



University of Warwick institutional repository: <http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap>

This paper is made available online in accordance with publisher policies. Please scroll down to view the document itself. Please refer to the repository record for this item and our policy information available from the repository home page for further information.

To see the final version of this paper please visit the publisher's website. Access to the published version may require a subscription.

Author(s): Saul D. Jacka, Zorana Lazic, and Jon Warren

Article Title: Conditioning an additive functional of a Markov chain to stay nonnegative. II. Hitting a high level

Year of publication: 2006

Link to published article:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1239/aap/1134587752>

Publisher statement: None

CONDITIONING AN ADDITIVE FUNCTIONAL OF A MARKOV CHAIN TO STAY NON-NEGATIVE II: HITTING A HIGH LEVEL ¹

Saul D. Jacka, University of Warwick
Zorana Lazic, University of Warwick
Jon Warren, University of Warwick

Abstract

Let $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a continuous-time irreducible Markov chain on a finite statespace E , let $v : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and let $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be defined by $\varphi_t = \int_0^t v(X_s) ds$. We consider the cases where the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is oscillating and where $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ has a negative drift. In each of the cases we condition the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on the event that $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ hits level y before hitting zero and prove weak convergence of the conditioned process as $y \rightarrow \infty$. In addition, we show the relation between conditioning the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ with a negative drift to oscillate and conditioning it to stay non-negative until large time, and the relation between conditioning $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ with a negative drift to drift to drift to $+\infty$ and conditioning it to hit large levels before hitting zero.

1 Introduction

Let $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a continuous-time irreducible Markov chain on a finite statespace E , let v be a map $v : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, let $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be an additive functional defined by $\varphi_t = \varphi + \int_0^t v(X_s) ds$ and let H_y , $y \in \mathbb{R}$, be the first hitting time of level y by the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$. In the previous paper Jacka, Najdanovic, Warren (2005) we discussed the problem of conditioning the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on the event that the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ stays non-negative, that is the event $\{H_0 = +\infty\}$. In the oscillating case and in the case of the negative drift of the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$, when the event $\{H_0 = +\infty\}$ is of zero probability, the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ can instead be conditioned on some approximation of the event $\{H_0 = +\infty\}$. In Jacka et al. (2005) we considered the approximation by the events $\{H_0 > T\}$, $T > 0$, and proved weak convergence as $T \rightarrow \infty$ of the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ conditioned on this approximation.

In this paper we look at another approximation of the event $\{H_0 = +\infty\}$ which is the approximation by the events $\{H_0 > H_y\}$, $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Again, we are interested in weak convergence as $y \rightarrow \infty$ of the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ conditioned on this approximation.

¹MSC Classification: Primary 60J27, Secondary 60B10

Keywords: Markov chain, conditional law, weak convergence

Our motivation comes from a work by Bertoin and Doney. In Bertoin, Doney (1994) the authors considered a real-valued random walk $\{S_n, n \geq 0\}$ that does not drift to $+\infty$ and conditioned it to stay non-negative. They discussed two interpretations of this conditioning, one was conditioning S to exceed level n before hitting zero, and another was conditioning S to stay non-negative up to time n . As it will be seen, results for our process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ conditioned on the event $\{H_0 = +\infty\}$ appear to be analogues of the results for a random walk.

Furthermore, similarly to the results obtained in Bertoin, Doney (1994) for a real-valued random walk $\{S_n, n \geq 0\}$ that does not drift to $+\infty$, we show that in the negative drift case

- (i) taking the limit as $y \rightarrow \infty$ of conditioning the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on $\{H_y < +\infty\}$ and then further conditioning on the event $\{H_0 = +\infty\}$ yields the same result as the limit as $y \rightarrow \infty$ of conditioning $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on the event $\{H_0 > H_y\}$;
- (ii) conditioning the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on the event that the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ oscillates and then further conditioning on $\{H_0 = +\infty\}$ yields the same result as the limit as $T \rightarrow \infty$ of conditioning the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on $\{H_0 > T\}$.

The organisation of the paper is as follows: in Section 2 we state the main theorems in the oscillating and in the negative drift case; in Section 3 we calculate the Green's function and the two-sided exit probabilities of the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ that are needed for the proofs in subsequent sections; in Section 4 we prove the main theorem in the oscillating case; in Section 5 we prove the main theorem in the negative drift case. Finally, Sections 6 and 7 deal with the negative drift case of the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and commuting diagrams in conditioning the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on $\{H_y < H_0\}$ and $\{H_0 > T\}$, respectively, listed in (i) and (ii) above.

