mathbb{D}^I giving the transition from I to \mathcal{E} , and a family of walks \mathbb{V} whose components are Bernoulli variables (G_n) distributed as $\pi(\bullet | \mathcal{E})$. The

length of these walks is $\text{Geometric}(\gamma) - 1$ distributed, and so they could be empty.

It is straightforward to check the following equality, relating $h(\mathbb{X})$ given by (5) to the entropies of the elements forming the chain \mathbb{X} .

Proposition 5.7. *We have*

$$h(\mathbb{X}) = \pi(I)h(\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{A})}) + \pi(\mathcal{E})^2 h(\mathbb{G}) + \pi(I)\pi(\mathcal{E}) \log \pi(I) + \pi(\mathcal{E})^2 \log \pi(\mathcal{E}).$$

□

Below we discuss the way this equality appears. We have reduced the elements forming the chain \mathbb{X} to only two, the absorbed chains $\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{A})}$ and the walks \mathbb{V} with Bernoulli variables G_n . From (24) we have

$$\begin{aligned} h(\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{A})}) &= -\pi(\mathcal{E}) \sum_{j \in I} \mu(j) \log \mu(j) - \sum_{i, j \in I} \mu(i) P(i, j) \log P(i, j) \\ &\quad - \sum_{i \in I, \delta \in \mathcal{E}} \mu(i) P(i, \delta) \log P(i, \delta), \end{aligned}$$

and the Bernoulli sequence $\mathbb{G} = (G_n)$ has entropy

$$h(\mathbb{G}) = - \sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{E}} \pi(\delta | \mathcal{E}) \log \pi(\delta | \mathcal{E}) = -\pi(\mathcal{E})^{-1} \sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{E}} \pi(\delta) \log \pi(\delta) + \log \pi(\mathcal{E}).$$

Take big N , we divide the sequence (X_1, \dots, X_N) into the set of absorbed chains $X^{(a)}$ and the set of nonempty walks V in \mathcal{E} . The proportion of elements in I approaches $\pi(I)$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. On the other hand, from (9) one obtains that for every time $t \in \mathbb{T}$ there are in mean $\sum_{i \in I} \mu(i) P(i, \mathcal{E}) (\pi(I)^{-1} - 1)$ points belonging to a walk in \mathcal{E} . Since,

$$\sum_{i \in I} \mu(i) P(i, \mathcal{E}) (\pi(I)^{-1} - 1) = \pi(\mathcal{E})^2,$$

one finds that the proportion of sites in (X_1, \dots, X_N) with symbols in \mathbb{G} arising from a walk V in \mathcal{E} approaches to $\pi(\mathcal{E})^2$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. We have

$$\pi(\mathcal{E})^2 h(\mathbb{G}) = -\pi(\mathcal{E}) \sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{E}} \pi(\delta) \log \pi(\delta) + \pi(\mathcal{E})^2 \log \pi(\mathcal{E}). \quad (25)$$

Let us compute $\pi(I)h(\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{A})})$. Since $\mu(i) = \pi(i)/\pi(I)$ for $i \in I$, one has

$$-\pi(I) \sum_{j \in I} \mu(j) \log \mu(j) = - \sum_{j \in I} \pi(j) \log \pi(j) + \pi(I) \log \pi(I),$$

and so by using (24) one obtains,

$$\begin{aligned}\pi(I)h(\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{A})}) &= -\pi(\mathcal{E}) \sum_{j \in I} \pi(j) \log \pi(j) + \pi(\mathcal{E})\pi(I) \log \pi(I) \\ &\quad - \sum_{i,j \in I} \pi(i)P(i,j) \log P(i,j) - \sum_{i \in I, \delta \in \mathcal{E}} \pi(i)P(i,\delta) \log P(i,\delta).\end{aligned}$$

Then, one has checked the equality given in Proposition 5.7,

$$h(\mathbb{X}) - (\pi(\mathcal{E})^2 h(\mathbb{G}) + \pi(\mathcal{E})^2 \log \pi(\mathcal{E})) = \pi(I)h(\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{A})}) + \pi(\mathcal{E})\pi(I) \log \pi(I).$$

