

## RAY-KNIGHT COMPACTIFICATION OF BIRTH AND DEATH PROCESSES

LIPING LI

ABSTRACT. A birth and death process is a continuous time Markov chain with the minimal state space  $\mathbb{N}$ , whose transition matrix is standard and whose density matrix is the given birth-death matrix. Birth and death processes are unique if and only if  $\infty$  is entrance or natural. When  $\infty$  is neither entrance nor natural, there have appeared two methods in history to obtain all birth and death processes. The first one is an analytic treatment put forward by Feller in 1959, and the second is a probabilistic construction completed by Wang in 1958.

In this paper we will raise a third way by virtue of the Ray-Knight compactification. This new way has benefits of both analytic and probabilistic treatments. By Ray-Knight compactification, every birth and death process can be regarded as a Ray process on  $\mathbb{N}_\infty = \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ . All of them are further classified into two classes: One is the class of celebrated Doob processes and the other one is the class of Feller  $Q$ -processes. Every birth and death process in the second class is actually a Feller process on  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$ . We will derive the expression of its infinitesimal operator, which indicates probabilistic heuristics for its boundary behaviours at  $\infty$ . Furthermore, utilizing transformations of killing and Ikeda-Nagasawa-Watanabe's piecing out, we will also give a probabilistic construction for all birth and death processes.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Main results and heuristics	5
3. Uniqueness criteria	8
4. Ray-Knight compactification of birth and death processes	12
5. Doob processes	15
6. Infinitesimal operators of Feller birth and death processes	17
7. Symmetrizable birth and death processes	19
8. Birth and death processes with only big non-local jumps	21
9. Birth and death processes with small non-local jumps	22
Appendix A. Piecing out of Ikeda-Nagasawa-Watanabe	23
Appendix B. Analytic construction of birth and death processes	24
References	25

---

*Date:* November 23, 2022.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 60J27, 60J40, 60J46, 60J50, 60J74.

*Key words and phrases.* Birth and death processes, Continuous time Markov chains, Ray-Knight compactification, Ray processes, Doob processes, Feller processes, Dirichlet forms, Boundary conditions.

The author is partially supported by Alexander von Humboldt Foundation in Germany. The author would like to thank Professor Jiangang Ying for his helpful suggestions.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout this paper we are given a *conservative* and *totally stable* birth-death density matrix

$$Q = (q_{ij})_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}} := \begin{pmatrix} -q_0 & b_0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ a_1 & -q_1 & b_1 & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & a_2 & -q_2 & b_2 & \cdots \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $a_k > 0$ ,  $k \geq 1$ ,  $b_k > 0$ ,  $k \geq 0$  and  $q_k = a_k + b_k$  (Set  $a_0 = 0$  for convenience). As is well known, a transition matrix  $(p_{ij}(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  with the *minimal state space*  $\mathbb{N}$  is called honest if  $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} p_{ij}(t) = 1$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $t \geq 0$ . The terminology of minimal state space is referred to in, e.g., [4, II §4]. A non-honest (or *substochastic*) transition matrix can be always treated as an honest one on  $E = \mathbb{N} \cup \{\partial\}$  by a standard argument, where  $\partial$  is an attached trap point; see, e.g., [4, II §3, Theorem 3]. It is called *standard* if  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} p_{ij}(t) = \delta_{ij}$  for any  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ . A continuous time Markov chain is called a *birth-death  $Q$ -process* ( $Q$ -process for short) if its transition matrix  $(p_{ij}(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is standard and its *density matrix* is  $Q$ , i.e.  $p'_{ij}(0) = q_{ij}$  for  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ . This amounts to saying that  $\mathbf{P}(t) := (p_{ij}(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is standard and satisfies the Kolmogorov backward equation:

$$\mathbf{P}'(t) = Q\mathbf{P}(t). \quad (1.2)$$

Two  $Q$ -processes with the same transition matrix will not be distinguished in our consideration. For convenience we would also call such  $(p_{ij}(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  a  $Q$ -process if no confusions caused.

There always exists at least one  $Q$ -process, called the *minimal  $Q$ -process*; see, e.g., [7], [8, §10] and also §3.1. It is stopped at the first *flying time* (i.e. the first time almost reaching  $\infty$ ; see Corollary 4.7). A well-known uniqueness criterion states that the  $Q$ -processes are unique, if and only if the minimal  $Q$ -process is *conservative* in the sense that its lifetime is equal to infinity (Namely, the minimal transition matrix is honest on  $\mathbb{N}$ ). In Feller's terminologies classifying the right boundary point  $\infty$  in terms of the minimal  $Q$ -process (see Definition 3.3), the uniqueness of  $Q$ -processes is also equivalent to that  $\infty$  is *entrance* or *natural*; see Theorem 3.5. When  $\infty$  is neither entrance nor natural (i.e. *regular* or *exit*), there exist other  $Q$ -processes than the minimal one. The most famous examples are so-called *Doob processes*; see, e.g., [8, §15] and [24, §6.1]. Roughly speaking, a Doob process re-enters the minimal state space immediately at each flying time and, in fact, is uniquely determined by its entering distribution, a certain probability measure on  $E = \mathbb{N} \cup \{\partial\}$ . Particularly, it reduces to the minimal  $Q$ -process if the entering distribution is the point measure at  $\partial$ .

It is certainly interesting to find out all  $Q$ -processes for the non-trivial case that  $\infty$  is regular or exit. To our knowledge there have appeared two different approaches in history. The first one is an analytic treatment by constructing the corresponding resolvents. This way was put forward by Feller [8] and then completed by Yang in 1965 (see [24]). The main result shows that the resolvent of every  $Q$ -process is uniquely determined by a triple  $(\nu, \gamma, \beta)$ , where  $\nu$  is a positive Radon measure on  $\mathbb{N}$  and  $\gamma, \beta$  are two non-negative constants. The concrete expression of this resolvent will be reviewed in Appendix B for readers' convenience. This argument is simple to follow but seems not easy to catch the probabilistic meaning of these parameters. Wang in 1958 (see [24]) raised another probabilistic construction for all  $Q$ -processes. It turns out that every  $Q$ -process can be approached by a sequence of Doob processes, and hence can be further characterized by some parameters

with certain probabilistic meaning. This construction is more friendly to probabilists, while the argument is long and somewhat complicated.

The Ray-Knight compactification, raised by Ray [21] and firmly established after a revision by Knight [15], provides a wonderful way to modify an (almost arbitrary) Markov process very slightly and to result in a nice Markov process on a merely larger topology space, called *Ray process*. The original process is assumed to enjoy neither strong Markov property nor certain regularity of sample paths (only the Borel measurability of sample paths should be assumed). The resulting Ray process is, however, càdlàg and strong Markovian. In addition, the quasi-left-continuity of sample paths also holds in a certain meaning. Roughly speaking, it is almost a Feller process except for the possible presence of *branching points*. Its difference from a Feller process also concentrates on the set of branching points:  $\bar{P}_0(x, \cdot) = \delta_x(\cdot)$  if and only if  $x$  is not branching, where  $(\bar{P}_t)$  denotes the transition semigroup of a Ray process. For a branching point  $x$ ,  $\bar{P}_0(x, \cdot)$  is a probability measure on the set of non-branching points. More heuristically, when almost reaches a branching point  $x$ , a Ray process would never arrive at  $x$  but “branch” to a non-branching position according to the distribution  $\bar{P}_0(x, \cdot)$  instead. We refer readers to, e.g., [5], [10] and [22] for more details.

In this paper, we will introduce a third way to construct all  $Q$ -processes by virtue of the Ray-Knight compactification. This method leads to a Ray process on  $\mathbb{N}_\infty := \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  which is a modification of given  $Q$ -process, and particularly, only the additional point  $\infty$  is possibly a branching point; see Lemma 4.4 (2). Hence there are only two essentially different cases:  $\infty$  is branching or not branching. The former case that  $\infty$  is branching turns out to be very simple: The Ray process (not distinguished with the  $Q$ -process in our context because they have the same transition matrix) is exactly a Doob process; see Theorem 5.1. The latter case is more involved, but it is worth pointing out that this Ray process must become a Feller process; see, e.g., [22, III (37.1)]. This also implies a remarkable fact: Except for Doob processes, all  $Q$ -processes are Feller processes on  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$ .

With the help of Feller property, we can go farther in characterizing  $Q$ -processes in both analytic aspect and probabilistic aspect. In analytic aspect, the infinitesimal operator of a Feller  $Q$ -process is obtained in Theorem 6.3, in which the boundary condition (6.4) sheds light on the significance of the triple  $(\nu, \gamma, \beta)$  determining the resolvent: The measure  $\nu$  is the *non-local* jumping intensity from  $\infty$  to  $\mathbb{N}$ ,  $\gamma$  is the killing intensity at  $\infty$  (i.e. jumping intensity from  $\infty$  to  $\partial$ ) and  $\beta$  is the reflecting intensity at  $\infty$ . Here and hereafter non-local (resp. local) jumps mean those between non-adjacent (resp. adjacent) positions. A more detailed explanation will be phrased in §2.3. It is also necessary to point out that  $\nu$  plays a similar role to the Lévy measure for a Lévy process, though the non-local jumps of  $Q$ -process appear only at flying times. In probabilistic aspect, we present an intuitive construction of  $Q$ -processes by means of the transformations of *killing* and Ikeda-Nagasawa-Watanabe’s *piecing out* (see [11] and also Appendix A). The ground of this construction is a special  $Q$ -process, called  $(Q, 1)$ -process in the terminology of [24]. It is the (unique) honest, symmetrizable  $Q$ -processes satisfying both backward and forward Kolmogorov equations; see, e.g., [8, Theorem 11.1]. (Strictly speaking, it exists only for the case the  $\infty$  is regular.) Then every Feller  $Q$ -process can be built as follows: Break the  $(Q, 1)$ -process at a certain flying time (the constant  $\beta$  measures the intensity of this breaking time) and piece out a renewal sample path starting from a random position in  $\mathbb{N}$  chosen by  $\nu$  until the next break. Then operate these two procedures repeatedly. This construction is rigorous when  $\nu$  is a finite measure. But if  $\nu$  is not finite, choosing a random position by  $\nu$  looks pathological. In fact, like a Lévy process with an infinite Lévy measure,

the  $Q$ -process for this case contains “small” non-local jumps (accordingly, a  $Q$ -process with finite  $\nu$  admits only “big” non-local jumps). These small jumps make the  $Q$ -process look like a “diffusion” near  $\infty$  rather than a jump process. Analogously to the *Lévy-Itô decomposition*, a  $Q$ -process with small non-local jumps can be always approached by a certain sequence of  $Q$ -processes with only big non-local jumps; see Theorem 9.2.

This new method we put forward is simpler or more comprehensible than the two methods introduced in [8] and [24] (at least to whom is familiar with the general theory of Markov processes). Most proofs in our treatment still appeal to the resolvent representation of  $Q$ -processes. Except for this, we also utilize the theory of Dirichlet forms when treating symmetrizable  $Q$ -processes. We refer readers to [2], [3] and [9] for the terminologies and notations concerning Dirichlet forms. A  $Q$ -process with transition matrix  $(p_{ij}(t))$  is called *symmetrizable* if there is a  $\sigma$ -finite measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{N}$  such that  $\mu_i p_{ij}(t) = \mu_j p_{ji}(t)$  for any  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $t \geq 0$ , where  $\mu_i := \mu(\{i\})$ . Note that a symmetrizable measure of  $(p_{ij}(t))$  is always a symmetrizable measure of  $Q$ , i.e.  $\mu_i q_{ij} = \mu_j q_{ji}$  for any  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ ; see [2, Lemma 6.6]. Hence  $\mu$  must be unique up to a multiplicative constant. Throughout this paper we always take  $\mu$  to be

$$\mu_0 = 1, \quad \mu_k = \frac{b_0 b_1 \cdots b_{k-1}}{a_1 a_2 \cdots a_k}, \quad k \geq 1.$$

It is also called the *speed measure* of the (minimal)  $Q$ -process. It extends to  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$  always by letting  $\mu_\infty := \mu(\{\infty\}) = 0$  if necessary. A symmetrizable  $Q$ -process is always associated with a Dirichlet form. Both the minimal  $Q$ -process and the  $(Q, 1)$ -process are symmetrizable. The minimal  $Q$ -process corresponds to the *minimal Dirichlet form* and  $(Q, 1)$ -process corresponds to the *basic Dirichlet form*; see [2, §6] and also §3. Other symmetrizable  $Q$ -processes are also easy to describe. In fact, each one is the killed process of  $(Q, 1)$ -process at a breaking time with constant intensity (i.e. piecing out should not be applied to obtain symmetrizable  $Q$ -processes); see Theorem 7.3.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In §2 we will summarize the main results and give some heuristics for principle ideas. The section §3 is an introduction to two important  $Q$ -processes, i.e. the minimal one and the  $(Q, 1)$ -process. They are closely related to the uniqueness of  $Q$ -processes. We adopt a method of time changed Brownian motion to reach them. This is not the only way but very convenient to whom has knowledge of Dirichlet forms. The Ray-Knight compactification of a  $Q$ -process will be established in §4. Then §5 is devoted to the case that  $\infty$  is branching. This amounts to that the  $Q$ -process is a Doob process. In the reminder sections we will study the other case that  $\infty$  is not branching. In other words, the  $Q$ -process is a Feller process on  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$ .

**Notations.** Recall that  $E := \mathbb{N} \cup \{\partial\}$ , where  $\partial$  is a trap. We emphasis that  $\partial$  is viewed as an isolated point in  $E$  rather than the one forming the Alexandroff compactification of  $\mathbb{N}$ . The latter point will be denoted by  $\infty$ . In other words,  $\mathbb{N}_\infty = \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  (not  $E$ ) endowed with a suitable metric is a compact metric space.