All the notation in the present paper is taken from Jacka et al. (2005).

2 Main theorems

First we recall some notation from Jacka et al. (2005).

Let the process (X_t, φ_t) be as defined in Introduction. Suppose that both $E^+ = v^{-1}(0, \infty)$ and $E^- = v^{-1}(-\infty, 0)$ are non-empty. Let, for any $y \in \mathbb{R}$, E_y^+ and E_y^- be the halfspaces defined by $E_y^+ = (E \times (y, +\infty)) \cup (E^+ \times \{y\})$ and $E_y^- = (E \times (-\infty, y)) \cup (E^- \times \{y\})$. Let $H_y, y \in \mathbb{R}$, be the first crossing time of the level y by the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ defined by

$$H_y = \begin{cases} \inf\{t > 0 : \varphi_t < y\} & \text{if } (X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0} \text{ starts in } E_y^+ \\ \inf\{t > 0 : \varphi_t > y\} & \text{if } (X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0} \text{ starts in } E_y^- \end{cases}$$

Let $P_{(e, \varphi)}$ denote the law of the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ starting at (e, φ) and let $E_{(e, \varphi)}$ denote the expectation operator associated with $P_{(e, \varphi)}$. Let Q denote the conservative irreducible Q -matrix of the process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and let V be the diagonal matrix $diag(v(e))$.

Let $V^{-1}Q\Gamma = \Gamma G$ be the unique Wiener-Hopf factorisation of the matrix $V^{-1}Q$ (see Lemma 3.4 in Jacka et al. (2005)). Let J , J_1 and J_2 be the matrices

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & -I \end{pmatrix} \quad J_1 = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad J_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and let a matrix Γ_2 be given by $\Gamma_2 = J\Gamma J$. For fixed $y > 0$, let $P_{(e,\varphi)}^{[y]}$ denote the law of the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$, starting at $(e, \varphi) \in E_0^+$, conditioned on the event $\{H_y < H_0\}$, and let $P_{(e,\varphi)}^{[y]}|_{\mathcal{F}_t}$, $t \geq 0$, be the restriction of $P_{(e,\varphi)}^{[y]}$ to \mathcal{F}_t . We are interested in weak convergence of $(P_{(e,\varphi)}^{[y]}|_{\mathcal{F}_t})_{y \geq 0}$ as $y \rightarrow +\infty$.

Theorem 2.1 *Suppose that the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ oscillate. Then, for fixed $(e, \varphi) \in E_0^+$ and $t \geq 0$, the measures $(P_{(e,\varphi)}^{[y]}|_{\mathcal{F}_t})_{y \geq 0}$ converge weakly to the probability measure $P_{(e,\varphi)}^{h_r}|_{\mathcal{F}_t}$ as $y \rightarrow \infty$ which is defined by*

$$P_{(e,\varphi)}^{h_r}(A) = \frac{E_{(e,\varphi)}\left(I(A)h_r(X_t, \varphi_t)I\{t < H_0\}\right)}{h_r(e, \varphi)}, \quad t \geq 0, A \in \mathcal{F}_t,$$

where h_r is a positive harmonic function for the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ given by

$$h_r(e, y) = e^{-yV^{-1}Q}J_1\Gamma_2r(e), \quad (e, y) \in E \times \mathbb{R},$$

and $V^{-1}Qr = 1$.

By comparing Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.1 in Jacka et al. (2005) we see that the measures $(P_{(e,\varphi)}^{[y]})_{y \geq 0}$ and $(P_{(e,\varphi)}^T)_{T \geq 0}$ converge weakly to the same limit. Therefore, in the oscillating case conditioning $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on $\{H_y < H_0\}$, $y > 0$, and conditioning $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on $\{H_0 > T\}$, $T > 0$, yield the same result.