The term $\pi(I)\pi(\mathcal{E}) \log \pi(I)$ has an origin similar to the one of last term in (25). In fact, from Remark 5.3, the weights $\mu(j), j \in I$, appear with frequency $\pi(\mathcal{E})$ in the sequence \mathbb{Y} because this occurs at the sites where is a jump to \mathcal{E} . Since the sequence \mathbb{Y} appears with frequency $\pi(I)$, then with frequency $\pi(I)\pi(\mathcal{E})$ it will appear the term $-\sum_{i \in I} \mu(i) \log \mu(i)$. Hence, as in (25) one has

$$-\pi(I)\pi(\mathcal{E}) \sum_{i \in I} \mu(i) \log \mu(i) = -\pi(\mathcal{E}) \sum_{i \in I} \pi(i) \log \pi(i) + \pi(I)\pi(\mathcal{E}) \log \pi(I),$$

and since $-\pi(\mathcal{E}) \sum_{i \in I} \pi(i) \log \pi(i)$ is the term present in (5), it appears the extra term $\pi(I)\pi(\mathcal{E}) \log \pi(I)$.

Remark 5.8. *From Remark 5.6 the length of an absorbed trajectory in $\mathbb{Y}^{\mathcal{A}}$ with alphabet $I^2 \times \mathcal{E}^*$, has the same length as the number of elements in I of an absorbed trajectory $X^{(a)}$ starting from μ and absorbed when hitting \mathcal{E} (this is of length $|X^{(a)}| - 1$ which counts the visited sites in I , but not the one containing the absorbing state). Since the entropy of a system is the gain of entropy per unit of time, the proportion of symbols given the entropy $h(\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{A})})$ is $\pi(I)$. This explains why it appears the term $\pi(I)h(\mathbb{Y}^{(\mathcal{A})})$. \square*

6 Appendix: Proof of Proposition 4.3

Since only a shift is needed to construct the stationary process \mathbb{S}^s from \mathbb{S} , we get for any $a, b \in I \cup \mathcal{E}$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_{t+1}^s = b \mid \mathbb{S}_t^s = a) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_{t+1} = b \mid \mathbb{S}_t = a).$$

Or, more generally, for any $b \in I \cup \mathcal{E}$ and any sequence of symbols $a(u \leq t) = (a(u) \in I \cup \mathcal{E} : u \leq t)$, one has

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_{t+1}^s = b \mid \mathbb{S}_u = a(u), u \leq t) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_{t+1} = b \mid \mathbb{S}_u = a(u), u \leq t).$$

Since there is regeneration at the times in $\mathbb{T} = \{t \in \mathbb{Z} : \mathbb{S}_t \in I\}$, one gets

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_{t+1}^s = b \mid \mathbb{S}_u^s = a(u), u \leq t) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_{t+1}^s = b \mid \mathbb{S}_u^s = a(u), u = t, \dots, t - r) \quad (26)$$

being $r \geq 0$ the first nonnegative element such that $a(t - r) \in I$.

Let us compute $\mathbb{P}(t \in \mathbb{T})$. It suffices to calculate $\mathbb{P}(t \notin \mathbb{T})/\mathbb{P}(t \in \mathbb{T})$. From (9) one gets that for every time $t \in \mathbb{T}$ there are in mean

$$\sum_{i \in I} \mu(i) \sum_{j \in I} Q(i, j) \theta_{i,j} \pi(I)^{-1} = \sum_{i \in I} \mu(i) P(i, \mathcal{E}) \pi(I)^{-1}$$

points in $\mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathbb{T}$. Then, from (4) one finds

$$\mathbb{P}(t \notin \mathbb{T})/\mathbb{P}(t \in \mathbb{T}) = \sum_{i \in I} \mu(i) P(i, \mathcal{E}) \pi(I)^{-1} = \pi(\mathcal{E})/\pi(I).$$

We conclude

$$\mathbb{P}(t \in \mathbb{T}) = \pi(I) \text{ and } \mathbb{P}(t \notin \mathbb{T}) = \pi(\mathcal{E}). \quad (27)$$

Since $(\mathbb{S}_{T_l} : l \in \mathbb{Z})$ is equally distributed as $(Y_n : n \in \mathbb{Z})$ one gets for $i \in I$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_t^s = i \mid \mathbb{S}_t^s \in I) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_t = i \mid \mathbb{S}_t \in I) = \mu(i),$$

and so, by using (27) one gets

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_t^s = i) = \mu(i) \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_t \in I) = \mu(i) \pi(I) = \pi(i). \quad (28)$$

Let $i, j \in I$, from definition of $\theta_{i,j}$ in (10) and since $\bar{\theta}_{i,j} = 1 - \theta_{i,j}$ one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_{t+1}^s = j \mid \mathbb{S}_t^s = i) &= \bar{\theta}_{i,j} Q(i, j) \\ &= \bar{\theta}_{i,j} (P(i, j) + P(i, \mathcal{E}) \mu(j)) = P(i, j). \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