Put the following parameters that will be frequently used:

$$c_0 = 0, \quad c_1 = \frac{1}{2b_0}, \quad c_k = \frac{1}{2b_0} + \sum_{i=2}^k \frac{a_1 a_2 \cdots a_{i-1}}{2b_0 b_1 \cdots b_{i-1}}, \quad k \geq 2.$$

This sequence is also called the *scale function* of the (minimal)  $Q$ -process. For a positive measure  $\nu$  on  $\mathbb{N}$ , write  $\nu_k := \nu(\{k\})$  and  $|\nu| := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \nu_k$ .

## 2. MAIN RESULTS AND HEURISTICS

**2.1. Doob's separable modification and Ray-Knight compactification.** In the study of continuous time Markov chains, one of the most important tools is Doob's separable modification; see, e.g., [4, II §4]. To realize it, certain additional *fictitious states* may have to be attached to the minimal state space. In our consideration (the minimal state space is  $\mathbb{N}$  endowed with discrete topology), the only possible fictitious state is  $\infty$ ; see [4, II §4, Theorem 2]. In the terminology of [4],  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$  is called the *compactified (minimal) state space*. If  $\infty$  is actually attached as a fictitious state,  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$  is also identified with the *essential range* (otherwise the essential range should still be  $\mathbb{N}$ ). We wish to state emphatically that, in the context of general Markov processes, the compactified state space (or the essential range, since the complement of essential range is, in fact, a polar set), not the minimal state space, should be regarded as the “real” state space.

Doob's separable modification method can lead to a *canonical version* of  $Q$ -process that is *well-separable*, Borel measurable and right lower semicontinuous; see, e.g., [4, II §7, Theorem 1]. Ray-Knight compactification begins with this canonical version, but in fact, only the Borel measurability is necessary for its establishing in Theorem 4.2. It does not matter whether  $\infty$  is a fictitious state (of the canonical  $Q$ -process) or not either.

As shown in Lemma 4.4 (1), the resulting Ray process  $\bar{X}$  is a modification of the canonical  $Q$ -process. The state space of  $\bar{X}$  is  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$  with  $\partial$  still being the trap in the context of Markov processes. Nevertheless it is still a continuous time Markov chain whose minimal state space is  $\mathbb{N}$  and whose transition matrix is the same as the canonical  $Q$ -process.

**2.2. Ray  $Q$ -processes and Feller  $Q$ -processes.** To avoid ambiguity, we call  $\bar{X}$  obtained in Theorem 4.2 a *Ray  $Q$ -process* (with the transition matrix  $(p_{ij}(t))$ ). Another result, Theorem 5.1, makes a classification of Ray  $Q$ -processes. When  $\infty$  is branching,  $\bar{X}$  is a Doob process. When  $\infty$  is not branching,  $\bar{X}$  is Feller on  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$ . Meanwhile we call it a *Feller  $Q$ -process*.

Doob processes are not Feller on  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$  because the quasi-left-continuity fails at the first flying time. But a particular Doob process, the minimal  $Q$ -process whose entering distribution is the point measure at  $\partial$ , should be treated individually. Its corresponding Ray  $Q$ -process is not Feller on  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$ , while it is Feller on  $\mathbb{N}$  if we identify  $\partial$  with  $\infty$ , i.e.  $E = \mathbb{N} \cup \{\partial\}$  is regarded as the one-point compactification of  $\mathbb{N}$ . Besides it, other Doob processes cannot be Feller even if  $E$  is regarded as the one-point compactification of  $\mathbb{N}$ .

In the context of continuous time Markov chains,  $\infty$  is a fictitious state for a Feller  $Q$ -process, while is not for a Doob process.

**2.3. Boundary behaviours of Feller  $Q$ -processes.** Every Feller  $Q$ -process is determined by a Fellerian triple  $(\nu, \gamma, \beta)$  (see Definition 6.1). Based on the resolvent representation, we derive its infinitesimal operator in Theorem 6.3. It turns out the this operator must be a sub-operator of the *maximal (discrete) generalized second order differential operator* satisfying the boundary condition:

$$\beta F^+(\infty) + \sum_{k \geq 0} (F(\infty) - F(k))\nu_k + \gamma F(\infty) = 0 \quad (2.1)$$

for  $F$  in the domain of infinitesimal operator. Some special cases should be noted (even though the triple is not Fellerian in (a)):

- (a)  $|\nu| = 0$  and  $\gamma \neq 0, \beta = 0$ : (2.1) is the *Dirichlet boundary condition* and the  $Q$ -process reduces to the minimal one;

- (b)  $|\nu| = 0$  and  $\gamma = 0, \beta \neq 0$ : This is only possible for the case that  $\infty$  is regular, and (2.1) is the *Neumann boundary condition*. The corresponding  $Q$ -process is the  $(Q, 1)$ -process. (The *reflecting  $Q$ -process* is probably a better name.)
- (c)  $|\nu| = 0$  and  $\gamma, \beta \neq 0$ : This is also for the case that  $\infty$  is regular, and (2.1) is the *Robin boundary condition*; see also [8, Theorem 11.1]. We call this  $Q$ -process an *elastic  $Q$ -process*.

In the context of Laplace operators, these boundary conditions correspond to minimal (or absorbing) Brownian motion, reflecting Brownian motion and elastic Brownian motion in probability respectively.

We turn to explain the probabilistic significance of (2.1). The cases of (a) and (b) are definitely clear. Let us begin with the Robin boundary condition (c). The elastic  $Q$ -process is the symmetrizable one with parameter  $\kappa = \gamma/\beta$ , as characterized in Theorem 7.3. Its lifetime is

$$\zeta = \inf\{t > 0 : L_t > \xi\}, \quad (2.2)$$

where  $L_t$  is the local time of  $(Q, 1)$ -process at  $\infty$ , i.e. the positive continuous additive functional (PCAF in abbreviation) of  $\delta_\infty$  for  $(Q, 1)$ -process, and  $\xi$  is a non-negative random variable of exponential distribution with mean  $\beta/\gamma$  which is independent of  $(Q, 1)$ -process; see, e.g., [9, Theorem A.2.11]. Note that  $L_t$  increases only when the  $(Q, 1)$ -process visits  $\infty$ , as is analogous to the case of reflecting Brownian motion. Hence  $L_t$  may be used to measure the intensity of reflecting at  $\infty$  before time  $t$ , and (2.2) says that  $\xi$  is the maximal reflecting intensity of  $\bar{X}$  before killing. Since the mean of  $\xi$  is  $\beta/\gamma$ , we find that the bigger  $\beta$  is, the more time  $\bar{X}$  spends at  $\infty$  by reflecting; while the bigger  $\gamma$  is, the earlier the killing happens. In this sense  $\beta$  measures the mean reflecting intensity and  $\gamma$  measures the mean killing intensity for  $\bar{X}$ .

Regarding the general boundary condition (2.1), we make the convention  $F(\partial) = 0$  and set  $\tilde{\nu}|_{\mathbb{N}} := \nu, \tilde{\nu}(\{\partial\}) := \gamma$ . By rewriting (2.1) as

$$\beta F^+(\infty) + \sum_{k \in E} (F(\infty) - F(k)) \tilde{\nu}_k = 0, \quad (2.3)$$

we treat killing as jumping to  $\partial$  for brevity. Like killing with mean intensity  $\gamma$  breaks  $(Q, 1)$ -process to attain elastic  $Q$ -process for (c), jumping with mean intensity  $|\tilde{\nu}| = |\nu| + \gamma$  works analogously in (2.3). Meanwhile (2.2) becomes the first non-local jumping time, and  $\tilde{\nu}/|\tilde{\nu}|$  gives the distribution of arriving random positions of non-local jumps. When  $|\nu| < \infty$ , this description is made rigorous in Theorem 8.1. When  $|\nu| = \infty$ , it seems illogical because  $\beta/|\tilde{\nu}| = \tilde{\nu}_k/|\tilde{\nu}| = 0$  for all  $k \in E$ . But the following fact may convince readers that in this case,  $\bar{X}$  still admits non-local jumps from  $\infty$  to  $\mathbb{N}$  (it is just not easy to catch them): Consider that  $\infty$  is exit (hence  $\beta = 0$ ) and  $|\nu| = \infty, \gamma = 0$ . Let

$$\tau_0^1 := \inf\{t > \eta : \bar{X}_t = 0\}$$

be the first hitting time of 0 after the first flying time  $\eta$ . Set

$$\tau := \sup\{t : t \leq \tau_0^1, t \in L(\omega)\},$$

where  $L(\omega)$  is the set of flying times; see Corollary 4.7. In other words,  $\tau$  is the last flying time before  $\tau_0^1$ . Of course  $\bar{X}_{\tau-} = \infty$  due to Corollary 4.7 and the càdlàg property of  $\bar{X}$ . Theorem 2 of [24, §6.5] indicates that

$$\mathbf{P}(\bar{X}_\tau = \infty) = 0,$$

and in addition, if  $\nu_j > 0$ , then  $\mathbf{P}(\bar{X}_\tau = j) > 0$ .

We should point out that when  $\infty$  is exit, the mean reflecting intensity  $\beta$  must be equal to 0. This is exactly the heuristic explanation for the word “exit”: The process cannot retrace its steps after leaving the state space through an exit boundary. But it can re-enter the state space by non-local jumps.

The boundary condition (2.1) also indicates heuristics for symmetrization of  $Q$ -processes. Roughly speaking, a symmetrizable  $Q$ -process is unchanged after time reversal. Hence it cannot admit non-local jumps from  $\infty$  to  $\mathbb{N}$ , because no  $Q$ -processes enjoy non-local jumps from  $\mathbb{N}$  to  $\infty$ . This is the reason why the minimal  $Q$ -process, the  $(Q, 1)$ -process and the elastic  $Q$ -processes listed in (a), (b) and (c) constitute all symmetrizable  $Q$ -processes, as stated in Theorem 7.3.

**2.4. Comparison with diffusions on an interval.** As Feller [8] suggested, a  $Q$ -process may be treated as a “diffusion process”. A diffusion process  $Y = (Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$  on a closed interval  $[l, r]$  is usually led to by a *scale function*  $s$  and a *speed measure*  $m$ , where  $s$  is a continuous and strictly increasing function on  $(l, r)$  and  $m$  is a fully supported Radon measure on  $(l, r)$ . This pair  $(s, m)$  determining the part of  $Y$  in the interior  $(l, r)$  plays a similar role to  $Q$  for birth and death processes. When  $Y$  is Feller on  $[l, r]$ , its infinitesimal operator enjoys an analogous boundary condition at a regular or exit boundary  $r$  (or  $l$ ) to (2.1), but there may appear another *sojourn term*; see [20, II §5, Theorem 2]. Non-trivial sojourn at  $r$  roughly means that the time set  $\{t : Y_t = r\}$  is of positive Lebesgue measure. Fortunately, this is not the case that we will meet when dealing with  $Q$ -processes, because  $\infty$  is polar or fictitious. In other words, the total visiting time of  $\infty$  for a  $Q$ -process must be zero.

Nevertheless, one can still consider a *generalized  $Q$ -process* with non-trivial sojourn at  $\infty$ ; see, e.g., [8, §12-15]. Meanwhile  $\infty$  should be contained in the minimal state space and hence not fictitious. The real birth-death matrix should be the extension of  $Q$  to  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$ . In the context of the Kolmogorov backward equation (1.2), it corresponds to a solution  $(p_{ij}(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  which satisfies

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} p_{ik}(t)p_{kj}(t) \leq p_{ij}(t+s), \quad i, j \in \mathbb{N}, t, s \geq 0,$$

in place of the Chapman-Kolmogorov equation.

**2.5. Comparison with Lévy processes.** Non-local jumps with  $|\nu| = \infty$  for a  $Q$ -process can also be compared with Lévy jumps. We first take a look at the jumping measure  $\nu$ . Imagine  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$  as an interval  $[l, r]$ , where  $r$  corresponds to  $\infty$  for  $Q$ -process, and imagine  $(c, \mu)$ ,  $c = (c_k)_{k \geq 0}$ , as the pair of scale function  $s$  and speed measure  $m$  on  $[l, r]$ . Assume  $r = 0$  for simplification. Then the first identity in (B.1) reads as

$$\int_{[l, 0)} \left( \int_x^0 m([l, y]) ds(y) \right) \hat{\nu}(dx) < \infty, \quad (2.4)$$

where  $\hat{\nu}$  is the analogue of  $\nu$  on  $[l, 0]$ . In the Brownian case that  $s(x) = x$  and  $m$  is the Lebesgue measure, (2.4) amounts to

$$\hat{\nu}([l, e]) < \infty, \quad \int_{[e, 0)} |x| \hat{\nu}(dx) < \infty,$$

where  $e$  is an arbitrary fixed point in  $(l, 0)$ . By this observation,  $\nu$  has an analogous form to the Lévy measure of a *subordinator*.

We wish to establish a Lévy-Itô decomposition for a  $Q$ -process with  $|\nu| = \infty$  and especially to find out a sequence of  $Q$ -processes with finite jumping measures that converges

to it. An unsatisfactory attempt will be made in §9, in which only the convergence in the sense of distribution (for processes) is obtained.

### 3. UNIQUENESS CRITERIA

**3.1. Minimal  $Q$ -process as a quasidiffusion.** We give a probabilistic construction for the minimal  $Q$ -process by virtue of time change transformation. Set  $\widehat{\mathbb{N}} := \{c_k : k \geq 0\}$  and

$$\Xi : \widehat{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}, \quad c_k \mapsto k.$$

Denote by  $\widehat{\mu} := \mu \circ \Xi$  the positive measure on  $\widehat{\mathbb{N}}$ , i.e.  $\widehat{\mu}(\{c_k\}) := \mu_k$  for  $k \geq 0$ . Let  $c_\infty := \lim_{k \uparrow \infty} c_k \leq \infty$ .

