

A Markov jump process associated with the matrix-exponential distribution

Oscar Peralta*

Abstract

Let f be the density function associated to a matrix-exponential distribution of parameters $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, T, \mathbf{s})$. By exponentially tilting f , we find a probabilistic interpretation which generalises the one associated to phase-type distributions. More specifically, we show that for any sufficiently large $\lambda \geq 0$, the function $x \mapsto (\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} f(s) ds)^{-1} e^{-\lambda x} f(x)$ can be described in terms of a Markov jump process whose generator is tied to T . Finally, we show how to revert the exponential tilting in order to assign a probabilistic interpretation to f itself.

1 Introduction

A phase-type distribution corresponds to the law of $Y := \inf\{t \geq 0 : J_t = \star\}$ where $\{J_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a Markov jump process with state space $\{1, \dots, p\} \cup \{\star\}$, with $\{1, \dots, p\}$ assumed to be transient states and $\{\star\}$ absorbing. If $\{J_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ has a block-partitioned initial distribution $(\boldsymbol{\pi}, 0)$ and intensity matrix given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & \mathbf{b} \\ \mathbf{0} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{b} = -A\mathbf{1}, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\mathbf{0}$ represents a p -dimensional row vector of 0's and $\mathbf{1}$ a p -dimensional column vector of 1's, then we say that the phase-type distribution is of parameters $(\boldsymbol{\pi}, A)$. Via simple probabilistic arguments, it can be shown that the density function of a phase-type distribution of parameters $(\boldsymbol{\pi}, A)$ is of the form

$$g(x) = \boldsymbol{\pi} e^{Ax} \mathbf{b}, \quad x \geq 0. \quad (1.2)$$

Indeed, the vector $\boldsymbol{\pi} e^{Ax}$ yields the probabilities of $\{J_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ being in some state $\{1, \dots, p\}$ at time x , and \mathbf{b} corresponds to the intensity vector of an absorption happening immediately after. Phase-type distributions were first introduced in [12] with the aim of constructing a robust and tractable class of distributions on \mathbb{R}_+ to be used in econometric problems. A more comprehensive study of phase-type distributions was carried on by Neuts [13, 14], whose work popularized their use in more general stochastic models.

*The University of Adelaide, School of Mathematical Sciences, SA 5005, Australia, oscar.peraltagutierrez@adelaide.edu.au

On the other hand, a *matrix-exponential distribution* of dimension $p \geq 1$ is an absolutely continuous distribution on $(0, \infty)$ whose density function can be written as

$$f(x) = \boldsymbol{\alpha} e^{Tx} \mathbf{s}, \quad x \geq 0, \quad (1.3)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p)$ is a p -dimensional row vector, $T = \{t_{ij}\}_{i,j \in \{1, \dots, p\}}$ is a $(p \times p)$ -dimensional square matrix, and $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_p)^\top$ is a p -dimensional column vector, all with complex entries. If the dimension need not be specified, we refer to such a distribution simply as *matrix-exponential*. It follows from (1.2) and (1.3) that the class of phase-type distributions is a subset of those that are matrix-exponential, with the inclusion being strict (see [15] for details on the latter).

Matrix-exponential distributions were first studied in [7, 8] through the concept of complex-valued transition probabilities. More precisely, it was shown that certain systems with complex-valued elements can be formally studied by analytical means without assigning a specific physical interpretation to their components. While their method provided mathematical rigour to systems “driven” by complex-valued intensity matrices, it failed to provide a physical meaning to each individual component, as opposed to the case of Markov jump processes with genuine intensity matrices. Later on, it was proved in [15, 5] that matrix-exponential distributions have an interpretation in terms of a Markov process with continuous state space, as opposed to the finite-state-space one that phase-type distributions enjoy. Even after the previous physical interpretations of matrix-exponential distributions were discovered, properties of this class of distributions are still not as well understood as they are for its phase-type counterpart. One of the main reasons for this is that continuous state space processes are more difficult to handle, so that studying matrix-exponential distributions by physical means requires a more sophisticated framework. For example, this is the case in [2, 4, 3] where the theory of piecewise-deterministic Markov processes is used to study models with matrix-exponential components. Thus, having a finite-state system interpretation for matrix-exponential distributions available may potentially lead to the discovery of new properties, as it has traditionally been the case for phase-type distributions.

In this paper we give a physical interpretation to *each element* of the parameters $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, T, \mathbf{s})$ satisfying:

- A1.** The elements of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, T and \mathbf{s} are real,
- A2.** The dominant eigenvalue of T , denoted σ_0 , is real and strictly negative.