We have $\sum_{j \in I} \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_{t+1}^s = j \mid \mathbb{S}_t^s = i) = 1 - P(i, \mathcal{E})$, so

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_{t+1}^s \in \mathcal{E} \mid \mathbb{S}_t^s = i) = P(i, \mathcal{E}).$$

Then, when $\mathbb{S}_t^s = i$ jumps to \mathcal{E} it does it with probability $P(i, \mathcal{E})$, and the jump to some particular state $\delta \in \mathcal{E}$ is done with probability

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_{t+1}^s = \delta \mid \mathbb{S}_t^s = i) = P(i, \mathcal{E}) P(i, \delta) / P(i, \mathcal{E}) = P(i, \delta). \quad (30)$$

For $\delta \in \mathcal{E}$, $\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}$ one has $P(\epsilon, \delta) = \pi(\delta)$, then

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_{t+1}^s = \epsilon \mid \mathbb{S}_t^s = \delta) = \pi(\epsilon \mid \mathcal{E}) \mathbb{P}_\delta(\tau_I > 1) = \pi(\epsilon \mid \mathcal{E}) \pi(\mathcal{E}) = \pi(\epsilon).$$

Then, for $\delta \in \mathcal{E}$ one finds

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_t^s = \delta) &= \sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_{t-1}^s = i, \mathbb{S}_t^s = \delta) + \sum_{\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}} \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_{t-1}^s = \epsilon, \mathbb{S}_t^s = \delta) \\
&= \sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_t^s = \delta \mid \mathbb{S}_{t-1}^s = i) \pi(i) + \sum_{\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}} \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_t^s = \delta \mid \mathbb{S}_{t-1}^s = \epsilon) \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_{t-1}^s = \epsilon) \\
&= \sum_{i \in I} P(i, \delta) \pi(i) + \pi(\delta) \sum_{\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}} \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_{t-1}^s = \epsilon) \\
&= \sum_{i \in I} P(i, \delta) \pi(i) + \pi(\delta) \pi(\mathcal{E}) = \pi(\delta) (\pi(I) + \pi(\mathcal{E})) = \pi(\delta).
\end{aligned}$$

By definition of the process \mathbb{S} , for $\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}$ one gets

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_{t+1}^s = \epsilon \mid \mathbb{S}_t^s = \delta, \mathbb{S}_u^s = a(u), u < t) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_{t+1}^s = \epsilon \mid \mathbb{S}_t^s = \delta) = \pi(\epsilon). \quad (31)$$

Now, let us compute $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_t^s = \epsilon, \mathbb{S}_{t+1}^s = j)$ for $\epsilon \in \mathcal{E}, j \in I$. We necessarily have that this sequence has its origin in some $(Y_s = i, Y_{s+1} = j)$ and $B_{s+1}^{i,j} = 0$, for some $i \in I$. Then, by summing over all the states $i \in I$ and all pieces of trajectories in \mathcal{E} that are built between i and j , and by using (30) and (8) one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_t^s = \epsilon, \mathbb{S}_{t+1}^s = j) \\
&= \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{l \geq 1} \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_{t-l} = i; \mathbb{S}_{t-u} \in \mathcal{E}, 1 \leq u < l; \mathbb{S}_t^s = \epsilon, \mathbb{S}_{t+1}^s = j) \\
&= \sum_{i \in I} \mu(i) \mu(j) P(i, \epsilon) \pi(I) + \sum_{i \in I} \mu(i) \mu(j) \sum_{l \geq 1; \delta_1, \dots, \delta_l \in \mathcal{E}} \left(P(i, \delta_1) \prod_{k=2}^{l-1} \pi(\delta_k) \right) \pi(\epsilon) \pi(I) \\
&= \pi(\epsilon) \pi(I) \mu(j) = \pi(\epsilon) \pi(j).
\end{aligned}$$

From (28) and (31) the bivariate marginals of the stationary chains $\mathbb{X} = (X_n)$ and $\mathbb{S}^s = (\mathbb{S}_n^s)$ are the same. Now we turn to prove that \mathbb{S}^s satisfies the Markov property. In view of the regeneration property (26), this will be proven once we show

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_{t+1}^s = b \mid \mathbb{S}_u^s = a(u), u = t, \dots, t-r) = \mathbb{P}(X_{t+1} = b \mid X_u = a(t)) \quad (32)$$

where $r \geq 0$ and satisfies $a(t-r) \in I, a(t-u) \in \mathcal{E}$ for $u = 1, \dots, r-1$. This was shown for the case $r = 0$ in (29) and (30). On the other hand (31) proves (32) in the case $b \in \mathcal{E}$ and $r > 0$. So, the unique case left to show is $b \in I$ and $r > 0$.

