

Decay property of stopped $M^X/M/1$ -queueing networks

LI YANYUN* *Sun Yat-Sen University*

LI JUNPING** *Guangdong University of Science & Technology; Central South University*

Abstract

In this paper, we mainly consider the decay property of stopped $M^X/M/1$ -queueing networks with $d(\geq 2)$ nodes. The exact value of the decay parameter λ_C is obtained by using a new method. Then, the corresponding λ_C -invariant measures and quasi-distributions are presented.

Keywords: Queueing networks, decay parameter, invariant measures, subinvariant measures, subinvariant vectors, quasi-distributions

AMS 2000 SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION: PRIMARY 60J27
SECONDARY 60J35

1. Introduction

The decay property plays an important role in the development of continuous-time and discrete-time Markov chains. The existence of decay parameter was firstly revealed by Kingman [11] which showed that if C is an irreducible class of a continuous-time Markov chain on the state space $\mathbf{E}$, then there exists a nonnegative number λ_C , called the decay parameter of the corresponding process, such that for all $i, j \in C$,

$$\frac{1}{t} \log p_{ij}(t) \rightarrow -\lambda_C \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow +\infty,$$

where $P(t) = (p_{ij}(t) : i, j \in \mathbf{E})$ is the transition function of the corresponding continuous-time Markov chain. It can be proved that this decay parameter can be expressed as

$$\lambda_C = \inf\{\lambda \geq 0 : \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} p_{ij}(t) dt = \infty\} = \sup\{\lambda \geq 0 : \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} p_{ij}(t) dt < \infty\}, \quad (1.1)$$

where the latter two quantities in (1.1) are independent of $i, j \in C$. Beginning with this pioneer and remarkable work, the theory of decay property has been flourished due to much important research, including Flaspohler [8], Pollett [19, 20], Darroch and Seneta [6], Kelly [9], Kijima [10], Nair and Pollett [17], Tweedie [23], Van Doorn [21, 22] and many others.

* Postal address: School of Mathematics, Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou, 510275, China. E-mail address: liyy536@mail2.sysu.edu.cn

** Postal address: Guangdong University of Science & Technology, Dongguan, 523083, China; Central South University, Changsha, 410083, China. E-mail address: jpli@mail.csu.edu.cn

The deep relationship between invariant measures and quasi-stationary distributions has been revealed by Van Doorn [22], and Nair and Pollett [17]. In spite of flourish developments in both continuous-time Markov chains and queueing theory, it seems that the deep relationship between decay properties and Markov queueing models has not been fully revealed. In fact, even calculating the exact value of the decay parameter for most transient Markov queueing models remains open yet.

On the other hand, Markov queueing theory occupies a significant niche in applied probability and plays an important role both in the development of general queueing theory and in the theory and application of continuous-time Markov chains, see for example, Anderson [1], Asmussen and Hering [2], Asmussen [3], Athreya and Jagers [5], Gross and Harris [7], Kleinrock [12], Medhi [16]), Pakes and Tavaré [18] and Lucantoni [15].

The main aim of this paper is to consider the decay properties of stopped $M^X/M/1$ -queueing networks with d nodes. Its evolution can be described as follows:

(i) The network consists of d nodes, labeled $1, 2, \dots, d$, where $d < \infty$. For each $k = 1, 2, \dots, d$, when the k 'th node is nonempty, the entrance of this node is open and arrival of customers from outside to this node follows a compound Poisson process with arrival rates λ_{kj} ($j \geq 1$); When the k 'th node is empty, the entrance of this node is closed and no customer from outside is allowed to enter this node. Therefore, $\lambda_k := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{kj}$ is the whole arrival rate of customers at the k 'th node;

(ii) There is exactly one sever with service rate μ_k at node k . When a customer at node k has been served, he/she leaves the system with probability γ_{k0} or transfer to node j with probability γ_{kj} ($k, j = 1, \dots, d$), where $\sum_{j=0}^d \gamma_{kj} = 1$ for each k ;

(iii) The arrival of customers and service at each node are all independent of each other;

(iv) When the network is empty, it stops.

For convenience of our discussion, we adopt the following conventions throughout this paper:

$$(C-1) \mathbf{Z}_+^d = \{(i_1, \dots, i_d) : i_1, \dots, i_d \in \mathbf{Z}_+\}.$$

$$(C-2) [0, 1]^d = \{(x_1, \dots, x_d) : 0 \leq x_1, \dots, x_d \leq 1\}.$$

$$(C-3) \chi_{\mathbf{Z}_+^d}(\cdot) \text{ is the indicator of } \mathbf{Z}_+^d.$$

$$(C-4) \mathbf{0} = (0, \dots, 0), \mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1), \mathbf{e}_i = (0, \dots, 1_i, \dots, 0) \text{ are vectors in } [0, 1]^d.$$

$$(C-5) \text{ Define } T_{kl}(\mathbf{i}) = \mathbf{i} - \mathbf{e}_k + \mathbf{e}_l \text{ for } k, l \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\} \text{ and } \mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d \text{ with } i_k > 0.$$

By the above description in (i)-(iv), the stopped $M^X/M/1$ -queueing network with d nodes satisfies the following conditions:

(a) the state space is $\mathbf{Z}_+^d$;

(b) its generator $Q = (q_{ij} : \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d)$ satisfies

$$q_{ij} = \begin{cases} \lambda_{kl}, & \text{if } \mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{0}, i_k > 0, \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{i} + l\mathbf{e}_k, \\ \mu_k \gamma_{k0}, & \text{if } i_k > 0, \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{i} - \mathbf{e}_k, \\ \mu_k \gamma_{kl}, & \text{if } i_k > 0, \mathbf{j} = T_{kl}(\mathbf{i}), \\ -\sum_{k=1}^d (\lambda_k + \mu_k) \cdot \chi_{\{i_k > 0\}}, & \text{if } \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{0}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

The matrix Q given in (1.2) is called a d -QN q -matrix. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\gamma_{kk} = 0$ for all $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. In order to avoid trivial cases, we further assume that $\gamma_{k0} > 0$ for some $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ and the routing matrix $\Gamma = (\gamma_{ij} : 1 \leq i, j \leq d)$ is irreducible, which guarantees that $\mathcal{C} := \mathbf{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ is communicating.

For d -QN q -matrix Q given in (1.2), by the theory of Markov processes, we know that Q determines exactly one Markov process, i.e., the Feller minimal Q -process. Let $\{X(t) : t \geq 0\}$ be the Q -process and $P(t) = (p_{ij}(t) : \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d)$ be the transition probability function of $\{X(t) : t \geq 0\}$.

It is well known that the decay parameter and quasi-stationary distributions are closely linked with the so-called μ -subinvariant/invariant measures and μ -subinvariant/invariant vectors. An elementary but detailed discussion of this theory can be seen in Anderson [1]. For convenience, we briefly repeat these definitions as follows:

Definition 1.1. Let $Q = (q_{ij} : \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d)$ be a d -QN q -matrix given in (1.2) and $\mathcal{C}$ be a communicating class. Assume that $\mu \geq 0$. A set $(m_i : \mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{C})$ of positive numbers is called a μ -subinvariant measure for Q on $\mathcal{C}$ if

$$\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{C}} m_i q_{ij} \leq -\mu m_j, \quad \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C}. \quad (1.3)$$

If the equality holds in (1.3), then $(m_i : \mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{C})$ is called a μ -invariant measure for Q on $\mathcal{C}$.

Definition 1.2. Let $Q = (q_{ij} : \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d)$ be a d -QN q -matrix given in (1.2), $P(t) = (p_{ij}(t) : \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d)$ be the Q -process and $\mathcal{C}$ be a communicating class. Assume that $(m_i : \mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{C})$ is a probability distribution over $\mathcal{C}$. Denote $p_j(t) = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{C}} m_i p_{ij}(t)$ for $\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C}, t \geq 0$. If

$$\frac{p_j(t)}{\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{C}} p_j(t)} = m_j, \quad \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C}, t > 0, \quad (1.4)$$

then $(m_i : \mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{C})$ is called a quasi-stationary distribution.

