arXiv:cond-mat/0406034v2 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 3 Jun 2004

Random Walks with Shrinking Steps: First Passage Characteristics

Tonguç Rador* and Sencer Taneri†
Feza Gürsey Institute
Emek. Mah. No:61 8100
Çengelköy, İstanbul, Turkey
(Dated: December 9, 2021)

We study the mean first passage time and the ultimate survival probability of a one-dimensional random walker with step sizes decaying exponentially with discrete time, that is step sizes go like λ^N with $\lambda \leq 1$. We have also presented for pedagogical purposes a continuum system with a diffusion constant decaying exponentially in continuous time. Qualitatively both systems are alike in their global properties. The discrete case however shows a very rich mathematical behavior depending on the value of the shrinking parameter, such as self-repetitive and fractal-like structure for the first passage characteristics. The results we present proves that the most important quantitative behavior of the discrete case is that the support of the distribution function evolves in time in a rather complicated way in contrast to the time independent lattice structure of the ordinary random walker. We also show that there are critical values of λ defined by the equation $\lambda^K + 2\lambda^P - 2 = 0$ with $\{K, N\} \in \mathcal{N}$ where the mean first passage time and also the ultimate survival probability undergo transitions.

PACS numbers: 02.50.-r, 05.40-a

I. INTRODUCTION

The common model of random walk is an integral part of almost all scientific disciplines in such a way that it would not be an overstatement to call it a meta-model. In this respect it is important to look for extensions and possible generalizations of the model. In fact many of these extensions are already present, the ordinary random walk is solvable in many lattices with arbitrary nearest neighbour sites (coordination number), the continuum limits are known for various geometries and also generalizations for space dependent diffusion constant exist in nature.

Another likely extension of a random walk could be the case of a walker with step sizes shrinking with time. Although there is considerable work [5]-[10] on this in mathematical literature the idea has not been studied extensively from a physics perspective: see [1]-[4]. However there is a rather straightforward motivation for it to be important. The idea is the dichotomy between a Brownian particle and an *active* random walker. In the former case the particle is merely pushed around by the surrounding molecules. That is, it is under the influence of a random external force. In the latter case however, there is a possibility of internal energy dissipation and hence the step sizes (the ability to diffuse in the medium) might decrease in time. It is a difficult exercise however to visualize how this might occur in atomic scales, therefor it is more likely that this motivation would make sense only in some form of macroscopic mean field theory.

If we can be allowed to be a little humorous, the very analogy of a *drunk man* for the ordinary random walk is in essence closer to a walker with shrinking step sizes. This example might at first seem rather non-scientific however it brings in mind how biological systems, with rather short memory, propagate in nature without energy intake, let it be a fish in a bowl or a fly in a room. It is most likely that step size changes in nature are not fierce under normal circumstances so their effect is immaterial, however under extreme circumstances such as lions hunting prey the internal energy dissipation could be important and then it is a matter of determining how the step sizes change in time from biological principles.

Nevertheless, the aim of this paper is not to make a full case for the physical relevance of a random walker with shrinking step sizes. We believe that random walk would remain a meta-model with this extension as well.

The motivation for this work is the very interesting first passage characteristics of the ordinary random walk, consider for example the dichotomy between certain passage and infinite mean first passage time for a random walker in one dimension. Various processes in nature proceed by a first passage processes for example the hunt will be over when the prey and predator meets for the first time, or a neuron will fire when the electric potential first reaches a threshold value, etc. So it is interesting to study the first passage characteristics of a random walk with shrinking step sizes.

The outline of the paper is as follows. In Section II for purposes of motivation and developping a qualitative understanding of the problem we consider the first passage characteristics of a diffusion equation with a diffusion constant that decreases exponentially with time. Section III introduces the discrete case, where step size decays exponentially in discrete time, with an emphasis on the most general aspects of the model. The first pas-

*rador@gursey.gov.tr
†taneri@gursey.gov.tr

sage characteristics of the model are presented in sections IV, where an example is studied in detail numerically from which observations and generalizations are drawn for the mean first passage time, and V where we make a similar albeit shorter analysis for the ultimate survival probability .