Firstly we take a Brownian motion  $W^{\min} := (W_t^{\min})_{t \geq 0}$  with lifetime  $\zeta^{W^{\min}}$  on the interval  $[c_0, c_\infty)$ , which is reflected at  $c_0$  and absorbed at  $c_\infty$  whenever  $c_\infty < \infty$ . In other words,  $W^{\min}$  is symmetric with respect to the Lebesgue measure and associated with the regular Dirichlet form  $(\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}, H_0^1([c_0, c_\infty]))$  on  $L^2([c_0, c_\infty))$ :

$$\begin{aligned} H_0^1([c_0, c_\infty)) &= \{f \in L^2([c_0, c_\infty)) : f \text{ is absolutely continuous on } (c_0, c_\infty) \\ &\quad \text{and } f' \in L^2([c_0, c_\infty)), f(c_\infty) = 0 \text{ if } c_\infty < \infty\}, \\ \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}(f, g) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{c_0}^{c_\infty} f'(x)g'(x)dx, \quad f, g \in H_0^1([c_0, c_\infty)). \end{aligned}$$

Next, using  $\widehat{\mu}$  we obtain a time-changed Brownian motion  $\widehat{W}^{\min} = (\widehat{W}_t^{\min})_{t \geq 0}$  on  $\widehat{\mathbb{N}}$ . More precisely,  $\widehat{\mu}$ , viewed as a measure on  $[c_0, c_\infty)$  by setting  $\widehat{\mu}([c_0, c_\infty) \setminus \widehat{\mathbb{N}}) = 0$ , is clearly a Radon smooth measure with respect to  $W^{\min}$ , and hence induces a PCAF  $(A_t^{\min})_{t \geq 0}$ . Note that  $A_t^{\min} = \sum_{k \geq 0} \mu_k L_t^{\min}(c_k)$ , where  $L_t^{\min}(c_k)$  is the local time of  $W^{\min}$  at  $c_k$ . Set

$$\tau_t^{\min} := \begin{cases} \inf\{s : A_s^{\min} > t\}, & t < A_{\zeta^{W^{\min}}}^{\min}, \\ \infty, & t \geq A_{\zeta^{W^{\min}}}^{\min}. \end{cases}$$

Then, by definition,  $\widehat{W}_t^{\min} := W_{\tau_t^{\min}}^{\min}$  with its lifetime  $\widehat{\zeta}^{\min} := A_{\zeta^{W^{\min}}}^{\min}$ . The process  $\widehat{W}^{\min}$  is also called a *quasidiffusion* in, e.g., [1, 18], *generalized diffusion* in, e.g., [17, 25] and *gap diffusion* in, e.g., [16], and  $\widehat{\mu}$  is called the speed measure of  $\widehat{W}^{\min}$ . Finally we put

$$X_t^{\min} := \Xi(\widehat{W}_t^{\min}), \quad t \geq 0. \quad (3.1)$$

The lifetime of  $X^{\min}$  is denoted by  $\zeta^{\min}$ . This is actually the desirable minimal  $Q$ -process.

**Lemma 3.1.** *The process  $X^{\min} = (X_t^{\min})_{t \geq 0}$  defined as (3.1) is identified with the minimal  $Q$ -process.*

*Proof.* As obtained in [19, Theorems 3.4 and 3.6],  $\widehat{W}^{\min}$  is symmetric with respect to  $\widehat{\mu}$  and associated with the regular and irreducible Dirichlet form on  $L^2(\widehat{\mathbb{N}}, \widehat{\mu})$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathcal{G}}^{\min} &:= \left\{ \widehat{f} \in L^2(\widehat{\mathbb{N}}, \widehat{\mu}) : \widehat{\mathcal{A}}^{\min}(\widehat{f}, \widehat{f}) < \infty, \widehat{f}(c_\infty) := \lim_{k \uparrow \infty} \widehat{f}(c_k) = 0 \text{ if } c_\infty < \infty \right\}, \\ \widehat{\mathcal{A}}^{\min}(\widehat{f}, \widehat{g}) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{(\widehat{f}(c_{k+1}) - \widehat{f}(c_k))(\widehat{g}(c_{k+1}) - \widehat{g}(c_k))}{|c_{k+1} - c_k|}, \quad \widehat{f}, \widehat{g} \in \widehat{\mathcal{G}}^{\min}. \end{aligned}$$



Hence  $X^{\min}$  is symmetric with respect to  $\mu$  and associated with the regular and irreducible Dirichlet form on  $L^2(\mathbb{N}, \mu)$ :

$$\mathcal{G}^{\min} := \left\{ f \in L^2(\mathbb{N}, \mu) : \mathcal{A}^{\min}(f, f) < \infty, f(\infty) := \lim_{k \uparrow \infty} f(k) = 0 \text{ if } c_\infty < \infty \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{A}^{\min}(f, g) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{(f(k+1) - f(k))(g(k+1) - g(k))}{|c_{k+1} - c_k|}, \quad f, g \in \mathcal{G}^{\min}.$$

Applying [2, Proposition 6.59], we can conclude that  $X^{\min}$  is identified with the minimal  $Q$ -process.  $\square$

*Remark 3.2.* Note that  $X^{\min}$  is a Hunt process only if we take the trap  $\partial$  as the point forming the Alexandroff compactification of  $\mathbb{N}$ , i.e.  $\partial = \infty$ . When  $\partial \neq \infty$  (as we noted in §1), put  $(\mathcal{A}^{\min}, \mathcal{G}^{\min})$  on  $L^2(\mathbb{N}_\infty, \mu)$ , where  $\mathbb{N}_\infty := \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  is the Alexandroff compactification of  $\mathbb{N}$  and  $\mu$  extends to  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$  by  $\mu(\{\infty\}) = 0$ . It is quasi-regular rather than regular. Accordingly  $X^{\min}$  can be viewed as a Borel standard process on  $\mathbb{N}$  and  $\{\infty\}$  is an  $\mathcal{A}^{\min}$ -polar set.

The Dirichlet form  $(\mathcal{A}^{\min}, \mathcal{G}^{\min})$  in this proof is called the *minimal Dirichlet form* in [2]. Another important Dirichlet form, named the *basic Dirichlet form*, is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{G}^* := \{f \in L^2(\mathbb{N}, \mu) : \mathcal{A}^*(f, f) < \infty\},$$

$$\mathcal{A}^*(f, g) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{(f(k+1) - f(k))(g(k+1) - g(k))}{|c_{k+1} - c_k|}, \quad f, g \in \mathcal{G}^*.$$

It corresponds to another symmetrizable  $Q$ -process, namely the  $(Q, 1)$ -process; see, e.g., [2, Theorem 6.55]. We should point out that  $f(c_\infty) := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f(c_k)$  exists and is finite for any  $f \in \mathcal{G}^*$  whenever  $c_\infty < \infty$ ; see [19, Lemma 2.3].

**3.2. Uniqueness criteria.** Set two parameters

$$\sigma := \int_0^{c_\infty} \hat{\mu}([0, x]) dx = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (c_{k+1} - c_k) \cdot \sum_{i=0}^k \mu_i, \quad \lambda := \int_0^{c_\infty} x \hat{\mu}(dx) = \sum_{k \geq 0} c_k \mu_k.$$

The following classification for the boundary point  $\infty$  in Feller's sense is very well known; see also [19, §7.3].

**Definition 3.3.** The boundary point  $\infty$  (for  $X^{\min}$ ) is called

- (1) *regular*, if  $\sigma < \infty, \lambda < \infty$ ;
- (2) *exit*, if  $\sigma < \infty, \lambda = \infty$ ;
- (3) *entrance*, if  $\sigma = \infty, \lambda < \infty$ ;
- (4) *natural*, if  $\sigma = \lambda = \infty$ .

*Remark 3.4.* Note that  $\infty$  is regular if and only if  $c_\infty + \mu(\mathbb{N}) < \infty$ . If  $\infty$  is exit, then  $c_\infty < \infty$  and  $\mu(\mathbb{N}) = \infty$ . If  $\infty$  is entrance, then  $c_\infty = \infty$  and  $\mu(\mathbb{N}) < \infty$ . If  $\infty$  is natural, then  $c_\infty + \mu(\mathbb{N}) = \infty$ .

It is also well known that  $X^{\min}$  is conservative, i.e.  $\mathbf{P}_k(\zeta^{\min} < \infty) = 0$  for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , if and only if  $\sigma = \infty$  (Namely,  $\infty$  is entrance or natural); see, e.g., [19, Proposition 7.9]. As a result,  $\sigma = \infty$  is equivalent to the uniqueness of  $Q$ -processes. When  $\infty$  is regular or exit, there are many other  $Q$ -processes. For this non-uniqueness case, we further have a uniqueness criterion for symmetrizable  $Q$ -processes, see, e.g., [2, Corollary 6.62]. More precisely, symmetrizable  $Q$ -processes are unique if and only if the basic Dirichlet form

is identified with the minimal one, i.e.  $(\mathcal{A}^*, \mathcal{G}^*) = (\mathcal{A}^{\min}, \mathcal{G}^{\min})$ . We summarize these uniqueness criteria in the following.

- Theorem 3.5.** (1) *The symmetrizable  $Q$ -processes are unique, if and only if  $\infty$  is not regular, i.e.  $c_\infty = \infty$  or  $\mu(\mathbb{N}) = \infty$ .*  
 (2) *The uniqueness of  $Q$ -processes holds, if and only if  $\infty$  is entrance or natural, i.e.*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (c_{k+1} - c_k) \cdot \sum_{i=0}^k \mu_i = \infty.$$

*Proof.* The second assertion is clear. When  $\infty$  is regular, we will obtain another symmetrizable  $Q$ -process in §3.3 so that the uniqueness fails. When  $\infty$  is exit,  $c_\infty < \infty$  and hence  $f(c_\infty)$  exists for any  $f \in \mathcal{G}^*$ . But  $\mu(\mathbb{N}) = \infty$ . We must have  $f(c_\infty) = 0$  because of  $f \in L^2(\mathbb{N}, \mu)$ . Therefore  $(\mathcal{A}^*, \mathcal{G}^*) = (\mathcal{A}^{\min}, \mathcal{G}^{\min})$  and the first assertion can be concluded. That completes the proof.  $\square$

**3.3.  $(Q, 1)$ -process.** When  $\infty$  is not regular, the basic Dirichlet form is identified with the minimal one. In this subsection we treat the regular case and give an analogical probabilistic construction for the  $(Q, 1)$ -process. Currently  $c_\infty < \infty$  and  $\widehat{\mu}(\widehat{\mathbb{N}}) = \mu(\mathbb{N}) < \infty$ .

Take a reflecting Brownian motion  $W^* := (W_t^*)_{t \geq 0}$  on the closed interval  $[c_0, c_\infty]$ . The measure  $\widehat{\mu}$  extends to  $[c_0, c_\infty]$  by letting  $\widehat{\mu}([c_0, c_\infty] \setminus \widehat{\mathbb{N}}) := 0$ . Note that  $\widehat{\mu}$  is a Radon smooth measure with respect to  $W^*$  and corresponds to a PCAF  $A_t^* = \sum_{k \geq 0} \mu_k L_t^*(c_k)$ , where  $L_t^*(c_k)$  is the local time of  $W^*$  at  $c_k$ . Set  $\tau_t^* := \inf\{s : A_s^* > t\}$  for any  $t \geq 0$ . Define a time-changed Brownian motion on  $\widehat{\mathbb{N}} \cup \{c_\infty\}$ :

$$\widehat{W}_t^* := W_{\tau_t^*}^*, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Finally we put

$$X_t^* := \Xi(\widehat{W}_t^*), \quad t \geq 0. \quad (3.2)$$

Then  $X^* = (X_t^*)_{t \geq 0}$  is a  $\mu$ -symmetric Markov process on  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$ . Applying [19, Theorems 3.4 and 3.6], one can find that the Dirichlet form of  $X^*$  on  $L^2(\mathbb{N}_\infty, \mu)$  is exactly the basic Dirichlet form  $(\mathcal{A}^*, \mathcal{G}^*)$ .

**Proposition 3.6.** *Let  $X^*$  be defined as (3.2). Then*

$$p_{ij}^*(t) := \mathbf{P}_i(X_t^* = j), \quad i, j \in \mathbb{N}, t \geq 0 \quad (3.3)$$

*is an honest and symmetrizable  $Q$ -process, whose Dirichlet form on  $L^2(\mathbb{N}, \mu)$  is the basic Dirichlet form  $(\mathcal{A}^*, \mathcal{G}^*)$ .*

*Proof.* Note that the time-changed Brownian motion  $\widehat{W}^*$  is also a quasidiffusion, as obtained in [19]. Hence its transition semigroup  $P_t^*(x, \cdot) = \mathbf{P}_x(X_t^* \in \cdot)$  is absolutely continuous with respect to its symmetric measure  $\mu$ ; see, e.g., [13]. Particularly,  $P_t^*(x, \{\infty\}) = 0$  for any  $x \in \mathbb{N}_\infty$ . As a result, it is straightforward to verify that  $(p_{ij}^*(t))_{i, j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is an honest and  $\mu$ -symmetric transition matrix whose Dirichlet form on  $L^2(\mathbb{N}, \mu)$  is exactly  $(\mathcal{A}^*, \mathcal{G}^*)$ .

We have to prove that  $(p_{ij}^*(t))$  is a  $Q$ -process. Clearly it is standard because of the right continuity of all sample paths of  $X^*$ . Let us turn to show

$$\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{p_{ij}^*(t) - \delta_{ij}}{t} = q_{ij}, \quad i, j \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.4)$$

Set  $\eta_\infty := \inf\{t > 0 : X_t^* = \infty\}$ . Then the stopped process of  $X^*$  at  $\eta_\infty$  is exactly the minimal  $Q$ -process  $X^{\min}$ . Consequently,

$$\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{\mathbf{P}_i(X_t^* = j, t < \eta_\infty) - \delta_{ij}}{t} = q_{ij}, \quad i, j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

To conclude (3.4), it suffices to obtain

$$\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{\mathbf{P}_i(\eta_\infty \leq t)}{t} = 0.$$

This proof is somewhat standard by means of the strong Markov property and ‘‘local’’ property of  $X^*$ ; see, e.g., [12, §5.2]. We present the details for readers’ convenience.