Li and Chen [13] considered the decay property of Markovian bulk-arrival queues with control at idle time. Li and Wang [14] discussed the decay property of n -type branching processes. The main purpose of this paper is to investigate the decay properties of stopped $M^X/M/1$ -queueing networks with d nodes. Different from the one-node case, when a customer at one node has finished his/her service, he/she can enter another node and make

the queue length at another node changed. Therefore, the method used in Li and Chen [13] is not applicable (see Theorems 3.2-3.3) and some new approaches should be used in the current situation.

The structure of this paper is organized as follows. Some preliminary results are firstly establish in Section 2. In Section 3, the exact value of decay parameter is obtained. The λ_C -invariant measure and quasi-stationary distribution are discussed in Section 4.

2. Preliminaries

In order to discuss the decay properties of stopped $M^X/M/1$ -queueing networks with d nodes, we make some preliminaries regarding our model in this section. Since Q is determined by the sequences $\{\lambda_{kj} : j \geq 1, k = 1, \dots, d\}$, $\{\gamma_{kl} : 1 \leq k \leq d, 0 \leq l \leq d\}$ and $\{\mu_k : 1 \leq k \leq d\}$, we define the following functions as

$$\Lambda_k(x_k) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{kj} x_k^j, \quad k = 1, \dots, d$$

$$\Gamma_k(\mathbf{x}) = \mu_k(\gamma_{k0} + \sum_{l=1}^d \gamma_{kl} x_l), \quad k = 1, \dots, d$$

and denote

$$B_k(\mathbf{x}) = x_k[\Lambda_k(x_k) - \lambda_k] + \Gamma_k(\mathbf{x}) - \mu_k x_k, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, d,$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$. Let

$$r_k = \frac{1}{\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n]{\lambda_{kn}}}$$

be the convergence radius of $\Lambda_k(x_k)$ for each $k = 1, \dots, d$. It is obvious that $r_k \geq 1$ ($k = 1, \dots, d$) and therefore, $\{B_k(\mathbf{x}) : k = 1, \dots, d\}$ are well-defined at least on $\prod_{k=1}^d [0, r_k]$.

For convenience of notations, let

$$b_j^{(k)} = \begin{cases} \mu_k \gamma_{k0}, & \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{0}, \\ -\mu_k - \lambda_k, & \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{e}_k, \\ \mu_k \gamma_{kl}, & \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{e}_l, l = 1, \dots, d, \\ \lambda_{kn}, & \mathbf{j} = (n+1)\mathbf{e}_k, n \geq 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

Then, q_{ij} and $B_k(\mathbf{x})$ can be rewritten as

$$q_{ij} = \begin{cases} \sum_{k=1}^d b_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}+\mathbf{e}_k}^{(k)} \chi_{\{i_k > 0, \mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}+\mathbf{e}_k \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d\}}, & \mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and

$$B_k(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d} b_j^{(k)} \mathbf{x}^j$$

respectively.

The following lemma shows the basic property of the transition probability function of $\{X(t) : t \geq 0\}$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $Q = (q_{ij} : \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d)$ be a d -QN q -matrix given in (1.2), $P(t) = (p_{ij}(t) : \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d)$ and $\Phi(\lambda) = (\phi_{ij}(\lambda) : \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d)$ be the Q -function and Q -resolvent, respectively. Then for any $\mathbf{i} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d$,*

$$p'_{i0}(t) + \frac{\partial F_i(t, \mathbf{x})}{\partial t} = \sum_{k=1}^d B_k(\mathbf{x}) \cdot F_i^{(k)}(t, \mathbf{x}), \quad (2.2)$$

or in resolvent version

$$\lambda \phi_{i0}(\lambda) + \lambda \Phi_i(\lambda, \mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x}^i = \sum_{k=1}^d B_k(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \Phi_i^{(k)}(\lambda, \mathbf{x}), \quad (2.3)$$

where $F_i(t, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}} p_{ij}(t) \cdot \mathbf{x}^j$, $F_i^{(k)}(t, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_k^+} p_{ij}(t) \cdot \mathbf{x}^{j-e_k}$, $\Phi_i(\lambda, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}} \phi_{ij}(\lambda) \cdot \mathbf{x}^j$ and $\Phi_i^{(k)}(\lambda, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_k^+} \phi_{ij}(\lambda) \cdot \mathbf{x}^{j-e_k}$ with $\mathcal{C}_k^+ = \{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{C} : i_k > 0\}$.

Proof. By the Kolmogorov forward equations, we know that for any $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} p'_{i0}(t) &= \sum_{k=1}^d p_{ie_k}(t) b_0^{(k)} \\ p'_{ij}(t) &= \sum_{l \in \mathcal{C}} p_{il}(t) \sum_{k=1}^d b_{j-l+e_k}^{(k)} \chi_{\{l_k > 0, j-l+e_k \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d\}} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{l \in \mathcal{C}_k^+} p_{il}(t) b_{j-l+e_k}^{(k)} \chi_{\{j-l+e_k \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d\}}, \quad \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C}. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying $\mathbf{x}^j$ on both sides of the above equality and then summing on $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d$ yields

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d} p'_{ij}(t) \mathbf{x}^j = \sum_{k=1}^d B_k(\mathbf{x}) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_k^+} p_{ij}(t) \mathbf{x}^{j-e_k}$$

Hence, (2.2) is proved. Taking Laplace transform on both sides of (2.2) immediately yields (2.3). $\square$ $\square$

Denote $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}) = (B_1(\mathbf{x}), \dots, B_d(\mathbf{x}))$ and let

$$B_{ij}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\partial B_i(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j}, \quad g_{ij}(\mathbf{x}) = \delta_{ij} + \frac{B_{ij}(\mathbf{x})}{\mu_i + \lambda_i}, \quad i, j = 1 \dots, d.$$

The matrices $(B_{ij}(\mathbf{x}))$ and $(g_{ij}(\mathbf{x}))$ are denoted by $\mathbf{B}'(\mathbf{x})$ and $G(\mathbf{x})$, respectively. Since

$$g_{ij}(1) = \begin{cases} (\mu_i + \lambda_i)^{-1} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (l+1) \lambda_{il} x_i^l, & i = j \\ (\mu_i + \lambda_i)^{-1} \mu_i \gamma_{ij}, & i \neq j, \end{cases}$$

it is easy to see that $G(\mathbf{1})$ is positively regular, i.e., there exists an integer N such that $[G(\mathbf{1})]^N > 0$.

Let $\rho(\mathbf{x})$ denote the maximal eigenvalue of $\mathbf{B}'(\mathbf{x})$. The following lemma presents the property of $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x})$.

Lemma 2.2. *The system of equations*

$$\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0} \tag{2.4}$$

has at most two solutions in $[0, 1]^d$. Let $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, \dots, q_d)$ denote the smallest nonnegative solution of (2.4). Then,

- (i) q_k is the extinction probability when the process starts at state $\mathbf{e}_k$ ($k = 1, \dots, d$). Moreover, if $\rho(\mathbf{1}) \leq 0$, then $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{1}$; while if $\rho(\mathbf{1}) > 0$, then $\mathbf{q} < \mathbf{1}$, i.e., $q_1, \dots, q_d < 1$.
- (ii) $\rho(\mathbf{q}) \leq 0$.

Proof. Since $G(\mathbf{1})$ is positively regular, $\Gamma = (\gamma_{ij} : 1 \leq i, j \leq d)$ is irreducible and $\lambda_k > 0$ ($k = 1, \dots, d$). Hence, (i)-(ii) follow from Athreya [5]. □ □

In addition, the following lemma reveals the property of $\rho(\mathbf{x})$.