II. A CONTINUUM EXAMPLE

For presentation purposes, before getting into the intricacies of a discrete random walk, we expose the behavior of a shrinking diffusion constant in continuum diffusion equation. In view of the rest of this work we consider the following

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial t} = D\, e^{-t/\tau}\, \frac{\partial^2 P}{\partial x^2} \quad . \tag{1}$$

We would like to solve this in a semi-infinite line with the initial condition that $P(x,0) = \delta(x - x_0)$ and absorbing boundary conditions at the origin $P(0,t) = 0$.

The differential equation in (1) can be easily solved with the above conditions to give,

$$P(x,T) \;=\; \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi D T}} \left[e^{-\frac{(x+x_0)^2}{4DT}} - e^{-\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{4DT}} \right] \tag{2}$$

$$T \;=\; \tau \, \left(1 - e^{-t/\tau}\right) \tag{3}$$

The first passage probability to the origin is just the flux to this point. The flux can be read from the diffusion equation if one writes it as $\partial P/\partial t = \partial F/\partial x$, which would give

$$F(x_o, t) = \frac{x_0}{\sqrt{4\pi D T^3}} \exp\left[\frac{x_0^2}{4DT}\right] \quad . \tag{4}$$

From this the zeroth moment or the eventual first passing probability can be calculated to give

$$F_0(x_0) = 1 - \mathrm{Erf}\left[\frac{x_0}{\sqrt{4D\tau}}\right] \quad . \tag{5}$$

Here, $\mathrm{Erf}(u) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^u dt e^{-t^2}$ is the error function. The result above should be contrasted to the ordinary diffusion equation where $F_0(x_0) = 1$. There is a finite first passage probability from the origin however this is rapidly vanishing with increasing x_0 as one would expect.

The survival probability, that is the probability to never have been at the origin at time t, is defined as

$$S(x_0, t) \equiv 1 - \int_0^t F(x_0, t')dt' \tag{6}$$

which gives an exact result

$$S(x_0, t) = \mathrm{Erf}\left[\frac{x_0}{\sqrt{4D\tau\left(1 - e^{-t/\tau}\right)}}\right] \tag{7}$$

which predicts a finite survival probability $S(x_0, \infty) = \mathrm{Erf}(\frac{x_0}{\sqrt{4D\tau}})$ for infinite time. This is again in contrast to the ordinary random walk with the survival probability vanishing as $\frac{x_0}{\sqrt{4Dt}}$.

The mean first passage time can also be calculated. However in this case the result is only available as a series,

$$\left\langle t(x_0) \right\rangle = \frac{\tau}{1 - \mathrm{Erf}(u)} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} u^{2n} \Gamma(0.5 - n, u^2) \;, \tag{8}$$

with $u = \frac{x_0}{\sqrt{4D\tau}}$ and $\Gamma(a,z) \equiv \int_z^\infty dt\; e^{-t} t^{z-1}$, the incomplete gamma function. To understand the behavior of this quantity we study its asymptotic behavior. The analytic properties of the error function and the incomplete gamma function are readily available in textbooks. The results for the two regimes of interest are

For $u \to 0$

$$\langle t(x_0) \rangle \simeq \sqrt{\frac{\tau}{\pi}} \frac{x_0}{\sqrt{D}} - \frac{\pi - 2}{2\pi} \frac{x_0^2}{D} + \ldots \tag{9}$$

Here we emphasized the τ dependence for reasons that will become clear in the next sections.

For $u \to \infty$

$$\langle t(x_0) \rangle \to \tau \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} \quad - \tau^2 \frac{4D}{x_0^2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 1 + \ldots \quad . \tag{10}$$

So as $u \to \infty$ we expect a logarithmic divergence with a linear dependence on τ.

We are now equipped with enough intuition to attack the much more difficult case of a discrete random walk with shrinking steps.