Let f_{max} be the eigenvector of the matrix $V^{-1}Q$ associated with its eigenvalue with the maximal non-positive real part. The weak limit as $y \rightarrow +\infty$ of the sequence $(P_{(e,\varphi)}^{[y]}|_{\mathcal{F}_t})_{y \geq 0}$ in the negative drift case is given in the following theorem:

Theorem 2.2 *Suppose that the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ drifts to $-\infty$. Then, for fixed $(e, \varphi) \in E_0^+$ and $t \geq 0$, the measures $(P_{(e,\varphi)}^{[y]}|_{\mathcal{F}_t})_{y \geq 0}$ converge weakly to the probability measure $P_{(e,\varphi)}^{h_{f_{max}}}|_{\mathcal{F}_t}$ as $y \rightarrow \infty$ which is given by*

$$P_{(e,\varphi)}^{h_{f_{max}}}(A) = \frac{E_{(e,\varphi)}\left(I(A)h_{f_{max}}(X_t, \varphi_t)I\{t < H_0\}\right)}{h_{f_{max}}(e, \varphi)}, \quad t \geq 0, A \in \mathcal{F}_t,$$

where the function $h_{f_{max}}$ is positive and harmonic for the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and is given by

$$h_{f_{max}}(e, y) = e^{-yV^{-1}Q}J_1\Gamma_2f_{max}(e), \quad (e, y) \in E \times \mathbb{R}.$$

Before we prove Theorems 2.1 and 2.2, we recall some more notation from Jacka et al. (2005) that will be in use in the sequel.

The matrices G^+ and G^- are the components of the matrix G and the matrices Π^+ and Π^- are the components of the matrix Γ determined by the Wiener-Hopf factorisation of the matrix $V^{-1}Q$, that is

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} G^+ & 0 \\ 0 & -G^- \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma = \begin{pmatrix} I & \Pi^- \\ \Pi^+ & I \end{pmatrix}.$$

In other words, the matrix G^+ is the Q -matrix of the process $(X_{H_y})_{y \geq 0}$, $(X_0, \varphi_0) \in E^+ \times \{0\}$, the matrix G^- is the Q -matrix of the process $(X_{H_{-y}})_{y \geq 0}$, $(X_0, \varphi_0) \in E^- \times \{0\}$, and the matrices Π^- and Π^+ determine the probability distribution of the process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ at the time when $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ hits zero, that is the probability distribution of X_{H_0} (see Lemma 3.4 in Jacka et al. (2005)).

A matrix $F(y)$, $y \in \mathbb{R}$, is defined by

$$F(y) = \begin{cases} J_1 e^{yG} = e^{yG} J_1, & y > 0 \\ J_2 e^{yG} = e^{yG} J_2, & y < 0. \end{cases}$$

For any vector g on E , let g^+ and g^- denote its restrictions to E^+ and E^- respectively. We write the column vector g as $g = \begin{pmatrix} g^+ \\ g^- \end{pmatrix}$ and the row vector μ as $\mu = (\mu^+ \quad \mu^-)$.

A vector g is associated with an eigenvalue λ of the matrix $V^{-1}Q$ if there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(V^{-1}Q - \lambda I)^k g = 0$.

\mathcal{B} is a basis in the space of all vectors on E such that there are exactly $n = |E^+|$ vectors $\{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n\}$ in \mathcal{B} such that each vector f_j , $j = 1, \dots, n$ is associated with an eigenvalue α_j of $V^{-1}Q$ for which $Re(\alpha_j) \leq 0$, and that there are exactly $m = |E^-|$ vectors $\{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_m\}$ in \mathcal{B} such that each vector g_k , $k = 1, \dots, m$, is associated with an eigenvalue β_k of $V^{-1}Q$ with $Re(\beta_k) \geq 0$. The vectors $\{f_1^+, f_2^+, \dots, f_n^+\}$ form a basis \mathcal{N}^+ in the space of all vectors on E^+ . and the vectors $\{g_1^-, g_2^-, \dots, g_m^-\}$ form a basis \mathcal{P}^- in the space of all vectors on E^- .

The matrix $V^{-1}Q$ cannot have strictly imaginary eigenvalues. All eigenvalues of $V^{-1}Q$ with negative (respectively positive) real part coincide with the eigenvalues of G^+ (respectively $-G^-$). G^+ and G^- are irreducible Q -matrices and

$$\alpha_{max} \equiv \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} Re(\alpha_j) \leq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad -\beta_{min} \equiv \max_{1 \leq k \leq m} Re(-\beta_k) = -\min_{1 \leq k \leq m} Re(\beta_k) \leq 0$$

are simple eigenvalues of G^+ and G^- , respectively. f_{max} and g_{min} are the eigenvectors of the matrix $V^{-1}Q$ associated with its eigenvalues α_{max} and β_{min} , respectively, and therefore f_{max}^+ and g_{min}^- are the Perron-Frobenius eigenvectors of the matrices G^+ and G^- , respectively.

