

# INVERSE PROBLEMS FOR ERGODICITY OF MARKOV CHAINS

ZHI-FENG WEI<sup>1,2</sup>

**ABSTRACT.** For both continuous-time and discrete-time Markov Chains, we provide criteria for inverse problems of classical types of ergodicity: (ordinary) ergodicity, algebraic ergodicity, exponential ergodicity and strong ergodicity. Our criteria are in terms of the existence of solutions to inequalities involving the  $Q$ -matrix (or transition matrix  $P$  in time-discrete case) of the process. Meanwhile, these criteria are applied to some examples and provide “universal” treatment, including single birth processes and several multi-dimensional models.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Criteria for various types of ergodicity by drift condition for Markov Chains have been studied extensively over the past decades, see [6, 9, 7, 8, 3]. According to these criteria, a solution to some inequality implies, for example, strong ergodicity of a Markov Chain. However, one may find it not that easy to make sure a process, for instance, not being strongly ergodic. In fact, the celebrated strong ergodicity criteria with drift condition reads as follows.

**Theorem** ([6, 9]). *Let  $Q$  be an irreducible regular  $Q$ -matrix and  $H$  a non-empty finite subset of a countable state space  $E$ . Then the  $Q$ -process is strongly ergodic if and only if there exists a bounded solution  $(y_i)_{i \in E}$  to inequality*

$$\sum_{j \in E} q_{ij} y_j \leq -1, \quad i \notin H.$$

---

<sup>1</sup>SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES AND LAB. MATH. COM. SYS., BEIJING NORMAL UNIVERSITY, BEIJING 100875, CHINA

<sup>2</sup>DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON, 831. E 3RD ST., BLOOMINGTON, IN 47405, USA [ZFWEI@IU.EDU](mailto:ZFWEI@IU.EDU)

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 60J27, 60J10; Secondary: 60J75, 82C22.

*Key words and phrases.* Markov Chain,  $Q$ -process, Ergodicity, Non-ergodicity, instability, test function.

If we are proving a  $Q$ -process is not strongly ergodic using this criterion, we have to show that there is no bounded solution to this inequality. Nevertheless, this is not so practical. We intend to complement ergodicity criteria in this paper. For instance, can we assert non-strong ergodicity of a  $Q$ -process from some inequality and some of its solutions?

Since we are dealing with ergodic properties, we assume processes considered are all recurrent without loss of generality. And we will deal with not only continuous-time but also discrete-time Markov Chains using exactly the same method.

Consider an irreducible regular  $Q$ -matrix  $Q = (q_{ij} : i, j \in E)$  on a countable state space  $E$  with transition probability matrix  $P(t) = (p_{ij}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ . Meanwhile, denote

$$q_i := -q_{ii} = \sum_{j \neq i} q_{ij} < \infty, \quad i \in E.$$

We have the following ergodic notions.

- (1) The  $Q$ -process is ergodic, if for each  $i$ ,  $\|p_{i\cdot}(t) - \pi\|_{\text{Var}} := \sum_{j \in E} |p_{ij}(t) - \pi_j| \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .
- (2) (algebraic ergodicity) The  $Q$ -process is  $\ell$ -ergodic for some integer  $\ell \geq 1$ , if for each  $i, j \in E$ ,  $|p_{ij}(t) - \pi_j| = O(t^{-(\ell-1)})$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .
- (3) The  $Q$ -process is exponentially ergodic, if for each  $i, j \in E$ ,  $|p_{ij}(t) - \pi_j| = O(e^{-\beta t})$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  for some  $\beta > 0$ .
- (4) The  $Q$ -process is strongly ergodic, if  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{i \in E} \|p_{i\cdot}(t) - \pi\|_{\text{Var}} = 0$ .

Note that we occasionally say a  $Q$ -process is 0-ergodic when it is recurrent for ease of terminology. Also, we may say a  $Q$ -process is 1-ergodic if it is ergodic.

Set

$$\sigma_H := \inf\{t \geq \eta_1 : X_t \in H\}, \quad H \subseteq E,$$

where  $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is the  $Q$ -process and  $\eta_1$  is the first jump time. There are probabilistic descriptions of above ergodic notions.

- (1) The  $Q$ -process is ergodic if and only if (abbr. iff)  $\max_{i \in H} \mathbf{E}_i \sigma_H$  is finite for some (equivalently, for any) non-empty finite subset  $H$  of  $E$ .
- (2) (algebraic ergodicity) The  $Q$ -process is  $\ell$ -ergodic for some integer  $\ell \geq 1$  iff  $\max_{i \in H} \mathbf{E}_i \sigma_H^\ell$  is finite for some (equivalently, for any) non-empty finite subset  $H$  of  $E$ .
- (3) The  $Q$ -process is exponentially ergodic iff  $\max_{i \in H} \mathbf{E}_i e^{\lambda \sigma_H}$  is finite for some positive  $\lambda$  (with  $\lambda < q_i, \forall i \in E$ ) and some (equivalently, for any) non-empty finite subset  $H$  of  $E$ .

- (4) The  $Q$ -process is strongly ergodic iff  $(\mathbf{E}_i \sigma_H)_{i \notin H}$  is bounded for some (equivalently, for any) non-empty finite subset  $H$  of  $E$ .

Now, we declare our main results. Let  $\Pi = (\Pi_{ij} : i, j \in E)$  be the embedding chain of the  $Q$ -process, where we have

$$\Pi_{ij} = \begin{cases} q_{ij}/q_i, & j \neq i, \\ 0, & j = i. \end{cases}$$

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $Q$  be an irreducible regular  $Q$ -matrix and  $H$  a non-empty finite subset of  $E$ . Then the  $Q$ -process is non-ergodic iff there is a sequence  $\{y^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ , where  $y^{(n)} = (y_i^{(n)})_{i \in E}$  for each  $n \geq 1$ , and  $\{y^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$  satisfies the following conditions:*

- (1) *for each  $n \geq 1$ ,  $(y_i^{(n)})_{i \in E}$  satisfies  $\sup_{i \in E} y_i^{(n)} < \infty$  and solves inequality*

$$(1) \quad y_i \leq \sum_{j \notin H} \Pi_{ij} y_j + \frac{1}{q_i}, \quad i \in E;$$

- (2)  $\sup_{n \geq 1} \max_{i \in H} y_i^{(n)} = \infty$  (or equivalently,  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{i \in H} y_i^{(n)} = \infty$ ).

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $Q$  be an irreducible regular  $Q$ -matrix and  $H$  a non-empty finite subset of  $E$ . Then the  $Q$ -process is non-strongly ergodic iff there is a sequence  $\{y^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ , where  $y^{(n)} = (y_i^{(n)})_{i \notin H}$  for each  $n \geq 1$ , and  $\{y^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$  satisfies the following conditions:*

- (1) *for each  $n \geq 1$ ,  $(y_i^{(n)})_{i \notin H}$  satisfies  $\sup_{i \notin H} y_i^{(n)} < \infty$  and solves inequality*

$$(2) \quad y_i \leq \sum_{j \notin H} \Pi_{ij} y_j + \frac{1}{q_i}, \quad i \notin H;$$

- (2)  $\sup_{n \geq 1} \sup_{i \notin H} y_i^{(n)} = \infty$  (or equivalently,  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{i \notin H} y_i^{(n)} = \infty$ ).

*Remark.* Testing sequence in Theorems 1 and 2 need not be non-negative. Take Theorem 1 for instance. Let  $\{y^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$  be a sequence satisfying the conditions in Theorem 1. Then for each  $n \geq 1$ ,  $y^{(n)} = (y_i^{(n)})_{i \in E}$  is a function on  $E$ . Here,  $y^{(n)}$  is not required to be non-negative. We may even allow  $\inf_{i \in E} y_i^{(n)} = -\infty$ . However,  $y^{(n)}$  should be a finite-valued function. In other words, for each  $n \geq 1$  and  $i \geq 1$ ,  $y_i^{(n)}$  is a finite real number.

The following inverse problem criterion for algebraic ergodicity generalizes Theorem 1.

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $Q$  be an irreducible regular  $Q$ -matrix and  $H$  a non-empty finite subset of  $E$ . Suppose the  $Q$ -process is  $\ell$ -ergodic for some non-negative integer  $\ell$ , then the  $Q$ -process is not  $(\ell + 1)$ -ergodic iff there is a sequence  $\{y^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ , where  $y^{(n)} = (y_i^{(n)})_{i \in E}$  for each  $n \geq 1$ , and  $\{y^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$  satisfies the following conditions:*

(1) *for each  $n \geq 1$ ,  $(y_i^{(n)})_{i \in E}$  satisfies  $\sup_{i \in E} y_i^{(n)} < \infty$  and solves inequality*

$$(3) \quad y_i \leq \sum_{j \notin H} \Pi_{ij} y_j + \frac{(\ell + 1)}{q_i} \mathbf{E}_i \sigma_H^\ell, \quad i \in E;$$

(2)  $\sup_{n \geq 1} \max_{i \in H} y_i^{(n)} = \infty$  (or equivalently,  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{i \in H} y_i^{(n)} = \infty$ ).

Theorem 4 is a non-exponential ergodicity criterion for  $Q$ -processes.

**Theorem 4.** *Let  $Q$  be an irreducible regular  $Q$ -matrix with  $\inf_{i \in E} q_i > 0$  and  $H$  a non-empty finite subset of  $E$ . Then the  $Q$ -process is non-exponentially ergodic iff there is a sequence of positive numbers  $\{\lambda_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  and a sequence of functions  $\{y^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$  on  $E$  satisfying the following conditions:*

(1)  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n = 0$ ;

(2) *for each  $n \geq 1$ ,  $(y_i^{(n)})_{i \in E}$  is finitely supported and solves inequality*

$$(4) \quad y_i^{(n)} \leq \frac{q_i}{q_i - \lambda_n} \sum_{j \notin H} \Pi_{ij} y_j^{(n)} + \frac{1}{q_i - \lambda_n}, \quad i \in E;$$

(3)  $\sup_{n \geq 1} \max_{i \in H} y_i^{(n)} = \infty$  (or equivalently,  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{i \in H} y_i^{(n)} = \infty$ ).

Although we need a sequence of testing functions in applications of above results, we can actually manufacture testing functions in batch. For example, one may consult the following interesting example and its proof in Section 3.2.

**Example.** *Let  $Q = (q_{ij})$  be a conservative  $Q$ -matrix on  $E = \mathbb{Z}_+ = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  with*

$$q_{ij} = \begin{cases} i + 1, & \text{if } i \geq 0, j = i + 1, \\ \alpha_i \geq 0, & \text{if } i \geq 1, j = 0, \\ 0, & \text{other } i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

*Assume there are infinitely many non-zero  $\alpha_i$ , so  $Q$  is irreducible. Then, the  $Q$ -process is non-exponentially ergodic if  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_i = 0$ .*

Brussel's model (see [11]) is a typical model of reaction-diffusion process with several species. Finite-dimensional Brussel's model is exponentially ergodic (cf. [?]). In Section 4, we will demonstrate that it is non-strongly ergodic using Theorem 2, which was actually proved for the first time in [10] by comparison method. Comparison method works for Brussel's model but it is no longer available for more involved models like the following one. However, we can still deal with it using our drift criteria developed in this paper, see Section 4 for further details.