III. RANDOM WALKS WITH SHRINKING STEPS

Consider a random walker which hops equally likely to left and right by some distance s_N at a given time N, then the random variable for the position of the walker is simply

$$x(N) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \epsilon_n \; s_n \quad . \tag{11}$$

with $\epsilon_n = \pm 1$ the random variable for hopping. The mean of $x(N)$,as expected, is zero: the random walker

does not propagate in the mean but rather in the standard deviation which is given by

$$\left\langle x^2(N)\right\rangle = \sum_{n=1}^{N} s_N^2 \ . \tag{12}$$

From this relation it follows that if the sum converges to a constant as $N \to \infty$ there can be no continuum limit. The reasoning being if we scale the position variable by a length scale and let this scale vanish, there can be no non-trivial limit for the variance[11]. This difficulty in fact is present because the support of the probability distribution function for the random variable $x(N)$ evolves in time, in sharp contrast to the ordinary random walker for which we know the walker always resides on a lattice site which is a time independent regular structure allowing a limit for zero lattice spacing.

Disregarding this difficulty one might be tempted to introduce a probability distribution for the random variable $x(N)$ and try to use known machinery such as Fourier transforms. However as we will expose below this does not actually help unless special cases occur, such as infinite time limit or a particular shrinking parameter, which could be studied by other elementary methods as well. But the fact that the support of the distribution evolves in time in a generally non-uniform way will ultimately infest these approaches, especially if one is interested in the temporal evolution in the finite time regime.

A. An example

Consider for example the case with $s_N = \lambda^{N-1}$, then by elementary means one can write down a difference equation for the distribution

$$P(x, N+1) = \frac{1}{2}\left[P(x-\lambda^N, N) + P(x+\lambda^N, N)\right]. \tag{13}$$

This equation can be solved in Fourier space by taking $P(x,0) = \delta(x)$ yielding

$$P(k, N) = \prod_{n=0}^{N} \cos(\lambda^n k) \ . \tag{14}$$

As shown in [1] this is manageable only for special cases of λ namely $\lambda = 1/2^m$. We present here the case $\lambda = 1/2$ for our purposes,

$$P(k, N) = \frac{1}{2^{N+1}} \frac{\sin(2k)}{\sin(k/2^N)}, \quad \text{for} \quad \lambda = \frac{1}{2} \ . \tag{15}$$

Now to study the time dependence we need to invert this function back to x space which is not possible by analytical means. And even if we could, we could not use the known machinery of z-transforms (discrete analogue of Laplace transforms) to study first passage characteristics again because of technical difficulties.

However there is a more intuitive way to understand the time evolution of the system for the particular value of λ mentioned above. We advocate that understanding the time evolution of the support of the distribution is crucial. Consider again the case with $s_N = \lambda^N$ and we choose $\lambda = 1/2$ as above for the present purpose. Now it is clear that the support of the distribution is evolving in time as follows

$$\begin{array}{ll} N = 1 & \{-1, 1\} \\ N = 2 & \{-3/2, -1/2, 1/2, 3/2\} \\ N = 3 & \{-7/4, -5/4, -3/4, -1/4, 1/4, 3/4, 5/4, 7/4\} \\ \quad \vdots & \quad \vdots \end{array}$$

as we see the support set evolves in such a way that it is always uniform which makes this case more tractable. Also, it is for the values of x in the list above that we can inverse Fourier transform the function in (15) exactly.

For more general cases, namely the infinite time limit for $\lambda = 1/2^m$, studied in [1]. what happens is that the supports are actually unions of m evenly distributed support sets which results in mathematical terms to products (convolutions) of the distributions in momentum (position) space. This is the reason why these case are easily manageable. For further examples of λ's having special properties and hence amenable to reasonable analytic study in the infinite time limit (but not exact as $\lambda = 1/2^m$) we refer the reader to [1].

IV. GEOMETRIC SHRINKING: MEAN FIRST PASSAGE TIME

In this section we will investigate the mean first passage time of a random walker with $s_N = \lambda^{N-1}$. Since there are no generally tractable analytic methods we will resort to numerical methods in this section. Contrary to the ordinary random walk yielding infinite mean first passage time and hence rendering a numerical analysis impossible, the walker we are interested in ultimately comes to a stop and numerical analysis is indeed very feasible. There are however certain issues to be resolved in the present case that do not exist in the ordinary random walk.

Also another difficulty we have encountered in this system is the very rich structure of behavior (crucial or otherwise) and this presents a challenge for a coherent exposition. We apologize from the reader if the way we lay out the aspects of the problem will cause confusion at the beginning.