Argue by contradiction and suppose that

$$\overline{\lim}_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{\mathbf{P}_i(\eta_\infty \leq t)}{t} > 0.$$

Then there is a constant  $c > 0$  and a decreasing sequence  $t_n \downarrow 0$  such that

$$\mathbf{P}_i(\eta_\infty \leq t_n) \geq ct_n. \quad (3.5)$$

Write  $Y_t := X_t^*$  for  $t < \eta_\infty$  and  $Y_t := \infty$  for  $t \geq \eta_\infty$ . We will lead to a contradiction in several steps.

Firstly set  $\Lambda_s := \{\omega \in \Omega : Y_t(\omega) = i, 0 \leq t \leq s\}$  for any  $s > 0$ . Clearly  $\Lambda_s$  is increasing as  $s \downarrow 0$  and  $\Omega \subset \cup_{s>0} \Lambda_s$ ,  $\mathbf{P}_i$ -a.s. Thus there exists  $s > 0$  such that

$$\mathbf{P}_i(\Lambda_s) > 1/2. \quad (3.6)$$

Fix such  $s > 0$  in (3.6). Next we put for any  $n \geq 1$

$$K_n := \cup_{\{m \geq 1: mt_n \leq s\}} \{Y_{(m-1)t_n} = i, Y_{mt_n} = \infty\}.$$

Obviously

$$K_n \subset \tilde{K}_n := \{\omega \in \Omega : \exists r_1 < r_2 \leq s, \text{ s.t. } r_2 - r_1 \leq t_n, Y_{r_1}(\omega) = i, Y_{r_2}(\omega) = \infty\},$$

$\tilde{K}_n$  is decreasing as  $n \uparrow \infty$  and  $\mathbf{P}_i(\cap_{n \geq 1} \tilde{K}_n) = 0$ . Consequently

$$\mathbf{P}_i(K_n) \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.7)$$

Finally let

$$K_{n,m} := \{Y_{(m-1)t_n} = i, Y_{mt_n} = \infty\},$$

i.e.  $K_n = \cup_{\{m \geq 1: mt_n \leq s\}} K_{n,m}$ . Note that  $K_{n,m} \cap K_{n,m'} = \emptyset$  for  $m \neq m'$  and

$$K_{n,m} \supset K'_{n,m} := \{Y_t = i, \forall 0 \leq t \leq (m-1)t_n \text{ and } (m-1)t_n < \eta_\infty \leq mt_n\}.$$

The strong Markov property of  $X^*$  yields that

$$\mathbf{P}_i(K'_{n,m}) = \mathbf{P}_i(\eta_\infty \leq t_n) \mathbf{P}_i(Y_t = i, \forall 0 \leq t \leq (m-1)t_n).$$

Using (3.5), (3.6) and  $(m-1)t_n \leq s$ , we have  $\mathbf{P}_i(K'_{n,m}) \geq ct_n/2$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_i(K_n) &= \sum_{\{m \geq 1: mt_n \leq s\}} \mathbf{P}_i(K_{n,m}) \geq \sum_{\{m \geq 1: mt_n \leq s\}} \mathbf{P}_i(K'_{n,m}) \\ &\geq \sum_{\{m \geq 1: mt_n \leq s\}} \frac{ct_n}{2} > \frac{cs}{4}, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts with (3.7). This completes the proof.  $\square$

*Remark 3.7.* In view of (3.3),  $X^*$  is actually a continuous Markov chain with the minimal state space  $\mathbb{N}$  whose transition matrix is  $(p_{ij}^*(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$ . In addition,  $\infty$  is a fictitious state of  $X^*$ . The essential range of  $X^*$  is identified with the compactified state space  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$ .

#### 4. RAY-KNIGHT COMPACTIFICATION OF BIRTH AND DEATH PROCESSES

From now on we assume that  $\infty$  is exit or regular. Take a  $Q$ -process  $(p_{ij}(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Recall that  $(p_{ij}(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  extends to an honest transition matrix on  $E = \mathbb{N} \cup \{\partial\}$ . Denote by  $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  a canonical chain realized on a certain probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$  with the transition function  $(p_{ij}(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$ , i.e.  $X$  is well separable, Borel measurable and right lower semicontinuous. Here we omit the initial distribution (on  $E$ ) of  $X$ . If it is  $\delta_i$  for some  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , we write  $\mathbf{P}$  as  $\mathbf{P}_i$ . The transition semigroup of  $X$  is denoted by  $P_t$ , i.e.  $P_t(i, B) = P_t 1_B(i) = \mathbf{P}_i(X_t \in B)$  for  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $B \subset \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $(R_\alpha)_{\alpha > 0}$  be the resolvent of  $P_t$ , i.e. for any  $f \in \mathcal{N}_b^+$ , the family of all bounded and positive Borel functions on  $\mathbb{N}$ ,

$$R_\alpha f(i) := \mathbf{E}_i \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} f(X_t) dt = \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} P_t f(x) dt.$$

Particularly for  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $P_t(i, \{j\}) = p_{ij}(t)$  and

$$R_\alpha(i, \{j\}) := \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} p_{ij}(t) dt$$

Let  $\eta_n := \inf\{t > 0 : X_t = n\}$  and

$$\eta := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta_n. \quad (4.1)$$

Then  $\mathbf{P}_i(\eta < \infty) = 1$  for  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  and the stopped process of  $X$  at  $\eta$  is identified with the minimal  $Q$ -process; see, e.g., [24, §5.1]. Clearly  $X$  is càdlàg before  $\eta$ . For  $\alpha > 0$ , define a function

$$u_\alpha(i) := \mathbf{E}_i e^{-\alpha \eta}, \quad i \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (4.2)$$

Of course  $u_\alpha(\partial) = 0$ . The following lemma is simple but important.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Assume that  $\infty$  is regular or exit. Let  $u_\alpha$  be defined as (4.2). Then*

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} u_\alpha(i) = 1.$$

*Proof.* This fact can be seen by, e.g., repeating the proof of [19, Proposition 7.9]. See also [8, Theorem 7.1] or [24, §7.3, Theorem 1 (ii)].  $\square$

Now we have a position to handle the Ray-Knight compactification (see, e.g., [5, 10, 15, 21]) of  $X$ . We begin with the following family of 1-*supermedian functions*

$$G := \{R_1 1_{\{i\}} : i \in E\} \cup \{u_1\}.$$

Due to [15] (see also [5, Lemma 8.24]), there exists a unique minimal convex cone  $\mathcal{S}(G)$ , called *Ray cone*, such that

- (i)  $1_E \in \mathcal{S}(G)$ ,  $G \subset \mathcal{S}(G)$ ;
- (ii)  $\mathcal{S}(G)$  is separable in  $\mathcal{N}_b^+$  and separates points of  $E$ ;
- (iii)  $f \in \mathcal{S}(G)$  implies that  $R_\alpha f \in \mathcal{S}(G)$  for  $\alpha > 0$ ;
- (iv) If  $f, g \in \mathcal{S}(G)$ , then  $f \wedge g \in \mathcal{S}(G)$ .

Here the separable property means that there is a countable subset of  $\mathcal{S}(G)$  whose closure in  $\mathcal{N}_b^+$  with respect to the uniform norm contains  $\mathcal{S}(G)$ . Using this Ray cone, the method of Ray-Knight compactification yields the following (see, e.g., [5, Theorem 8.25]).

**Theorem 4.2.** *There exists a compact metric space  $\mathbf{F}$  and a Ray resolvent  $(\bar{R}_\alpha)_{\alpha>0}$  on  $\mathbf{F}$  such that*

- (1)  $E$  is a dense Borel subset of  $\mathbf{F}$ ;
- (2) Every  $h \in \mathcal{S}(G)$  can extend to a unique function  $\bar{h}$  in  $C(\mathbf{F})$ ;
- (3)  $\overline{\mathcal{S}(G)} - \overline{\mathcal{S}(G)}$  is dense in  $C(\mathbf{F})$ , where  $\overline{\mathcal{S}(G)} = \{\bar{h} : h \in \mathcal{S}(G)\}$ ;
- (4) For each  $i \in E$ ,  $A \subset E$ ,  $\bar{R}_\alpha(i, A) = R_\alpha(i, A)$ .

Furthermore, there is a càdlàg Ray process  $\bar{X} = (\bar{X}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  (realized on the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ ) on  $\mathbf{F}$  such that

- (5)  $\bar{X}$  admits  $(\bar{R}_\alpha)_{\alpha>0}$  as resolvent;
- (6) For a.e.  $t$ ,  $\mathbf{P}(\bar{X}_t = X_t) = 1$ .

*Remark 4.3.* The enlarged metric space  $\mathbf{F}$  and Ray resolvent  $\bar{R}_\alpha$  only rely on the choice of  $G$ . They do not depend on the initial distribution of  $X$ . In general  $\bar{X}$  is not necessarily a modification of  $X$  and particularly,  $\bar{X}$  may have different initial distribution from  $X$ . Fortunately this is not the case we will meet; see Lemma 4.4 (1).

The terminologies of Ray resolvent and Ray process are referred to in, e.g., [5, 10]. Particularly,  $\mathbf{F}$  and  $\bar{X}$  are called the *Ray-Knight compactifications* of  $E$  and  $X$  respectively. The set of *non-branching points* for this Ray process is by definition

$$D := \{x \in \mathbf{F} : \alpha \bar{R}_\alpha f(x) \rightarrow f(x), \alpha \uparrow \infty, \forall f \in C(\mathbf{F})\}.$$

And  $B := \mathbf{F} \setminus D$  is called the set of *branching points*. Denote by  $(\bar{P}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  the transition semigroup of  $\bar{X}$ . We wish to state emphatically that it does NOT hold that  $\bar{P}_0(x, \cdot) = \delta_x$  for  $x \in B$ . Of course it holds for  $x \in D$ . The lemma below is crucial to our subsequent considerations. We emphasize that the identity in the third assertion means the identifying of not only their set elements but also the topologies.

- Lemma 4.4.** (1) For any  $t \geq 0$ ,  $\mathbf{P}(\bar{X}_t = X_t) = 1$ .
- (2)  $E \subset D$ .
  - (3)  $\mathbf{P}$ -a.s.,  $\bar{X}_t = X_t$  for a.e.  $t$ .
  - (4)  $\mathbf{F} = E \cup \{\infty\}$ .

*Proof.* (1) Fix  $t \geq 0$ . We first note that

$$\lim_{h \downarrow 0} \mathbf{P}(X_{t+h} = X_t) = \lim_{h \downarrow 0} \sum_{i, k \in E} \mathbf{P}(X_0 = i) p_{ik}(t) p_{kk}(h) = 1. \quad (4.3)$$

Using (4.3) and Theorem 4.2 (6), one can take a decreasing sequence  $h_n \downarrow 0$  such that  $\mathbf{P}(\bar{X}_{t+h_n} = X_{t+h_n}) = 1$  and  $\mathbf{P}(X_{t+h_n} = X_t) > 1 - 1/2^n$ . Set  $A_n := \{X_{t+h_n} \neq X_t\}$  and  $N := \bigcap_{k \geq 1} \bigcup_{n \geq k} A_n$ . Clearly  $\mathbf{P}(N) = 0$ , and for  $\mathbf{P}$ -a.s.  $\omega \notin N$ , there exists  $k \geq 1$  such that for any  $n \geq k$ ,

$$\bar{X}_{t+h_n}(\omega) = X_{t+h_n}(\omega) = X_t(\omega).$$

Since  $\bar{X}$  is càdlàg, it follows that  $\mathbf{P}(X_t = \bar{X}_t) = 1$ .

- (2) Fix  $i \in E$ . Theorem 4.2 (4) yields that  $\bar{P}_t(i, \{i\}) = p_{ii}(t)$  for a.e.  $t$ . Since  $t \mapsto \bar{P}_t f(i)$  is right continuous for  $f \in C(\mathbf{F})$  (see, e.g., [5, Theorem 8.2]), it follows that  $\bar{P}_t(i, \cdot)$  converges to  $\bar{P}_0(i, \cdot)$  weakly on  $\mathbf{F}$  as  $t \downarrow 0$ . Take  $t_n \downarrow 0$  with  $\bar{P}_{t_n}(i, \{i\}) = p_{ii}(t_n)$ . Note that  $\{i\}$  is closed in  $\mathbf{F}$ . We have

$$\bar{P}_0(i, \{i\}) \geq \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{P}_{t_n}(i, \{i\}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p_{ii}(t_n) = 1.$$

As a result,  $i \in D$ .

(3) This is obvious because by Theorem 4.2 (6) and the Fubini theorem,

$$\mathbf{E} \int_0^\infty 1_{\{\bar{X}_t \neq X_t\}} dt = \int_0^\infty \mathbf{P}(\bar{X}_t \neq X_t) dt = 0.$$

(4) Take a countable subset  $\mathcal{S}_0 \subset \mathcal{S}(G)$  with  $u_1 \in \mathcal{S}_0$  such that  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}_0 := \{\bar{f} : f \in \mathcal{S}_0\}$  separates points of  $\mathbf{F}$ , where  $\bar{f}$  is the extension of  $f$  in  $C(\mathbf{F})$ . Recall that  $\mathbf{P}(\eta < \infty) = 1$ . Since  $\bar{X}$  is càdlàg in  $\mathbf{F}$ , it follows that for  $\mathbf{P}$ -a.s.  $\omega \in \Omega$ , the limit

$$\lim_{t \uparrow \eta} \bar{f}(\bar{X}_t) = \bar{f}(\bar{X}_{\eta-}), \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{S}_0$$

exist. The previous assertion yields that

$$\bar{f}(\bar{X}_{\eta-}) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \eta} f(X_t). \quad (4.4)$$

Note that  $X$  must pass through  $n$  before reaching  $n+1$ . Hence the right hand side of (4.4) is also equal to  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(n)$ . This implies that  $\bar{f}(\bar{X}_{\eta-}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(n)$  for  $f \in \mathcal{S}_0$  are independent of  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Since  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}_0$  separates points of  $\mathbf{F}$ , there is an element  $\xi \in \mathbf{F}$  such that  $\bar{X}_{\eta-} = \xi$ ,  $\mathbf{P}$ -a.s. Particularly,

$$\bar{f}(\xi) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{f}(n), \quad f \in \mathcal{S}_0.$$

Next we note that  $\xi \notin E$ . This is because  $\bar{u}_1(i) = u_1(i)$  for any  $i \in E$  while, in view of Lemma 4.1,  $\bar{u}_1(\xi) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_1(n) > \bar{u}_1(i)$ .