**Example.** Let  $S$  be a finite set,  $E = (\mathbb{Z}_+)^S$  and  $p(u, v)$  a transition probability matrix on  $S$ . We denote by  $\theta \in E$  whose components are identically 0 and denote by  $e_u \in E$  the unit vector whose component at site  $u \in S$  is equal to 1 and other components at  $v \neq u$  all equal 0. Define an irreducible  $Q$ -matrix  $Q = (q(x, y) : x, y \in E)$  as follows:

$$q(x, y) = \begin{cases} x(u)^\gamma, & \text{if } y = x + e_u, \ x \neq \theta, \\ 1, & \text{if } x = \theta, \ y = e_u, \\ x(u)^\gamma, & \text{if } y = x - e_u, \\ x(u)p(u, v), & \text{if } y = x - e_u + e_v, \ v \neq u, \\ 0, & \text{other } y \neq x, \end{cases}$$

and  $q(x) = -q(x, x) = \sum_{y \neq x} q(x, y)$ , where  $x = (x(u) : u \in S) \in E$ . In Section 4, we will prove the following results:

- (1) when  $\gamma \leq 2$ , the  $Q$ -process is non-strongly ergodic;
- (2) when  $\gamma \leq 1$ , the  $Q$ -process is non-ergodic.

As for discrete time chains, we also have the following parallel criteria.

**Theorem 1'.** Let  $P = (P_{ij})$  be an irreducible aperiodic transition matrix and  $H$  a non-empty finite subset of  $E$ . Then the chain is non-ergodic iff there is a sequence  $\{y^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ , where  $y^{(n)} = (y_i^{(n)})_{i \in E}$  for each  $n \geq 1$ , and  $\{y^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$  satisfies the following conditions:

- (1) for each  $n \geq 1$ ,  $(y_i^{(n)})_{i \in E}$  satisfies  $\sup_{i \in E} y_i^{(n)} < \infty$  and solves inequality

$$(1') \quad y_i \leq \sum_{j \notin H} P_{ij} y_j + 1, \quad i \in E;$$

- (2)  $\sup_{n \geq 1} \max_{i \in H} y_i^{(n)} = \infty$  (or equivalently,  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{i \in H} y_i^{(n)} = \infty$ ).

**Theorem 2'.** Let  $P = (P_{ij})$  be an irreducible aperiodic transition matrix and  $H$  a non-empty finite subset of  $E$ . Then the chain is non-strongly ergodic iff there is  $\{y^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ , where  $y^{(n)} = (y_i^{(n)})_{i \notin H}$  for each  $n \geq 1$ , and  $\{y^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$  satisfies the following conditions:

(1) for each  $n \geq 1$ ,  $(y_i^{(n)})_{i \notin H}$  satisfies  $\sup_{i \notin H} y_i^{(n)} < \infty$  and solves inequality

$$(2') \quad y_i \leq \sum_{j \notin H} P_{ij} y_j + 1, \quad i \notin H;$$

(2)  $\sup_{n \geq 1} \sup_{i \notin H} y_i^{(n)} = \infty$  (or equivalently,  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{i \notin H} y_i^{(n)} = \infty$ ).

**Theorem 3'.** Let  $P = (P_{ij})$  be an irreducible aperiodic transition matrix and  $H$  a non-empty finite subset of  $E$ . Suppose the chain is  $\ell$ -ergodic for some non-negative integer  $\ell$ , then the chain is not  $(\ell + 1)$ -ergodic iff there is a sequence  $\{y^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ , where  $y^{(n)} = (y_i^{(n)})_{i \in E}$  for each  $n \geq 1$ , and  $\{y^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$  satisfies the following conditions:

(1) for each  $n \geq 1$ ,  $(y_i^{(n)})_{i \in E}$  satisfies  $\sup_{i \in E} y_i^{(n)} < \infty$  and solves inequality

$$(3') \quad y_i \leq \sum_{j \notin H} P_{ij} y_j + \mathbf{E}_i \sigma_H^\ell, \quad i \in E;$$

(2)  $\sup_{n \geq 1} \max_{i \in H} y_i^{(n)} = \infty$  (or equivalently,  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{i \in H} y_i^{(n)} = \infty$ ).

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present proofs for our criteria. In Section 3, our criteria are applied to single birth processes. Some multi-dimensional models are treated in Section 4.

## 2. PROOFS OF CRITERIA FOR INVERSE PROBLEMS

**2.1. Minimal Solution Theory Preparations.** Our proofs are based on minimal solution theory. To begin, let's first recall promptly some useful results in minimal solution theory from [6, 2].

Let  $E$  be an arbitrary non-empty set. Denote by  $\mathcal{H}$  a set of mappings from  $E$  to  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+ := [0, +\infty]$ :  $\mathcal{H}$  contains constant 1 and is closed under non-negative linear combination and monotone increasing limit, where the order relation " $\geq$ " in  $\mathcal{H}$  is defined pointwise. Then,  $\mathcal{H}$  is a convex cone. We say that  $A: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is a cone mapping if  $A0 = 0$  and

$$A(c_1 f_1 + c_2 f_2) = c_1 A f_1 + c_2 A f_2, \quad \text{for all } c_1, c_2 \geq 0 \text{ and } f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Denote by  $\mathcal{A}$  the set of all such mappings which also satisfy the following hypothesis:

$$\mathcal{H} \ni f_n \uparrow f \quad \text{implies} \quad Af_n \uparrow Af.$$

**Definition 5.** Given  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $g \in \mathcal{H}$ . We say  $f^*$  is a minimal non-negative solution (abbr. minimal solution) to equation

$$(5) \quad f = Af + g, \quad x \in E,$$

if  $f^*$  satisfies Eq. (5) and for any solution  $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{H}$  to Eq. (5), we have

$$\tilde{f} \geq f^*, \quad x \in E.$$

**Theorem 6** ([2, Theorem 2.2]). *The minimal solution to Eq. (5) always exists uniquely.*

**Definition 7.** Let  $A, \tilde{A} \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $g, \tilde{g} \in \mathcal{H}$  satisfy

$$\tilde{A} \geq A, \quad \tilde{g} \geq g.$$

Then we call

$$(6) \quad \tilde{f} \geq \tilde{A}\tilde{f} + \tilde{g}, \quad x \in E$$

a controlling equation of Eq. (5).

**Theorem 8** ([2, Theorem 2.6], Comparison Principle). *Let  $f^*$  be the minimal solution to Eq. (5). Then for any solution  $\tilde{f}$  to Eq. (6), we have  $\tilde{f} \geq f^*$ .*

By Theorem 6, we may define a map

$$\begin{aligned} m_A: \mathcal{H} &\rightarrow \mathcal{H}, \\ g &\mapsto m_A g, \end{aligned}$$

where  $m_A g$  denotes the minimal solution to Eq. (5).

**Theorem 9** ([2, Theorem 2.7]).  *$m_A$  is a cone mapping. For  $\{A_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ ,  $A_n \uparrow A$  and  $\{g_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ ,  $g_n \uparrow g$ , we have  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $g \in \mathcal{H}$  and  $m_{A_n} g_n \uparrow m_A g$ .*

The following minimal solution characterizations of moments of hitting times are essential for us to exploit minimal solution theory.

**Theorem 10** ([8, Theorem 3.1]). *For any  $\ell \geq 1$ , the moments of return times  $\mathbf{E}_i \sigma_H, \mathbf{E}_i \sigma_H^2, \dots, \mathbf{E}_i \sigma_H^\ell$  are inductively the minimal solution to the following  $\ell$ -family of systems for  $0 \leq n \leq \ell - 1$ ,*

$$x_i^{(n+1)} = \sum_{j \notin H} \Pi_{ij} x_j^{(n+1)} + \frac{(n+1)}{q_i} x_i^{(n)}, \quad i \in E,$$

where  $x_i^{(0)} = 1$  ( $i \in E$ ).

When  $\ell = 1$ , Theorem 10 gives

**Corollary 11.**  $(\mathbf{E}_i \sigma_H)_{i \in E}$  is the minimal solution to

$$x_i = \sum_{j \notin H} \Pi_{ij} x_j + \frac{1}{q_i}, \quad i \in E.$$

**Theorem 12** ([2, Theorem 4.48]). *For a non-empty finite subset  $H$  of  $E$  and positive  $\lambda$  with  $\lambda < q_i$  for all  $i \in E$ , set*

$$e_{iH}(\lambda) := \frac{1}{\lambda} (\mathbf{E}_i e^{\lambda \sigma_H} - 1) = \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} \mathbf{P}_i[\sigma_H > t] dt$$

*for each  $i \in E$  (cf. [2, Page 148, Equivalence of Theorems 4.45 and 4.44]). Then  $(e_{iH}(\lambda))_{i \in E}$  is the minimal solution to*

$$x_i = \frac{q_i}{q_i - \lambda} \sum_{j \notin H} \Pi_{ij} x_j + \frac{1}{q_i - \lambda}, \quad i \in E.$$

To prove the criteria, we may assume  $E = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  and  $H = \{0\}$  without loss of generality. Since the proofs for discrete-time Markov Chains are similar with those for continuous-time Chains, we only give the proofs in time-continuous setup. One may easily prove time-discrete results using similar technic.

Before proceeding further, let's briefly describe the main points in our proofs. Take non-ergodicity for instance. In order to prove the expectation of return time to the state 0 is infinity, we first get a lower bound for the expectation of return time. Then a sequence of increasing lower bound implies the desired result. On another hand, finite approximation method would guarantee existence of an increasing sequence of lower bound and therefore necessity of our conditions.

## 2.2. Lower Bound for Polynomial Moments and Sufficiency.

**Theorem 13.** *Let  $P = (P_{ij})$  be an irreducible conservative transition matrix on  $E$ . Then the chain is transient iff the inequality*

$$\sum_{j \geq 0} P_{ij} z_j \leq z_i, \quad i \geq 1$$

*has a solution  $z = (z_i)_{i \geq 0}$  satisfying*

$$-\infty < \inf_{i \geq 0} z_i < z_0.$$

As Theorem 13 is a slight modification of [2, Theorem 4.25], its proof would not be included here. One may also find a proof in [5, Proposition 1.3].