A. Numerical Caveats

First passage from a point: The fact that the support of the distribution evolves haunts us here again. In the ordinary random walk a first passage from a point is actually *to occupy* that point for the first time. In the case of a walker with shrinking steps it is no longer possible to predict that a given point is part of the support set at a given time. However the idea of *passing* certainly makes sense: that is to be *to the right of a point for the first time* is a meaningful statement. This unfortunately has the corollary that *a particular path may contribute to the first passage distribution of more than one point if these points are close*. So one expects a peculiar behavior in the mean first passage time as a function of the point to be first passed. One could for example try to avoid this problem by considering small intervals around a point and ask for the first time that the particle lands on this interval, this is certainly possible but in this case one would miss certain path that jumps over the interval, also this process would be target hitting instead of first passing.

Falling out of range: In the ordinary random walk the walker never falls out of range of a point. But, with the walker we are interested in this will be possible. Certain walks will fall out of range of a point due to a *bad choice of direction* at some point earlier in time. One could say earlier mistakes are punished more severely. However in terms of computer simulations this is more than welcome since it eliminates a walk that would never reach a point. This is a great help in reducing the simulation time.

Spatial Resolution: A random walker with geometrically shrinking step size will theoretically walk for an infinite amount of time. However in practice one can think that after some time it does not walk appreciably and the subsequent walk will have negligible effect. We have always chosen such a cut-off time such that the subsequent step sizes would be less then 10^{-9}.

With these in mind we have performed several simulation as follows. We start the walker at the origin and make a histogram of the time values for which the walker first passes a point x_0 this defines the first passage probability distribution $F(x_0, N)$ we then compute the normalized mean first passage time as follows

$$\langle t(x_0)\rangle \equiv \frac{F_1(x_0)}{F_0(x_0)} \tag{16}$$

with

$$F_n(x_0) \equiv \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} N^n F(x_0, N) \ . \tag{17}$$

defining the moments of $F(x_0, N)$.

The general details of the simulations were as follows. For a given x_0, we let the walker walk 10^5 times upto the step number cutoff defined so that the spatial resolution is below 10^{-9}[12]. After this bunch is completed we have a single distribution for $F(x_0, N)$. We repeat this procedure about 200 times[13] to get a statistical histogram for values from which now everything can be calculated. The procedure is repeated for different values of x_0.




FIG. 1: The mean first passage time from x_0 for $\lambda = 0.55$. The vertical line at $x = 2.\bar{2}$ is the ultimate range $\frac{1}{1-\lambda}$ of the walker for this value of λ. The error bars are very small and




FIG. 2: Zoom of Fig. 1 to the region $x_0 \in [0, 1]$. The straight line has zero error. See text for explanation.

B. Case Study for $\lambda = 0.55$

The result for $\lambda = 0.55$ can be seen in Fig. 1. As can be expected, the graph has a global increase pattern and also a self-repetiting, ladder-like local structure. That is the function between $x_0 \in [1, 1 + \lambda]$ *looks like* the one between $x_0 \in [0, 1]$ but scaled with λ. This is because once we reach $x_0 = 1$ the subsequent walk can be seen as starting from $x_0 = 1$ and with an overall scale of λ appearing in front of the distances. Consequently, to have a **feeling** of the *local behavior* of the first passage time, *it is sufficient to study the graph for mean first*




FIG. 3: Mean first passage time for $\lambda = 1/\sqrt{2}$ for the first ladder.




FIG. 4: Mean first passage time for $\lambda = 0.9$ for the first ladder.

passage time for only $x_0 \in [0, 1]$. We will argue later on that for a range of λ's this similarity is numerically exact when we quantify the global increase in Fig. 1. For now we would like to point out that the ladders in Fig. 1 increase in unit steps.

In Fig. 2 which a zoom-out of Fig. 1 to the region $x_0 \in [0, 1]$ we see very interesting features and we outline their meaning below.