Since it can be shown that for a given matrix-exponential density of the form (1.3) the parameters $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, T, \mathbf{s})$ can be chosen in such a way that **A1** and **A2** hold (see [1]), the interpretation that we develop essentially completes the picture laid out in [7, 8]. Our method, inspired by the recent work in [16], provides a transparent interpretation of $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, T, \mathbf{s})$ in terms of a finite-state Markov jump process. To do so, we employ the technique known as *exponential tilting*, which means that we focus on the density proportional to $e^{-\lambda \cdot} f(\cdot)$ for large enough $\lambda > 0$. After we perform this transformation, we construct a Markov jump process on a finite state space formed by two groups: the *original states* and the *anti-states*, the latter being a copy of the former. Heuristically, jumps within the set of original states or within the set of anti-states occur according to the off-diagonal nonnegative “jump intensities” of T , while

jumps between the original and the anti-states occur according to the negative “jump intensities” of T . Eventual absorption or termination happens, and each realization “carries” a positive or negative sign depending only on its initial and final state. Our main contribution is showing that this mechanism yields the exponentially-tilted matrix-exponential distribution, and by reverting the exponential tilting, providing some probabilistic insight of the original matrix-exponential distribution as well.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we provide a brief exposition on exponential tilting and how it affects the representation of a matrix-exponential distribution. In Section 3 we present our main results, Theorem 3.2 and Corollary 3.4, where we give a precise interpretation of an exponentially-tilted matrix-exponential density in terms of a Markov jump process. Finally, in Section 4 we provide methods to recover formulae and probabilistic interpretations for any matrix-exponential distribution based on the results on their exponentially-tilted version.

2 Preliminaries

Exponential tilting, also known as the *Escher transform*, is a technique which transforms any probability density function f with support on $[0, \infty)$ into a new probability density function f_λ defined by

$$f_\lambda(x) = \frac{e^{-\lambda x} f(x)}{\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda r} f(r) dr}, \quad x \geq 0,$$

where $\lambda \geq 0$ is the *tilting rate*. The use of exponential tilting goes back at least to [10], where it was used to build upon Crámer’s classical actuarial models [9]. Later on, the exponential tilting method played a prominent role in the theory of option pricing [11].

The exponentially-tilted version of a matrix-exponential distribution has a simple form which happens to be matrix-exponential itself. To see this, notice that if f is of the form (1.3), then

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda r} f(r) dr = \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda r} (\boldsymbol{\alpha} e^{Tr} \mathbf{s}) dr = \boldsymbol{\alpha} (\lambda I - T)^{-1} \mathbf{s},$$

where we used the fact that $T - \lambda I$ has eigenvalues with strictly negative real parts and thus $e^{(T-\lambda I)r}$ vanishes as $r \rightarrow \infty$. Thus,

$$f_\lambda(x) = \frac{e^{-\lambda x} (\boldsymbol{\alpha} e^{Tx} \mathbf{s})}{\boldsymbol{\alpha} (\lambda I - T)^{-1} \mathbf{s}} = \left(\frac{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}{\boldsymbol{\alpha} (\lambda I - T)^{-1} \mathbf{s}} \right) e^{(T-\lambda I)x} \mathbf{s}, \quad x \geq 0, \quad (2.1)$$

implying that f_λ corresponds to the density function of a matrix-exponential distribution of parameters $\left(\frac{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}{\boldsymbol{\alpha} (\lambda I - T)^{-1} \mathbf{s}}, T - \lambda I, \mathbf{s} \right)$.

Recall that the parameters $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, T, \mathbf{s})$ need not have a probabilistic meaning in terms of a finite state space Markov chain, as opposed to the parameters associated to phase-type distributions. For instance, the parameters

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (1, 0, 0), \quad T = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -1 & 2/3 \\ 1 & -1 & -2/3 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{s} = \begin{bmatrix} 4/3 \\ 2/3 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.2)$$

yield a valid matrix-exponential distribution whose density function is given by $f(x) = \frac{2}{3}e^{-x}(1 + \cos(x))$, and where the dominant eigenvalue of T is -1 (see [6, Example 4.5.21] for details). In the following section we show how to assign a probabilistic meaning to the exponentially-tilted version of (2.2), and more generally to those attaining properties **A1** and **A2**, in terms of a finite-state Markov jump process.

3 Main results

Let $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, T, \mathbf{s})$ be parameters associated to a p -dimensional matrix-exponential distribution which attain properties **A1** and **A2**. For $1 \leq i, j \leq p$ denote by t_{ij} the (i, j) -entry of T , and denote by s_i the i -th entry of \mathbf{s} . For $\ell \in \{+, -\}$, define the $(p \times p)$ -dimensional matrix $T^\ell = \{t_{ij}^\ell\}_{1 \leq i, j \leq p}$ and the p -dimensional column vector $\mathbf{s}^\ell = (s_1^\ell, \dots, s_p^\ell)^\top$ where

$$\begin{aligned} t_{ij}^\pm &= \max\{0, \pm t_{ij}\} \quad \forall i \neq j, \\ t_{ii}^\pm &= \pm \min\{0, \pm t_{ii}\} \quad \forall i, \text{ and} \\ s_i^\pm &= \max\{0, \pm s_i\} \quad \forall i. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that T^+ has nonnegative off-diagonal elements and nonpositive diagonal elements, T^- is a nonnegative matrix, \mathbf{s}^+ and \mathbf{s}^- are nonnegative column vectors, $T = T^+ - T^-$ and $\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{s}^+ - \mathbf{s}^-$. Now, let

$$\lambda_0 = \min \left\{ r \geq 0 : \sum_{j=1}^p s_{ij}^+ + s_{ij}^- + s_i^+ + s_i^- - \lambda \leq 0 \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq p \right\}.$$