**Lemma 14.** *Let  $\ell$  be a non-negative integer and  $Q$  an irreducible regular  $Q$ -matrix on  $E$ . Assume further inequality*

$$y_i \leq \sum_{\substack{j \geq 1 \\ j \neq i}} \frac{q_{ij}}{q_i} y_j + \frac{(\ell + 1)}{q_i} \mathbf{E}_i \sigma_0^\ell, \quad i \geq 1$$

*has a finite solution  $y = (y_i)_{i \geq 1}$  with  $\sup_{i \geq 1} y_i < \infty$ . If the  $Q$ -process is  $(\ell + 1)$ -ergodic, then we have*

$$y_i \leq \mathbf{E}_i \sigma_0^{\ell+1}, \quad i \geq 1.$$

*Proof.* Since the  $Q$ -process is  $(\ell + 1)$ -ergodic,  $(\mathbf{E}_i \sigma_0^{\ell+1})_{i \geq 1}$  is finite and is the minimal non-negative solution to

$$x_i = \sum_{\substack{j \geq 1 \\ j \neq i}} \frac{q_{ij}}{q_i} x_j + \frac{(\ell + 1)}{q_i} \mathbf{E}_i \sigma_0^\ell, \quad i \geq 1.$$

Set

$$z_i = \begin{cases} 0, & i = 0, \\ \mathbf{E}_i \sigma_0^{\ell+1} - y_i, & i \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Then  $(z_i)_{i \geq 0}$  satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \sum_{j \geq 0} \Pi_{ij} z_j \leq z_i, & i \geq 1, \\ \inf_{i \geq 0} z_i > -\infty. \end{cases}$$

The  $Q$ -process is recurrent by our assumption, so is its embedding chain. Applying Theorem 13 to the embedding chain  $\Pi = (\Pi_{ij})$ , we arrive at the conclusion that

$$z_i \geq z_0, \quad i \geq 1.$$

In other words,

$$y_i \leq \mathbf{E}_i \sigma_0^{\ell+1}, \quad i \geq 1. \quad \square$$

*Remark 15.* The hypothesis “ $\sup_{i \geq 1} y_i < \infty$ ” cannot be removed from Lemma 14. In fact, we consider an ergodic  $Q$ -process, then  $(\mathbf{E}_i \sigma_0)_{i \geq 1}$  is the minimal non-negative solution to

$$(7) \quad x_i = \sum_{\substack{j \geq 1 \\ j \neq i}} \frac{q_{ij}}{q_i} x_j + \frac{1}{q_i}, \quad i \geq 1.$$

On another hand, fix an arbitrary  $\varepsilon > 0$ , if we take

$$\begin{aligned} x'_1 &= \mathbf{E}_1 \sigma_0 + \varepsilon, \\ x'_i &= x'_1 \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} F_k^{(0)} - \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} d_k^{(0)}, \quad i \geq 2, \end{aligned}$$

then  $(x'_i)_{i \geq 1}$  also solves Eq. (7) (cf. [4]). Because the  $Q$ -process is assumed to be ergodic and thus recurrent, we have  $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} F_k^{(0)} = \infty$  (cf. [2, 4]). Note that

$$x'_i - \mathbf{E}_i \sigma_0 = \varepsilon \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} F_k^{(0)},$$

we may conclude that  $(x'_i)_{i \geq 1}$  is unbounded. Meanwhile, we have

$$\mathbf{E}_i \sigma_0 < x'_i, \quad i \geq 1.$$

This implies that the condition “ $\sup_{i \geq 1} y_i < \infty$ ” cannot be removed.

It is straightforward to write the time-discrete analogue of Lemma 14 and we shall omit its proof.

**Lemma 14'.** *Let  $\ell$  be a non-negative integer and  $P$  an irreducible aperiodic transition matrix on  $E$ . Assume further inequality*

$$y_i \leq \sum_{j \geq 1} P_{ij} y_j + \mathbf{E}_i \sigma_0^\ell, \quad i \geq 1$$

*has a finite solution  $y = (y_i)_{i \geq 1}$  with  $\sup_{i \geq 1} y_i < \infty$ . If the chain is  $(\ell + 1)$ -ergodic, then we have*

$$y_i \leq \mathbf{E}_i \sigma_0^{\ell+1}, \quad i \geq 1. \quad \square$$

*Proof of sufficiency of Theorem 3.* If the  $Q$ -process is  $(\ell + 1)$ -ergodic, by Theorem 10 and Lemma 14, for each  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$y_0^{(n)} \leq \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{q_{0j}}{q_0} y_j^{(n)} + \frac{(\ell + 1)}{q_i} \mathbf{E}_0 \sigma_0^\ell \leq \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{q_{0j}}{q_0} \mathbf{E}_j \sigma_0^{\ell+1} + \frac{(\ell + 1)}{q_i} \mathbf{E}_0 \sigma_0^\ell = \mathbf{E}_0 \sigma_0^{\ell+1}.$$

It follows that

$$\infty = \sup_{n \geq 1} y_0^{(n)} \leq \mathbf{E}_0 \sigma_0^{\ell+1} < \infty,$$

a contradiction.  $\square$

*Proof of sufficiency of Theorem 2.* It suffices to prove Theorem 2 when the  $Q$ -process is ergodic. By Lemma 14 with  $\ell = 0$ , we have

$$y_i^{(n)} \leq \mathbf{E}_i \sigma_0, \quad i \geq 1, \quad n \geq 1.$$

Consequently,

$$\infty = \sup_{n \geq 1} \sup_{i \geq 1} y_i^{(n)} \leq \sup_{i \geq 1} \mathbf{E}_i \sigma_0.$$

Thus the  $Q$ -process is non-strongly ergodic. Our proof is now complete.  $\square$

### 2.3. Approximation for Polynomial Moments and Necessity.

Let  $\ell$  be a fixed non-negative integer. To prove necessity of Theorems 2 and 3, we consider truncated equations for each  $n \geq 1$ :

$$(8.n) \quad x_i = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq n \\ j \neq i}} \frac{q_{ij}}{q_i} x_j + \frac{(\ell + 1)}{q_i} \mathbf{E}_i \sigma_0^\ell, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

Denote the minimal non-negative solution to Eq. (8.n) as

$$x^{(n)} = (x_i^{(n)}, 1 \leq i \leq n).$$

Also, we set  $M_n = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} x_i^{(n)}$ .

**Lemma 16.** *If the  $Q$ -process is  $\ell$ -ergodic, then we have the following assertions:*

- (1)  $M_n$  is finite for each  $n \geq 1$ ;
- (2)  $\mathbf{E}_i \sigma_0^{\ell+1} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \uparrow x_i^{(n)}$  for each  $i \geq 1$ , and  $(M_n)_{n \geq 1}$  is increasing;
- (3)  $(M_n)_{n \geq 1}$  is bounded iff  $(\mathbf{E}_i \sigma_0^{\ell+1})_{i \geq 1}$  is bounded;
- (4) pick  $\ell = 0$ , then it follows from (3) that the  $Q$ -process is non-strongly ergodic iff  $\sup_{n \geq 1} M_n = \infty$ .

*Proof.* a) Since the  $Q$ -process is  $\ell$ -ergodic, we may pick a positive constant

$$C_n = (\ell + 1) \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathbf{E}_i \sigma_0^\ell + 1.$$

Now consider inequality

$$x_i \geq \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq n \\ j \neq i}} \frac{q_{ij}}{q_i} x_j + \frac{C_n}{q_i}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

Introducing a change of variable  $\tilde{x}_i = \frac{x_i}{C_n}$ , we have the following equivalent form of the above inequality:

$$(9.n) \quad \tilde{x}_i \geq \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq n \\ j \neq i}} \frac{q_{ij}}{q_i} \tilde{x}_j + \frac{1}{q_i}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

By Corollary 11, the minimal solution to Eq. (9.n) is the expectation of return time to state 0 of the  $Q^{(n)}$ -process and is therefore finite, where

$Q^{(n)}$  has the following form:

$$Q^{(n)} = \begin{pmatrix} -n & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ q_{10} + \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} q_{1,k} & q_{11} & q_{12} & \cdots & q_{1n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ q_{n0} + \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} q_{n,k} & q_{n1} & q_{n2} & \cdots & q_{nn} \end{pmatrix}_{(n+1) \times (n+1)}.$$

Now by Theorem 8,  $M_n$  is finite.

b) By Theorem 10,  $(\mathbf{E}_i \sigma_0^{\ell+1})_{i \geq 1}$  is the minimal solution to

$$x_i = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq n \\ j \neq i}} \frac{q_{ij}}{q_i} x_j + \frac{(\ell+1)}{q_i} \mathbf{E}_i \sigma_0^\ell, \quad i \geq 1.$$

Exploiting Theorem 9, we obtain the second assertion.

c) Some trivial manipulation leads to the other two assertions. We omit the details.  $\square$

*Proof of necessity of Theorem 3.* Suppose the  $Q$ -process is not  $(\ell+1)$ -ergodic. Set

$$y_i^{(n)} = \begin{cases} \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{q_{0j}}{q_0} x_j^{(n)} + \frac{(\ell+1)}{q_0} \mathbf{E}_0 \sigma_0^\ell, & i = 0, \\ x_i^{(n)}, & 1 \leq i \leq n, \\ 0, & i \geq n+1. \end{cases}$$

By the monotone convergence theorem and Theorem 10,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_0^{(n)} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{q_{0j}}{q_0} y_j^{(n)} + \frac{(\ell+1)}{q_0} \mathbf{E}_0 \sigma_0^\ell \\ &= \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{q_{0j}}{q_0} \mathbf{E}_j \sigma_0^{\ell+1} + \frac{(\ell+1)}{q_0} \mathbf{E}_0 \sigma_0^\ell \\ &= \mathbf{E}_0 \sigma_0^{\ell+1} = \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Now it is easy to check that  $\{y^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$  with  $y^{(n)} = (y_i^{(n)})_{i \in E}$  is a required sequence. Necessity of Theorem 3 is proved.  $\square$

*Proof of necessity of Theorem 2.* Assume the  $Q$ -process is non-strongly ergodic. We pick  $\ell = 0$  in Lemma 16 and set

$$y_i^{(n)} = \begin{cases} x_i^{(n)}, & 1 \leq i \leq n, \\ 0, & i \geq n+1. \end{cases}$$

Then  $\{y^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is a sequence required in Theorem 2. In fact, we may easily deduce that for each  $n \geq 1$ ,  $y^{(n)}$  solves Eq. (2). Meanwhile, for

each  $n \geq 1$ , we have

$$\sup_{i \geq 1} y_i^{(n)} = M_n < \infty.$$

By the last assertion of Lemma 16,  $\sup_{n \geq 1} M_n = \infty$ . Therefore,

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \sup_{i \geq 1} y_i^{(n)} = \sup_{n \geq 1} M_n = \infty.$$

Hence we prove necessity of Theorem 2.  $\square$

**2.4. Proof of Theorem 4.** Now, we prove Theorem 4, non-exponential ergodicity criteria. Since we are discussing exponential ergodicity in this subsection, we assume the process is ergodic without loss of generality. Our idea for proof of Theorem 4 is similar with that of Theorems 2 and 3 but technical details here are different and more complex. Briefly speaking, we first use Lemma 18 to get a lower bound for exponential moment of return time. On another hand, we use finite approximation to prove the necessity.

First, using the notation in Section 2.1, we have the following two useful lemmas.