1. Straight line between $x_0 \in [0.\bar{2}, 1]$**:** This is a manifestation of the *falling out of range* effect we have outlined above. The error bar of this line vanishes and this can be due to only one reason, there is one and only one path that can pass from this interval[14]. This becomes easier to understand if we also realize that the value $0.\bar{2}$ is nothing but $-1 + \frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda}$. Thus if the walker chooses to take the first step to the left then the ultimate position it can go is simply the value quoted above, any point beyond this value can only be first passed by a single step to the right. One could ask the question what should be the largest value for λ such that there is such a behavior. This is answered by the solution of the inequality

$$-1 + \frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda} \leq 1 \quad \rightarrow \lambda \leq \frac{2}{3}. \tag{18}$$

It is instructive to note that this value of λ has been observed in [2] to be the smallest value for which, the condition to have infinite number of paths to any point from the origin, is sufficient. In contrast to the case for $\lambda \geq \frac{1}{2}$ to have at least one path from the origin to any point, again mentioned in [2]. Here we see an example where the condition is reversed, that is there are only finite number of paths to certain positions and some positions can only be reached by unique paths. For $\lambda \geq \frac{2}{3}$ we expect this straight line behavior to disappear since there will be infinite number of paths from the origin to any point, see Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 the discussion in text.

2. Time goes up as x_0 **gets small?** First of all, this is only a local behavior. If we consult Fig. 1 we see that as x_0 increases there is global increase in the mean first passage time and indeed, as expected, there is a singularity at the ultimate range. The local increase, as we have outlined above, is due to the fact that the same path might contribute to more than one x_0 and as $x_0 \rightarrow 0$ the paths that do so generally increase yielding a larger mean first passage time. On the other hand we expect as $\lambda \rightarrow 1$ that this behavior would disappear since the number of x_0's a particular path might contribute would naturally decrease. One might argue that this is actually a minor concern since this increase is not appreciable compared to the base value of 1 for $x_0 = 1$, and in this problem we measure time in integers, so unless this increase is large compared to other values in the interval of a ladder one can safely assume this to be a peculiarity of the problem without real relevance. To make out point clearer we refer the reader to Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 where it is clearly visible that the local behavior revolves around similar values, but not necessarily the same base value for different values of λ.

3. There are multiple plateau's: This is again a manifestation of the condition that for $\lambda \geq \frac{2}{3}$ there are infinite paths from the origin to any point. The converse is not necessarily true and it is apparent in Fig. 2. Certain values of x_0 are reached by a *finite* (not one) number of paths and there are ranges of x_0 such that this number is constant. Consequently, the appearance of plateau's is guaranteed by the condition $\lambda \leq \frac{2}{3}$ and we see this to disappear otherwise in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 where the plateau structure has transformed into a cascaded hill form.

4. Global Structure: As we have mentioned and can be seen in Fig. 1 there is a global increase in the mean first passage time. On the other hand as also apparent there seems to be a repetitive pattern, the figure has the form of a ladder. And the values of the ladder are just integers with unit increments. In fact for values of $\lambda \leq \frac{2}{3}$ using the argument that there are unique paths to certain regions the envelope for the curve can be found to be

$$\langle t(x_0)\rangle = \frac{\ln\left[1-(1-\lambda)x_0\right]}{\ln\lambda} \quad . \tag{19}$$

as can be verified this increases with unit steps once x_0 reaches certain values given by

$$x_0(K) = \frac{1-\lambda^K}{1-\lambda} \quad . \tag{20}$$

These values represent what can be called **extremity walks** that is, walks with all the steps in one direction. We also would like to make a note of the fact that for $x_0 = \frac{1}{1-\lambda} - \epsilon$, that is x_0 is close to its maximal range with ϵ small, we get,

$$\langle t(x_0)\rangle = \frac{\ln\epsilon}{\ln\lambda} \quad . \tag{21}$$

This has the same logarithmic divergence as (10) if we do the analogy

$$\tau \;\sim\; -\frac{1}{\ln\lambda} \;, \tag{22}$$

we thus have at least a qualitative connection to the continuum case as one would expect.