For some fixed $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$, consider a (possibly) terminating Markov jump process $\{\varphi_t^\lambda\}_{t \geq 0}$ driven by the block-partitioned subintensity matrix

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} T^+ - \lambda I & T^- & \mathbf{s}^+ & \mathbf{s}^- \\ T^- & T^+ - \lambda I & \mathbf{s}^- & \mathbf{s}^+ \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & 0 & 0 \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.1)$$

evolving on the state space $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}^o \cup \mathcal{E}^a \cup \{\Delta^o\} \cup \{\Delta^a\}$ where $\mathcal{E}^o := \{1^o, 2^o, \dots, p^o\}$ and $\mathcal{E}^a = \{1^a, 2^a, \dots, p^a\}$. The state space \mathcal{E} may be thought as the union of two sets: a collection of *original states* $\mathcal{E}^o \cup \{\Delta^o\}$ and a collection of *anti-states* $\mathcal{E}^a \cup \{\Delta^a\}$, where both Δ^o and Δ^a are absorbing. In the case $\lambda > \lambda_0$, the process $\{\varphi_t^\lambda\}_{t \geq 0}$ alternates between sojourn times in \mathcal{E}^o and \mathcal{E}^a up until one of the following happens: (a) get absorbed into Δ^o , (b) get absorbed into Δ^a or (c) undergo termination due to the defect of (3.1). If $\lambda = \lambda_0$, the states $\mathcal{E}^o \cup \mathcal{E}^a$ may or may not be transient, their status depending on the values of T .

In Theorem 3.1 we establish a link between the absorption probabilities of $\{\varphi_t^\lambda\}_{t \geq 0}$ and the vector $e^{(T-\lambda I)x} \mathbf{s}$ appearing in the exponentially-tilted matrix-exponential density (2.1). More specifically, we express each element in $e^{(T-\lambda I)x} \mathbf{s}$ as the sum of some positive density functions and some negative density function, where the

positive density is associated to an absorption of $\{\varphi_t^\lambda\}_{t \geq 0}$ to Δ^o , while the negative density function corresponds to an absorption of $\{\varphi_t^\lambda\}_{t \geq 0}$ to Δ^a . To shorten notation, from now on we denote by \mathbb{P}_j (\mathbb{E}_j), $j \in \mathcal{E}$, the probability measure (expectation) associated to $\{\varphi_t^\lambda\}_{t \geq 0}$ conditional on the event $\{\varphi_0^\lambda = j\}$.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$ be such that the states $\mathcal{E}^o \cup \mathcal{E}^a$ are transient. Define*

$$\tau = \inf\{x \geq 0 : \varphi_x^\lambda \notin \mathcal{E}^o \cup \mathcal{E}^a\}. \quad (3.2)$$

Then, for $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ and $x \geq 0$,

$$(\mathbf{e}_i^\top e^{(T-\lambda I)x} \mathbf{s}) dx = \mathbb{E}_{i^o} [\mathbf{1}\{\tau \in [x, x+dx]\} \beta(\varphi_\tau^\lambda)] \quad (3.3)$$

$$= (\mathbf{e}_i^\top, \mathbf{0}) \exp \left(\begin{bmatrix} T^+ - \lambda I & T^- \\ T^- & T^+ - \lambda I \end{bmatrix} x \right) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{s} \\ -\mathbf{s} \end{bmatrix} dx, \quad (3.4)$$

where \mathbf{e}_i denotes the column vector with 1 on its i -th entry and 0 elsewhere, and $\beta(j) := \mathbf{1}\{j = \Delta^o\} - \mathbf{1}\{j = \Delta^a\}$. Moreover,

$$(-\mathbf{e}_i^\top e^{(T-\lambda I)x} \mathbf{s}) dx = \mathbb{E}_{i^a} [\mathbf{1}\{\tau \in [x, x+dx]\} \beta(\varphi_\tau^\lambda)] \quad (3.5)$$

$$= (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{e}_i^\top) \exp \left(\begin{bmatrix} T^+ - \lambda I & T^- \\ T^- & T^+ - \lambda I \end{bmatrix} x \right) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{s} \\ -\mathbf{s} \end{bmatrix} dx. \quad (3.6)$$

Proof. The block structure of (3.1) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{i^o}(\tau \in [x, x+dx], \varphi_\tau^\lambda = \Delta^o) &= (\mathbf{e}_i^\top, \mathbf{0}) \exp \left(\begin{bmatrix} T^+ - \lambda I & T^- \\ T^- & T^+ - \lambda I \end{bmatrix} x \right) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{s}^+ \\ \mathbf{s}^- \end{bmatrix}, \\ \mathbb{P}_{i^o}(\tau \in [x, x+dx], \varphi_\tau^\lambda = \Delta^a) &= (\mathbf{e}_i^\top, \mathbf{0}) \exp \left(\begin{bmatrix} T^+ - \lambda I & T^- \\ T^- & T^+ - \lambda I \end{bmatrix} x \right) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{s}^- \\ \mathbf{s}^+ \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

therefore, the r.h.s. of (3.3) is equal to (3.4). We prove that (3.3) holds next.