Lemma 2.3. (i) $\rho(\mathbf{x})$ is continuous on $\prod_{k=1}^d [0, r_k)$. Moreover, for any $\mathbf{x} < \tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ (i.e., $x_k < \tilde{x}_k$

for all $k = 1, \dots, d$), $\rho(\mathbf{x}) < \rho(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$.

- (ii) For any $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^d$, there exist positive vectors $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x})$ such that

$$\mathbf{B}'(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{v}^T(\mathbf{x}) = \rho(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{v}^T(\mathbf{x})$$

and

$$\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{B}'(\mathbf{x}) = \rho(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Proof. The characteristic polynomial of $\mathbf{B}'(\mathbf{x})$ can be expressed as

$$f(\lambda; \mathbf{x}) = \lambda^d + A_1(\mathbf{x})\lambda^{d-1} + \dots + A_d(\mathbf{x}),$$

where all the functions $A_k(\mathbf{x})$ ($k = 1, \dots, d$) are continuous in $\mathbf{x} \in \prod_{k=1}^d [0, r_k)$ because $B_{kl}(\mathbf{x})$ ($k, l = 1, \dots, d$) are continuous. For any $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbf{x}}$, if $f(\lambda; \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) > 0$, then it follows

from the continuity of $f(\lambda; \mathbf{x})$ in $\mathbf{x}$ that $f(\lambda; \mathbf{x}) > 0$ for $\mathbf{x}$ being close to $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$. Therefore, $\liminf_{\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbf{x}}} \rho(\mathbf{x}) \geq \rho(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$. Similarly, if $f(\lambda; \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) < 0$, then $f(\lambda; \mathbf{x}) < 0$ for $\mathbf{x}$ being close to $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$. Therefore, $\limsup_{\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbf{x}}} \rho(\mathbf{x}) \leq \rho(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$. Thus, $\rho(\mathbf{x})$ is continuous. The monotone property of $\rho(\mathbf{x})$ follows from Lemma 2.6 of Li and Wang [14]. (i) is proved.

(ii) follows from Athreya [5]. The proof is complete. $\square$ $\square$

3. Decay parameter

Having made some preliminaries in the previous section, we now consider the decay parameter $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$ of $P(t)$ on $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{Z}_+^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$.

For any $\lambda \in (-\infty, \infty)$, consider the system of inequalities:

$$\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}) + \lambda \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{0}. \quad (3.1)$$

Let

$$\lambda_* = \sup\{\lambda : (3.1) \text{ has a solution in } [0, \infty)^d\}. \quad (3.2)$$

Lemma 3.1. (i) $0 \leq \lambda_* \leq \min\{\lambda_k + \mu_k : k = 1, \dots, d\}$.

(ii) *The system of equations*

$$\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}) + \lambda_* \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0} \quad (3.3)$$

has exactly one solution $\mathbf{q}_ = (q_{*1}, \dots, q_{*d})$ on $\prod_{k=1}^d [0, r_k]$.*

(iii) *For any $\lambda < \lambda_*$, the system of equations*

$$\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}) + \lambda \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0} \quad (3.4)$$

*has exactly one solution on $\prod_{k=1}^d [0, q_{*k}]$.*

Proof. Since $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{1}$ is a solution of (3.1) for $\lambda = 0$, we know that $\lambda_* \geq 0$. On the other hand, for any λ such that (3.1) has a solution $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in [0, \infty)^d$,

$$\lambda \leq -\frac{B_k(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})}{x_k} \leq \lambda_k + \mu_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, d.$$

Hence, $\lambda_* \leq \min\{\lambda_k + \mu_k : k = 1, \dots, d\}$. (i) is proved.

Next prove (ii). By the definition of λ_* and the continuity of $B_k(\mathbf{x})$, we know that the system of inequalities

$$\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}) + \lambda_* \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{0} \quad (3.5)$$

has solution on $\prod_{k=1}^d [0, r_k]$. Next, we prove that (3.5) has exactly one solution on $\prod_{k=1}^d [0, r_k]$.

Indeed, suppose $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = (\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_d)$ and $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = (\hat{x}_1, \dots, \hat{x}_d)$ are two different solutions of (3.5).

Denote $f_k(\mathbf{x}) = B_k(\mathbf{x}) + \lambda_* x_k$, ($k = 1, \dots, d$) and let $f_k''(\mathbf{x})$ be the Hessian matrix of $f_k(\mathbf{x})$, i.e., $f_k''(\mathbf{x}) = (\frac{\partial^2 f_k}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} : i, j = 1, \dots, d)$. Then, for any k , $f_k''(\mathbf{x}) = \text{diag}(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (j+1)j\lambda_{1j}x_1^{j-1}, \dots, \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (j+1)j\lambda_{dj}x_d^{j-1})$, which is definitely positive for $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$. Therefore, $f_k(\mathbf{x})$ is convex on $\prod_{k=1}^d (0, r_k]$. By the property of convex function, we know that for any $\theta \in (0, 1)$ and $\mathbf{z} = (1 - \theta)\tilde{\mathbf{x}} + \theta\hat{\mathbf{x}}$,

$$f_k(\mathbf{z}) < (1 - \theta)f_k(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) + \theta f_k(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \leq 0.$$

Fix $\theta_0 \in (0, 1)$ and take $\bar{\mathbf{z}} = (1 - \theta_0)\tilde{\mathbf{x}} + \theta_0\hat{\mathbf{x}}$. Then

$$f_k(\bar{\mathbf{z}}) = B_k(\bar{\mathbf{z}}) + \lambda_* \bar{z}_k < 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, d.$$

Take

$$\bar{\lambda} = \min\left\{-\frac{B_k(\bar{\mathbf{z}})}{\bar{z}_k} : k = 1, \dots, d\right\}.$$

Then, $\bar{\lambda} > \lambda_*$ and $B_k(\bar{\mathbf{z}}) + \bar{\lambda}\bar{z}_k \leq B_k(\bar{\mathbf{z}}) - \frac{B_k(\bar{\mathbf{z}})}{\bar{z}_k} \cdot \bar{z}_k = 0$ for $k = 1, \dots, d$, which contradicts with the definition of λ_* . Therefore, (3.5) has exactly one solution on $\prod_{k=1}^d [0, r_k]$. Hence, by

Li and Wang [14], we further know that (3.3) has exact one solution on $\prod_{k=1}^d [0, r_k]$.

Now prove (iii). Since $\mathbf{q}_* = (q_{*1}, \dots, q_{*d})$ is a solution of (3.3), we see that $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{q}_*) + \lambda \mathbf{q}_* < \mathbf{0}$. By Li and Wang [14], (3.4) has exactly one solution on $\prod_{k=1}^d [0, q_{*k}]$. The proof is complete. $\square$

By Lemma 3.1, we use $\mathbf{q}_* = (q_{*k} : k = 1, \dots, d)$ to denote the unique solution of (3.3) and use $\mathbf{q}(\lambda) = (q_1(\lambda), \dots, q_d(\lambda))$ to denote the unique solution of (3.4) on $\prod_{k=1}^d [0, q_{*k}]$ for $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_*]$ in the following. The following theorem reveals the relationship of $\rho(\mathbf{q}(\lambda))$ and $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_*]$.

Theorem 3.1. (i) For any $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_*]$, let $\mathbf{q}(\lambda) = (q_1(\lambda), \dots, q_d(\lambda))$ be the unique solution of $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}) + \lambda \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ on $\prod_{k=1}^d [0, q_{*k}]$. We have $\rho(\mathbf{q}(\lambda)) \leq -\lambda$.

(ii) If $\mathbf{q}_* \in \prod_{k=1}^d [0, r_k]$, then $\rho(\mathbf{q}_*) = -\lambda_*$.

(iii) If $\rho(\mathbf{1}) = 0$, then $\lambda_* = 0$ and $\mathbf{q}_* = \mathbf{1}$.