Finally we show that  $\mathbf{F} = E \cup \{\xi\}$  and  $n \rightarrow \xi$  in  $\mathbf{F}$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . These mean that  $\xi$  is identified with the point forming the Alexandroff compactification of  $\mathbb{N}$ . Therefore  $\xi = \infty$  and  $\mathbf{F} = E \cup \{\infty\}$ . Argue by contradiction and suppose that  $\xi' \in \mathbf{F} \setminus E$  and  $\xi' \neq \xi$ . On account of Theorem 4.2 (1), there exists a sequence  $\{n_k : k \geq 1\} \subset \mathbb{N}$  such that  $n_k \rightarrow \xi'$  in  $\mathbf{F}$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence

$$\bar{f}(\xi') = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{f}(n_k) = \bar{f}(\xi), \quad \bar{f} \in \mathcal{S}_0.$$

Since  $\mathcal{S}_0$  separates points of  $\mathbf{F}$ , we must have  $\xi' = \xi$ , leading to a contradiction. Likewise, we can also conclude that  $n \rightarrow \xi$  in  $\mathbf{F}$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

That completes the proof.  $\square$

*Remark 4.5.* If we do not put  $u_1$  in  $G$  and obtain the Ray-Knight compactification of  $(p_{ij}(t))$  analogously, then it may happen that  $\xi \in E$  in the proof of the fourth assertion (in fact, only when  $X$  is a Doob process whose entering distribution is a point measure at  $\xi$ ). Meanwhile  $\mathbf{F} = E$  (but their topologies are not the same) and  $n \rightarrow \xi$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  with respect to the topology of  $\mathbf{F}$ . See, e.g., [5, Remark 9.13].

We readily have the following corollary.

**Corollary 4.6.** *Every  $Q$ -process admits a càdàg modification on  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$  with strong Markov property.*

The Ray-Knight compactification is very helpful to understanding a  $Q$ -process, and especially to making some mazy concepts clearer. For example, the set of *flying times* of  $(p_{ij}(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  can be expressed as the set of times  $t$  that  $\bar{X}_{t-} = \infty$ . More precisely, the time  $t$  is called a *jumping time* (for  $X.(\omega)$ ) if there is a constant  $\varepsilon > 0$  and two states  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $i \neq j$  such that  $X_s(\omega) = i$  for  $s \in (t - \varepsilon, t)$  and  $X_t(\omega) = j$ . The set of flying times  $L(\omega)$  for  $\omega \in \Omega$  is by definition

$$L(\omega) := \{t \in (0, \infty) : \forall \varepsilon > 0, [t - \varepsilon, t] \text{ contains infinite jumping times for } X.(\omega)\}.$$

This definition is due to [24, §6.1]. Recall that  $\bar{X}$  is càdlàg in  $\mathbf{F}$ , so that for  $\mathbf{P}$ -a.s.  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $\bar{X}_{t-}$  exists in  $\mathbf{F}$ .

**Corollary 4.7.** *For  $\mathbf{P}$ -a.s.  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,*

$$L(\omega) = \{t \in (0, \infty) : \bar{X}_{t-}(\omega) = \infty\}.$$

*Proof.* If  $\bar{X}_{t-}(\omega) = \infty$ , then Lemma 4.4 (3) implies that  $\mathbb{N} \ni X_{t_n}(\omega) \rightarrow \infty$  for a certain sequence  $t_n \uparrow t$ . Clearly  $t$  is flying time. To the contrary, take  $t \in L(\omega)$ . Argue by contradiction and suppose  $\bar{X}_{t-}(\omega) = j \in E$ . Then Lemma 4.4 (3) implies that there is a constant  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $X_s(\omega) = j$  for a.e.  $s \in [t - \varepsilon, t)$ . Noting that  $j$  is stable and applying [4, II §7, Theorem 4], one can get that  $X_s(\omega) = j$  for any  $s \in [t - \varepsilon, t)$ . This is a contradiction with  $t \in L(\omega)$ . That completes the proof.  $\square$

In view of Lemma 4.4, henceforth we would not distinguish the  $Q$ -process with its Ray-Knight compactification if no confusions caused. In other words, we will always assume that the  $Q$ -process  $X$  is a Ray process on  $\mathbf{F} = E \cup \{\infty\}$  without other statements. In the terminology of §2.2,  $X$  is also called a Ray  $Q$ -process.

## 5. DOOB PROCESSES

The notion of *Doob process* is referred to in, e.g., [24, §2.3]. It is a celebrated  $Q$ -process, which will re-enter the minimal state space immediately after each flying time. It is uniquely determined by its entering distribution, a certain probability measure  $\pi$  on  $E = \mathbb{N} \cup \{\partial\}$ . So we also call it the  $(Q, \pi)$ -Doob process for accuracy. Particularly if  $\pi = \delta_{\partial}$ , then the  $(Q, \pi)$ -Doob process reduces to the minimal  $Q$ -process.

Now we take a  $Q$ -process  $(p_{ij}(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  that is not the minimal one. Its realization  $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$  is a Ray process on  $\mathbf{F} = E \cup \{\infty\}$ . The resolvent and transition semigroup of  $X$  are denoted by  $(R_\alpha)_{\alpha > 0}$  and  $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$  respectively. The set of branching (non-branching) points is  $B$  (resp.  $D = \mathbf{F} \setminus B$ ). Note that  $E \subset D$  and hence  $P_0(x, \cdot) = \delta_x$  for  $x \in E$ . In addition,  $P_0(\infty, \cdot) = \delta_\infty$  if and only if  $\infty \in D$ . If  $\infty \in B$ , then  $P_0(\infty, \cdot)$  is a probability measure on  $E$  (not on  $\mathbf{F}$ !); see, e.g., [5, Proposition 8.8 (i)].

Recall that  $X^{\min}$  is the minimal  $Q$ -process; see §3.1. The celebrated Ikeda-Nagasawa-Watanabe piecing out is reviewed in Appendix A. The main result of this section is as follows.

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let  $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  be a  $Q$ -process and  $\pi$  be a probability measure on  $E$ . The following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $X$  is the  $(Q, \pi)$ -Doob process;
- (2)  $X$  is the piecing out of  $X^{\min}$  with respect to  $\pi$ ;
- (3)  $\infty$  is branching for  $X$  and  $P_0(\infty, \cdot) = \pi$ .

*Proof.* We first obtain the equivalence between (1) and (2). It suffices to compute the resolvent  $(\tilde{R}_\alpha)$  of the piecing out  $\tilde{X} = (X^{\min}, \pi)$ . Fix  $\alpha > 0$  and  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Adopt the notations through (A.2) to (A.4). Write  $\pi_k := \pi(\{k\})$  and  $\Phi_{ij}(\alpha) := R_\alpha^{\min}(i, \{j\})$  for convenience. Since  $\tau(\tilde{\omega}) := \zeta(\omega_1)$  is an  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t$ -stopping time (see the remark before Theorem 1 in [11]), the strong Markov property of  $\tilde{X}$  and the Dynkin formula yield

$$\tilde{R}_{ij}(\alpha) := \tilde{R}_\alpha(i, \{j\}) = \Phi_{ij}(\alpha) + \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_i \left[ e^{-\alpha\tau} \tilde{R}_\alpha(\tilde{X}_\tau, \{j\}) \right]. \quad (5.1)$$

In view of (A.2) and (A.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathbf{E}}_i \left[ e^{-\alpha\tau} \tilde{R}_\alpha(\tilde{X}_\tau, \{j\}) \right] &= \int_{(\omega_1, y_1) \in \Omega \times E} e^{-\alpha\zeta(\omega_1)} \tilde{R}_\alpha(y_1, \{j\}) \mathbf{P}_i(d\omega_1) \nu(\omega_1, dy_1) \\ &= u_\alpha(i) \sum_{k \in E} \tilde{R}_{kj}(\alpha) \pi_k.\end{aligned}$$

Integrating (5.1) for  $i$  with respect to  $\pi$ , we get

$$\sum_{k \in E} \tilde{R}_{kj}(\alpha) \pi_k = \frac{\sum_{k \in E} \Phi_{kj}(\alpha) \pi_k}{1 - \pi(u_\alpha)}.$$

Hence

$$\tilde{R}_{ij}(\alpha) = \Phi_{ij}(\alpha) + u_\alpha(i) \cdot \frac{\sum_{k \in E} \Phi_{kj}(\alpha) \pi_k}{1 - \pi(u_\alpha)}. \quad (5.2)$$

On account of Theorem B.1 (3),  $\tilde{R}_\alpha$  is identified with the resolvent of  $(Q, \pi)$ -Doob process. Therefore this equivalence can be eventually concluded.

Next suppose that  $X$  is the  $(Q, \pi)$ -Doob process, i.e.  $R_\alpha = \tilde{R}_\alpha$ , where the latter resolvent is expressed as (5.2). Letting  $i \rightarrow \infty$  in (5.2) and noting that  $\Phi_{ij}(\alpha) \rightarrow 0$ ,  $u_\alpha(i) \rightarrow 1$  (see Lemma 4.1) as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ , one gets that

$$R_\alpha 1_{\{j\}}(\infty) = \frac{\sum_{k \in E} \Phi_{kj}(\alpha) \pi_k}{1 - \pi(u_\alpha)}.$$

Then a straightforward computation yields that  $\alpha R_\alpha 1_{\{j\}}(\infty) \rightarrow \pi_j \neq 1_{\{j\}}(\infty)$  as  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence  $\infty$  is branching for  $X$ . Mimicking (5.1), we can obtain that

$$R_\alpha 1_{\{j\}}(i) = \Phi_{ij}(\alpha) + \mathbf{E}_i \left[ e^{-\alpha\eta} R_\alpha 1_{\{j\}}(X_\eta) \right],$$

where  $\eta$  is defined as (4.1). It follows from [5, Proposition 8.7] that

$$\mathbf{E}_i \left[ e^{-\alpha\eta} R_\alpha 1_{\{j\}}(X_\eta) \right] = \mathbf{E}_i \left[ e^{-\alpha\eta} \mathbf{E}_i \left[ R_\alpha 1_{\{j\}}(X_\eta) \mid \mathcal{F}_{\eta-} \right] \right] = u_\alpha(i) \pi'(R_\alpha 1_{\{j\}}),$$

where  $\pi' := P_0(\infty, \cdot)$ . Hence we can further obtain that

$$R_\alpha 1_{\{j\}}(i) = \Phi_{ij}(\alpha) + u_\alpha(i) \cdot \frac{\sum_{k \in E} \Phi_{kj}(\alpha) \pi'_k}{1 - \pi'(u_\alpha)}, \quad (5.3)$$

where  $\pi'_k := \pi'(\{k\})$ . Comparing (5.3) with (5.2), one has

$$\frac{\sum_{k \in E} \alpha \Phi_{kj}(\alpha) \pi_k}{1 - \pi(u_\alpha)} = \frac{\sum_{k \in E} \alpha \Phi_{kj}(\alpha) \pi'_k}{1 - \pi'(u_\alpha)}. \quad (5.4)$$

Let  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$  in (5.4) and then  $\pi_k = \pi'_k$  follows. Therefore  $P_0(\infty, \cdot) = \pi$  is concluded.

Finally suppose  $\infty$  is branching for  $X$  and  $P_0(\infty, \cdot) = \pi$ . Repeating the arguments in the previous step one can easily obtain (5.3) with  $\pi' = \pi$ . Thus  $X$  is actually the  $(Q, \pi)$ -Doob process. That completes the proof.  $\square$

This result readily yields the following. The first assertion is due to [23, Chapter I, Theorem 9.13] and [10, page 56]. The second is referred to in, e.g., [22, III (37.1)].

**Corollary 5.2.** *Doob processes are Borel right processes on  $\mathbb{N}$ . Every Ray  $Q$ -process that is not a Doob process is a Feller process on  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$ .*



## 6. INFINITESIMAL OPERATORS OF FELLER BIRTH AND DEATH PROCESSES

As obtained in Theorem 5.1, the  $Q$ -process  $X$  is a Feller process on  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$  if and only if it is not a Doob process. Due to Theorem B.1, this also amounts to

$$|\nu| = \infty \text{ or } \beta > 0, \quad (6.1)$$

where  $(\nu, \gamma, \beta)$  is the triple determining the resolvent of  $X$ .

**Definition 6.1.** The triple  $(\nu, \gamma, \beta)$  is called *Fellerian* if (6.1) and (B.1) hold, and  $\beta = 0$  whenever  $\infty$  is exit.