Define the collection of $(p \times p)$ -dimensional matrices $\{\Phi_{oa}(x)\}_{x \geq 0}$, $\{\Phi_{ao}(x)\}_{x \geq 0}$, $\{\Phi_{oo}(x)\}_{x \geq 0}$ and $\{\Phi_{aa}(x)\}_{x \geq 0}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} (\Phi_{oa}(x))_{ij} &= \mathbb{P}_{i^o}(\tau > x, \varphi_x^\lambda = j^a), & (\Phi_{ao}(x))_{ij} &= \mathbb{P}_{i^a}(\tau > x, \varphi_x^\lambda = j^o), \\ (\Phi_{oo}(x))_{ij} &= \mathbb{P}_{i^o}(\tau > x, \varphi_x^\lambda = j^o), & (\Phi_{aa}(x))_{ij} &= \mathbb{P}_{i^a}(\tau > x, \varphi_x^\lambda = j^a), \end{aligned}$$

for all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. By the symmetry of the subintensity matrix G it is clear that for all $x \geq 0$, $\Phi_{oa}(x) = \Phi_{ao}(x)$ and $\Phi_{oo}(x) = \Phi_{aa}(x)$, even if their probabilistic interpretations differ. For all $x \geq 0$, let $\Phi_o(x) := \Phi_{oo}(x) - \Phi_{oa}(x)$ and $\Phi_a(x) := \Phi_{aa}(x) - \Phi_{ao}(x)$. Define

$$\gamma = \inf\{r \geq 0 : \varphi_r^\lambda \notin \mathcal{E}^o\}.$$

Then, for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{e}_i^\top \Phi_o(x) \mathbf{e}_j &= \mathbb{P}_{i^o}(\tau > x, \varphi_x^\lambda = j^o) - \mathbb{P}_{i^o}(\tau > x, \varphi_x^\lambda = j^a) \\
&= \left\{ \mathbb{P}_{i^o}(\gamma > x, \varphi_x^\lambda = j^o) + \int_0^x \mathbb{P}_{i^o}(\gamma \in [r, r + dr], \tau > x, \varphi_x^\lambda = j^o) \right\} \\
&\quad - \left\{ \mathbb{P}_{i^o}(\gamma > x, \varphi_x^\lambda = j^a) + \int_0^x \mathbb{P}_{i^o}(\gamma \in [r, r + dr], \tau > x, \varphi_x^\lambda = j^a) \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{P}_{i^o}(\gamma > x, \varphi_x^\lambda = j^o) \\
&\quad + \int_0^x \sum_{k=1}^p \mathbb{P}_{i^o}(\gamma \in [r, r + dr], \varphi_\gamma^\lambda = k^a) \mathbb{P}_{k^a}(\tau > x - r, \varphi_{x-r}^\lambda = j^o) \\
&\quad - \int_0^x \sum_{k=1}^p \mathbb{P}_{i^o}(\gamma \in [r, r + dr], \varphi_\gamma^\lambda = k^a) \mathbb{P}_{k^a}(\tau > x - r, \varphi_{x-r}^\lambda = j^a),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

where in the last equality we used that $\{\gamma > x, \varphi_x^\lambda = j^a\} = \emptyset$ and the Markov property of $\{\varphi_x^\lambda\}_{x \geq 0}$. Note that all the elements in (3.7) correspond to transition probabilities or intensities that can be expressed in matricial form as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_{i^o}(\gamma > x, \varphi_x^\lambda = j^o) &= \mathbf{e}_i^\top e^{(T^+ - \lambda I)x} \mathbf{e}_j, \\
\mathbb{P}_{i^o}(\gamma \in [r, r + dr], \varphi_\gamma^\lambda = k^a) &= \mathbf{e}_i^\top e^{(T^+ - \lambda I)r} T^- \mathbf{e}_k dr, \\
\mathbb{P}_{k^a}(\tau > x - r, \varphi_{x-r}^\lambda = j^o) &= \mathbf{e}_k^\top \Phi_{ao}(x - r) \mathbf{e}_j, \\
\mathbb{P}_{k^a}(\tau > x - r, \varphi_{x-r}^\lambda = j^a) &= \mathbf{e}_k^\top \Phi_{aa}(x - r) \mathbf{e}_j.
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting these expressions into (3.7) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{e}_i^\top \Phi_o(x) \mathbf{e}_j &= \mathbf{e}_i^\top e^{(T^+ - \lambda I)x} \mathbf{e}_j + \int_0^x \sum_{k=1}^p \left(\mathbf{e}_i^\top e^{(T^+ - \lambda I)r} T^- \mathbf{e}_k \right) \left(\mathbf{e}_k^\top \Phi_{ao}(x - r) \mathbf{e}_j \right) dr \\
&\quad - \int_0^x \sum_{k=1}^p \left(\mathbf{e}_i^\top e^{(T^+ - \lambda I)r} T^- \mathbf{e}_k \right) \left(\mathbf{e}_k^\top \Phi_{aa}(x - r) \mathbf{e}_j \right) dr \\
&= \mathbf{e}_i^\top \left(e^{(T^+ - \lambda I)x} + \int_0^x e^{(T^+ - \lambda I)r} T^- [\Phi_{ao}(x - r) - \Phi_{aa}(x - r)] dr \right) \mathbf{e}_j \\
&= \mathbf{e}_i^\top \left(e^{(T^+ - \lambda I)x} + \int_0^x e^{(T^+ - \lambda I)r} T^- [\Phi_{oa}(x - r) - \Phi_{oo}(x - r)] dr \right) \mathbf{e}_j \\
&= \mathbf{e}_i^\top \left(e^{(T^+ - \lambda I)x} + \int_0^x e^{(T^+ - \lambda I)r} (-T^-) \Phi_o(x - r) dr \right) \mathbf{e}_j,
\end{aligned}$$