Let $i, j \in I, r > 0, \delta_u \in \mathcal{E}$ for $u = 0, \dots, r-1$. Since

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{t+1} = j \mid X_{t-u} = \delta_0) = \pi(j),$$

to achieve the proof of (32), the unique relation that we are left to show is

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_{t+1}^s = j \mid \mathbb{S}_{t-u}^s = \delta_u, u = 0, \dots, r-1, \mathbb{S}_{t-r}^s = i) = \pi(j).$$

Let us prove it. One has

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_{t+1}^s = j, \mathbb{S}_{t-u}^s = \delta_u, u = 0, \dots, r-1, \mathbb{S}_{t-r}^s = i) \\ &= \mu(i)(P(i, j) + P(i, \mathcal{E})\mu(j))\theta_{i,j} \frac{P(i, \delta_0)}{P(i, \mathcal{E})} \left(\prod_{l=1}^{r-1} \pi(\delta_l) \right) \pi(I) \\ &= \mu(i)P(i, \mathcal{E})\mu(j) \frac{P(i, \delta_0)}{P(i, \mathcal{E})} \left(\prod_{l=1}^{r-1} \pi(\delta_l) \right) \pi(I) \\ &= \mu(i)P(i, \delta_0)\mu(j) \left(\prod_{l=1}^{r-1} \pi(\delta_l) \right) \pi(I), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_t^s = i, \mathbb{S}_{t-u}^s = \delta_u : u = 0, \dots, r-1) &= \left(\sum_{j \in I} \mu(i)P(i, \delta_0)\mu(j) \right) \left(\prod_{l=1}^{r-1} \pi(\delta_l) \right) \\ &= \mu(i)P(i, \delta_0) \left(\prod_{l=1}^{r-1} \pi(\delta_l) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{S}_{t+1}^s = j \mid \mathbb{S}_{t-u}^s = \delta_u, u = 0, \dots, r-1, \mathbb{S}_{t-r}^s = i) = \mu(j)\pi(I) = \pi(j).$$

Then (32) follows. We have proven that the laws of the stationary chains $\mathbb{X} = (X_n)$ and $\mathbb{S}^s = (\mathbb{S}_n^s)$ are the same.

Acknowledgments: This work was supported by the Basal Conicyt project AFB170001. The author thanks Dr. Michael Schraudner from CMM, University of Chile, for calling my attention to reference [6].

References

- [1] L. Abramov, V. Rokhlin. The entropy of a skew product of measure-preserving transformations. Vestnik Leningrad. Univ. 17 (1962), 513 (in Russian).

- [2] S. Asmussen. Applied probability and queues. Second edition. Applications of Mathematics (New York), 51. Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability. Springer-Verlag, New York (2003).
- [3] P. Collet, S. Martínez, J. San Martín. Quasi-stationary distributions. Markov chains, diffusions and dynamical systems. Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer, Heidelberg (2013).
- [4] J. Darroch, E. Seneta. On quasi-stationary distributions in absorbing discrete-time finite Markov chains. J. Appl. Probab. 2 (1965), 88100.
- [5] M. Denker, C. Grillenberger, K. Sigmund. Ergodic theory on compact spaces. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 527. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York (1976).
- [6] T. Downarowicz, J. Serafin. Fiber entropy and conditional variational principles in compact non-metrizable spaces. Fund. Math. 172 (2002), No. 3, 217247.
- [7] P.A. Ferrari, S. Martínez, P. Picco. Existence of Non-Trivial Quasi-Stationary Distributions in the Birth-Death Chain. Adv. Appl. Probab. 24 (1992), No. 4, pp. 795-813
- [8] P.A. Ferrari, H. Kesten, S. Martínez, P. Picco. Existence of quasi-stationary distributions. A renewal dynamical approach. Ann. Probab. 23 (1995), No. 2, 501-521.
- [9] M. Keane, M. Smorodinsky. Finitary isomorphisms of irreducible Markov shifts. Israel J. of Math. 34 (1979), no. 4, 281-286.

SERVET MARTÍNEZ

Departamento Ingeniería Matemática and Centro Modelamiento Matemático, Universidad de Chile, UMI 2807 CNRS, Casilla 170-3, Correo 3, Santiago, Chile. e-mail: smartine@dim.uchile.cl