Proof. First prove (i). Let $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_*]$ and $\mathbf{q}(\lambda) = (q_1(\lambda), \dots, q_d(\lambda))$ be the unique solution of $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}) + \lambda \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ on $\prod_{k=1}^d [0, q_{*k}]$. Consider

$$\tilde{B}_k(\mathbf{x}) = B_k(\mathbf{q}(\lambda) \otimes \mathbf{x}) + \lambda q_k(\lambda) x_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, d,$$

where $\mathbf{q}(\lambda) \otimes \mathbf{x} = (q_1(\lambda)x_1, \dots, q_d(\lambda)x_d)$. It is easy to see that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{x}) = (\tilde{B}_1(\mathbf{x}), \dots, \tilde{B}_d(\mathbf{x})) = \mathbf{0}$$

has exactly one solution on $[0, 1]^d$, that is $\mathbf{1}$. Let $\tilde{\rho}(\mathbf{1})$ denote the maximal eigenvalue of $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}'(\mathbf{1})$. By Lemma 2.2, $\tilde{\rho}(\mathbf{1}) \leq 0$. On the other hand, one can check that $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}'(\mathbf{1}) = (\mathbf{B}'(\mathbf{q}(\lambda)) + \lambda I) \cdot \text{diag}(q_1(\lambda), \dots, q_d(\lambda))$. Hence, by Lemma 2.4 of Li and Wang [14], we know that $\rho(\mathbf{q}(\lambda)) + \lambda \leq 0$, i.e., $\rho(\mathbf{q}(\lambda)) \leq -\lambda$. (i) is proved.

Next prove (ii). By Lemma 2.6 of Li and Wang [14], there exists a positive eigenvector $\mathbf{v}^* = (v_1^*, \dots, v_d^*)$ such that

$$\sum_{l=1}^d B_{kl}(\mathbf{q}_*) v_l^* = \rho(\mathbf{q}_*) v_k^*, \quad k = 1, \dots, d.$$

By Taylor expansion,

$$\begin{aligned} & B_k(\mathbf{q}_* + \varepsilon \mathbf{v}^*) + \lambda_*(q_{*k} + \varepsilon v_k^*) \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^d B_{kl}(\mathbf{q}_*) v_l^* \varepsilon + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial B_k^2(\mathbf{q}_* + \theta \varepsilon \mathbf{v}^*)}{\partial x_k^2} \varepsilon^2 + \lambda_* \varepsilon v_k^* \\ &= [\rho(\mathbf{q}_*) + \lambda_*] \varepsilon v_k^* + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial B_k^2(\mathbf{q}_* + \theta \varepsilon \mathbf{v}^*)}{\partial x_k^2} \varepsilon^2, \quad k = 1, \dots, d. \end{aligned}$$

If $\rho(\mathbf{q}_*) < -\lambda_*$, then it follows from the above equalities that for $k = 1, \dots, d$,

$$B_k(\mathbf{q}_* + \varepsilon \mathbf{v}^*) + \lambda_*(q_{*k} + \varepsilon v_k^*) < 0$$

with small $\varepsilon > 0$. Hence, there exists $\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0$ such that

$$B_k(\mathbf{q}_* + \tilde{\varepsilon} \mathbf{v}^*) + \lambda_*(q_{*k} + \tilde{\varepsilon} v_k^*) < 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, d.$$

Let $\tilde{\lambda} = -\max\left\{\frac{B_k(\mathbf{q}_* + \tilde{\varepsilon} \mathbf{v}^*) + \lambda_*(q_{*k} + \tilde{\varepsilon} v_k^*)}{q_{*k} + \tilde{\varepsilon} v_k^*} : 1 \leq k \leq d\right\}$. Then, $\tilde{\lambda} > \lambda_*$ and

$$B_k(\mathbf{q}_* + \tilde{\varepsilon} \mathbf{v}^*) + \tilde{\lambda}(q_{*k} + \tilde{\varepsilon} v_k^*) \leq 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, d,$$

which contradicts with the definition of λ_* . Therefore, $\rho(\mathbf{q}_*) = -\lambda_*$.

Now prove (iii). Suppose that $\rho(\mathbf{1}) = 0$ but $\lambda_* > 0$. Denote $D = \{k : q_{*k} < 1\}$. Since $\rho(\mathbf{1}) = 0$, we know that $\{1, 2, \dots, d\} \setminus D \neq \emptyset$. If $D \neq \emptyset$, then we can assume $D = \{1, \dots, \tilde{k}\}$ without loss of generality. Then,

$$B_k(q_{*1}, \dots, q_{*\tilde{k}}, 1, \dots, 1) \leq B_k(\mathbf{q}_*) < 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, \tilde{k}$$

and

$$B_k(q_{*1}, \dots, q_{*\tilde{k}}, 1, \dots, 1) \leq B_k(\mathbf{1}) \leq 0, \quad k = \tilde{k} + 1, \dots, d.$$

By Lemma 2.6 of Li and Wang [14],

$$\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}) = 0$$

has a solution on $\prod_{k=1}^{\tilde{k}} [0, q_{*k}] \times [0, 1]^{d-\tilde{k}}$, which contradicts with $\rho(\mathbf{1}) = 0$. Therefore, we have

$\mathbf{q}_* \in \prod_{k=1}^d (1, r_k]$. However,

$$-\lambda_* q_{*k} = B_k(\mathbf{q}_*) = \sum_{l=1}^d B_{kl}(\mathbf{1})(q_{*l} - 1) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 B_k(\mathbf{a})}{\partial x_k^2} (q_{*k} - 1)^2, \quad k = 1, \dots, d,$$

where $\mathbf{a} \in \prod_{k=1}^d [1, q_{*k}]$. By Lemma 2.2, there exists a positive vector $\mathbf{u}^* = (u_1^*, \dots, u_d^*)$ such that

$$\sum_{k=1}^d u_k^* B_{kl}(\mathbf{1}) = 0, \quad l = 1, \dots, d.$$

Therefore,

$$-\sum_{k=1}^d u_k^* \lambda_* q_{*k} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^d u_k^* \frac{\partial^2 B_k(\mathbf{a})}{\partial x_k^2} (q_{*k} - 1)^2,$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, $\lambda_* = 0$. Hence, $\mathbf{q}_* = \mathbf{1}$. The proof is complete. $\square \quad \square$

The following theorem gives a lower bound of $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$.

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose that Q is the d -QN q -matrix defined in (1.2) and $P(t) = (p_{ij}(t) : i, j \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d)$ is the Q -function. Then $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}} \geq \lambda_*$. Furthermore, if $\lambda_* = -\rho(\mathbf{q}_*)$, then*

$$\lambda_{\mathcal{C}} = \lambda_*.$$

Proof. First prove $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}} \geq \lambda_*$. Let $\mathbf{q}_* = (q_{*1}, \dots, q_{*d})$ be the nonnegative solution of (3.3). Define

$$v_{\mathbf{i}} = \mathbf{q}_*^{\mathbf{i}}, \quad \mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_d) \in \mathcal{C}.$$

Denote $D(\mathbf{i}) = \{k : i_k > 0\}$. Then $D(\mathbf{i}) \neq \emptyset$ for $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_d) \in \mathcal{C}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{C}} q_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{k}} v_{\mathbf{k}} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in D(\mathbf{i})} \left(\mu_k [\gamma_{k0} \mathbf{q}_*^{\mathbf{i}-\mathbf{e}_k} + \sum_{l=1}^d \gamma_{kl} \mathbf{q}_*^{\mathbf{i}-\mathbf{e}_k+\mathbf{e}_l} - \mathbf{q}_*^{\mathbf{i}}] + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{kj} \mathbf{q}_*^{\mathbf{i}+j\mathbf{e}_k} - \lambda_k \mathbf{q}_*^{\mathbf{i}} \right) \\ &= \mathbf{q}_*^{\mathbf{i}} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in D(\mathbf{i})} \left[q_{*k}^{-1} \mu_k (\gamma_{k0} + \sum_{l=1}^d \gamma_{kl} q_{*l} - q_{*k}) + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{kj} q_{*k}^j - \lambda_k \right] \\ &= \mathbf{q}_*^{\mathbf{i}} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in D(\mathbf{i})} \frac{B_k(\mathbf{q}_*)}{q_{*k}} \\ &\leq -\lambda_* v_{\mathbf{i}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $(\mathbf{q}_*^j : \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C})$ is a λ_* -subinvariant vector for Q on $\mathcal{C}$. By the Anderson [1] (remarks on p.175), we know that $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}} \geq \lambda_*$.