so that $\{\Phi_o(x)\}_{x \geq 0}$ is the bounded solution to the matrix-integral equation

$$\Phi_o(x) = e^{(T^+ - \lambda I)x} + \int_0^x e^{(T^+ - \lambda I)r} (-T^-) \Phi_o(x - r) dr.$$

By [3, Theorem 3.10],

$$\Phi_o(x) = e^{[(T^+ - \lambda I) + (-T^-)]x} = e^{(T - \lambda I)x}.$$

The Markov property implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}_{i^o}(\tau \in [x, x + dx], \varphi_\tau^\lambda = \Delta^o) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^p \mathbb{P}_{i^o}(\tau > x, \varphi_x^\lambda = k^o) \mathbb{P}_{k^o}(\tau \in [x, x + dx], \varphi_\tau^\lambda = \Delta^o) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=1}^p \mathbb{P}_{i^o}(\tau > x, \varphi_x^\lambda = k^a) \mathbb{P}_{k^a}(\tau \in [x, x + dx], \varphi_\tau^\lambda = \Delta^o) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^p (\mathbf{e}_i^\top \Phi_{oo}(x) \mathbf{e}_k) (\mathbf{e}_k^\top \mathbf{s}^+) dx + \sum_{k=1}^p (\mathbf{e}_i^\top \Phi_{oa}(x) \mathbf{e}_k) (\mathbf{e}_k^\top \mathbf{s}^-) dx \\
&= \mathbf{e}_i^\top (\Phi_{oo}(x) \mathbf{s}^+ + \Phi_{oa}(x) \mathbf{s}^-) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\mathbb{P}_{i^o}(\tau \in [x, x + dx], \varphi_\tau^\lambda = \Delta^a) = \mathbf{e}_i^\top (\Phi_{oa}(x) \mathbf{s}^+ + \Phi_{oo}(x) \mathbf{s}^-) dx.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}_{i^o}(\tau \in [x, x + dx], \varphi_\tau^\lambda = \Delta^o) - \mathbb{P}_{i^o}(\tau \in [x, x + dx], \varphi_\tau^\lambda = \Delta^a) \\
&= \mathbf{e}_i^\top ([\Phi_{oo}(x) \mathbf{s}^+ + \Phi_{oa}(x) \mathbf{s}^-] - [\Phi_{oa}(x) \mathbf{s}^+ + \Phi_{oo}(x) \mathbf{s}^-]) dx \\
&= \mathbf{e}_i^\top ([\Phi_{oo}(x) - \Phi_{oa}(x)] \mathbf{s}^+ - [\Phi_{oo}(x) - \Phi_{oa}(x)] \mathbf{s}^-) dx \\
&= \mathbf{e}_i^\top \Phi_o(x) \mathbf{s} dx = \mathbf{e}_i^\top e^{(T-\lambda I)x} \mathbf{s} dx,
\end{aligned}$$

so that (3.3) holds. Analogous arguments follow for (3.5) and (3.6), which completes the proof. \square

Heuristically, Equations (3.3) and (3.5) imply that initiating $\{\varphi_t^\lambda\}_{t \geq 0}$ in the anti-state i^a has the opposite effect, in terms of sign, to initiating in the original state i^o . In the following we exploit this fact to provide a probabilistic interpretation not only for the elements of $e^{(T-\lambda I)x} \mathbf{s}$, but for the exponentially-tilted matrix-exponential density $\boldsymbol{\alpha} e^{(T-\lambda I)x} \mathbf{s}$.

Define w^+ and w^- by

$$w^\pm = \sum_{i=1}^p \max\{0, \pm \alpha_i\},$$

and define $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^+ = (\alpha_1^+, \dots, \alpha_p^+)$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^- = (\alpha_1^-, \dots, \alpha_p^-)$ by

$$\alpha_i^\pm = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{w^\pm} \max\{0, \pm \alpha_i\} & \text{if } w^\pm > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } w^\pm = 0. \end{cases}$$

If $w^\pm > 0$ then $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\pm$ is a probability vector and in general,

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha} = w^+ \boldsymbol{\alpha}^+ - w^- \boldsymbol{\alpha}^-. \quad (3.8)$$

In some sense, $(w^+ + w^-)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ can be thought as a mixture of the probability vectors $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^+$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^-$, with the latter contributing “negative mass”. Fortunately, this “negative mass” in the context of $\boldsymbol{\alpha} e^{(T-\lambda I)x} \mathbf{s}$ can be given a precise probabilistic interpretation by means of anti-states as follows.