C. Global Structure for General λ

For $\lambda \geq \frac{2}{3}$ the mean first passage time differs from (19) even for the extremity walks defined in (20) as can be checked from Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 where the mean first passage times are not 1 for $x_0 = 1$, however the ladder structure is nevertheless present and the ladder transitions are still given by extremity walks. So we have to consider another approach. To study how much discreapency arises, we have simulated the random walk for different extremity points for all λ's and computed the mean first passage time minus the values that is given by (19), that is we computed

$$\langle t'(K)\rangle \equiv \langle t(x_0(K))\rangle - K \quad +1 \quad . \tag{23}$$

The result is presented in Fig. 5. Where we have again suppressed the error bars to have a clear picture. A representative picture with the error bars are given in Fig. 6. The discrepancy starts at $\lambda = 2/3$ as anticipated and it is small for not too large values of λ and diverges later on. However we see that the discrepancy itself has a pattern. All the curves agree until a certain value of λ, then the curve for $K = 1$ starts to deviate after this point the remaining ones agree up to a certain value of λ and then the curve for $K = 2$ starts to deviate and this goes in the same way for higher values of K.




FIG. 5: λ behavior of the first passage time for various ex-




FIG. 6: Fig. 7 shown with error bars for the first two extremity walk points.

To understand and quantify this behavior we would like to remind the reader that extremity walks are in essence the fastest paths to a given point. Then, the next most fast path would be one with a single step in the wrong direction. Of course it is important when the wrong step is realized and this will be the crucial point in our line of reasoning. Let us try to construct our argument by an example; consider a first passage path from the origin to $x_0(2)$, the fastest path is of course an extremity walk that would take two steps to the right. Next, we would like to consider paths with one step in the wrong direction that would still first pass x_0 at hand. There are two possibilities: one can either choose the wrong direction in the first step or in the second. Considering these choices would be in range we have two equations

$$-1 + \frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda} \;=\; 1+\lambda \rightarrow \lambda \simeq 0.732051 \tag{24}$$

$$1 - \lambda + \frac{\lambda^2}{1-\lambda} \;=\; 1+\lambda \rightarrow \lambda = \frac{2}{3} \tag{25}$$

Now (25) is the same as the condition to reach $x_0(1)$ with one step in the wrong direction, so it is not a new condition. However (24) is new and once λ gets bigger than the value quoted this walk (which was already contributing to $x_0(1)$) will start to contribute to the first passage time for $x_0(2)$. Thus between these two values of λ the value of $\langle t'(K)\rangle$ will coincide for $K = 1$ and $K = 2$ (and consequently for all K by the unit shifting and scaling by λ property of the equations (24) and (25)). However as soon as λ get bigger than 0.732051 a new path will start to contribute to the first passage time for $x_0(2)$, and the others by the same argument in the parenthesis just above, meaning that its difference from the base value will be bigger. This is why the curves for $K = 1$ and the rest start to branch at this point which we have also checked with a further numerical analysis.

To iterate and make the idea clearer let us know consider the same argument for $x_0(3)$. There are three possible ways one can opt for the wrong direction and demanding the walks will be in range we get the following

$$-1 + \frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda} = 1 + \lambda + \lambda^2 \tag{26}$$

$$1 - \lambda + \frac{\lambda^2}{1-\lambda} = 1 + \lambda + \lambda^2 \tag{27}$$

$$1 + \lambda - \lambda^2 + \frac{\lambda^3}{1-\lambda} = 1 + \lambda + \lambda^2 \tag{28}$$

which would yield respectively,

$$\lambda \simeq 0.770917 \tag{29}$$

$$\lambda \simeq 0.732051 \tag{30}$$

$$\lambda = \frac{2}{3} \tag{31}$$

So it is a plausible (and observed) fact that the curves for $K = 2$ and $K = 3$ would agree up to around $\lambda \simeq 0.770917$ since as λ gets bigger than this value a path that was already contributing to $x_0(1)$ and $x_0(2)$ would be added to the first walk path to $x_0(3)$ and hence creating a discrepancy.