If the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ drifts to $-\infty$, then $\alpha_{max} < 0$ and $\beta_{min} = 0$. If the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ drifts to $+\infty$, then $\alpha_{max} = 0$ and $\beta_{min} > 0$. If the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ oscillates then $\alpha_{max} = \beta_{min} = 0$ and there exists a vector r such that $V^{-1}Qr = 1$.

3 The Green's function and the hitting probabilities of the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$

The Green's function of the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$, denoted by $G((e, \varphi), (f, y))$, for any $(e, \varphi), (f, y) \in E \times \mathbb{R}$, is defined as

$$G((e, \varphi), (f, y)) = E_{(e, \varphi)} \left(\sum_{0 \leq s < \infty} I(X_s = f, \varphi_s = y) \right),$$

noting that the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ hits any fixed state at discrete times. For simplicity of notation, let $G(\varphi, y)$ denote the matrix $(G((\cdot, \varphi), (\cdot, y)))_{E \times E}$.

Theorem 3.1 *In the drift cases,*

$$G(0, 0) = \Gamma_2^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} (I - \Pi^- \Pi^+)^{-1} & \Pi^- (I - \Pi^+ \Pi^-)^{-1} \\ \Pi^+ (I - \Pi^- \Pi^+)^{-1} & (I - \Pi^+ \Pi^-)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

In the oscillating case, $G(0, 0) = +\infty$.

Proof: By the definition of $G(0, 0)$ and the matrices Π^+ , Π^- and Γ_2 ,

$$G(0, 0) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \Pi^- \\ \Pi^+ & 0 \end{pmatrix}^n = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (I - \Gamma_2)^n.$$

Suppose that the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ drifts either to $+\infty$ or $-\infty$. Then by (3.8) and Lemma 3.5 (iv) in Jacka et al. (2005) exactly one of the matrices Π^+ and Π^- is strictly substochastic. In addition, the matrix $\Pi^- \Pi^+$ is positive and thus primitive. Therefore, the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue λ of $\Pi^- \Pi^+$ satisfies $0 < \lambda < 1$ which, by the Perron-Frobenius theorem for primitive matrices (see Seneta (1981)), implies that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(\Pi^- \Pi^+)^n}{(1 + \lambda)^n} = \text{const.} \neq 0.$$

Therefore, $(\Pi^- \Pi^+)^n \rightarrow 0$ elementwise as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, and similarly $(\Pi^+ \Pi^-)^n \rightarrow 0$ elementwise as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. Hence, $(I - \Gamma_2)^n \rightarrow 0$, $n \rightarrow +\infty$. Since

$$I - (I - \Gamma_2)^{n+1} = \Gamma_2 \sum_{k=0}^n (I - \Gamma_2)^k,$$

and, by Lemma 3.5 (ii) in Jacka et al. (2005), Γ_2^{-1} exists, by letting $n \rightarrow +\infty$ we obtain

$$G(0, 0) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (I - \Gamma_2)^n = \Gamma_2^{-1}. \quad (3.1)$$

Suppose now that the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ oscillates. Then again by (3.8) and Lemma 3.5 (iv) in Jacka et al. (2005), the matrices Π^+ and Π^- are stochastic. Thus, $(I - \Gamma_2)1 = 1$ and

$$G(0, 0)1 = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (I - \Gamma_2)^n 1 = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 1 = +\infty. \quad (3.2)$$

Since the matrix Q is irreducible, it follows that $G(0, 0) = +\infty$. \square

Theorem 3.2 *In the drift cases, the Green's function $G((e, \varphi), (f, y))$ of the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is given by the $E \times E$ matrix $G(\varphi, y)$, where*

$$G(\varphi, y) = \begin{cases} \Gamma F(y - \varphi) \Gamma_2^{-1}, & \varphi \neq y \\ \Gamma_2^{-1}, & \varphi = y. \end{cases}$$

Proof: By Theorem 3.1, $G(y, y) = G(0, 0) = \Gamma_2^{-1}$, and by Lemma 3.5 (vii) in Jacka et al. (2005),

$$P_{(e, \varphi - y)}(X_{H_0} = e', H_0 < +\infty) = \Gamma F(y - \varphi)(e, e'), \quad \varphi \neq y.$$