Theorem 3.2. Let $f_\lambda(x) = (\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\lambda I - T)^{-1} \mathbf{s})^{-1} \boldsymbol{\alpha} e^{(T-\lambda I)x} \mathbf{s}$, $x \geq 0$, be the density of the exponentially-tilted matrix-exponential distribution of parameters $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, T, \mathbf{s})$. Define the vectors

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^+ := \frac{w^+}{w^+ + w^-} \boldsymbol{\alpha}^+ \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^- := \frac{w^-}{w^+ + w^-} \boldsymbol{\alpha}^-,$$

and suppose $\varphi_0^\lambda \sim (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^+, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^-)$. Then,

$$f_\lambda(x) dx = \frac{w^+ + w^-}{\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\lambda I - T)^{-1} \mathbf{s}} \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{1}\{\tau \in [x, x + dx]\} \beta(\varphi_\tau^\lambda)] \quad (3.9)$$

$$= \frac{w^+ + w^-}{\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\lambda I - T)^{-1} \mathbf{s}} \left((\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^+, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^-) \exp \left(\begin{bmatrix} T^+ - \lambda I & T^- \\ T^- & T^+ - \lambda I \end{bmatrix} x \right) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{s} \\ -\mathbf{s} \end{bmatrix} \right) dx, \quad (3.10)$$

where τ and $\beta(\cdot)$ are defined as in Theorem 3.1.

Proof. Equation (3.8) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} f_\lambda(x) &= \frac{1}{\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\lambda I - T)^{-1} \mathbf{s}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^p w^+ \alpha_i^+ (\mathbf{e}_i^\top e^{(T-\lambda I)x} \mathbf{s}) + \sum_{i=1}^p w^- \alpha_i^- (-\mathbf{e}_i^\top e^{(T-\lambda I)x} \mathbf{s}) \right) \\ &= \frac{w^+ + w^-}{\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\lambda I - T)^{-1} \mathbf{s}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \frac{w^+}{w^+ + w^-} \alpha_i^+ (\mathbf{e}_i^\top e^{(T-\lambda I)x} \mathbf{s}) + \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{w^-}{w^+ + w^-} \alpha_i^- (-\mathbf{e}_i^\top e^{(T-\lambda I)x} \mathbf{s}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

Equality (3.9) follows from (3.11), (3.3) and (3.5). Equality (3.10) follows from (3.11), (3.4) and (3.6). \square

Example 3.3. Let $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, T, \mathbf{s})$ be the matrix-exponential parameters corresponding to (2.2). As noted previously, these parameters by themselves lack a probabilistic interpretation, so we apply Theorem 3.1 to construct one. For such parameters we take the tilting parameter $\lambda := \lambda_0 = 2$, leading to the block-partitioned matrices

$$\begin{bmatrix} T^+ - \lambda I & T^- \\ T^- & T^+ - \lambda I \end{bmatrix} = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} -3 & 0 & 2/3 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & -3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2/3 \\ 0 & 0 & -3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 0 & -3 & 0 & 2/3 \\ 0 & 0 & 2/3 & 1 & -3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -3 \end{array} \right],$$

$$(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^+, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^-) = (1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0), \quad \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{s} \\ -\mathbf{s} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 4/3 \\ 2/3 \\ 1 \\ -4/3 \\ -2/3 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix},$$

and $w^+ = 1$, $w^- = 0$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\lambda I - T)^{-1}\mathbf{s} = 4$. We can then verify that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{w^+ + w^-}{\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\lambda I - T)^{-1}\mathbf{s}} \left((\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^+, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^-) \exp \left(\begin{bmatrix} T^+ - \lambda I & T^- \\ T^- & T^+ - \lambda I \end{bmatrix} x \right) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{s} \\ -\mathbf{s} \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{6} e^{-3x} (1 + \cos(x)) = \frac{e^{-2x}}{4} \left(\frac{2}{3} e^{-x} (1 + \cos(x)) \right), \end{aligned}$$

the latter corresponding to the exponentially-tilted matrix-exponential density function $f(x) = \frac{2}{3} e^{-x} (1 + \cos(x))$. \square

A probabilistic interpretation of f_λ alternative to that of (3.9) is the following.

Corollary 3.4. Define $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_p)^\top := -(T^+ - \lambda I)\mathbf{1} - T^-\mathbf{1}$ to be the termination intensities vector from \mathcal{E}^o or \mathcal{E}^a , and define $\mathbf{q}^\pm = (q_1^\pm, \dots, q_p^\pm)^\top$ by

$$q_i^\pm = \begin{cases} \frac{s_i^\pm}{d_i} & \text{if } d_i > 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } d_i = 0. \end{cases}$$

Let $\bar{q} : \mathcal{E}^o \cup \mathcal{E}^a \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$\bar{q}(i^o) = q_i^+ - q_i^- \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{q}(i^a) = q_i^- - q_i^+ \quad \text{for } i \in \{1, \dots, p\}.$$

Then,

$$f_\lambda(x) dx = \left(\frac{w^+ + w^-}{\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\lambda I - T)^{-1}\mathbf{s}} \right) \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{1}\{\tau \in [x, x + dx]\} \bar{q}(\varphi_{\tau^-}^\lambda)] \quad (3.12)$$

where $\{\varphi_t^\lambda\}_{t \geq 0}$ and τ are defined as in Theorem 3.2.