Before moving on to deriving the infinitesimal operator of a Feller  $Q$ -process on  $C(\mathbb{N}_\infty)$ , we prepare some notations. Clearly a function  $F$  defined on  $\mathbb{N}$  can extend to a function in  $C(\mathbb{N}_\infty)$  if and only if  $F(\infty) := \lim_{k \uparrow \infty} F(k)$  exists. In this case we write  $F \in C(\mathbb{N}_\infty)$  and still denote its continuous extension by  $F$ . For a function  $F$  on  $\mathbb{N}$ , define

$$F^+(k) := \frac{F(k+1) - F(k)}{c_{k+1} - c_k}, \quad k \geq 0$$

and  $F^+(\infty) := \lim_{k \uparrow \infty} F^+(k)$  if exists. Make a convention for every  $F$ :

$$F^+(-1) := 0.$$

This is exactly the *fictitious* Neumann boundary condition at 0. Then set further

$$D_\mu F^+(k) := \frac{F^+(k) - F^+(k-1)}{\mu_k}, \quad k \geq 0.$$

Recall that  $Q$  is the birth and death matrix defined as (1.1). In abuse of notations define a linear operator for every function  $F$  on  $\mathbb{N}$ ,

$$QF(k) := a_k F(k-1) - q_k F(k) + b_k F(k+1), \quad k \geq 0, \quad (6.2)$$

where  $F(-1) := 0$ . Put  $\mathcal{D}(Q) := \{F \in C(\mathbb{N}_\infty) : QF \in C(\mathbb{N}_\infty)\}$ .

**Lemma 6.2.** For every function  $F$  on  $\mathbb{N}$ ,

$$QF = \frac{1}{2} D_\mu F^+. \quad (6.3)$$

In addition,  $\mathcal{D}(Q)$  is dense in  $C(\mathbb{N}_\infty)$ .

*Proof.* (6.3) can be verified by a straightforward computation. For the denseness of  $\mathcal{D}(Q)$ , it suffices to note that  $1_{\mathbb{N}_\infty} \in \mathcal{D}(Q)$  and

$$C_c(\mathbb{N}) := \{F : \exists n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } F(k) = 0, \forall k \geq n\} \subset \mathcal{D}(Q).$$

That completes the proof.  $\square$

Now we have a position to present the main result of this section. In the expression (6.4), when  $\infty$  is exit, we put  $\beta \cdot F^+(\infty) := 0$  even if  $F^+(\infty)$  does not exist. Otherwise  $F^+(\infty)$  or the sum  $\sum_{k \geq 0} (F(\infty) - F(k))\nu_k$  is tacitly assumed to be well defined. A heuristic explanation for this boundary condition has been phrased in §2.3.

**Theorem 6.3.** A linear operator  $\mathcal{L}$  with domain  $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{L})$  on  $C(\mathbb{N}_\infty)$  is the infinitesimal operator of a Feller  $Q$ -process  $X$  on  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$ , if and only if there is a unique (up to a multiplicative constant) Fellerian triple  $(\nu, \gamma, \beta)$  such that

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{L}) = \left\{ F \in \mathcal{D}(Q) : \beta F^+(\infty) + \sum_{k \geq 0} (F(\infty) - F(k))\nu_k + \gamma F(\infty) = 0 \right\} \quad (6.4)$$

and  $\mathcal{L}F = QF$  for  $F \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{L})$ . Meanwhile the resolvent matrix of  $X$  is given by (B.2) with this triple.

*Proof.* Take such a Fellerian triple  $(\nu, \gamma, \beta)$  and let  $X$  be the corresponding Feller  $Q$ -process on  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$  whose semigroup and resolvent are denoted by  $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$  and  $(R_\alpha)_{\alpha > 0}$  respectively. It suffices to prove that

$$R_\alpha f \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{L}), \quad f \in C(\mathbb{N}_\infty)$$

and for any fixed  $f \in C(\mathbb{N}_\infty)$ ,  $F := R_\alpha f$  is the unique solution of the equation

$$\alpha G - \mathcal{L}G = f. \quad (6.5)$$

We first note that

$$\begin{aligned} F(k) &= R_\alpha^{\min} f(k) + u_\alpha(k) \cdot \frac{\sum_{i \geq 0} \nu_i R_\alpha^{\min} f(i) + \sum_{i \geq 0} u_\alpha(i) f(i) \mu_i}{\gamma + \sum_{i \geq 0} \nu_i (1 - u_\alpha(i)) + \beta \alpha \sum_{i \geq 0} \mu_i u_\alpha(i)} \\ &=: R_\alpha^{\min} f(k) + u_\alpha(k) \cdot M(f), \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

where  $M(f)$  is a constant depending on  $(\nu, \gamma, \beta)$  and  $f$ . In addition, in view of [8, Lemma 9.1] and Lemma 4.1,  $F \in C(\mathbb{N}_\infty)$  with  $F(\infty) = M(f)$ .

Secondly we show that  $F \in \mathcal{D}(Q)$ . Since  $X$  is Feller, it follows that there is a function  $h \in C(\mathbb{N}_\infty)$  such that

$$\limsup_{t \downarrow 0} \sup_k \left| \frac{P_t F(k) - F(k)}{t} - h(k) \right| = 0.$$

On account of [4, II §3, Corollary],

$$\left| \frac{P_t F(k) - F(k)}{t} - QF(k) \right| \leq \left( \sum_j \left| \frac{p_{kj}(t) - \delta_{kj}}{t} - q_{kj} \right| \right) \sup_j |F(j)| \rightarrow 0$$

for any  $k \geq 0$  as  $t \downarrow 0$ . Hence  $QF = h \in C(\mathbb{N}_\infty)$ .

Thirdly we derive the boundary condition for  $F$  and obtain  $F \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{L})$ . Only the case that  $\infty$  is regular will be considered. The other case that  $\infty$  is exit can be treated similarly. By virtue of [8, Theorem 8.1], one can obtain that  $(R_\alpha^{\min} f)^+(\infty) := \lim_{k \uparrow \infty} (R_\alpha^{\min} f)^+(k)$  exists and

$$(R_\alpha^{\min} f)^+(\infty) = - \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} u_\alpha(j) f(j) \mu_j.$$

Note that  $u_\alpha^+(\infty) = \lim_{k \uparrow \infty} u_\alpha^+(k) < \infty$  due to [3, (7.4)]. Hence (6.6) yields that

$$F^+(\infty) = - \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} u_\alpha(j) f(j) \mu_j + M(f) \cdot u_\alpha^+(\infty). \quad (6.7)$$

On the other hand,

$$F(\infty) - F(k) = M(f)(1 - u_\alpha(k)) - R_\alpha^{\min} f(k)$$

and thus

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} (F(\infty) - F(k)) \nu_k = M(f) \sum_{i \geq 0} \nu_i (1 - u_\alpha(i)) - \sum_{i \geq 0} \nu_i R_\alpha^{\min} f(i). \quad (6.8)$$

Using (6.7), (6.8),  $F(\infty) = M(f)$  and noting that  $u_\alpha^+(\infty) = \alpha \sum_j u_\alpha(j) \mu_j$  (see, e.g., [8, (7.5)]), we can conclude that

$$\beta \cdot F^+(\infty) + \sum_{k \geq 0} (F(\infty) - F(k)) \nu_k + \gamma \cdot F(\infty) = 0. \quad (6.9)$$

This, together with the previous two steps, yields that  $F \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{L})$ .

Finally let us turn to prove that  $F$  is the unique solution of (6.5). In fact, it follows from Lemma 6.2 and [8, Theorem 9.1] that

$$\alpha R_\alpha^{\min} f - Q(R_\alpha^{\min} f) = f.$$

In view of [8, Theorem 7.1],

$$\alpha u_\alpha - Q u_\alpha = 0.$$

Since  $F = R_\alpha^{\min} f + M(f) \cdot u_\alpha \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{L})$ , we have

$$\alpha F - \mathcal{L}F = \alpha F - QF = f.$$

It remains to verify that uniqueness of the solutions of (6.5). Argue by contradiction and suppose that  $F_0 \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{L})$  with  $QF_0 = \alpha F_0$  and  $F_0 \neq 0$ . By means of [8, Theorem 7.1],  $F_0$  must be equal to  $K \cdot u_\alpha$  for some constant  $K \neq 0$ . However  $u_\alpha \notin \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{L})$  because  $u_\alpha$  is increasing and particularly, (6.9) does not hold for  $u_\alpha$  besides  $\gamma = \beta = \nu_k = 0$ . That completes the proof.  $\square$

When  $\infty$  is exit,  $\beta = 0$  and hence  $|\nu| = \infty$  in Theorem 6.3. Meanwhile the boundary condition in (6.4) reads as

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} (F(\infty) - F(k)) \nu_k + \gamma F(\infty) = 0. \quad (6.10)$$

On the other hand, if  $X$  is a Doob process, i.e.  $\beta = 0, |\nu| < \infty$  and  $|\nu| + \gamma > 0$ , then its entering distribution  $\pi$  is expressed as (B.3). Mimicking the third step in the proof of Theorem 7.3, one can also obtain (6.10) for every  $F = R_\alpha f$ . Particularly, the minimal  $Q$ -process satisfies the Dirichlet boundary condition  $F(\infty) = 0$ .

## 7. SYMMETRIZABLE BIRTH AND DEATH PROCESSES

Before moving on to probabilistic construction of Feller  $Q$ -processes, we treat all symmetrizable ones in this section. All of them, except for the minimal  $Q$ -process, are not Doob processes. Because of Theorem 3.5, we must impose that  $\infty$  is regular.

Recall that  $X^*$  is the  $(Q, 1)$ -process corresponding to the basic Dirichlet form  $(\mathcal{A}^*, \mathcal{G}^*)$ , which is regular on  $L^2(\mathbb{N}_\infty, \mu)$ ; see §3.3. Take a constant  $\kappa \in [0, \infty)$ . The lemma below is simple; see, e.g., [9, §6.1].

**Lemma 7.1.** *Let  $\kappa \in [0, \infty)$ . The Dirichlet form*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^\kappa &:= \mathcal{G}^*, \\ \mathcal{E}^\kappa(f, g) &:= \mathcal{A}^*(f, g) + \kappa \cdot f(\infty)g(\infty), \quad f, g \in \mathcal{F}^\kappa \end{aligned}$$

*is a regular Dirichlet form on  $L^2(\mathbb{N}_\infty, \mu)$ .*

We denote by  $X^\kappa$  the associated Markov process of  $(\mathcal{E}^\kappa, \mathcal{F}^\kappa)$ . It is a killed process of  $X^*$  with only possible killing at  $\infty$  and the killing ratio is  $\kappa$ . At a heuristic level, the constant  $1/\kappa$  measures the mean killing intensity of  $X^\kappa$ ; see (2.2). Particularly,  $X^0 = X^*$  and we may treat the minimal  $Q$ -process as the case  $\kappa = \infty$  as well. Mimicking the proof of Proposition 3.6, it is easy to find out that

$$\mathbf{P}_i(X_t^\kappa = \infty) = 0, \quad t \geq 0, i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (7.1)$$

and hence

$$p_{ij}^\kappa(t) := \mathbf{P}_i(X_t^\kappa = j), \quad t \geq 0, i, j \in \mathbb{N} \quad (7.2)$$

gives a symmetrizable  $Q$ -process.

**Lemma 7.2.** *Let  $(p_{ij}^\kappa(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  be the  $Q$ -process defined as (7.2) for  $\kappa \in [0, \infty)$ . Then  $X^\kappa$  is the Ray-Knight compactification of  $(p_{ij}^\kappa(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Particularly,  $\infty$  is not branching for  $(p_{ij}^\kappa(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$ .*

*Proof.* Write  $C(\mathbb{N}_\infty) := \{f \in C(\mathbf{F}) : f(\partial) = 0\}$ . Then every function  $f \in C(\mathbf{F})$  admits a decomposition:

$$f = (f - f(\partial) \cdot 1_{\mathbf{F}}) + f(\partial) \cdot 1_{\mathbf{F}} =: f_0 + f(\partial) \cdot 1_{\mathbf{F}},$$

where  $f_0 \in C(\mathbb{N}_\infty)$  and  $f(\partial) \cdot 1_{\mathbf{F}}$  is a constant function on  $\mathbf{F}$ . Let  $(R_\alpha^\kappa)_{\alpha > 0}$  be the resolvent of  $X^\kappa$ . Since  $C(\mathbb{N}_\infty) \subset L^2(\mathbb{N}_\infty, \mu)$ , it follows that  $R_\alpha^\kappa C(\mathbb{N}_\infty) \subset \mathcal{F}^\kappa \subset C(\mathbb{N}_\infty)$ .

Denote by  $\bar{X}$  the Ray-Knight compactification of  $(p_{ij}^\kappa(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  and by  $\bar{R}_\alpha$  its resolvent on  $C(\mathbf{F})$ . It suffices to show that for any  $\bar{f} \in C(\mathbb{N}_\infty)$ ,

$$\bar{R}_\alpha \bar{f}(i) = R_\alpha^\kappa \bar{f}(i), \quad i \in \mathbb{N}_\infty.$$

Set  $f := \bar{f}|_{\mathbb{N}}$ . For  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , it follows from Theorem 4.2 (4), Lemma 4.4 and (7.1) that

$$\bar{R}_\alpha \bar{f}(i) = \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} dt \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} p_{ij}^\kappa(t) f(j) = \mathbf{E}_i \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} \bar{f}(X_t^\kappa) dt = R_\alpha^\kappa \bar{f}(i). \quad (7.3)$$

Note that  $\bar{R}_\alpha \bar{f} \in C(\mathbf{F})$  and  $R_\alpha^\kappa \bar{f} \in C(\mathbb{N}_\infty)$ . Letting  $i \rightarrow \infty$  in (7.3), we further obtain  $\bar{R}_\alpha \bar{f}(\infty) = R_\alpha^\kappa \bar{f}(\infty)$ . That completes the proof.  $\square$

In fact, (7.2) give all symmetrizable  $Q$ -processes. That is the following.

**Theorem 7.3.** *Assume that  $\infty$  is regular. Let  $(p_{ij}(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a  $Q$ -process that is not the minimal one. Then it is symmetrizable, if and only if there is a constant  $\kappa \in [0, \infty)$  such that*

$$p_{ij}(t) = p_{ij}^\kappa(t), \quad t \geq 0, i, j \in \mathbb{N},$$

where  $(p_{ij}^\kappa(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is defined as (7.2). Particularly, the branching set for  $(p_{ij}(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is empty.