**Theorem 17** ([2, Theorem 2.10]). *Given an arbitrary non-negative  $\tilde{f}^{(0)}$  satisfying  $0 \leq \tilde{f}^{(0)} \leq pf^*$  for some non-negative number  $p$ , set*

$$\tilde{f}^{(n+1)} = A\tilde{f}^{(n)} + g, \quad n \geq 0.$$

*Then we have  $\tilde{f}^{(n)} \rightarrow f^*$  ( $n \rightarrow \infty$ ).*

**Lemma 18.** *Let  $f^*$  be the minimal solution to Eq. (5) and  $\tilde{f}$  be a non-negative function satisfying*

$$(10) \quad \tilde{f} \leq A\tilde{f} + g, \quad x \in E.$$

*If  $\tilde{f} \leq pf^*$  for some non-negative number  $p$ , then  $\tilde{f} \leq f^*$ .*

*Proof.* Assume  $p > 1$  without loss of generality. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}^{(0)} &= \tilde{f}, \\ \tilde{f}^{(n+1)} &= A\tilde{f}^{(n)} + g, \quad n \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

We claim

$$\tilde{f}^{(n)} \uparrow f^*, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

In fact, by Theorem 17, we have

$$\tilde{f}^{(n)} \rightarrow f^*, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

So we need only show the monotonicity. According to Eq. (10),

$$\tilde{f}^{(0)} \leq A\tilde{f}^{(0)} + g = \tilde{f}^{(1)}.$$

Now if  $\tilde{f}^{(n)} \leq \tilde{f}^{(n+1)}$  for some  $n \geq 0$ , then

$$\tilde{f}^{(n+1)} = A\tilde{f}^{(n)} + g \leq A\tilde{f}^{(n+1)} + g = \tilde{f}^{(n+2)}.$$

So the monotonicity holds by induction. It follows immediately that

$$\tilde{f} = \tilde{f}^{(0)} \leq f^*.$$

Lemma 18 is proved.  $\square$

Let  $Q$  be a  $Q$ -matrix on  $E$  with  $\inf_{i \in E} q_i > 0$ . Fix an integer  $N \geq 1$  and consider  $Q$ -matrix on finite states

$$Q^{(N)} = \begin{pmatrix} -N & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ q_{10} + \sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} q_{1,k} & q_{11} & q_{12} & \cdots & q_{1N} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ q_{N0} + \sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} q_{N,k} & q_{N1} & q_{N2} & \cdots & q_{NN} \end{pmatrix}_{(N+1) \times (N+1)}.$$

Meanwhile, we consider the following equation for  $\lambda \in (0, \inf_{i \in E} q_i)$ :

$$(11) \quad x_i = \frac{q_i}{q_i - \lambda} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq N \\ j \neq i}} \frac{q_{ij}}{q_i} x_j + \frac{1}{q_i - \lambda}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq N.$$

Denote the minimal solution to Eq. (11) as  $(x_i^{(\lambda, N)}, 0 \leq i \leq N)$ . Then by Theorem 9, we have

$$x_0^{(\lambda, N)} \uparrow e_{00}(\lambda), \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Also, we set  $\lambda' = \frac{1}{2} \inf_{i \in E} q_i$ .

**Lemma 19.** (1) Assume the  $Q$ -process is non-exponentially ergodic, then

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \uparrow x_0^{(\lambda', N)} = e_{00}(\lambda') = \infty.$$

- (2) If  $x_0^{(\tilde{\lambda}, N)}$  is finite for some  $\tilde{\lambda} \in (0, \inf_{i \in E} q_i)$ , then for some  $\hat{\lambda} \in (\tilde{\lambda}, \inf_{i \in E} q_i)$ ,  $x_0^{(\hat{\lambda}, N)}$  is finite.
- (3) If  $x_0^{(\tilde{\lambda}, N)} < \infty$  for some  $\tilde{\lambda} \in (0, \inf_{i \in E} q_i)$ , then  $x_0^{(\lambda, N)}$  is continuous at  $\tilde{\lambda}$  as a function of  $\lambda$ .
- (4) If  $x_0^{(\tilde{\lambda}, N)} = \infty$  for some  $\tilde{\lambda} \in (0, \inf_{i \in E} q_i)$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\lambda \uparrow \tilde{\lambda}} x_0^{(\lambda, N)} &= \infty, \\ x_0^{(\lambda, N)} &= \infty, \quad \lambda > \tilde{\lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

In other words,  $x_0^{(\lambda, N)}$  is continuous at  $\tilde{\lambda}$  as an extended real-valued function.

(5) For any fixed integer  $N \geq 1$ ,

$$\lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} x_0^{(\lambda, N)} \leq \mathbf{E}_0 \sigma_0 < \infty.$$

*Proof.* a) The first assertion is a direct inference of Theorem 9 and non-exponential ergodicity.

b) By Eq. (11),  $(2x_i^{(\tilde{\lambda}, N)}, 0 \leq i \leq N)$  is a finite solution to

$$x_i = \frac{q_i}{q_i - \tilde{\lambda}} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq N \\ j \neq i}} \frac{q_{ij}}{q_i} x_j + \frac{2}{q_i - \tilde{\lambda}}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq N.$$

So it satisfies

$$x_i > \frac{q_i}{q_i - \tilde{\lambda}} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq N \\ j \neq i}} \frac{q_{ij}}{q_i} x_j + \frac{1}{q_i - \tilde{\lambda}}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq N.$$

Consequently,  $(2x_i^{(\tilde{\lambda}, N)}, 0 \leq i \leq N)$  also satisfies

$$x_i > \frac{q_i}{q_i - \tilde{\lambda}} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq N \\ j \neq i}} \frac{q_{ij}}{q_i} x_j + \frac{1}{q_i - \tilde{\lambda}}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq N,$$

for some  $\hat{\lambda}$  slightly larger than  $\tilde{\lambda}$ . Now by Theorem 8,  $x_0^{(\hat{\lambda}, N)}$  is finite.

c) By the second assertion, to prove the third one, we need only prove  $x_0^{(\lambda, N)}$  is continuous on the interval  $(0, \tilde{\lambda}]$ . Because

$$x_i^{(\lambda, N)} = \frac{1}{\lambda} (\mathbf{E}_i^{(Q^{(N)})} e^{\lambda \sigma_0} - 1), \quad 1 \leq i \leq N,$$

$x_i^{(\lambda, N)}$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ ) is continuous on the interval  $(0, \tilde{\lambda}]$  by the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem. Furthermore,  $x_0^{(\lambda, N)}$  is continuous on the interval according to equality

$$x_0 = \frac{q_0}{q_0 - \lambda} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq N} \frac{q_{0j}}{q_0} x_j + \frac{1}{q_0 - \lambda}.$$

d) The fourth assertion is obvious according to above discussions.

e) Now we prove the last assertion. Since the  $Q$ -process is assumed to be ergodic,  $\mathbf{E}_0 \sigma_0 < \infty$ . We need only illustrate

$$\lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} x_0^{(\lambda, N)} \leq \mathbf{E}_0 \sigma_0.$$

By the proof of ‘‘Equivalence of Theorems 4.45 and 4.44’’ in [2, Page 148], we have

$$x_i^{(\lambda, N)} = \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} \mathbf{P}_i^{(Q^{(N)})} [\sigma_0 > t] dt, \quad i \geq 1.$$

Because the  $Q^{(N)}$ -process, as a process on finite state space, must be exponentially ergodic, the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem gives

$$\lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} x_i^{(\lambda, N)} = \int_0^\infty \mathbf{P}_i^{(Q^{(N)})}[\sigma_0 > t] dt = \mathbf{E}_i^{(Q^{(N)})} \sigma_0 \leq \mathbf{E}_i \sigma_0, \quad i \geq 1,$$

where the last inequality is by Theorem 9 and corollary 11. Furthermore, by Eq. (11),

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} x_0^{(\lambda, N)} &= \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{q_0}{q_0 - \lambda} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq N} \frac{q_{0j}}{q_0} x_j^{(\lambda, N)} + \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{q_0 - \lambda} \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq j \leq N} \frac{q_{0j}}{q_0} \mathbf{E}_j^{(Q^{(N)})} \sigma_0 + \frac{1}{q_0} \\ &\leq \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{q_{0j}}{q_0} \mathbf{E}_j \sigma_0 + \frac{1}{q_0} = \mathbf{E}_0 \sigma_0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the last assertion holds.  $\square$

**Corollary 20.** *For each  $N \geq 1$ ,  $x_0^{(\lambda, N)}$  is an extended real-valued continuous function as a function of  $\lambda$  on interval  $(0, \lambda']$ .  $\square$*

*Proof of necessity of Theorem 4.* For each positive integer  $n \leq \mathbf{E}_0 \sigma_0$ , we define  $y_i^{(n)} \equiv 0$  ( $i \in E$ ) and  $\lambda_n = \lambda'$ . And for each  $n > \mathbf{E}_0 \sigma_0$ , we now construct  $y^{(n)} = (y_i^{(n)})_{i \in E}$  and  $\lambda_n$  satisfying

$$y_0^{(n)} \geq n, \quad \lambda_n \leq \frac{1}{n}.$$

In fact, by the first assertion of Lemma 19, we may pick a large  $N_n$  such that

$$x_0^{(\lambda', N_n)} \geq n.$$

Then for each  $N \geq N_n$ ,

$$x_0^{(\lambda', N)} \geq n.$$

Furthermore, by Corollary 20 and the last assertion of Lemma 19, for each  $N \geq N_n$ , there exists  $\lambda(n, N) \in (0, \lambda']$  such that

$$x_0^{(\lambda(n, N), N)} = n.$$

For ease of notation, we write  $c = \inf_{N \geq N_n} \lambda(n, N)$ . Now, we claim  $c = 0$ .

Otherwise if  $c > 0$ , we have

$$e_{00}(c) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} x_0^{(c, N)} \leq n,$$



contradicting non-exponential ergodicity.

Consequently, we may pick some  $\lambda(n, \tilde{N}_n) \leq \frac{1}{n}$  and denote it as  $\lambda_n$ .