Now prove the second assertion. By Theorem 3.1, there exists a unique $\mathbf{q}_* = (q_1, \dots, q_{*d}) \in \prod_{k=1}^d [0, r_k]$ such that $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{q}_*) + \lambda_* \mathbf{q}_* = \mathbf{0}$ and hence by Li & Wang [14], we have $\rho(\mathbf{q}_*) \leq 0$.

(a) First assume that $\rho(\mathbf{1}) = 0$. In this case, $\lambda_* = 0$ and $\mathbf{q}_* = \mathbf{1}$. Suppose that $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}} > \lambda_* = 0$. Then for any $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_{\mathcal{C}})$, we have $\int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} p_{i\mathbf{e}_k}(t) dt < \infty$ for $\mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{0}$ and $k = 1, \dots, d$. By the proof of Lemma 2.1, $\int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} p'_{i\mathbf{0}}(t) dt < \infty$ and hence $T^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) := \int_0^\infty F_{\mathbf{e}_1}^{(k)}(t, \mathbf{x}) dt < \infty$ for $\mathbf{x} \in \prod_{k=1}^d [0, r_k]$. Therefore,

$$1 - x_1 = \sum_{k=1}^d B_k(\mathbf{x}) \cdot T^{(k)}(\mathbf{x})$$

and hence

$$-\delta_{1,l} = \sum_{k=1}^d B_{kl}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot T^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{k=1}^d B_k(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \frac{\partial T^{(k)}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_l}, \quad l = 1, \dots, d. \quad (3.6)$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 2.2, there exists a positive vector $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}) = (v_1(\mathbf{x}), \dots, v_d(\mathbf{x}))$ such that

$$\sum_{l=1}^d B_{kl}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot v_l(\mathbf{x}) = 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, d.$$

Multiplying $v_l(\mathbf{x})$ and then summing on l , yield that

$$\sum_{k=1}^d B_k(\mathbf{x}) \sum_{l=1}^d \frac{\partial T^{(k)}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_l} v_l(\mathbf{x}) = -v_1(\mathbf{x}).$$

Let $\mathbf{x} \uparrow \mathbf{1}$, we can see that the left hand side is nonnegative while the right hand side is $-v_1(\mathbf{1}) < 0$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}} = 0$.

(b) We now remove the condition $\rho(\mathbf{1}) = 0$. Suppose that $\lambda_* = -\rho(\mathbf{q}_*)$. Obviously, $q_{*k} > 0$ ($k = 1, \dots, d$). We can define $\tilde{Q} = (\tilde{q}_{ij} : \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C})$ as follows:

$$\tilde{q}_{ij} = \begin{cases} \sum_{k=1}^d \tilde{b}_{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{i}+\mathbf{e}_k}^{(k)} \chi_{\{i_k > 0\}}, & \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C}, \mathbf{j} - \mathbf{i} + \mathbf{e}_k \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{b}_{\mathbf{j}}^{(k)} = b_{\mathbf{j}}^{(k)} \mathbf{q}_*^{\mathbf{j}-\mathbf{e}_k} + \delta_{\mathbf{j}, \mathbf{e}_k} \lambda_*$ ($\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d, k = 1, \dots, d$) with $\{b_{\mathbf{j}}^{(k)}\}$ being given in (2.1).

Let $(\tilde{p}_{ij}(t) : \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{C})$ be the minimal $\tilde{Q}$ -function and $\tilde{B}_k(\mathbf{x})$ be the generating function of

$\{\tilde{b}_j^{(k)} : \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d\}$ ($k = 1, \dots, d$). Then

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}_k(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d} \tilde{b}_j^{(k)} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{j}} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d} (b_j^{(k)} \mathbf{q}_*^{j-e_k} + \delta_{j,e_k} \lambda_*) \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{j}} \\ &= q_{*k}^{-1} [B_k(\mathbf{q}_* \otimes \mathbf{x}) + \lambda_* q_{*k} x_k] \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{q}_* \otimes \mathbf{x} = (q_{*1}x_1, \dots, q_{*d}x_d)$.

Since $(\mathbf{q}_*^j : \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C})$ is a λ_* -subinvariant vector for Q on $\mathcal{C}$ and note that for any $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{q}_{ij} &= \sum_{k=1}^d (b_{j-i+e_k}^{(k)} \mathbf{q}_*^{j-i} + \delta_{i,j} \lambda_*) \chi_{\{i_k > 0\}} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^d (b_{j-i+e_k}^{(k)} + \delta_{i,j} \lambda_*) \chi_{\{i_k > 0\}} \mathbf{q}_*^{j-i} \\ &= (q_{i,j} + \delta_{i,j} \lambda_*) \frac{\mathbf{q}_*^j}{\mathbf{q}_*^i}, \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 5.4.2 of Anderson [1], we know that

$$\tilde{p}_{ij}(t) = \mathbf{q}_*^{j-i} p_{ij}(t) e^{\lambda_* t}, \quad \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C}.$$

Denote $\tilde{\lambda}_{\mathcal{C}} = \sup\{\lambda : \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} \tilde{p}_{ij}(t) dt < \infty\}$, which is independent of $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C}$ by Kingman [11]. We claim that $\tilde{\lambda}_{\mathcal{C}} = 0$. Indeed, suppose that $\tilde{\lambda}_{\mathcal{C}} > 0$. It follows from Kolmogorov forward equations that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C}} \tilde{p}'_{ij}(t) \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{j}} = \sum_{k=1}^d \tilde{B}_k(\mathbf{x}) \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C}_k^+} \tilde{p}_{ij}(t) \mathbf{x}^{j-e_k} - \sum_{k=1}^d \tilde{p}_{ie_k}(t) \tilde{b}_0^{(k)}.$$

In particular,

$$-x_1 = \sum_{k=1}^d \tilde{B}_k(\mathbf{x}) \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C}_k^+} \tilde{T}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) - \sum_{k=1}^d p_{e_1 e_k}(t) \tilde{b}_0^{(k)},$$

where $\tilde{T}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C}_k^+} (\int_0^\infty \tilde{p}_{e_1 j}(t) dt) \mathbf{x}^{j-e_k} < \infty$. Hence,

$$-\delta_{l,1} = \sum_{k=1}^d \tilde{B}_{kl}(\mathbf{x}) \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C}_k^+} \tilde{T}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{k=1}^d \tilde{B}_k(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\partial \tilde{T}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_l}, \quad l = 1, \dots, d. \quad (3.7)$$

Define

$$\tilde{\lambda}_* = \sup\{\lambda \geq 0 : \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{x}) + \lambda \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{0} \text{ has a solution in } [0, +\infty)^d\}.$$

Then $\tilde{\lambda}_* = 0$. Since $\mathbf{q}_* \in \prod_{k=1}^d [0, r_k)$, the unique solution of $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ is $\mathbf{1} < (\frac{r_1}{q_{*1}}, \dots, \frac{r_d}{q_{*d}})$.