*Proof.* Only the necessity should be proved. Let  $\bar{X}$  be the Ray-Knight compactification of a symmetrizable  $Q$ -process  $(p_{ij}(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$ . We first show that the branching set for  $\bar{X}$  is empty, i.e.  $\infty \notin B$ . Argue by contradiction and suppose that  $D = E$  and  $B = \{\infty\}$ . On account of, e.g., [23, Theorem 9.13], the restriction  $\bar{X}'$  of  $\bar{X}$  to  $D$  is a Borel right process, where  $D$  is endowed with the relative topology induced by  $\mathbf{F}$ . Set  $\eta'_n := \inf\{t > 0 : \bar{X}'_t = n\}$  and  $\eta' := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta'_n$ . Clearly the stopped process of  $\bar{X}'$  at  $\eta'$  is identified with the minimal  $Q$ -process. Since  $(p_{ij}(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is symmetric with respect to  $\mu$ , it follows that  $\bar{X}'$  is also symmetric with respect to  $\mu$ . Note that every  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  is not  $\mu$ -polar with respect to  $\bar{X}'$  because of  $\mu_i > 0$ . Hence [3, Corollary 3.1.14] yields that  $\bar{X}'$  is, in fact, a special Borel standard process. Particularly  $\bar{X}'$  is quasi-left-continuous. Let  $\zeta'$  be its lifetime. Then the quasi-left-continuity of  $\bar{X}'$  indicates that on  $\{\eta' < \zeta'\}$ ,

$$\bar{X}'_{\eta'_n} \rightarrow \bar{X}'_{\eta'} \in \mathbb{N},$$

while  $\bar{X}'_{\eta'_n} = n$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n$  is not contained in  $\mathbb{N}$ . Therefore we must have  $\eta' = \zeta'$ , in other words,  $\bar{X}'$  (and hence  $\bar{X}$ ) is identified with the minimal  $Q$ -process. This is a contradiction with the assumption that  $(p_{ij}(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is not minimal.

Now  $\bar{X}$  is a Feller process on  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$ . In view of Lemma 4.4 (1),  $\bar{X}$  is symmetric with respect to  $\mu$ , where  $\mu$  extends to  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$  by  $\mu(\{\infty\}) = 0$ . Denote by  $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$  its quasi-regular Dirichlet form on  $L^2(\mathbb{N}_\infty, \mu)$ . Since the part Dirichlet form of  $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$  on  $\mathbb{N}$  is identified with the minimal Dirichlet form  $(\mathcal{A}^{\min}, \mathcal{G}^{\min})$ , it follows that  $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$  admits no killing in  $\mathbb{N}$ . In other words, the killing measure  $\bar{k}$  of  $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$  must be supported on  $\{\infty\}$  and

thus there exists a constant  $\kappa \in [0, \infty)$  such that  $\bar{k} = \kappa \cdot \delta_\infty$ . Handle the resurrection on  $(\bar{\mathcal{E}}, \bar{\mathcal{F}})$  and we can obtain the resurrected Dirichlet form  $(\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{\text{res}}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{res}})$  for  $(\bar{\mathcal{E}}, \bar{\mathcal{F}})$ ; see [3, Theorem 5.2.17]. Note that the associated Markov process  $\bar{X}^{\text{res}}$  is still symmetric with respect to  $\mu$  and admits no killing inside  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$ . In addition, the part process of  $\bar{X}^{\text{res}}$  on  $\mathbb{N}$  is identified with the minimal  $Q$ -process  $X^{\text{min}}$ . In other words,  $\bar{X}^{\text{res}}$  is a one-point extension of  $X^{\text{min}}$  in the sense of [3, Definition 7.5.1]. Clearly the  $(Q, 1)$ -process  $X^*$  defined as (3.2) is also a one-point extension of  $X^{\text{min}}$ . Applying [3, Theorem 7.5.4], one can obtain that  $(\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{\text{res}}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{res}}) = (\mathcal{A}^*, \mathcal{G}^*)$ . In view of [3, Theorem 5.2.17] again, we eventually conclude that  $(\bar{\mathcal{E}}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}) = (\mathcal{E}^\kappa, \mathcal{F}^\kappa)$ , where the latter Dirichlet form is defined in Lemma 7.1. That completes the proof.  $\square$

## 8. BIRTH AND DEATH PROCESSES WITH ONLY BIG NON-LOCAL JUMPS

In this section we give a probabilistic construction for a Feller  $Q$ -process  $(p_{ij}(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  on  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$  with  $|\nu| := \sum_{k \geq 0} \nu_k < \infty$ . If  $\beta = 0$ , then Theorem B.1 (3) indicates that  $(p_{ij}(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a Doob process, as returns to §5. The main purpose of this subsection is to investigate the case  $\beta > 0$ .

**Theorem 8.1.** *Let  $(p_{ij}(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a Feller  $Q$ -process with the Fellerian triple  $(\nu, \gamma, \beta)$ , as stated in Theorem 6.3. Then  $|\nu| < \infty, \beta > 0$  if and only if  $(p_{ij}(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is the piecing out of  $X^\kappa$  with respect to  $\pi$ , where  $X^\kappa$  is the symmetrizable  $Q$ -process appearing in §7 and*

$$\kappa = \frac{|\nu| + \gamma}{\beta}, \quad \pi(\{k\}) = \frac{\nu_k}{|\nu| + \gamma}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \pi(\{\partial\}) = \frac{\gamma}{|\nu| + \gamma}. \quad (8.1)$$

*Proof.* Denote by  $\tilde{X}$  the piecing out of  $X^\kappa$  with respect to  $\pi$  with  $\kappa$  and  $\pi$  in (8.1). Let  $R_\alpha^\kappa$  and  $\tilde{R}_\alpha$  be the resolvents of  $X^\kappa$  and  $\tilde{X}$  respectively. Set

$$R_{ij}^\kappa(\alpha) := R_\alpha^\kappa(i, \{j\}), \quad \tilde{R}_{ij}(\alpha) := \tilde{R}_\alpha(i, \{j\}), \quad \alpha > 0, i, j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

The  $(Q, \nu, \gamma, \beta)$ -resolvent matrix is expressed as  $\Psi_{ij}(\alpha)$  in (B.2). It suffices to compute  $\tilde{R}_{ij}(\alpha)$  and obtain  $\tilde{R}_{ij}(\alpha) = \Psi_{ij}(\alpha)$  when  $|\nu| < \infty$  and  $\beta > 0$ . We will complete it by several steps.

Firstly we show that

$$R_\alpha^\kappa(\infty, \{j\}) = \frac{\mu_j u_\alpha(j)}{\kappa + \alpha \mu(u_\alpha)}. \quad (8.2)$$

To do this, write  $f := 1_{\{j\}}$ . Since  $f, 1_{\mathbb{N}_\infty} \in \mathcal{F}^\kappa$ , it follows that

$$\mu(f) = \mathcal{E}_\alpha^\kappa(R_\alpha^\kappa f, 1_{\mathbb{N}_\infty}) = \kappa R_\alpha^\kappa f(\infty) + \alpha \mu(R_\alpha^\kappa f). \quad (8.3)$$

The Dynkin formula indicates that

$$R_\alpha^\kappa f = R_\alpha^{\text{min}} f + R_\alpha^\kappa f(\infty) u_\alpha. \quad (8.4)$$

This together with (8.3) yields that

$$R_\alpha^\kappa f(\infty) = \frac{\mu(f - \alpha R_\alpha^{\text{min}} f)}{\kappa + \alpha \mu(u_\alpha)} = \frac{(1_{\mathbb{N}_\infty} - \alpha R_\alpha^{\text{min}} 1_{\mathbb{N}_\infty}, f)_\mu}{\kappa + \alpha \mu(u_\alpha)}.$$

Then it suffices to note that  $1_{\mathbb{N}_\infty} - \alpha R_\alpha^{\text{min}} 1_{\mathbb{N}_\infty} = u_\alpha$ .

Secondly, mimicking the argument deriving (5.2) we also have

$$\tilde{R}_\alpha f(i) = R_\alpha^\kappa f(i) + \frac{\pi(R_\alpha^\kappa f)}{1 - \pi(v_\alpha)} \cdot v_\alpha(i), \quad (8.5)$$

where  $v_\alpha(i) := \mathbf{E}_i^\kappa e^{-\alpha \zeta^\kappa}$ , where  $\zeta^\kappa$  is the lifetime of  $X^\kappa$ . Note that the strong Markov property of  $X^\kappa$  yields that  $v_\alpha(i) = c_\alpha u_\alpha(i)$ , where  $c_\alpha := \mathbf{E}_\infty^\kappa e^{-\alpha \zeta^\kappa}$ .

Finally, substituting (8.2) and (8.4) into (8.5) and proceeding a straightforward computation, we can find that

$$\tilde{R}_\alpha f(i) = R_\alpha^{\min} f(i) + u_\alpha(x) \cdot \frac{\mu_j u_\alpha(j) + c_\alpha \pi(R_\alpha^{\min} f) \cdot (\kappa + \alpha \mu(u_\alpha))}{(1 - c_\alpha \pi(u_\alpha))(\kappa + \alpha \mu(u_\alpha))}. \quad (8.6)$$

It follows from (8.2) that

$$1 - c_\alpha = 1 - \mathbf{E}_\infty^\kappa e^{-\alpha \zeta^\kappa} = \alpha R_\alpha^\kappa 1_{\mathbb{N}_\infty}(\infty) = \frac{\alpha \mu(u_\alpha)}{\kappa + \alpha \mu(u_\alpha)}.$$

Hence  $c_\alpha = \kappa / (\kappa + \alpha \mu(u_\alpha))$ . We substitute this into (8.6) to obtain that

$$\tilde{R}_\alpha f(i) = R_\alpha^{\min} f(i) + u_\alpha(i) \cdot \frac{\kappa \pi(R_\alpha^{\min} f) + \mu_j u_\alpha(j)}{\kappa - \kappa \pi(u_\alpha) + \alpha \mu(u_\alpha)}. \quad (8.7)$$

Eventually comparing (8.7) with (B.2) and using (8.1) one can conclude that  $\tilde{R}_{ij}(\alpha) = \tilde{R}_\alpha f(i) = \Psi_{ij}(\alpha)$ . That completes the proof.  $\square$

*Remark 8.2.* When  $\beta \downarrow 0$ , the mean killing intensity of  $X^\kappa$  in Theorem 8.1 is

$$\frac{1}{\kappa} = \frac{\beta}{|\nu| + \gamma} \downarrow 0,$$

so that it reduces to the situation that the  $Q$ -process enters the state space immediately at each flying time. This is actually the case of Doob processes.

## 9. BIRTH AND DEATH PROCESSES WITH SMALL NON-LOCAL JUMPS

Finally we come to the reminder case that  $|\nu| = \infty$ , and Feller [8] called  $(p_{ij}(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  for this case a ‘‘pathological’’ birth and death processes. Its resolvent matrix is still explicit and expressed as (B.2) with a certain Fellerian triple  $(\nu, \gamma, \beta)$ . But the probabilistic construction raised in Theorem 8.1 is not valid any more. Fortunately we may build a sequence of piecing out  $Q$ -processes that converges to a pathological one in a sense. To do this, take a sequence of vector  $\nu^n = (\nu_0^n, \dots, \nu_k^n, \dots) \geq 0$ ,  $n \geq 1$ , such that

$$|\nu^n| := \sum_{k \geq 0} \nu_k^n < \infty, \quad \nu_k^n \leq \nu_k \text{ and } \nu_k^n \uparrow \nu_k \text{ (} n \uparrow \infty \text{)}, \quad k \geq 0.$$

A simple example is  $\nu_k^n = \nu_k$  for  $k \leq n$  and  $\nu_k^n = 0$  for  $k > n$ . If  $\beta > 0$ , put  $\beta_n := \beta$ . Otherwise take a sequence of constants  $\beta_n > 0$  such that  $\beta_n \downarrow 0$ . Set

$$\kappa_n := \frac{|\nu^n| + \gamma}{\beta_n}, \quad \pi_n(\{k\}) = \frac{\nu_k^n}{|\nu^n| + \gamma}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \pi_n(\{\partial\}) = \frac{\gamma}{|\nu^n| + \gamma}. \quad (9.1)$$

We first demonstrate that the transition matrix corresponding to  $(\nu^n, \gamma, \beta_n)$  converges to  $(p_{ij}(t))$ . That is the following.