It is also possible to argue about the existence of paths with two or more steps in the wrong direction which in general will give an infinite number of possible constraint equations and possibly interfering with the picture above. Let us consider the case with two steps in the wrong direction. There are three generally possible cases. First, one could choose the two wrong steps early in the walk and not so separated in time thus subjecting the subsequent walk to greater punishment. Second, one could choose them after having subsequent steps to the right, again not so separated in time, meaning a much less punishment for the subsequent walk. Or third, one could have them separated by a long walk to the right for which the punishment would be somewhere in between compared to the other two cases. It is clear that only the first case comes with more probability because less number of steps are fixed [15] So we would like to introduce the idea of *worst case punishment extremity walk* as the path in which all the wrong steps are taken at the beginning of the walk. This is a generalization of the idea we outlined above. The general constraint equation for the worst case punishment extremity walk (that is P steps to the left at the very beginning) to go to $x_0(K)$ extremity point is given by

$$\lambda^K + 2\lambda^P - 2 = 0 \ . \tag{32}$$

the possible roots of this equation for the first few values of (K, P) and are presented below

P \ K	1	2	3
1	0.666667	0.732051	0.770917
2	0.780776	0.816497	0.839287
3	0.835122	0.858094	0.87358

From this table the fourth highest value is given for $(K = 1, P = 2)$ and not $(3, 1)$. This means that just before the path $(3, 1)$ contributes to $x_0(3)$ the path $(1, 2)$ starts to contribute to $x_0(1)$ and this condition would also satisfy a different walk of the form $1 - \lambda - \lambda^2 + \frac{\lambda^3}{1-\lambda} = x_0(2) = 1 + \lambda$. So the process of branching we have mentioned above is frustrated (since the value $(1, 2)$ add a path to $x_0(1)$ and $x_0(2)$ but not to $x_0(3)$) with this complication since this transition will work to get the curves $K = 2$ and $K = 3$ in Fig 5. together. In short as apparent from the table the branching process is present but beset with many immaculate behavior. However the behavior from $\lambda = 0.66666$ to $\lambda = 0.732051$ is free of this difficulties. Thus one can safely state that we have the following

$$\langle t'(K)\rangle = f(\lambda) \quad \text{for } \frac{2}{3} \leq \lambda \leq 0.732051 \tag{33}$$

a function independent of K.

As a final remark we would like to mention that all the curves in Fig. fit very well to the following ansatz

$$\frac{a_0(K)}{\sqrt{-\ln\lambda}} + a_1(K) + \frac{a_2(K)}{\ln\lambda} \ , \tag{34}$$

with a_0, a_1 and a_2 are fit parameters. Here the first two terms, which dominate the small λ behavior, represent an analogy the small u behavior of (9), whereas the last one, which dominate the large λ behavior, is the analogue of large u asymptotic behavior in (10), if we would like to make the analogy $\tau \sim -1/\ln\lambda$. With this identification and for fixed $x_0(K)$, increasing (decreasing) λ would be similar to increasing (decreasing) u. So the discrete case is not qualitatively very different than the continuum model we have presented.




FIG. 7: Ultimate survival probability for various λ's. The graphs differ in breadth because of the different ultimate ranges for different λ's.

V. GEOMETRIC SHRINKING: ULTIMATE SURVIVAL PROBABILITY

In this section we would like to present a similar study for the ultimate survival probability $S(x_0)$ of a random walker with geometrically shrinking steps. Much of the observations we have made in the previous section also apply here. So in order to prevent unnecessary repetitions we will briefly outline the general behavior. In Fig. 7 we present the results of numerical simulation of $S(x_0)$ for various representative values of λ. In direct analogy to the previous chapter for values of $\lambda \leq 2/3$, the ultimate survival probability can be calculated exactly for exremity walks. can be calculated exactly for the extremity walks. It is

$$S(x_0(K)) = 1 - \frac{1}{2^K} \tag{35}$$

which is directly connected to the probability to have an extremity walk at all. For different values of λ an analysis similar to the previous chapter can be performed but we would like to omit it here. The analogy to the continuum example is apparent in Fig. 7, since the case for $\lambda = 0.9$ is qualitatively very close to the analogous quantity we have presented for our continuum representative example, $S(u) = 1 - \mathrm{Erf}(u)$.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this work we have studied the first passage characteristics of a random walker with step sizes decaying exponentially with time. There is a very rich mathematical structure which could be phenomenologically studied via computer simulations. One of the most interesting things we would like to mention is that much unlike the peculiar λ dependence of the probability distribution function in the infinite time limit, giving rise for example to sudden changes in the shape of the function, the first passage characteristics do not show violent dependence on the values of λ. This is mainly due to the fact that the first passage times are somewhat an integrated quantity and also to the fact that the same path may contribute to the first passage time of more than one destination point. We have also shown that the discrete case has all the qualitative properties of a diffusion equation with a time varying diffusion constant which hints phenomenologically that the continuum case might be of choice for studying general aspects of such physical systems.