Therefore, by Theorem 3.1(ii), the maximal eigenvalue of $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}'(\mathbf{1})$ is 0. By Lemma 2.2, there exists a positive vector $\tilde{\mathbf{v}} = (\tilde{v}_1, \dots, \tilde{v}_d)$ such that

$$\sum_{k=1}^d \tilde{B}_{kl}(\mathbf{1}) \cdot \tilde{v}_l = 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, d.$$

Multiplying $\tilde{v}_l$ and then summing on l , yield that $-\tilde{v}_1 = 0$, which is a contradiction. Hence, $\tilde{\lambda}_C = 0$ and thus $\lambda_C = \lambda_*$. The proof is complete. $\square$ $\square$

The following theorem gives the exact value of λ_C .

Theorem 3.3. *Suppose that Q is the d -QN q -matrix defined in (1.2) and $P(t) = (p_{ij}(t) : \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d)$ is the Q -function. Then $\lambda_C = \lambda_*$.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.2, we only need to consider the case that $\lambda_* < -\rho(\mathbf{q}_*)$. Let $(\phi_{ij}(\lambda) : \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d)$ denote the Laplace transform of $(p_{ij}(t) : \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d)$. For any $n \geq 2$, define

$$q_{ij}^{(n)} = \begin{cases} \sum_{k=1}^d b_{j-i+e_k}^{(k,n)} \chi_{\{i_k > 0, j-i+e_k\}}, & \text{if } \mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $b_j^{(k,n)} = b_j^{(k)} \chi_{\{j_k \leq n\}}$ ($k = 1, \dots, d, n \geq 2$). It is obvious that $Q^{(n)} = (q_{ij}^{(n)} : \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d)$ is a nonconservative generator matrix as in (1.2) and $\mathcal{C}$ is still communicating for each $Q^{(n)}$ ($n \geq N_0$). Let $({}_n p_{ij}(t) : \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d)$ and $({}_n \phi_{ij}(\lambda) : \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d)$ be the Feller minimal $Q^{(n)}$ -function and the Feller minimal $Q^{(n)}$ -resolvent, respectively. Define

$$B_k^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d} b_j^{(k,n)} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{j}}, \quad k = 1, \dots, d, \quad n \geq N_0$$

and

$$\lambda_*^{(n)} = \sup\{\lambda \geq 0 : \mathbf{B}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}) + \lambda \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0} \text{ has a root in } [0, \infty)^d\},$$

where $\mathbf{B}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}) = (B_1^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}), \dots, B_d^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}))$. Obviously, the generating function $\mathbf{B}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})$ is well-defined on $[0, \infty)^d$, i.e., the convergence radius of $\{B_k^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}) : k = 1, \dots, d\}$ are all infinite. By Theorem 3.1, $\lambda_*^{(n)} = -\rho_0^{(n)}(\mathbf{q}_*^{(n)})$, where $\mathbf{q}_*^{(n)}$ is the unique solution of $\mathbf{B}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}) + \lambda_*^{(n)} \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\rho_0^{(n)}(\mathbf{q}_*^{(n)})$ is the maximal eigenvalue of $(B_{kl}^{(n)}(\mathbf{q}_*^{(n)}) : k, l = 1, \dots, d)$. Therefore, by Theorem 3.2, the decay parameter of $({}_n p_{ij}(t) : \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d)$ for $\mathcal{C}$ is $\lambda_C^{(n)} = \lambda_*^{(n)}$.

We now prove that $\lambda_*^{(n)} \downarrow \lambda_*$ ($n \uparrow \infty$). Indeed, by the definition of $\mathbf{B}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})$, we see that

$$\mathbf{B}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}) \leq \mathbf{B}^{(n+1)}(\mathbf{x}) \leq \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}), \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \prod_{k=1}^d [0, r_k], \quad n \geq N_0. \quad (3.8)$$

It can be easily proved that $\lambda_*^{(n)} \geq \lambda_*^{(n+1)} \geq \lambda_*$ ($n \geq N_0$). Therefore, $\bar{\lambda} := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_*^{(n)} \geq \lambda_*$. We further claim that $\bar{\lambda} = \lambda_*$. Actually, if $\bar{\lambda} > \lambda_*$, then choose $\tilde{\lambda} \in (\lambda_*, \bar{\lambda})$. By Lemma 3.1 and (3.8), there exists a unique $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{(n)} \in \prod_{k=1}^d [0, q_{*k}]$ such that $\mathbf{B}^{(n)}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{(n)}) + \tilde{\lambda} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{(n)} = \mathbf{0}$. By the definition of $\mathbf{B}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x})$ and the continuity of $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x})$, there exists $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \prod_{k=1}^d [0, q_{*k}]$ such that $\mathbf{B}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) + \tilde{\lambda} \tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{0}$, which contradicts with the definition of λ_* . Hence, $\bar{\lambda} = \lambda_*$.

On the other hand, it is well known that $(\phi_{ij}(\lambda) : \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d)$ and $({}_n\phi_{ij}(\lambda) : \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d)$ are the minimal nonnegative solution of the Kolmogorov backward equations

$$\phi_{ij}(\lambda) = \frac{\delta_{ij}}{\lambda - q_{ii}} + \sum_{l \neq i} \frac{q_{il}}{\lambda - q_{ii}} \cdot \phi_{lj}(\lambda), \quad \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d$$

and

$${}_n\phi_{ij}(\lambda) = \frac{\delta_{ij}}{\lambda - q_{ii}^{(n)}} + \sum_{l \neq i} \frac{q_{il}^{(n)}}{\lambda - q_{ii}^{(n)}} \cdot {}_n\phi_{lj}(\lambda), \quad \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d$$

respectively. Furthermore, all of them can be obtained by the well-known iteration scheme. Now note that $q_{ii}^{(n)} = q_{ii}$ ($n \geq \tilde{N}_0$) and $q_{il}^{(n)} \uparrow q_{il}$ ($n \uparrow \infty$) for all $\mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{l}$. By considering their iteration schemes, we know that ${}_n\phi_{ij}(\lambda) \uparrow \phi_{ij}(\lambda)$ as $n \uparrow \infty$ and thus for their corresponding transition functions we also have ${}_np_{ij}(t) \uparrow p_{ij}(t)$ as $n \uparrow \infty$. Therefore, $\lambda_*^{(n)} = \lambda_{\mathcal{C}}^{(n)} \geq \lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$ which implying $\lambda_* \geq \lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$. Hence, by Theorem 3.2, $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}} = \lambda_*$. The proof is complete. $\square$ $\square$

4. Transiency property and invariant measure

In this section, we further consider the transiency property and invariant measure of $P(t)$. As in the previous section, let $\mathbf{q}(\lambda) = (q_1(\lambda), \dots, q_d(\lambda))$ denote the unique solution of

$$\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}) + \lambda \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$$

on $\prod_{k=1}^d [0, q_{*k}]$ for $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_*]$. The following conclusion is our main result in this section.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose that Q is the d -QN q -matrix defined in (1.2) and $P(t) = (p_{ij}(t) : \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d)$ is the Q -function. Then for any $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_{\mathcal{C}}]$ and $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{C}$,*

$$\int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} p'_{i0}(t) dt \leq \mathbf{q}^i(\lambda) \quad (4.1)$$

and

$$\int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} p'_{i0}(t) dt - \mathbf{x}^i - \lambda \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} F_i(t, \mathbf{x}) dt = \sum_{k=1}^d B_k(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} F_i^{(k)}(t, \mathbf{x}) dt \quad (4.2)$$

Hence, $P(t)$ is $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}}$ -transient.