Proof. First, notice that the jump mechanism of $\{\varphi_t^\lambda\}_{t \geq 0}$ described in (3.1) imply that for $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\varphi_\tau^\lambda = \Delta^o \mid \tau, \varphi_{\tau^-}^\lambda = i^o) &= q_i^+, \\ \mathbb{P}(\varphi_\tau^\lambda = \Delta^a \mid \tau, \varphi_{\tau^-}^\lambda = i^o) &= q_i^-, \\ \mathbb{P}(\varphi_\tau^\lambda = \Delta^o \mid \tau, \varphi_{\tau^-}^\lambda = i^a) &= q_i^-, \\ \mathbb{P}(\varphi_\tau^\lambda = \Delta^a \mid \tau, \varphi_{\tau^-}^\lambda = i^a) &= q_i^+, \end{aligned}$$

which in turn implies that

$$\mathbb{E} [\beta(\varphi_\tau^\lambda) \mid \tau, \varphi_{\tau^-}^\lambda] = \mathbb{P}(\varphi_\tau^\lambda = \Delta^o \mid \tau, \varphi_{\tau^-}^\lambda) - \mathbb{P}(\varphi_\tau^\lambda = \Delta^a \mid \tau, \varphi_{\tau^-}^\lambda) = \bar{q}(\varphi_{\tau^-}^\lambda).$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{1}\{\tau \in [x, x + dx]\} \beta(\varphi_\tau^\lambda)] &= \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} [\mathbf{1}\{\tau \in [x, x + dx]\} \beta(\varphi_\tau^\lambda) \mid \tau, \varphi_{\tau^-}^\lambda]] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{1}\{\tau \in [x, x + dx]\} \mathbb{E} [\beta(\varphi_\tau^\lambda) \mid \tau, \varphi_{\tau^-}^\lambda]] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{1}\{\tau \in [x, x + dx]\} \bar{q}(\varphi_{\tau^-}^\lambda)] \end{aligned}$$

and the result follows from (3.9). \square

Though closely related, the interpretation provided by Corollary 3.4 is more suitable than that of Theorem 3.2 for Monte Carlo applications. Indeed, a realization of $\{\varphi_t^\lambda\}_{t \geq 0}$ may get absorbed in Δ^o , Δ^a or terminated. If termination is the case, such realization contributes nothing to the term in the r.h.s. of (3.9). In contrast, by observing the process until its exit time of $\mathcal{E}^o \cup \mathcal{E}^a$ and disregard its landing point as in Corollary 3.4, we make sure that each realization contributes towards the mass in the r.h.s. of (3.12).

4 Recovering the untilted distribution

Once the exponentially-tilted density f_λ of a matrix-exponential distribution of parameters $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, T, \mathbf{s})$ has a tractable known form, say as in (3.10), in principle it is straightforward to recover the original untilted density f by taking

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= (\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\lambda I - T)\mathbf{s})e^{\lambda x}f_\lambda(x) \\ &= (w^+ + w^-)(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^+, \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^-) \exp\left(\begin{bmatrix} T^+ & T^- \\ T^- & T^+ \end{bmatrix} x\right) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{s} \\ -\mathbf{s} \end{bmatrix}, \quad x \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

While (4.1) is a legitimate matrix-exponential representation of f , it has two drawbacks:

1. The matrix $\begin{bmatrix} T^+ & T^- \\ T^- & T^+ \end{bmatrix}$ may no longer be a subintensity matrix.
2. The dominant eigenvalue of $\begin{bmatrix} T^+ & T^- \\ T^- & T^+ \end{bmatrix}$ may be nonnegative.

The first item may impact the probabilistic interpretation of f , while the second one may make integration of certain functions (with respect to the density f) more difficult to handle. For instance, in the context of Example 3.3, the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} T^+ & T^- \\ T^- & T^+ \end{bmatrix} = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} -1 & 0 & 2/3 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2/3 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 2/3 \\ 0 & 0 & 2/3 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{array} \right]$$

is not a subintensity matrix since some row sums are strictly positive, and it has 0 as its dominant eigenvalue. Having 0 as an eigenvalue implies that some entries of $\exp\left(\begin{bmatrix} T^+ & T^- \\ T^- & T^+ \end{bmatrix} x\right)$ can potentially be of order $e^{0 \cdot x} = 1$, meaning that the matrix-integral

$$\int_0^\infty h(x) \exp\left(\begin{bmatrix} T^+ & T^- \\ T^- & T^+ \end{bmatrix} x\right) dx \quad (4.2)$$