The theorem now follows from

$$G((e, \varphi), (f, y)) = \sum_{e' \in E} P_{(e, \varphi - y)}(X_{H_0} = e', H_0 < +\infty) G((e', 0), (f, 0)).$$

\square

The Green's function $G_0((e, \varphi), (f, y))$, $(e, \varphi), (f, y) \in E \times \mathbb{R}$, of the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ killed when the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ crosses zero (in matrix notation $G_0(\varphi, y)$) is defined by

$$G_0((e, \varphi), (f, y)) = E_{(e, \varphi)} \left(\sum_{0 \leq s < H_0} I(X_s = f, \varphi_s = y) \right).$$

It follows that $G_0(\varphi, y) = 0$ if $\varphi y < 0$, that $G_0(\varphi, 0) = 0$ if $\varphi \neq 0$, and that $G_0(0, 0) = I$. To calculate $G_0(\varphi, y)$ for $|\varphi| \leq |y|$, $\varphi y \geq 0$, $y \neq 0$, we use the following lemma:

Lemma 3.1 *Let $(f, y) \in E^+ \times (0, +\infty)$ be fixed and let the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ start at $(e, \varphi) \in E \times (0, y)$. Let $(e, \varphi) \mapsto h((e, \varphi), (f, y))$ be a bounded function on $E \times (0, y)$ such that the process $(h((X_{t \wedge H_0 \wedge H_y}, \varphi_{t \wedge H_0 \wedge H_y}), (f, y)))_{t \geq 0}$ is a uniformly integrable martingale and that*

$$h((e, 0), (f, y)) = 0, \quad e \in E^- \quad (3.3)$$

$$h((e, y), (f, y)) = G_0((e, y), (f, y)). \quad (3.4)$$

Then

$$h((e, \varphi), (f, y)) = G_0((e, \varphi), (f, y)), \quad (e, \varphi) \in E \times (0, y).$$

Proof: The proof of the lemma is based on the fact that a uniformly integrable martingale in a region which is zero on the boundary of that region is zero everywhere. Therefore we omit the proof the lemma. \square

Let A_y, B_y, C_y and D_y be components of the matrix $e^{-yV^{-1}Q}$ such that, for any $y \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$e^{-yV^{-1}Q} = \begin{pmatrix} A_y & B_y \\ C_y & D_y \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.5)$$

Theorem 3.3 *The Green's function $G_0((e, \varphi), (f, y))$, $|\varphi| \leq |y|$, $\varphi y \geq 0$, $y \neq 0$, $e, f \in E$, is given by the $E \times E$ matrix $G_0(\varphi, y)$ with the components*

$$G_0(\varphi, y) = \begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} A_\varphi(A_y - \Pi^- C_y)^{-1} & A_\varphi(A_y - \Pi^- C_y)^{-1} \Pi^- \\ C_\varphi(A_y - \Pi^- C_y)^{-1} & C_\varphi(A_y - \Pi^- C_y)^{-1} \Pi^- \end{pmatrix}, & 0 \leq \varphi < y \\ \begin{pmatrix} B_\varphi(D_y - \Pi^+ B_y)^{-1} \Pi^+ & B_\varphi(D_y - \Pi^+ B_y)^{-1} \\ D_\varphi(D_y - \Pi^+ B_y)^{-1} \Pi^+ & D_\varphi(D_y - \Pi^+ B_y)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, & y < \varphi \leq 0, \\ \begin{pmatrix} (I - \Pi^- C_y A_y^{-1})^{-1} & \Pi^- (I - C_y A_y^{-1} \Pi^-)^{-1} \\ C_y A_y^{-1} (I - \Pi^- C_y A_y^{-1})^{-1} & (I - C_y A_y^{-1} \Pi^-)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, & \varphi = y > 0 \\ \begin{pmatrix} (I - B_y D_y^{-1} \Pi^+)^{-1} & B_y D_y^{-1} (I - \Pi^+ B_y D_y^{-1})^{-1} \\ \Pi^+ (I - B_y D_y^{-1} \Pi^+)^{-1} & (I - \Pi^+ B_y D_y^{-1})^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, & \varphi = y < 0, \end{cases}$$