Proof. For $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_C)$, we know that $\int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} p_{ij}(t) dt < \infty$ for all $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C}$ and hence $\int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} p'_{i0}(t) dt < \infty$ for all $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{C}$. By Lemma 2.1,

$$\int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} p'_{i0}(t) dt - \mathbf{x}^i - \lambda \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} F_i(t, \mathbf{x}) dt = \sum_{k=1}^d B_k(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} F_i^{(k)}(t, \mathbf{x}) dt, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \prod_{k=1}^d [0, q_{*k}],$$

which implies that (4.2) holds for $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_C)$. Let $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{q}(\lambda)$ in the above equality, we get (4.1). Letting $\lambda \uparrow \lambda_C$ in (4.1) yields $\int_0^\infty e^{\lambda_C t} p'_{i0}(t) dt \leq \mathbf{q}_*^i$ and hence $\int_0^\infty e^{\lambda_C t} p_{ij}(t) dt < \infty$ for all $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C}$. Therefore, $P(t)$ is λ_C -transient and (4.2) holds for $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_C]$. The proof is complete. $\square$

Now, we turn our attention to the quasi-stationary distribution of the stopped $M^X/M/1$ queue. We first consider the invariant measures.

Theorem 4.2. *Suppose that Q is the d -QN q -matrix defined in (1.2) and $P(t) = (p_{ij}(t) : \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d)$ is the Q -function. Then for any $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_C]$,*

- (i) *there exists a λ -invariant measure $(m_i : \mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{C})$ for Q on $\mathcal{C}$, which is unique up to constant multiples. Moreover, the generating function of this λ -invariant measure $M(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{C}} m_i \mathbf{x}^i$ satisfies*

$$\lambda M(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{k=1}^d B_k(\mathbf{x}) M^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{k=1}^d m_{e_k} b_0^{(k)}, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \prod_{k=1}^d [0, q_k], \quad (4.3)$$

where $M^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{C}_k^+} m_i \mathbf{x}^{i - e_k}$ and $\{m_{e_k} : k = 1, \dots, d\}$ are positive constants.

- (ii) *This measure $(m_i : \mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{C})$ is also a λ -invariant for $P(t)$ on $\mathcal{C}$.*
- (iii) *This λ -invariant measure is convergent (i.e., $\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{C}} m_i < \infty$) if and only if $\rho(\mathbf{1}) < 0$,*

$\lambda_C > 0$ and $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_C]$.

Proof. Let $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_C]$. It follows from Kolmogorov forward equations that for any $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{C}$, $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbf{Z}_+^d$,

$$p'_{ij}(t) = \sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{C}_k^+} p_{il}(t) b_{j - \mathbf{l} + e_k}^{(k)}.$$

Therefore,

$$\int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} p'_{i0}(t) dt = \sum_{k=1}^d \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} p_{ie_k}(t) dt b_0^{(k)} \quad (4.4)$$

and for $\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$\lambda \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} p_{ij}(t) dt + \sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{C}_k^+} \left(\int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} p_{il}(t) dt \right) b_{j - \mathbf{l} + e_k}^{(k)} = -\delta_{ij}. \quad (4.5)$$

Denote $m_j^{(i)} = (\int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} p'_{io}(t) dt)^{-1} \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} p_{ij}(t) dt$ and $\Delta_j^{(i)} = (\int_0^\infty e^{\lambda t} p'_{io}(t) dt)^{-1} \delta_{ij}$. Then (4.4) and (4.5) can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{k=1}^d b_o^{(k)} m_{e_k}^{(i)} = 1 \quad (4.6)$$

and for $\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$\lambda m_j^{(i)} + \sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{l \in \mathcal{C}_k^+} m_l^{(i)} b_{j-l+e_k}^{(k)} = -\delta_{ij}. \quad (4.7)$$

Since $m_{e_k}^{(i)} \geq 0$, it can be easily seen from (4.6) that there exists a subsequence $\mathbf{i}'$ such that $m_{e_k} := \lim_{\mathbf{i}' \rightarrow \infty} m_{e_k}^{(\mathbf{i}')} < \infty$ for $b_o^{(k)} > 0$. As for $b_o^{(k)} = 0$, we may take $m_{e_k} = 1$. Then

$$\sum_{k=1}^d b_o^{(k)} m_{e_k} = 1. \quad (4.8)$$

Consider (4.7) with $\mathbf{j} = \mathbf{e}_k$ and note that (4.7) also holds for $\mathbf{i} = \mathbf{i}'$, we can see that there exist $0 \leq m_{e_k+e_l} < \infty$ ($k, l = 1, \dots, d$) satisfying

$$\lambda m_{e_k} + m_{e_k} b_{e_k}^{(k)} + \sum_{l=1}^d m_{e_l} b_{e_k}^{(l)} + \sum_{l=1}^d m_{e_k+e_l} b_o^{(l)} = 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, d.$$

By mathematical induction principle, we can obtain $(m_j : \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C})$ which are nonnegative and finite such that

$$\lambda m_j + \sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{l \in \mathcal{C}_k^+} m_l b_{j-l+e_k}^{(k)} = 0, \quad \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C}. \quad (4.9)$$

Now we claim that all m_j ($\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C}$) are positive. Indeed, if $m_{\tilde{\mathbf{j}}} = 0$ for some $\tilde{\mathbf{j}} \in \mathcal{C}$, then by the communicating property of $\mathcal{C}$, we know that $m_j = 0$ for all $\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C}$, which contradicts with (4.8). Therefore, $m_j : \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C}$ is a λ -invariant measure for Q on $\mathcal{C}$. Since $\int_0^\infty e^{\lambda c t} p'_{io}(t) dt < \infty$ ($\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{C}$), by letting $\lambda \uparrow \lambda_c$ in (4.8)–(4.9) and a similar argument as above, we get a λ_c -invariant measure for Q on $\mathcal{C}$.

Since $\lambda < \min\{-b_{e_k}^{(k)} : k = 1, \dots, d\}$, multiplying $\mathbf{x}^j$ on both sides of (4.9) and summing over $\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C}$ yield that

$$\lambda M(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{k=1}^d B_k(\mathbf{x}) M^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{k=1}^d m_{e_k} b_o^{(k)} \quad (4.10)$$

for $\mathbf{x}$ in some neighbour-hood of $\mathbf{o}$. Note that $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{o}$ for $\mathbf{x} \in \prod_{k=1}^d [0, q_k)$, it is easily seen

that (4.10) holds for $\mathbf{x} \in \prod_{k=1}^d [0, q_k)$. (i) is proved.

In order to prove (ii), by Theorem 5.4.3 in Anderson [1], we only need to prove that the equations

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} y_i q_{ij} = -\mu y_j, \quad 0 \leq y_j \leq m_j, \quad \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C} \quad (4.11)$$

have no nontrivial solution for some $\mu < \lambda$.

For any $r < 0$, since $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{q}) + r\mathbf{q} = r\mathbf{q} < 0$, we know that $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}) + r\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ has exactly one solution $\mathbf{q}(r) \in \prod_{k=1}^d [0, q_k)$ and $\mathbf{q}(r) \uparrow \mathbf{q}$ as $r \uparrow 0$.

If $\lambda > 0$, then let $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{q}(r)$ in (4.10) and let $r \uparrow 0$, we see that $M(\mathbf{q}) = \lambda^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^d m_{e_k} b_{\mathbf{0}}^{(k)} < \infty$. Suppose that $(y_j : \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C})$ is a nontrivial solution of (4.11) with $\mu = 0$. A similar argument as above yields that all y_j 's are positive. Then it follows from (4.10) that for any $\mathbf{x} \in \prod_{k=1}^d [0, q_k]$,

$$\sum_{k=1}^d B_k(\mathbf{x}) Y^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{k=1}^d y_{e_k} b_{\mathbf{0}}^{(k)}, \quad (4.12)$$

where $Y^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C}_k^+} y_{\mathbf{j}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{j} - e_k}$. This contradicts with $y_j \leq m_j$.