may only be well-defined for functions $h : \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ that decrease to 0 fast enough. In comparison, $\exp(Tx)$ with T as in (2.2) has entries of at most $e^{\sigma_0 x} = e^{-x}$, so that

$$\int_0^\infty h(x) \exp(Tx) dx \quad (4.3)$$

is well-defined and finite for every function $h : \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ of the order $e^{\sigma x}$ for any $\sigma < 1$. This apparent disagreement between the applicability of (4.2) and (4.3) vanishes when we multiply $\exp\left(\begin{bmatrix} T^+ & T^- \\ T^- & T^+ \end{bmatrix} x\right)$ with $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{s} \\ -\mathbf{s} \end{bmatrix}$. Indeed, in the context of Example 3.3 it can be verified that the elements of the vector $\exp\left(\begin{bmatrix} T^+ & T^- \\ T^- & T^+ \end{bmatrix} x\right) \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{s} \\ -\mathbf{s} \end{bmatrix}$ are at most of order e^{-x} , with the higher order terms of $\exp\left(\begin{bmatrix} T^+ & T^- \\ T^- & T^+ \end{bmatrix} x\right)$ cancelling each other when we multiply the matrix-function by $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{s} \\ -\mathbf{s} \end{bmatrix}$. In the general case, this ‘‘cancellation’’ of higher order terms than those of $e^{\sigma_0 x}$ occurring *after* the matrix multiplication can be directly deduced from Theorem 3.1.

In terms of expectations, (3.9) and (3.12) provide alternative ways to recover properties of any matrix-exponential density f of parameters $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, T, \mathbf{s})$ in terms of the exponentially-tilted density f_λ . Indeed, for any function $h : \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ with $\int_0^\infty h(x)f(x)dx < \infty$, we have that

$$\int_0^\infty h(x)f(x)dx = (\boldsymbol{\alpha}(\lambda I - T)\mathbf{s}) \int_0^\infty h(x)e^{\lambda x}f(x)dx \quad (4.4)$$

$$= (w^+ + w^-)\mathbb{E} [h(\tau)e^{\lambda\tau}\beta(\varphi_\tau^\lambda)] \quad (4.5)$$

$$= (w^+ + w^-)\mathbb{E} [h(\tau)e^{\lambda\tau}\bar{q}(\varphi_{\tau^-}^\lambda)], \quad (4.6)$$

where $\{\varphi_t^\lambda\}_{t \geq 0}$ and τ are as in Theorem 3.2. Notice that, as opposed to the formula in (4.1), representations (4.5) and (4.6) still have probabilistic interpretations in terms of the Markov jump process $\{\varphi_t^\lambda\}_{t \geq 0}$.

Acknowledgement

The author acknowledges the funding of the Australian Research Council Discovery Project DP180103106.

References

- [1] S. Asmussen and M. Bladt. *Renewal theory and queueing algorithms for matrix-exponential distributions*, pages 313–341. Lecture notes in pure and applied mathematics. Marcel Dekker, 1996.
- [2] S. Asmussen and M. Bladt. Point processes with finite-dimensional conditional probabilities. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 82(1):127–142, 1999.
- [3] N. G. Bean, G. T. Nguyen, B. F. Nielsen, and O. Peralta. RAP-modulated fluid processes: First passages and the stationary distribution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.03242*, 2021.
- [4] N. G. Bean and B. F. Nielsen. Quasi-birth-and-death processes with rational arrival process components. *Stochastic Models*, 26(3):309–334, 2010.
- [5] M. Bladt and M. F. Neuts. Matrix-exponential distributions: calculus and interpretations via flows. *Stochastic Models*, 19(1):113–124, 2003.
- [6] M. Bladt and B. F. Nielsen. *Matrix-exponential distributions in applied probability*, volume 81. Springer, 2017.
- [7] D. R. Cox. A use of complex probabilities in the theory of stochastic processes. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 51(02):313–319, 1955.
- [8] D. R. Cox. The analysis of non-Markovian stochastic processes by the inclusion of supplementary variables. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 51(03):433, 1955.

- [9] H. Cramér. Collective risk theory: A survey of the theory from the point of view of the theory of stochastic processes. In *Collected Works II*, pages 1028–1115. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013.
- [10] F. Escher. On the probability function in the collective theory of risk. *Skand. Aktuarie Tidsskr.*, 15:175–195, 1932.
- [11] H. Gerber and E. Shiu. Option pricing by esscher transforms. *Transactions of the Society of Actuaries*, 46, 1994.
- [12] A. Jensen. *A Distribution Model, Applicable to Economics*. Copenhagen, 1954.
- [13] M. Neuts. Probability distributions of phase type. In *Liber Amicorum Prof. Emeritus H. Florin*, pages 173–206. Department of Mathematics, University of Louvain, Belgium, 1975.
- [14] M. Neuts. *Matrix-geometric Solutions in Stochastic Models: An Algorithmic Approach*. Dover Publications, 1981.
- [15] C. A. O’Cinneide. Characterization of phase-type distributions. *Stochastic Models*, 6(1):1–57, 1990.
- [16] F. Völlering. Markov process representation of semigroups whose generators include negative rates. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 25, 2020.