Then we have  $\lambda_n \leq \frac{1}{n}$  and  $x_0^{(\lambda_n, \tilde{N}_n)} = n$ . Set

$$y_i^{(n)} = \begin{cases} x_i^{(\lambda_n, \tilde{N}_n)}, & 0 \leq i \leq \tilde{N}_n, \\ 0, & i \geq \tilde{N}_n + 1. \end{cases}$$

It is now straightforward to verify that  $\{\lambda_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  and  $\{y^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$  are the desired sequences. Necessity of our condition follows immediately.  $\square$

*Proof of sufficiency of Theorem 4.* a) We first demonstrate

$$y_0^{(n)} \leq e_{00}(\lambda_n), \quad n \geq 1.$$

In fact, since  $(y^{(n)})_{i \in E}$  is finitely supported for each  $n \geq 1$ , we may pick  $N_n$  such that

$$y_i^{(n)} \leq \frac{q_i}{q_i - \lambda_n} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq N_n \\ j \neq i}} \frac{q_{ij}}{q_i} y_j^{(n)} + \frac{1}{q_i - \lambda_n}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq N_n.$$

At the same time, denote the minimal solution of

$$x_i = \frac{q_i}{q_i - \lambda_n} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq N_n \\ j \neq i}} \frac{q_{ij}}{q_i} x_j + \frac{1}{q_i - \lambda_n}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq N_n$$

as  $(x_i^{(\lambda_n, N_n)}, 1 \leq i \leq N_n)$ , which is positive. Then by Theorem 9 and Lemma 18,

$$y_i^{(n)} \leq x_i^{(\lambda_n, N_n)} \leq e_{i0}(\lambda_n), \quad 1 \leq i \leq N_n.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} y_0^{(n)} &\leq \frac{q_0}{q_0 - \lambda_n} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq N_n} \frac{q_{0j}}{q_0} y_j^{(n)} + \frac{1}{q_0 - \lambda_n} \\ &\leq \frac{q_0}{q_0 - \lambda_n} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq N_n} \frac{q_{0j}}{q_0} e_{j0}(\lambda_n) + \frac{1}{q_0 - \lambda_n} \\ &\leq \frac{q_0}{q_0 - \lambda_n} \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{q_{0j}}{q_0} e_{j0}(\lambda_n) + \frac{1}{q_0 - \lambda_n} = e_{00}(\lambda_n), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is by Theorem 12. This is exactly the desired inequality.

b) For an arbitrary  $\lambda > 0$ , when  $\lambda_n < \lambda$ ,

$$y_0^{(n)} \leq e_{00}(\lambda_n) \leq e_{00}(\lambda).$$

Consequently,

$$\infty = \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_0^{(n)} \leq e_{00}(\lambda).$$

It turns out that  $\mathbf{E}_0 e^{\lambda \sigma_0} = \infty$  ( $\lambda > 0$ ). So the  $Q$ -process is non-exponentially ergodic. Sufficiency of Theorem 4 is proved.  $\square$

### 3. APPLICATIONS TO SINGLE BIRTH PROCESSES

**3.1. Explicit Criteria for Single Birth Processes: Alternative Proofs.** Explicit and computable criteria for ergodicity and strong ergodicity of single birth processes have been studied in [11, 12], respectively. In this section, we present alternative proofs (of the necessity parts) for these explicit criteria.

Let  $Q$  be an irreducible regular single birth  $Q$ -matrix on state space  $E = \mathbb{Z}_+ = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} q_{i,i+1} &> 0, \\ q_{i,i+j} &= 0, \quad i \geq 0, \quad j \geq 2. \end{aligned}$$

Define  $q_n^{(k)} = \sum_{j=0}^k q_{nj}$  for  $0 \leq k < n$  ( $k, n \geq 0$ ) and

$$F_n^{(n)} = 1, \quad F_n^{(i)} = \frac{1}{q_{n,n+1}} \sum_{k=i}^{n-1} q_n^{(k)} F_k^{(i)} \quad (0 \leq i \leq n),$$

$$(12) \quad d_0 = 0, \quad d_n = \frac{1}{q_{n,n+1}} \left( 1 + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} q_n^{(k)} d_k \right) = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{F_n^{(k)}}{q_{k,k+1}} \quad (n \geq 1).$$

Also, we define

$$d = \sup_{k \geq 0} \frac{\sum_{n=0}^k d_n}{\sum_{n=0}^k F_n^{(0)}}.$$

It is well-known that the  $Q$ -process is recurrent iff  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} F_n^{(0)} = \infty$  (cf. [2, 4]).

To give alternative proofs for explicit ergodicity criteria for single birth processes, we first make some preparations.

**Lemma 21.** *Let  $Q$  be an irreducible regular single birth  $Q$ -matrix and  $N$  a positive integer. We investigate the following (truncated) equation:*

$$(13) \quad x_i = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq N \\ j \neq i}} \frac{q_{ij}}{q_i} x_j + \frac{1}{q_i}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq N.$$

(1) Eq. (13) has a unique solution, denoted as  $(x_1^{(N)}, x_2^{(N)}, \dots, x_N^{(N)})$ .

(2) We have a recurrence relation:

$$x_k^{(N)} = x_1^{(N)} \sum_{n=0}^{k-1} F_n^{(0)} - \sum_{n=0}^{k-1} d_n, \quad 1 \leq k \leq N.$$

(3) The unique solution is positive.

(4)  $\overline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} x_1^{(N)} \geq d$ .

*Proof.* a) Eq. (13) has the following equivalent form:

$$\sum_{j=1}^N q_{ij} x_j = -1, \quad 1 \leq i \leq N.$$

To prove regularity of this linear system, we need only prove the following homogeneous equation

$$(14) \quad \sum_{j=1}^N q_{ij} x_j = 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq N$$

has only trivial solution.

Otherwise, if Eq. (14) had a non-trivial solution  $(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \dots, \bar{x}_N)$ , assume  $\bar{x}_1 \geq 0$  without loss of generality. We claim  $\bar{x}_1 \leq \bar{x}_2$ . Since if  $\bar{x}_1 > \bar{x}_2$ , Eq. (14) with  $i = 1$  leads to

$$0 = q_{11}\bar{x}_1 + q_{12}\bar{x}_2 < q_{11}\bar{x}_1 + q_{12}\bar{x}_1 \leq 0,$$

a contradiction. So we obtain  $\bar{x}_1 \leq \bar{x}_2$ . Furthermore, we may proceed to prove that  $\bar{x}_k \leq \bar{x}_{k+1}$  using similar arguments for  $k = 2, 3, \dots, N-1$ . That is

$$\bar{x}_1 \leq \bar{x}_2 \leq \dots \leq \bar{x}_N.$$

Since the solution is non-trivial, we have  $\bar{x}_N > 0$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= q_{N1}\bar{x}_1 + q_{N2}\bar{x}_2 + \dots + q_{N,N-1}\bar{x}_{N-1} + q_{N,N}\bar{x}_N \\ &\leq (q_{N1} + q_{N2} + \dots + q_{N,N-1} + q_{N,N})\bar{x}_N < 0, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. So Eq. (14) has only trivial solution. In this way, we prove the first assertion.

b) To prove the second assertion, we mimic the proof of [12, Lemma 2.1]. Define

$$v_0 = x_1^{(N)}, \quad v_n = x_{n+1}^{(N)} - x_n^{(N)}, \quad 1 \leq n \leq N-1.$$

From Eq. (13), we easily derive that

$$v_n = \frac{1}{q_{n,n+1}} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} q_n^{(k)} v_k - 1 \right), \quad 1 \leq n \leq N-1.$$

By induction,  $v_n = v_0 F_n^{(0)} - d_n$  for  $0 \leq n \leq N-1$ . Our assertion follows immediately.

c) If  $x_i^{(N)} = \min_{1 \leq k \leq N} x_k^{(N)} \leq 0$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} -1 &= \sum_{j=1}^N q_{ij} x_j^{(N)} = \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} q_{ij} (x_j^{(N)} - x_i^{(N)}) - q_{i0} x_i^{(N)} \\ &\quad + (1 - \delta_{i,N}) q_{i,i+1} (x_{i+1}^{(N)} - x_i^{(N)}) - \delta_{i,N} q_{i,i+1} x_i^{(N)} \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\delta$  is the Kronecker delta. This contradiction infers that the unique solution is positive.

d) By the second assertion and the positiveness of the solution, we have

$$x_1^{(N)} > \max_{1 \leq k \leq N} \frac{\sum_{n=0}^{k-1} d_n}{\sum_{n=0}^{k-1} F_n^{(0)}}.$$

So the last assertion follows immediately.  $\square$

We are now in position to present our alternative proofs for explicit criteria of single birth processes.

The following ergodicity criterion is due to Shi-Jian Yan and Mu-Fa Chen [11]. Here, proof for sufficiency is picked from [11] for completeness.

**Theorem 22.** *Let  $Q$  be a regular single birth  $Q$ -matrix, then the  $Q$ -process is ergodic iff  $d < \infty$ .*

*Proof.* a) When  $d < \infty$ , we define

$$y_0 = 0, \quad y_k = \sum_{n=0}^{k-1} (F_n^{(0)} d - d_n), \quad k \geq 1.$$

Then  $(y_i)_{i \geq 0}$  satisfies the condition of [2, Theorem 4.45(1)] with  $H = \{0\}$ . So the  $Q$ -process is ergodic when  $d < \infty$ .

b) When  $d = \infty$ , for each  $N \geq 1$ , we define

$$y_0^{(N)} = x_1^{(N)} + \frac{1}{q_1}, \quad y_i^{(N)} = x_i^{(N)} \quad (1 \leq i \leq N), \quad y_i^{(N)} = 0 \quad (i \geq N+1).$$

Because  $\overline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} x_1^{(N)} \geq d = \infty$ , it can be easily seen that the conditions of Theorem 1 are satisfied by the sequences  $\{y^{(N)}\}_{N=1}^{\infty}$  and  $H = \{0\}$ . So the  $Q$ -process is non-ergodic if  $d = \infty$ .  $\square$

The following strong ergodicity criterion is due to Yu-Hui Zhang [12].

**Theorem 23.** *Let  $Q$  be a regular single birth  $Q$ -matrix, then the  $Q$ -process is strongly ergodic iff  $\sup_{k \geq 0} \sum_{j=0}^k (F_j^{(0)} d - d_j) < \infty$ .*

*Proof.* We assume the process is ergodic without loss of generality. In light of Theorem 22,  $d < \infty$  equivalently.

a) When  $\sup_{k \geq 0} \sum_{j=0}^k (F_j^{(0)} d - d_j) < \infty$ , we define

$$y_0 = 0,$$

$$y_k = \sum_{n=0}^{k-1} (F_n^{(0)} d - d_n), \quad k \geq 1.$$

Then  $(y_i)_{i \geq 0}$  satisfies the condition of [2, Theorem 4.45(3)] with  $H = \{0\}$ . So the  $Q$ -process is strongly ergodic. This proof of sufficiency is not original but picked from [12].

b) When  $\sup_{k \geq 0} \sum_{j=0}^k (F_j^{(0)} d - d_j) = \infty$ , for each  $N \geq 1$ , we define

$$y_i^{(N)} = x_i^{(N)} \quad (1 \leq i \leq N), \quad y_i^{(N)} = 0 \quad (i \geq N+1).$$

It is obvious that  $\sup_{i \geq 1} y_i^{(N)} < \infty$  for each  $N \geq 1$ . We now prove that  $\overline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{i \geq 1} y_i^{(N)} = \infty$ . In fact, for an arbitrary  $k \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{i \geq 1} y_i^{(N)} &\geq \overline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} x_k^{(N)} = \overline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=0}^{k-1} (F_n^{(0)} x_1^{(N)} - d_n) \\ &\geq \sum_{n=0}^{k-1} (F_n^{(0)} d - d_n). \end{aligned}$$

Taking supremum with respect to  $k$  on both sides, we obtain

$$\overline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{i \geq 1} y_i^{(N)} = \infty.$$

The conditions of Theorem 2 are satisfied by the sequences  $\{y^{(N)}\}_{N=1}^{\infty}$  and  $H = \{0\}$ . So the  $Q$ -process is non-strongly ergodic.  $\square$

**3.2. A Special Class of Single Birth Processes.** In this section, we study conservative single birth  $Q$ -matrix  $Q = (q_{ij})$  with

$$q_{ij} = \begin{cases} i+1, & \text{if } i \geq 0, \quad j = i+1, \\ \alpha_i \geq 0, & \text{if } i \geq 1, \quad j = 0, \\ 0, & \text{other } i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

Assume there are infinitely many non-zero  $\alpha_i$ , so  $Q$  is irreducible. The following illuminating example is a catalyst for this part.