Although, mainly to connect to the literature, we have confined ourselves to the exponentially decaying step sizes there are many other possibilities. One possibly interesting example that comes to mind is to assume $s_N = \left(1 - \frac{N}{M}\right)^\alpha$ with M integer and α arbitrary. This case has the nice extra feature that the walk really comes to a stop when the walker commits M steps therefor allowing an exact enumeration of paths for small values of M[16]. Furthermore this example has a connection to the exponential case remembering $e^x = \lim_{a\to\infty}(1 + \frac{x}{a})^a$. A preliminary analysis we have carried out gives similar behavior to the exponential case while differing in details. Another likely extension is, as proposed in [1], the 2-dimensional random walker with shrinking steps which might provide further interesting features.

Acknowledgments

The computer simulations for this work have been carried out on the 16-node Gilgamesh PC-cluster at Feza Gürsey Institute. We would like to thank A. Erzan, M. Mungan and E. Demiralp for useful discussions and comments on this work.

[1] P.L. Krapivsky and S. Redner, Am.J.Phys. **72**, 591 (2004).
[2] A.C. de la Torre, A. Maltz, H.O.Mártin, P. Catuogno and I. Garciá-Mata, Phys.Rev.E **62**, 7748-7754 (2000).
[3] E. Barkai and R. Silbey, Chem. Phys. Lett. **310**, 287-295 (1999).
[4] E. Ben-Naim, S. Redner and D. ben-Avraham, Phys. Rev. A **45**, 7207-7213 (1992).
[5] B. Jessen and A. Wintner, "Distribution functions and the Riemann zeta function", Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **38**, 48-88 (1935); B. Kershner and A. Wintner, "On symmetric Bernoulli convolutions", Amer. J. Math. **57**, 541-548 (1935); A. Wintner, "On convergent Poisson convolutions", *ibid.* **57**, 827-838 (1935).
[6] P. Erdős, "On a family of symmetric Bernoulli convolutions", Amer. J. Math. **61**, 974-976 (1939); P. Erdős,

"On smoothness properties of a family of Bernoulli convolutions", *ibid.* **62**, 180-186 (1940).

[7] A. M. Garsia, "Arithmetic properties of Bernoulli convolutions", Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **102**, 409-432 (1962); A. M. Garsia, "Entropy and singularity of infinite convolutions", Pacific J. Math. **13**, 1159-1169 (1963).

[8] J. C. Alexander and J. A. Yorke, "Fat baker's transformations", Ergodic Th. Dynam. Syst. **4**, 1-23 (1984); J. C. Alexander and D. Zagier, "The entropy of a certain infinitely convolved Bernoulli measure", J. London Math. Soc. **44**, 121-134 (1991).

[9] F. Ledrappier, "On the dimension of some graphs", Contemp. Math. **135**, 285-293 (1992).

[10] Y. Peres, W. Schlag, and B. Solomyak, "Sixty years of Bernoulli convolutions", in *Fractals and Stochastics II*, edited by C. Bandt, S. Graf, and M. Zähle (Progress in Probability, Birkhauser, 2000), Vol. 46, pp. 39-65.

[11] This argument is presented also in [2].

[12] Which of course is different for different values of λ

[13] Depending on λ and the x_0 under consideration, with different seeds or in a big run which would not hit the period of a common random number generator (such as the common rand() fucntion in stdlib of gcc) of about 2^{32}.

[14] One might argue that in a computer simulation a zero error bar can be a fake one if one does not cover the probabilities accurately. This is not the case here and as the text explains the proposition is rigorous.

[15] This line of reasonning about the probability of paths might seem speculative at first since we actually let the walker take an infinite steps to the right after all the wrong steps are taken. However this is only a constraint equation, once λ get bigger than the value given by the constraint, the last phase of the walk will certainly consist of a finite number of steps with step number decreasing with increasing λ. However the number of steps fixed at the beginning would still be reducing the overall probability of the path in question.

[16] The period of the average common random number generator is about 2^{32} therefor giving $M_{max} = 32$.