In the drift cases, $G_0(\varphi, y)$ written in matrix notation is given by

$$G_0(\varphi, y) = \begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma e^{-\varphi G} \Gamma_2 & F(y) \Gamma_2^{-1} \\ \Gamma F(-\varphi) \Gamma_2 & e^{yG} \Gamma_2^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, & 0 \leq \varphi < y \quad \text{or} \quad y < \varphi \leq 0 \\ \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma F(-\varphi) \Gamma_2 & e^{yG} \Gamma_2^{-1} \\ (I - \Gamma F(-y) \Gamma F(y)) \Gamma_2^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, & 0 < y < \varphi \quad \text{or} \quad \varphi < y < 0 \\ \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma F(-\varphi) \Gamma_2 & e^{yG} \Gamma_2^{-1} \\ (I - \Gamma F(-y) \Gamma F(y)) \Gamma_2^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, & \varphi = y \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

In addition, the Green's function $G_0(\varphi, y)$ is positive for all $\varphi, y \in \mathbb{R}$ except for $y = 0$ and for $\varphi y < 0$.

Proof: We prove the theorem for $y > 0$. The case $y < 0$ can be proved in the same way.

Let $y > 0$. First we calculate the Green's function $G_0(y, y)$. Let Y_y denote a matrix on $E^- \times E^+$ with entries

$$Y_y(e, e') = P_{(e, y)}(X_{H_y} = e', H_y < H_0).$$

Then

$$G_0(y, y) = \begin{pmatrix} I & \Pi^- \\ Y_y & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\Pi^- Y_y)^n & 0 \\ 0 & \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (Y_y \Pi^-)^n \end{pmatrix}.$$

By Lemma 3.5 (vi) in Jacka et al. (2005), the matrix Y_y is positive and $0 < Y_y 1^+ < 1^-$. Hence, $\Pi^- Y_y$ is positive and therefore irreducible and its Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue λ satisfies $0 < \lambda < 1$. Thus,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(\Pi^- Y_y)^n}{(1 + \lambda)^n} = \text{const.} \neq 0,$$

which implies that $(\Pi^- Y_y)^n \rightarrow 0$ elementwise as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. Similarly, $(Y_y \Pi^-)^n \rightarrow 0$ elementwise as $n \rightarrow +\infty$.

Furthermore, the essentially non-negative matrices $(\Pi^- Y_y - I)$ and $(Y_y \Pi^- - I)$ are invertible because their Perron-Frobenius eigenvalues are negative and, by the same argument, the matrices $(I - \Pi^- Y_y)^{-1}$ and $(I - Y_y \Pi^-)^{-1}$ are positive. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^n (\Pi^- Y_y)^k &= (I - \Pi^- Y_y)^{-1} (I - (\Pi^- Y_y)^{n+1}) \\ \sum_{k=0}^n (Y_y \Pi^-)^k &= (I - Y_y \Pi^-)^{-1} (I - (Y_y \Pi^-)^{n+1}). \end{aligned}$$

by letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ we finally obtain

$$G_0(y, y) = \begin{pmatrix} (I - \Pi^- Y_y)^{-1} & \Pi^- (I - \Pi^- Y_y)^{-1} \\ Y_y (I - Y_y \Pi^-)^{-1} & (I - Y_y \Pi^-)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I & -\Pi^- \\ -Y_y^{-1} & I \end{pmatrix}^{-1}. \quad (3.6)$$

By Lemma 3.5 (i) and (vi) in Jacka et al. (2005), the matrices Π^- and Y_y are positive. Since the matrices $(I - \Pi^- Y_y)^{-1}$ and $(I - Y_y \Pi^-)^{-1}$ are also positive, it follows that $G_0(y, y)$, $y > 0$ is positive.

Now we calculate the Green's function $G_0(\varphi, y)$ for $0 \leq \varphi < y$. Let $(f, y) \in E^+ \times (0, +\infty)$ be fixed and let the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ start in $E \times (0, y)$. Let

$$h((e, \varphi), (f, y)) = e^{-\varphi V^{-1} Q} g_{f, y}(e), \quad (3.7)$$

for some vector $g_{f, y}$ on E . Since by (3.6) in Jacka et.al (2005) $\mathcal{G}h = 0$, the process $(h((X_t, \varphi_t), (f, y)))_{t \geq 0}$ is a local martingale, and because the function h is bounded on every finite interval, it is a martingale. In addition, $(h((X_{t \wedge H_0 \wedge H_y}, \varphi_{t \wedge H_0 \wedge H_y}), (f, y)))_{t \geq 0}$ is a bounded martingale and therefore a uniformly integrable martingale.