**Example 24.** *It is obvious that the  $Q$ -process is unique for arbitrary  $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ .*

(1) *If  $\alpha_i = \frac{1}{i^\gamma}$  for sufficiently large  $i$ , the  $Q$ -process is transient for  $\gamma > 0$ .*

- (2) If  $\alpha_i = \frac{1}{\log^\gamma i}$  for sufficiently large  $i$ ,
- (a) the  $Q$ -process is transient for  $\gamma > 1$ ;
  - (b) the  $Q$ -process is null recurrent for  $\gamma = 1$ ;
  - (c) the  $Q$ -process is ergodic but non-exponentially ergodic for  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ .
- (3) If  $\alpha_i = \frac{1}{(\log \log i)^\gamma}$  for sufficiently large  $i$ , the  $Q$ -process is ergodic but non-exponentially ergodic for  $\gamma > 0$ .

(4) If

$$\alpha_i = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{i}, & i \text{ is an odd positive integer,} \\ 1, & i \text{ is an even positive integer,} \end{cases}$$

the  $Q$ -process is strongly ergodic.

- (5) The  $Q$ -process is strongly ergodic if  $\alpha_i \equiv 1$  ( $i \geq 1$ ).

This example will be demonstrated via the following propositions.

**Lemma 25.** (1) Let  $P = (P_{ij})$  be an irreducible conservative transition matrix on  $\mathbb{Z}_+ = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  with

$$P_{ij} = \begin{cases} p_i, & \text{if } i \geq 0, \ j = i + 1, \\ 1 - p_i, & \text{if } i \geq 0, \ j = 0, \\ 0, & \text{other } i, j \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Then  $P$  is recurrent iff  $\prod_{i=0}^{\infty} p_i = 0$ .

- (2) The  $Q$ -process mentioned above is recurrent iff  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_i}{i} = \infty$ .

*Proof.* a) By Theorems 4.24 and 4.25 in [2], we consider equation

$$(15) \quad (1 - p_i)y_0 + p_i y_{i+1} = y_i, \quad i \geq 1.$$

Setting  $y_0 = 0$ , we obtain a recurrence relation:

$$y_{i+1} = \frac{1}{p_i} y_i, \quad i \geq 1.$$

So Eq. (15) has a compact solution (non-constant bounded solution, respectively) if  $\prod_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{p_i} = \infty$  ( $< \infty$ , respectively). This completes our proof. b) By the first assertion, the  $Q$ -process is recurrent iff  $\prod_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{i+1}{i+1+\alpha_i} = 0$ . Note that

$$\prod_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{i+1}{i+1+\alpha_i} = 0 \quad (\Longleftrightarrow) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_i}{i} = \infty.$$

The second assertion follows immediately.  $\square$

**Lemma 26.** The  $Q$ -process is non-exponentially ergodic if  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_i = 0$ .

*Proof.* First, we deal with a special case:  $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$  is monotonically decreasing. For a fixed  $n \geq 1$ , we set

$$y_i^{(n)} = \begin{cases} 1/\alpha_i, & 1 \leq i \leq n, \\ 1/\alpha_n, & i \geq n+1. \end{cases}$$

It is straightforward to check that  $y^{(n)} = (y_i^{(n)})_{i \geq 1}$  satisfies

$$(i+1+\alpha_i)y_i^{(n)} \leq (i+1)y_{i+1}^{(n)} + 1, \quad i \geq 1.$$

So  $\{y^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is a sequence satisfying all conditions of Theorem 2. The  $Q$ -process is non-strongly ergodic.

Now if the  $Q$ -process is exponentially ergodic, by Theorem 12, the following Eq. (16) has a finite non-negative solution  $(x_i)_{i \geq 1}$  for some  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ .

$$(16) \quad x_i = \frac{i+1}{i+1+\alpha_i-\lambda}x_{i+1} + \frac{1}{i+1+\alpha_i-\lambda}, \quad i \geq 1.$$

Equivalently,

$$x_{i+1} = \frac{i+1+\alpha_i-\lambda}{i+1}x_i - \frac{1}{i+1}, \quad i \geq 1.$$

Because  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_i = 0$ , we have  $x_{i+1} \leq x_i$  for sufficiently large  $i$ . So  $(x_i)_{i \geq 1}$  is bounded. Consequently,  $(\frac{1}{\lambda}(\mathbf{E}_i e^{\lambda \sigma_0} - 1))_{i \geq 1}$  is bounded since it is the minimal non-negative solution to Eq. (16). Hence  $(\mathbf{E}_i e^{\lambda \sigma_0})_{i \geq 1}$  is bounded and so is  $(\mathbf{E}_i \sigma_0)_{i \geq 1}$ . The  $Q$ -process is thus strongly ergodic. This is impossible. The  $Q$ -process is therefore non-exponentially ergodic.

In general case where  $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$  may not be monotonically decreasing, we define conservative  $\tilde{Q} = (\tilde{q}_{ij})$ :

$$\tilde{q}_{ij} = \begin{cases} i+1, & \text{if } i \geq 0, \ j = i+1, \\ \sup_{k \geq i} \alpha_k, & \text{if } i \geq 1, \ j = 0, \\ 0, & \text{other } i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

Because

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} (\sup_{k \geq i} \alpha_k) = \overline{\lim}_{i \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_i = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_i = 0,$$

the  $\tilde{Q}$ -process is non-exponentially ergodic according to above discussions. Consequently, the  $Q$ -process is non-exponentially ergodic by comparison. Our proof is now complete.  $\square$

The above proof is based on Theorem 2, we may give a more direct proof using Theorem 4.

*Alternative Proof of Lemma 26.* Without loss of generality, we assume that  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \downarrow \alpha_i = 0$ . First, set

$$\lambda_n = \frac{1}{n+1}, \quad n \geq 1.$$

For each fixed positive integer  $n$ , by Theorem 4, we consider

$$\begin{aligned} y_0^{(n)} &\leq \frac{1}{1-\lambda_n} y_1^{(n)} + \frac{1}{1-\lambda_n}, \\ y_i^{(n)} &\leq \frac{i+1}{i+1+\alpha_i-\lambda_n} y_{i+1}^{(n)} + \frac{1}{i+1+\alpha_i-\lambda_n}, \quad i \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Introducing a change of variable  $d_i^{(n)} = y_{i+1}^{(n)} - y_i^{(n)}$  ( $i \geq 0$ ), the above inequality is transformed into

$$\begin{aligned} d_0^{(n)} &\geq -\lambda_n y_0^{(n)} - 1, \\ d_i^{(n)} &\geq \frac{1}{i+1} (\alpha_i - \lambda_n) y_i^{(n)} - \frac{1}{i+1}, \quad i \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Put  $y_0^{(n)} = n$ . As  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \downarrow \alpha_i = 0$ , there exists  $M_1$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_i &\geq \lambda_n, & 1 \leq i \leq M_1 - 1, \\ \alpha_i &< \lambda_n, & i \geq M_1. \end{aligned}$$

If we place

$$\begin{aligned} d_0^{(n)} &= 0, \\ d_i^{(n)} &= \frac{\alpha_i - \lambda_n}{i+1} y_i^{(n)}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq M_1 - 1, \end{aligned}$$

then

$$n = y_0^{(n)} = y_1^{(n)} \leq y_2^{(n)} \leq \cdots \leq y_{M_1}^{(n)}.$$

Furthermore, we may pick  $M_2 > M_1$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} y_{M_1}^{(n)} - \frac{1}{M_1+1} - \cdots - \frac{1}{M_2} &\geq 0, \\ y_{M_1}^{(n)} - \frac{1}{M_1+1} - \cdots - \frac{1}{M_2} - \frac{1}{M_2+1} &< 0. \end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, let

$$\begin{aligned} d_k^{(n)} &= -\frac{1}{k+1}, & M_1 \leq k \leq M_2 - 1, \\ d_{M_2}^{(n)} &= -y_{M_2}^{(n)}, \\ d_k^{(n)} &= 0, & k \geq M_2 + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $y_k^{(n)} = 0$  ( $k > M_2$ ).



Now, one may check that  $\{\lambda_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  coupled with  $\{y^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$  are sequences satisfying conditions in Theorem 4. The  $Q$ -process is non-exponentially ergodic.  $\square$

**Corollary 27.** *Let  $\alpha_i = \frac{1}{\log^\gamma i}$  ( $i \geq 3$ ).*

- (1) *The  $Q$ -process is ergodic for  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ .*
- (2) *The  $Q$ -process is null recurrent for  $\gamma = 1$ .*

*Proof.* a) When  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ , we set  $y_i = \log^{2\gamma} i$  ( $i \geq 3$ ). Then for sufficiently large  $i$ ,

$$(i + 1 + \alpha_i)y_i \geq (i + 1)y_{i+1} + 1.$$

In fact, for large  $i$ , by Lagrange mean value theorem,

$$(i + 1)(\log^{2\gamma}(i + 1) - \log^{2\gamma} i) \leq 2\gamma \frac{i + 1}{i} \log^{2\gamma-1}(i + 1) \leq \log^\gamma i - 1.$$

Thus, the  $Q$ -process is ergodic for  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  by [2, Teorem 4.45(1)]. b) To obtain the second assertion, we try to exploit Theorem 22. Using the O'Stoiz theorem and the explicit expression of  $F_i^{(k)}$  in [4, Example 8.2], we have

$$\begin{aligned} d &= \sup_{i \geq 0} \frac{\sum_{k=0}^i d_k}{\sum_{k=0}^i F_k^{(0)}} \geq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{k=0}^i d_k}{\sum_{k=0}^i F_k^{(0)}} = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d_i}{F_i^{(0)}} \\ &= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^i \frac{F_i^{(k)}}{q_{k,k+1}}}{F_i^{(0)}} \geq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \frac{1}{(k+1) \prod_{\ell=1}^k (1 + \frac{\alpha_\ell}{\ell+1})} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(k+1) \prod_{\ell=1}^k (1 + \frac{\alpha_\ell}{\ell+1})}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, by Kummer's test, one may see  $d = \infty$  for  $\alpha_i = \frac{1}{\log i}$  ( $i \geq 3$ ). The  $Q$ -process is therefore non-ergodic.  $\square$

**Lemma 28.** *Let  $Q$  be an irreducible regular  $Q$ -matrix and assume the  $Q$ -process is recurrent. If  $\inf_{i \geq 1} q_{i0} > 0$ , then the  $Q$ -process is strongly ergodic.*

*Proof.* Take  $c \in (0, \inf_{i \geq 1} q_{i0})$ , then

$$\frac{1}{c} \geq \frac{1}{c} + \frac{1 - \frac{q_{i0}}{c}}{q_i} = \frac{1}{c} \left(1 - \frac{q_{i0}}{q_i}\right) + \frac{1}{q_i} = \sum_{\substack{j \geq 1 \\ j \neq i}} \frac{q_{ij}}{q_i} \frac{1}{c} + \frac{1}{q_i}, \quad i \geq 1.$$