**Lemma 9.1.** *Let  $(p_{ij}(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a Feller  $Q$ -process with the Fellerian triple  $(\nu, \gamma, \beta)$  such that  $|\nu| = \infty$ . Then for any  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ,*

$$p_{ij}^n(t) \rightarrow p_{ij}(t), \quad n \rightarrow \infty \quad (9.2)$$

*uniformly in  $(t, i) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{N}$  for any fixed constant  $T > 0$ , where  $(p_{ij}^n(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is the piecing out of  $X^{\kappa_n}$  with respect to  $\pi_n$  and  $\kappa_n, \pi_n$  are given by (9.1).*

*Proof.* Note that both  $p_{ij}(t)$  and  $p_{ij}^n(t)$  are Feller processes on  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$ . Using (B.2) and Remark B.2, one can easily obtain that for any  $f \in C(\mathbb{N}_\infty)$ ,

$$R_\alpha^n f(i) \rightarrow R_\alpha f(i), \quad n \rightarrow \infty$$

uniformly in  $i \in \mathbb{N}_\infty$ , where  $R_\alpha^n$  is the resolvent of  $p_{ij}^n(t)$ . Then the theorem follows from the Trotter-Kato theorem; see, e.g., [14, IX, Theorem 2.16].  $\square$

Wang in 1958 (see [24]) achieved a sequence of Doob processes that converges to an arbitrary fixed  $Q$ -process in the same sense as (9.2) (but not uniformly). This convergence is, in fact, the convergence of finite dimensional distributions of corresponding  $Q$ -processes. Since both  $(p_{ij}^n(t))$  and  $(p_{ij}(t))$  in (9.2) are Feller, we can further obtain a much stronger convergence than it. Let  $X^n := (X_t^n)_{t \geq 0}$  be a Feller  $Q$ -process on  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$  with the transition matrix  $(p_{ij}^n(t))$  and  $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  be corresponding to  $(p_{ij}(t))$ . These processes can be realized on the Skorohod space, i.e.  $D_{\mathbb{N}_\infty}([0, \infty))$  consisting of all càdlàg functions on  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$ . Note that  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$  is endowed with a certain metric in accord with the topology of  $\mathbb{N}_\infty$ , so that  $D_{\mathbb{N}_\infty}([0, \infty))$  becomes a complete separable metric space; see, e.g., [6, §3 Theorem 5.6]. Then  $X^n$  (resp.  $X$ ) is identified with a certain probability measure  $\mathbf{P}^n$  (resp.  $\mathbf{P}$ ) on  $D_{\mathbb{N}_\infty}([0, \infty))$ . The main result of this section is as follows.

**Theorem 9.2.** *Adopt the same notations as Lemma 9.1. Assume that  $X_0^n$  converges to  $X_0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in distribution. Then  $\mathbf{P}^n$  converges weakly to  $\mathbf{P}$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , i.e. for any bounded and continuous function  $F$  on  $D_{\mathbb{N}_\infty}([0, \infty))$ ,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{D_{\mathbb{N}_\infty}([0, \infty))} F(\omega) \mathbf{P}^n(d\omega) = \int_{D_{\mathbb{N}_\infty}([0, \infty))} F(\omega) \mathbf{P}(d\omega).$$

*Proof.* Denote by  $P_t^n$  and  $P_t$  the transition semigroups of  $X^n$  and  $X$  respectively. The argument in the proof of Lemma 9.1 yields that for any  $f \in C(\mathbb{N}_\infty)$ ,  $P_t^n f$  converges to  $P_t f$  in  $C(\mathbb{N}_\infty)$  (uniformly in  $t \in [0, T]$ ). Then the result follows by applying [6, §4 Theorem 2.5].  $\square$

#### APPENDIX A. PIECING OUT OF IKEDA-NAGASAWA-WATANABE

Let  $S$  be a locally compact Hausdorff space with countable base and  $S_\Delta := S \cup \{\Delta\}$  is the one-point compactification of  $S$  (if  $S$  is compact,  $\Delta$  is attached as an isolated point). We are given a right continuous strong Markov process

$$X = \{\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, (\mathbf{P}_x)_{x \in S_\Delta}, X_t, \theta_t, \zeta\}$$

on  $S_\Delta$  with  $\Delta$  a trap point. Take a probability measure  $\pi$  on  $S_\Delta$  and set a kernel  $\nu(\omega, dy)$  on  $\Omega \times S_\Delta$  as follows:

$$\nu(\omega, dy) := \pi(dy), \quad \omega \neq \omega_\Delta, \quad \nu(\omega_\Delta, dy) := \delta_\Delta(dy), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where  $\omega_\Delta \in \Omega$  with  $X_t(\omega_\Delta) = \Delta$  for any  $t \geq 0$ .

Piecing out transformation raised by Ikeda et al. in [11] is, in some sense, the inverse of killing. As in [11], let  $W := \Omega \times S_\Delta$  with  $\mathcal{B}(W) := \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{B}(S_\Delta)$  and for any  $\mathbf{w} = (\omega, y) \in W$ , set

$$\dot{X}_t(\mathbf{w}) := \begin{cases} X_t(\omega), & t < \zeta(\omega), \\ y, & t \geq \zeta(\omega). \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

For each  $x \in S_\Delta$  put a probability measure  $\mathbf{Q}_x(d\mathbf{w}) := \mathbf{P}_x(d\omega)\nu(\omega, dy)$  on  $W$ . Further let  $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}})$  be the product of an infinite, countable copies of  $(W, \mathcal{B}(W))$ . Clearly, there exists

a unique probability measure  $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_x$  on  $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}})$  such that for any  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_x[d\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, d\mathbf{w}_n] = \mathbf{Q}_x[d\mathbf{w}_1] \mathbf{Q}_{y_1}[d\mathbf{w}_2] \cdots \mathbf{Q}_{y_{n-1}}[d\mathbf{w}_n], \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where  $\mathbf{w}_i = (\omega_i, y_i)$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Define a new trajectory for  $\tilde{\mathbf{w}} = (\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n, \dots) \in \tilde{\Omega}$  as follows:

$$\tilde{X}_t(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}) = \begin{cases} \dot{X}_t(\mathbf{w}_1), & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq \zeta(\omega_1), \\ \dots & \\ \dot{X}_{t - (\zeta(\omega_1) + \dots + \zeta(\omega_n))}(\mathbf{w}_{n+1}), & \text{if } \sum_{i=1}^n \zeta(\omega_i) < t \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \zeta(\omega_i), \\ \dots & \\ \Delta & \text{if } t \geq \tilde{\zeta}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}) := \sum_{i=1}^{N(\tilde{\mathbf{w}})} \zeta(\omega_i), \end{cases}$$

where  $N(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}) = \inf\{i : \zeta(\omega_i) = 0\}$  with  $\inf \emptyset := \infty$ . Intuitively speaking,  $\tilde{X}$  returns to the state space immediately according to the distribution  $\pi$  after its blow-up. After further defining the shift operators  $\tilde{\theta}_t$  and filtration  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t$  on  $\tilde{\Omega}$ , the principal result of [11] tells us

$$\tilde{X} = \left\{ \tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t, (\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_x)_{x \in S_\Delta}, \tilde{X}_t, \tilde{\theta}_t, \tilde{\zeta} \right\} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

is a right continuous strong Markov process on  $S_\Delta$  with  $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_\Delta[\tilde{X}_t = \Delta, \forall t \geq 0] = 1$ . The kernel  $\nu$  is called the *instantaneous distribution* of piecing out transform in [11] (But we take a special form of instantaneous distribution in (A.1)).

For convenience, we write

$$\tilde{X} = (X, \pi),$$

called the *piecing out* of  $X$  with respect to  $\pi$  and, in a little abuse of terminology, also call  $\pi$  the *instantaneous distribution* of  $\tilde{X}$ .

## APPENDIX B. ANALYTIC CONSTRUCTION OF BIRTH AND DEATH PROCESSES

Adopt the notations in §3. Let  $(p_{ij}(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a  $Q$ -process that is not the minimal one. In history there appeared a famous analytic treatment to reach all birth and death processes by solving their resolvents. It was put forward by Feller [8] and eventually completed by Yang in 1965 (see [24, Chapter 7]).

Recall that  $u_\alpha(i) = \mathbf{E}_i e^{-\alpha \eta}$  for  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  and denote by  $(R_\alpha^{\min})_{\alpha > 0}$  the resolvent of minimal  $Q$ -process. Set

$$\Phi_{ij}(\alpha) := R_\alpha^{\min}(i, \{j\}), \quad \alpha > 0, i, j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let  $\nu := (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_k, \dots)$  be a vector with  $\nu_k \geq 0$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\gamma, \beta \geq 0$  be two constants. Set  $|\nu| := \sum_{k \geq 1} \nu_k$ . When the triple  $(\nu, \gamma, \beta)$  satisfies

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} \nu_k \left( \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} (c_{j+1} - c_j) \sum_{i=0}^j \mu_i \right) < \infty, \quad |\nu| + \beta \neq 0, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

define for  $\alpha > 0$  and  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\Psi_{ij}(\alpha) := \Phi_{ij}(\alpha) + u_\alpha(i) \frac{\sum_{k \geq 0} \nu_k \Phi_{kj}(\alpha) + \beta \mu_j u_\alpha(j)}{\gamma + \sum_{k \geq 0} \nu_k (1 - u_\alpha(k)) + \beta \alpha \sum_{k \geq 0} \mu_k u_\alpha(k)}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$



Then  $(\Psi_{ij}(\alpha))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is called the  $(Q, \nu, \gamma, \beta)$ -resolvent matrix. Note that for a constant  $M > 0$ , the  $(Q, M\nu, M\gamma, M\beta)$ -resolvent matrix is identified with the  $(Q, \nu, \gamma, \beta)$ -resolvent matrix. Clearly, when  $|\nu| + \beta = 0$ , it reduces to the minimal resolvent matrix. The following theorem is referred to in [24, §7.6].

**Theorem B.1.** *The transition matrix  $(p_{ij}(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a  $Q$ -process but not the minimal one, if and only if there is a unique (up to a multiplicative positive constant) triple  $(\nu, \gamma, \beta) \geq 0$  with (B.1) such that the resolvent of  $(p_{ij}(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is*

$$R_\alpha(i, \{j\}) = \Psi_{ij}(\alpha), \quad \alpha > 0, i, j \in \mathbb{N},$$

where  $(\Psi_{ij}(\alpha))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is the  $(Q, \nu, \gamma, \beta)$ -resolvent matrix. Furthermore,

- (1) If  $\infty$  is exit, then  $\beta = 0$ .
- (2)  $(p_{ij}(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is honest, if and only if  $\gamma = 0$ .
- (3)  $(p_{ij}(t))_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is the  $(Q, \pi)$ -Doob process with  $\pi \neq \delta_\partial$ , if and only if  $0 < |\nu| < \infty, \beta = 0$  and

$$\pi(\{k\}) = \frac{\nu_k}{\gamma + \sum_{k \geq 0} \nu_k}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \pi(\{\partial\}) = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma + \sum_{k \geq 0} \nu_k}. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

**Remark B.2.** The first inequality in (B.1) amounts to  $\sum_{k,j \in \mathbb{N}} \nu_k \Phi_{kj}(\alpha) < \infty$  for any  $\alpha > 0$ ; see [24, §7.10].

## REFERENCES

- [1] G. Burkhardt and U. Küchler. The semimartingale decomposition of one-dimensional quasidiffusions with natural scale. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 25(2):237–244, 1987.
- [2] M.-F. Chen. *From Markov chains to non-equilibrium particle systems*. World Scientific, Mar. 2004.
- [3] Z.-Q. Chen and M. Fukushima. *Symmetric Markov processes, time change, and boundary theory*, volume 35 of *London Mathematical Society Monographs Series*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2012.
- [4] K. L. Chung. *Markov chains with stationary transition probabilities*. Second edition. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 104. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., New York, 1967.
- [5] K. L. Chung and J. B. Walsh. *Markov processes, Brownian motion, and time symmetry*, volume 249 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer, New York, New York, NY, second edition, 2005.
- [6] S. N. Ethier and T. G. Kurtz. *Markov Processes: Characterization and Convergence*. Wiley-Interscience, 2005.
- [7] W. Feller. On the integro-differential equations of purely discontinuous Markoff processes. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 48:488–515, 1940.
- [8] W. Feller. The birth and death processes as diffusion processes. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 38:301–345, 1959.
- [9] M. Fukushima, Y. Oshima, and M. Takeda. *Dirichlet forms and symmetric Markov processes*, volume 19 of *de Gruyter Studies in Mathematics*. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, extended edition, 2011.
- [10] R. K. Gettoor. *Markov processes: Ray processes and right processes*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 440. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1975.
- [11] N. Ikeda, M. Nagasawa, and S. Watanabe. A construction of Markov processes by piecing out. *Proc. Japan Acad.*, 42:370–375, 1966.
- [12] K. Itô. *Essentials of stochastic processes*, volume 231 of *Translations of Mathematical Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2006.
- [13] Y. Kasahara. Spectral theory of generalized second order differential operators and its applications to Markov processes. *Japan. J. Math. (N.S.)*, 1(1):67–84, 1975.
- [14] T. Kato. *Perturbation theory for linear operators*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995.
- [15] F. Knight. Note on regularization of Markov processes. *Illinois J. Math.*, 9(3):548–552, 1965.
- [16] F. B. Knight. Characterization of the Lévy measures of inverse local times of gap diffusion. In *Seminar on Stochastic Processes, 1981 (Evanston, Ill., 1981)*, pages 53–78. Birkhäuser, Boston, Mass., 1981.
- [17] S. Kotani and S. Watanabe. Krein’s spectral theory of strings and generalized diffusion processes. In *Functional analysis in Markov processes (Katata/Kyoto, 1981)*, pages 235–259. Springer, Berlin-New York, 1982.

- [18] U. Küchler. On sojourn times, excursions and spectral measures connected with quasidiffusions. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.*, 26(3):403–421, 1986.
- [19] L. Li. On diffusions with discontinuous scales. *arXiv: 2208.02719*, 2022.
- [20] P. Mandl. *Analytical treatment of one-dimensional Markov processes*. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 151. Academia Publishing House of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, Prague; Springer-Verlag New York Inc., New York, 1968.
- [21] D. Ray. Resolvents, transition functions, and strongly Markovian processes. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 70:43–72, 1959.
- [22] L. C. G. Rogers and D. Williams. *Diffusions, Markov processes, and martingales. I*. Cambridge Mathematical Library. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, Cambridge, 2 edition, 2000.
- [23] M. Sharpe. *General theory of Markov processes*, volume 133 of *Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Academic Press, Inc., Boston, MA, 1988.
- [24] Z. K. Wang and X. Q. Yang. *Birth and death processes and Markov chains*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin; Science Press Beijing, Beijing, 1992.
- [25] S. Watanabe. On time inversion of one-dimensional diffusion processes. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete*, 31(2):115–124, 1974.

FUDAN UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI, CHINA.

BIELEFELD UNIVERSITY, BIELEFELD, GERMANY.

*Email address:* liliping@fudan.edu.cn