If $\lambda = 0$. Suppose that $(y_j : \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C})$ is a nontrivial solution of (4.11) with $\mu < 0$. Similarly, we have that all y_j 's are positive and that for any $\mathbf{x} \in \prod_{k=1}^d [0, q_k]$,

$$\mu Y(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{k=1}^d B_k(\mathbf{x}) Y^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{k=1}^d y_{e_k} b_{\mathbf{0}}^{(k)}, \quad (4.13)$$

where $Y(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C}} y_{\mathbf{j}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{j}}$, $Y^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C}_k^+} y_{\mathbf{j}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{j} - e_k}$. Let $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{q}(r)$ in the above equality and note that $y_j \leq m_j$ ($\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{C}$), by (4.10) with $\lambda = 0$ we know that

$$-\mu Y(\mathbf{q}) \leq \sum_{k=1}^d b_{\mathbf{0}}^{(k)} (m_{e_k} - y_{e_k}) < \infty,$$

which contradicts with (4.13). (ii) is proved.

Finally, suppose that $\rho(\mathbf{1}) < 0$, $\lambda_{\mathcal{C}} > 0$ and $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_{\mathcal{C}}]$. Then $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{1}$. Let $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{q}(r)$ in (4.3), we get

$$\lambda M(\mathbf{q}(r)) - r \sum_{k=1}^d q_k(r) M^{(k)}(\mathbf{q}(r)) = \sum_{k=1}^d b_{\mathbf{0}}^{(k)} m_{e_k}.$$

Let $r \uparrow 0$, we see that $M(\mathbf{1}) \leq \lambda^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^d b_{\mathbf{0}}^{(k)} m_{e_k} < \infty$.

Conversely, suppose that $M(\mathbf{1}) < \infty$. If $\lambda = 0$, then by (4.3) with $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{q}(r)$, we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^d M^{(k)}(\mathbf{1}) = \lim_{r \uparrow 0} \sum_{k=1}^d q_k(r) M^{(k)}(\mathbf{q}(r)) = - \lim_{r \uparrow 0} r^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^d b_{\mathbf{o}}^{(k)} m_{e_k} = \infty.$$

Thus, $\lambda > 0$ and hence $\lambda_c > 0$. By Lemma 3.1, for any $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_c]$, $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}) + \lambda \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ has a unique solution $\mathbf{q}(\lambda) \in \prod_{k=1}^d [0, q_{*k}]$. If $\rho(\mathbf{1}) = 0$, then we claim that $\mathbf{q}(\lambda) \in \prod_{k=1}^d (1, q_{*k}]$. Indeed, if $H = \{k : q_k(\lambda) \leq 1\} \neq \emptyset$, then

$$B_k(\tilde{\mathbf{r}}) \leq B_k(\mathbf{q}(\lambda)) = -\lambda q_k(\lambda) < 0, \quad k \in H$$

and

$$B_k(\tilde{\mathbf{r}}) \leq B_k(\mathbf{1}) = 0, \quad k \in \{1, \dots, d\} \setminus H,$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{r}} = (\tilde{r}_k : k = 1, \dots, d)$ with $\tilde{r}_k = q_k(\lambda)$ ($k \in H$) and $\tilde{r}_k = 1$ ($k \in \{1, \dots, d\} \setminus H$).

Therefore, there exists $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \prod_{k=1}^d [0, \tilde{r}_k] \subset [0, 1]^d$ such that $\mathbf{B}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) = 0$. Since $\rho(\mathbf{1}) = 0$, we have $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \tilde{\mathbf{r}} = \mathbf{1}$ which contradicts with $B_k(\tilde{\mathbf{r}}) \leq -\lambda q_k(\lambda) < 0$ ($k \in H$). Therefore, $\mathbf{q}(\lambda) \in \prod_{k=1}^d (1, q_{*k}]$. However, by Theorem 3.1 and Lemma 2.3, $-\lambda \geq \rho(\mathbf{q}(\lambda)) > \rho(\mathbf{1}) = 0$. This is a contradiction. If $\rho(\mathbf{1}) > 0$, then $\mathbf{q} \in [0, 1]^d$. Since $M(\mathbf{1}) < \infty$, we know that (4.3) holds for $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^d$. Let $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{q}$ and $\mathbf{1}$ in (4.3), we get $\lambda M(\mathbf{q}) = \sum_{k=1}^d m_{e_k} b_{\mathbf{o}}^{(k)} = \lambda M(\mathbf{1})$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, $\rho(\mathbf{1}) < 0$. The proof is complete. $\square$ $\square$

Acknowledgement

This work is supported by the National Key Research and Development Program of China (2022YFA1004600) and the National Natural Sciences Foundations of China (No. 11771452).

Declarations

We declare that the authors of this paper have no competing interests as defined by Springer Nature, or other interests that might be perceived to influence the results and/or discussion reported in this paper.

We also declare that the data used to support the findings of this study are included within the article.

References

- [1] Anderson W. (1991) *Continuous-Time Markov Chains: An Applications-Oriented Approach*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- [2] Asmussen S. and Hering H. (1983) *Branching Processes*. Birkhauser, Boston.

- [3] Asmussen S. (2003) *Applied probability and Queues, 2nd ed.*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- [4] Athreya K.B. and Ney P.E. (1972) *Branching Processes*. Springer, Berlin.
- [5] Athreya K.B. and Jagers P. (1996) *Classical and Modern Branching Processes*. Springer, Berlin.
- [6] Darroch J.N. and Seneta E. (1967) On quasi-stationary distributions in absorbing continuous-time finite Markov chains. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 4, 192-196.
- [7] Gross D. and Harris C.M. (1985) *Fundamentals of Queueing Theory*. Wiley: New York.
- [8] Flaspohler D.C. (1974) *Quasi-stationary distributions for absorbing continuous-time denumerable Markov chains*. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.*, 26, 351-356.
- [9] Kelly F.P. (1983) Invariant measures and the generator. In Kingman, J.F.C. and Reuter, G.E., eds. *Probability, Statistics, and Analysis. London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes Series 79*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 143-160.
- [10] Kijima M. (1963) Quasi-limiting distributions of Markov chains that are skip-free to the left in continuous-time. *J. Appl. Prob.*, 30, 509-517.
- [11] Kingman J.F.C. (1963) The exponential decay of Markov transition probability. *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, 13, 337-358.
- [12] Kleinrock I. (1975) *Queueing Systems, Vol.1*. Wiley: New York.
- [13] Li J.P. and Chen A.Y. (2013) Decay parameter and invariant measures for Markovian bulk-arrival queues with control at idle time. *Methodology Comput. Appl. Prob.*, 15(2):467-484.
- [14] Li J.P. Wang J. (2012) Decay parameter and related properties of n -type branching processes. *Science in China Series A:Mathematics.*, 55, 2535-2556.
- [15] Lucantoni D.M. and Neuts M.F. (1994) Some steady-state distributions for the *MAP/SM/1* queue. *Stoch. Models*, 10, 575-589.
- [16] Medhi J. (1991) *Stochastic Models in Queueing Theory*. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.
- [17] Nair M.G. and Pollett P.K. (1993) On the relationship between μ -invariant measures and quasi-stationary distributions for continuous-time Markov chains. *Adv. Appl. Probab.*, 25, 82-102.
- [18] Pakes A.G. and Tavaré S. (1981) Comments on the age distribution of Markov processes. *Adv. Appl. Prob.*, 13, 681-703.
- [19] Pollett P.K. (1986) On the equivalence of μ -invariant measures for the minimal process and its q -matrix. *Stochastic Proc. Appl.*, 22, 203-221.

- [20] Pollett P.K. (1988) Reversibility, invariance and μ -invariance. *Adv. Appl. Prob.*, 20, 600-621.
- [21] Van Doorn E.A. (1985) Conditions for exponential ergodicity and bounds for the decay parameter of a birth-death process. *Adv. Appl. Probab.*, 17, 514-530.
- [22] Van Doorn E.A. (1991) Quasi-stationary distributions and convergence to quasi-stationarity of birth-death processes. *Adv. Appl. Probab.*, 23, 683-700.
- [23] Tweedie R.L. (1974) Some ergodic properties of the Feller minimal process. *Quart. J. Math. Oxford.*, 25(2):485-493.