So the  $Q$ -process is strongly ergodic by [2, Teorem 4.45(3)].  $\square$

**Lemma 29.** *Suppose  $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$  has a subsequence  $\{\alpha_{i_k}\}_{k=1}^\infty$  satisfying*

$$\inf_{k \geq 1} \alpha_{i_k} > 0, \quad \sup_{k \geq 1} \frac{i_{k+1}}{i_k} < \infty, \quad \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i_k} = \infty.$$

*Then the  $Q$ -process is strongly ergodic.*

*Proof.* For ease of notation, we write  $i_0 = 0$ . Define conservative  $\tilde{Q} = (\tilde{q}_{ij})$ :

$$\tilde{q}_{ij} = \begin{cases} i+1, & \text{if } i = i_k, \ j = i_{k+1} \text{ for some } k \geq 0, \\ i+1, & \text{if } i_k < i < i_{k+1} \text{ for some } k \geq 0, \ j = i+1, \\ c := \frac{1}{2} \inf_{k \geq 1} \alpha_{i_k}, & \text{if } i = i_k \text{ for some } k \geq 1, \ j = 0, \\ 0, & \text{other } i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that  $\{i_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$  is an irreducible subclass of  $\tilde{Q}$ . Note that  $\{i_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$  is also a recurrent subclass of the  $\tilde{Q}$ -process since  $\sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{1}{i_k} = \infty$  (This is easy to illustrate using Lemma 25). Because

$$\frac{1}{c} = \frac{i_k + 1}{i_k + 1 + c} \cdot \frac{1}{c} + \frac{1}{i_k + 1 + c}, \quad k \geq 1,$$

$\{i_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$  is furthermore a strongly ergodic subclass according to [2, Theorem 4.45(3)]. Since  $\sup_{k \geq 1} \frac{i_{k+1}}{i_k} < \infty$  implies

$$\sup_{k \geq 0} \left( \frac{1}{i_k + 2} + \frac{1}{i_k + 3} + \cdots + \frac{1}{i_{k+1}} \right) \leq \sup_{k \geq 1} \frac{i_{k+1} - i_k - 1}{i_k + 1} < \infty,$$

exploiting

$$\mathbf{E}_i^{(\tilde{Q})} \sigma_0 = \mathbf{E}_{i+1}^{(\tilde{Q})} \sigma_0 + \frac{1}{i+1}, \quad i_k < i < i_{k+1}, \ k \geq 0,$$

we have  $\sup_{i \geq 0} \mathbf{E}_i^{(\tilde{Q})} < \infty$ . Construct an order-preserving conservative coupling  $Q$ -matrix  $\overline{Q} = (\overline{q}(i, j; i', j'))$ , whose marginalities are  $Q$  and

$\tilde{Q}$ , with non-diagonal entries

$$\bar{q}(i, j; i', j') = \begin{cases} (i+1) \wedge (j+1), & \text{if } i' = i+1, i \geq 0, \\ & j' = j+1, i_k < j < i_{k+1} \text{ for some } k \geq 0, \\ (i+1) \wedge (j+1), & \text{if } i' = i+1, i \geq 0, \\ & j' = i_{k+1}, j = i_k \text{ for some } k \geq 0, \\ (i-j)^+, & \text{if } i' = i+1, i \geq 0, j' = j \geq 0, \\ c, & \text{if } i' = 0, i \geq 1, j' = 0, j = i_k \text{ for some } k \geq 1, \\ \alpha_i - c, & \text{if } i' = 0, i \geq 1, j' = j = i_k \text{ for some } k \geq 1, \\ \alpha_i, & \text{if } i' = 0, i \geq 1, i_k < j' = j < i_{k+1} \text{ for some } k \geq 0, \\ 0, & \text{other } (i', j') \neq (i, j). \end{cases}$$

Denote the  $\bar{Q}$ -process as  $(X(t), Y(t))_{t \geq 0}$ , then we easily deduce that

$$\mathbf{P}_{(i_1, i_2)}^{(\bar{Q})}[X(t) \leq Y(t)] = 1, \quad t > 0, \quad i_1 \leq i_2.$$

Hence,

$$\sup_{i \geq 1} \mathbf{E}_i^{(Q)} \sigma_0 \leq \sup_{i \geq 1} \mathbf{E}_i^{(\tilde{Q})} \sigma_0 < \infty,$$

so  $Q$ -process is strongly ergodic.  $\square$

#### 4. APPLICATIONS TO MULTI-DIMENSIONAL EXAMPLES

In this section, we shall apply our inverse problem criteria to some multi-dimensional models. Brussel's model (see [11]) is a typical model of reaction-diffusion process with several species.

**Example 30.** Let  $S$  be a finite set,  $E = (\mathbb{Z}_+^2)^S$  and let  $p_k(u, v)$  be transition probability on  $S$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ . Denote by  $e_{u1} \in E$  the unit vector whose first component at site  $u \in S$  is equal to 1 and the second component at  $u$  as well as other components at  $v \neq u$  all equal 0. Similarly, one can define  $e_{u2}$ . The model is described by the conservative  $Q$ -matrix  $Q = (q_{ij})$ :

$$q(x, y) = \begin{cases} \lambda_1 a(u), & \text{if } y = x + e_{u1}, \\ \lambda_2 b(u) x_1(u), & \text{if } y = x - e_{u1} + e_{u2}, \\ \lambda_3 \binom{x_1(u)}{2} x_2(u), & \text{if } y = x + e_{u1} - e_{u2}, \\ \lambda_4 x_1(u), & \text{if } y = x - e_{u1}, \\ x_k(u) p_k(u, v), & \text{if } y = x - e_{uk} + e_{vk}, \quad k = 1, 2, \quad v \neq u, \\ 0, & \text{other } y \neq x, \end{cases}$$

and  $q(x) = -q(x, x) = \sum_{y \neq x} q(x, y)$ , where  $x = \left( (x_1(u), x_2(u)) : u \in S \right) \in E$ .  $a$  and  $b$  are positive functions on  $S$  and  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_4$  are positive constants. Finite-dimensional Brussel's model is exponentially ergodic (cf. [?]). We now demonstrate that it is non-strongly ergodic, which was actually proved for the first time in [10]. But here we adopt different methods.

*Proof.* We shall prove our assertion by two approaches. For ease of notation, we write  $\tilde{a} = \sum_{u \in S} a(u)$ ,  $|x| = \sum_{u \in S} (x_1(u) + x_2(u))$  for  $x \in E$  and also  $E_i = \{x \in E : |x| = i\}$  for  $i \geq 0$ .

a) For each fixed  $n \geq 1$ , we construct function

$$F^{(n)}(x) = f_i^{(n)}, \quad x \in E_i, \quad i \geq 1,$$

with

$$f_i^{(n)} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\lambda_4} \log(i+1), & 1 \leq i \leq n, \\ \frac{1}{\lambda_4} \log(n+1), & i \geq n+1. \end{cases}$$

Because

$$\begin{aligned} \left(1 + \frac{1}{k}\right)^\ell &\leq e, & 1 \leq \ell \leq k, \\ \left(1 + \frac{1}{k}\right)^\ell \left(\frac{k+1}{k+2}\right)^{\frac{\lambda_1 \tilde{a}}{\lambda_4}} &\leq e, & 1 \leq \ell \leq k, \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda_1 \tilde{a} + \lambda_4 \ell) \frac{1}{\lambda_4} \log(k+1) &\leq \frac{\lambda_1 \tilde{a}}{\lambda_4} \log(k+1) + \ell \log k + 1, & 1 \leq \ell \leq k, \\ (\lambda_1 \tilde{a} + \lambda_4 \ell) \frac{1}{\lambda_4} \log(k+1) &\leq \frac{\lambda_1 \tilde{a}}{\lambda_4} \log(k+2) + \ell \log k + 1, & 1 \leq \ell \leq k. \end{aligned}$$

Now it is straightforward to check that

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \lambda_1 \tilde{a} + \lambda_4 \sum_{u \in S} x_1(u) \right) f_i^{(n)} &\leq \lambda_1 \tilde{a} f_{i+1}^{(n)} + \lambda_4 \sum_{u \in S} x_1(u) f_{i-1}^{(n)} + 1, \\ & \quad x \in E_i, \quad i \geq 1, \quad n \geq 1, \end{aligned}$$

where we naturally put  $f_0^{(n)} = 0$  ( $n \geq 1$ ).

It can be easily seen that  $F^{(n)}(x)$  satisfies Eq. (2) in current setup and  $\{F^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is a sequence satisfying conditions in Theorem 2. Consequently, we infer that finite-dimensional Brussel's model is non-strongly ergodic.

b) We try invoking Theorem 2 yet with a different testing sequence. For each fixed  $n \geq 1$ , we construct function

$$F^{(n)}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^k d_i^{(n)}, \quad x \in E_k, \quad k \geq 1,$$

with

$$d_i^{(n)} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\lambda_4(i+1)}, & 1 \leq i \leq n, \\ -\frac{1}{\lambda_1 \tilde{a}(n+1)}, & i = n+1, \\ -\frac{1}{\lambda_1 \tilde{a}}, & i \geq n+2. \end{cases}$$

Then a trivial calculation shows that  $\{F^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is a sequence satisfying conditions in Theorem 2. So finite-dimensional Brussel's model is non-strongly ergodic.  $\square$

**Example 31.** Let  $E = \mathbb{Z}_+^2$ . Epidemic process is defined by  $Q$ -matrix  $Q = \left( q((m, n), (m', n')) : (m, n), (m', n') \in E \right)$  with

$$q((m, n), (m', n')) = \begin{cases} \alpha, & \text{if } (m', n') = (m, n), \\ \gamma m, & \text{if } (m', n') = (m, n), \\ \beta, & \text{if } (m', n') = (m, n), \\ \delta n, & \text{if } (m', n') = (m, n), \\ \varepsilon mn, & \text{if } (m', n') = (m, n), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise, unless } (m', n') = (m, n), \end{cases}$$

and  $q(m, n) = -q((m, n), (m, n)) = \sum_{(m', n') \neq (m, n)} q((m, n), (m', n'))$ , where  $\alpha, \gamma, \beta, \delta$ , and  $\varepsilon$  are non-negative constants. We assume  $\gamma > 0$  and  $\delta > 0$ . The  $Q$ -process is unique and ergodic when  $\alpha + \beta > 0$  (cf. [1]). Epidemic process is non-strongly ergodic if  $\alpha + \beta, \gamma$ , and  $\delta$  are strictly positive by [10]. Using similar argument as in Example 30, we can also carry out this result and therefore give a new proof. We will not reproduce the details here.

**Example 32.** Consider a conservative birth-death  $Q$ -matrix with birth rate  $b_0 = 1$ ,  $b_i = i^\gamma$  ( $i \geq 1$ ) and death rate  $a_i = i^\gamma$  ( $i \geq 1$ ). It is known that this  $Q$ -matrix is regular for all  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$  and the  $Q$ -process is recurrent. The process is ergodic iff  $\gamma > 1$  and strongly ergodic iff  $\gamma > 2$  (cf. [2]). We now use Theorem 2 to demonstrate that the process is non-strongly ergodic if  $\gamma \leq 2$ . Also, we use Theorem 1 to present that the process is non-ergodic if  $\gamma \leq 1$ .

*Proof.* a) First we prove the process is non-strongly ergodic if  $\gamma \leq 2$  using Theorem 2. For each fixed  $n \geq 1$ , define

$$y_k^{(n)} = \sum_{i=1}^k d_i^{(n)}, \quad k \geq 1,$$

with

$$d_i^{(n)} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{i^{1+\frac{1}{i}}}, & 1 \leq i \leq n, \\ \frac{1}{i^{1+\frac{1}{n+1}}}, & i \geq n+1. \end{cases}$$

When  $\gamma \leq 2$ , we have the following estimates:

$$(17a) \quad \frac{1}{i^{1+\frac{1}{i}}} - \frac{1}{(i+1)^{1+\frac{1}{i+1}}} \leq \frac{1}{i^\gamma}, \quad i \geq 1,$$

$$(17b) \quad \frac{1}{i^{1+\frac{1}{n+1}}} - \frac{1}{(i+1)^{1+\frac{1}{n+1}}} \leq \frac{1}{i^\gamma}, \quad i \geq n+1.$$

In fact, Eq. (17a) holds obviously for  $i = 1, 2$ . Put

$$g_1(x) = \frac{1}{x^{1+\frac{1}{x}}}, \quad x > 0.$$

Differentiating  $g_1$ , we obtain

$$|g_1'(x)| = \frac{1}{x^{2+\frac{1}{x}}} \left( 1 + \frac{1 - \log x}{x} \right) \leq \frac{1}{x^2} \leq \frac{1}{x^\gamma}, \quad \text{if } x \geq e.$$

By Lagrange mean value theorem, Eq. (17a) holds.

We turn to Eq. (17b). Denote  $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{n+1}$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{i^{1+\varepsilon}} - \frac{1}{(i+1)^{1+\varepsilon}} &= \frac{(i+1)^{1+\varepsilon} - i^{1+\varepsilon}}{i^{1+\varepsilon}(i+1)^{1+\varepsilon}} \leq \frac{(1+\varepsilon)(i+1)^\varepsilon}{i^{1+\varepsilon}(i+1)^{1+\varepsilon}} \\ &= \frac{1+\varepsilon}{i^{1+\varepsilon}(i+1)} = \frac{1}{i^2} (1+\varepsilon) \frac{i^{1-\varepsilon}}{i+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where “ $\leq$ ” is obtained by mean value theorem.

Define

$$g_2(x) = (1+\varepsilon) \frac{x^{1-\varepsilon}}{x+1}, \quad x > 0.$$

By calculus method, we see that  $g_2$  is decreasing on the interval  $[n+1, \infty)$ . One can also verify easily that  $g_2(n+1) \leq 1$ . Therefore

$$g_2(i) = (1+\varepsilon) \frac{i^{1-\varepsilon}}{i+1} \leq 1, \quad i \geq n+1.$$

And Eq. (17b) follows.

By Eq. (17),  $(y_i^{(n)})_{i \geq 1}$  satisfies Eq. (2) in current setup:

$$(18) \quad d_i^{(n)} \leq d_{i+1}^{(n)} + \frac{1}{i^\gamma}, \quad i \geq 1.$$

and  $\{y^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is a sequence satisfying all conditions in Theorem 2. Consequently, we conclude that the  $Q$ -process is non-strongly ergodic if  $\gamma \leq 2$ .

b) We use Theorem 2 to deduce non-strong ergodicity yet with a different testing sequence. Define

$$d_i^{(n)} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{(i+9)\log(i+9)}, & 1 \leq i \leq n, \\ \frac{1}{(n+9)\log(n+9)} - \sum_{k=n}^{i-1} \frac{1}{k^2}, & i \geq n+1. \end{cases}$$

Because

$$\sum_{k=n}^\infty \frac{1}{k^2} > \int_n^\infty \frac{1}{x^2} dx = \frac{1}{n} > \frac{1}{(n+9)\log(n+9)}, \quad n \geq 1,$$

$$\frac{1}{(i+9)\log(i+9)} - \frac{1}{(i+10)\log(i+10)} \leq \frac{1}{i^2}, \quad i \geq 1,$$

it is straightforward to verify that  $\{y^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ , with  $y_k^{(n)} = \sum_{i=1}^k d_i^{(n)}$  ( $k \geq 1$ ), is a sequence satisfying conditions in Theorem 2.

c) We now turn to non-ergodicity. For each  $n \geq 1$ , we set

$$y_0^{(n)} = n+1, \quad y_i^{(n)} = \sum_{k=1}^i d_k^{(n)} \quad (i \geq 1),$$

where  $d_k^{(n)} = n - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{j}$  ( $k \geq 1$ ) and  $\sum_\emptyset = 0$ . Hence for each  $n \geq 1$ ,  $(y_i^{(n)})_{i \geq 0}$  satisfies

$$y_0^{(n)} \leq y_1^{(n)} + 1,$$

$$d_i^{(n)} \leq d_{i+1}^{(n)} + \frac{1}{i^\gamma}, \quad i \geq 1,$$

which is exactly Eq. (1) in current setup. So,  $\{y^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ , with  $y^{(n)} = (y_i^{(n)})_{i \geq 0}$ , is a sequence for Theorem 1. Therefore, the  $Q$ -process is non-ergodic for  $\gamma \leq 1$ .  $\square$

We further investigate a multi-dimensional version of Example 32.

**Example 32'.** Let  $S$  be a finite set,  $E = (\mathbb{Z}_+)^S$  and  $p(u, v)$  a transition probability matrix on  $S$ . We denote by  $\theta \in E$  whose components are identically 0 and denote by  $e_u \in E$  the unit vector whose component at site  $u \in S$  is equal to 1 and other components at  $v \neq u$  all equal 0. Define an irreducible  $Q$ -matrix  $Q = (q(x, y) : x, y \in E)$  as follows:

$$q(x, y) = \begin{cases} x(u)^\gamma, & \text{if } y = x + e_u, \ x \neq \theta, \\ 1, & \text{if } x = \theta, \ y = e_u, \\ x(u)^\gamma, & \text{if } y = x - e_u, \\ x(u)p(u, v), & \text{if } y = x - e_u + e_v, \ v \neq u, \\ 0, & \text{other } y \neq x, \end{cases}$$

and  $q(x) = -q(x, x) = \sum_{y \neq x} q(x, y)$ , where  $x = (x(u) : u \in S) \in E$ . It is easy to check by [11, Theorem 1] that the  $Q$ -process is unique for all  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ . We now prove the following results:

- (1) When  $\gamma \leq 2$ , the  $Q$ -process is non-strongly ergodic.
- (2) When  $\gamma \leq 1$ , the  $Q$ -process is non-ergodic.

*Proof.* We will reduce multi-dimensional problem to 1-dimensional case. We write  $|x| = \sum_{u \in S} x(u)$  for  $x \in E$  and  $E_i = \{x \in E : |x| = i\}$  for  $i \geq 0$ .

a) Using Theorem 2, to prove that the  $Q$ -process is non-strongly ergodic for  $\gamma \leq 2$ , we need only construct sequence  $\{F^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$  satisfying the conditions. We may guess  $F^{(n)}$  is identically  $f_i^{(n)}$  on  $E_i$  for each  $i \geq 1$ , and set

$$d_1^{(n)} = f_1^{(n)}, \quad d_i^{(n)} = f_i^{(n)} - f_{i-1}^{(n)} \ (i \geq 2).$$

Now, Eq. (2) becomes

$$d_i^{(n)} \leq d_{i+1}^{(n)} + \frac{1}{\sum_{u \in S} x(u)^\gamma}, \quad x \in E_i, \ i \geq 1.$$

Because

$$\sum_{u \in S} x(u)^\gamma \leq \sum_{u \in S} x(u)^2 \leq \left( \sum_{u \in S} x(u) \right)^2 = i^2, \quad x \in E_i, \ i \geq 1, \ \gamma \leq 2,$$

we need only construct sequence satisfying

$$d_i^{(n)} \leq d_{i+1}^{(n)} + \frac{1}{i^2}, \quad i \geq 1,$$

which is exactly Eq. (18) with  $\gamma = 2$ . Now we can proceed our proof as in Example 32. The  $Q$ -process is therefore non-strongly ergodic if  $\gamma \leq 2$ .



b) To deal with non-ergodicity, according to the discussions in a) and using similar notations, we need only consider equation

$$y_0 \leq y_1 + 1,$$

$$d_i \leq d_{i+1} + \frac{1}{i}, \quad i \geq 1.$$

And we can proceed as in proof c) of Example 32. Hence the multi-dimensional process is non-ergodic for  $\gamma \leq 1$ .  $\square$

**Acknowledgement:** Thanks to Prof. Mu-Fa Chen for his careful guidance and valuable suggestions. This work is supported by the National Nature Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11771046).

## REFERENCES

- [1] William J Anderson. *Continuous-Time Markov Chains*. Springer, New York, 1991.
- [2] Mu-Fa Chen. *From Markov Chains to Non-Equilibrium Particle Systems*. World Scientific, Singapore, 2nd edition, 2004.
- [3] Mu-Fa Chen and Ying-Zhe Wang. Algebraic convergence of markov chains. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 13(2):604–627, May 2003.
- [4] Mu-Fa Chen and Yu-Hui Zhang. Unified representation of formulas for single birth processes. *Front. Math. China*, 9(4):761–796, 2014.
- [5] Martin Hairer. *Convergence of Markov Processes, Lecture Notes*. <http://www.hairer.org/notes/Convergence.pdf>, 01 2016.
- [6] Zhen-Ting Hou and Qing-Feng Guo. *Time-homogeneous Countable Markov Processes*. Science Press, 1978.
- [7] Yong-Hua Mao. Algebraic convergence for discrete-time ergodic markov chains. *Science in China (Ser. A)*, 46(5):621–630, 2003.
- [8] Yong-Hua Mao. Ergodic degrees for continuous-time markov chains. *Science in China Ser. A Mathematics*, 47(2):161–174, 2004.
- [9] Richard Lewis Tweedie. Criteria for ergodicity, exponential ergodicity and strong ergodicity of markov processes. *J. Appl. Prob.*, 18(1):122–130, 1981.
- [10] Bo Wu and Yu-Hui Zhang. A class of multidimensional  $Q$ -processes. *J. Appl. Prob.*, 44(1):226–237, 2007.
- [11] Shi-Jian Yan and Mu-Fa Chen. Multi-dimensional  $Q$ -processes. *Chinese Ann. Math.*, 7B(1):90–110, 1986.
- [12] Yu-Hui Zhang. Strong ergodicity for single-birth processes. *J. Appl. Prob.*, 38(1):270–277, 2001.