We want the function h to satisfy the boundary conditions in Lemma 3.1. Let $h_y(\varphi)$ be an $E \times E^+$ matrix with entries

$$h_y(\varphi)(e, f) = h((e, \varphi), (f, y)).$$

Then, from (3.7) and the boundary condition (3.3),

$$h_y(\varphi) = \begin{pmatrix} A_\varphi & B_\varphi \\ C_\varphi & D_\varphi \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} M_y \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A_\varphi M_y \\ C_\varphi M_y \end{pmatrix}, \quad 0 \leq \varphi < y,$$

for some $E^+ \times E^+$ matrix M_y . From the boundary condition (3.4),

$$A_y M_y = (I - \Pi^- Y_y)^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad C_y M_y = Y_y (I - \Pi^- Y_y)^{-1}, \quad (3.8)$$

which implies that $M_y = (A_y - \Pi^- C_y)^{-1}$ and $Y_y = C_y A_y^{-1}$. Hence,

$$h_y(\varphi) = \begin{pmatrix} A_\varphi (A_y - \Pi^- C_y)^{-1} \\ C_\varphi (A_y - \Pi^- C_y)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad 0 \leq \varphi < y,$$

and the function $h((e, \varphi), (f, y))$ satisfies the boundary conditions (3.3) and (3.4) in Lemma 3.1. Therefore, for $0 \leq \varphi < y$, $G_0(\varphi, y) = h_y(\varphi)$ on $E \times E^+$, and because $G_0(\varphi, y) = h_y(\varphi)\Pi^-$ on $E \times E^-$,

$$G_0(\varphi, y) = \begin{pmatrix} A_\varphi(A_y - \Pi^- C_y)^{-1} & A_\varphi(A_y - \Pi^- C_y)^{-1}\Pi^- \\ C_\varphi(A_y - \Pi^- C_y)^{-1} & C_\varphi(A_y - \Pi^- C_y)^{-1}\Pi^- \end{pmatrix}, \quad 0 \leq \varphi < y.$$

Finally, since $G_0(y, y)$, $y > 0$, is positive, by irreducibility $G_0(\varphi, y)$ for $0 \leq \varphi < y$ is also positive. \square

Lemma 3.2 For $y \neq 0$ and any $(e, f) \in E \times E$

$$\begin{aligned} P_{(e, \varphi)}(X_{H_y} = f, H_y < H_0) &= G_0(\varphi, y)(G_0(y, y))^{-1}(e, f), \quad 0 < |\varphi| < |y|, \\ P_{(e, y)}(X_{H_y} = f, H_y < H_0) &= \left(I - (G_0(y, y))^{-1}\right)(e, f). \end{aligned}$$

Proof: By Theorem 3.3, the matrix $G_0(y, y)$ is invertible. Therefore, the equalities

$$\begin{aligned} G_0((e, \varphi), (f, y)) &= \sum_{e' \in E} P_{(e, \varphi)}(X_{H_y} = e', H_y < H_0) G_0((e', y), (f, y)), \quad \varphi \neq y \neq 0, \\ G_0((e, y), (f, y)) &= I(e, f) + \sum_{e' \in E} P_{(e, y)}(X_{H_y} = e', H_y < H_0) G_0((e', y), (f, y)), \quad y \neq 0, \end{aligned}$$

prove the lemma. \square

4 The oscillating case: Proof of Theorem 2.1

Let $t \geq 0$ be fixed and let $A \in \mathcal{F}_t$. We start by looking at the limit of $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{[y]}(A)$ as $y \rightarrow +\infty$. For $(e, \varphi) \in E_0^+$ and $y > \varphi$, by Lemma 3.5 (vi) in Jacka et al. (2005), $P_{(e, \varphi)}(H_y < H_0) > 0$ for all $y > 0$. Hence, by the Markov property, for any $(e, \varphi) \in E_0^+$ and any $A \in \mathcal{F}_t$,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{(e, \varphi)}^{[y]}(A) &= P_{(e, \varphi)}(A \mid H_y < H_0) \\ &= \frac{1}{P_{(e, \varphi)}(H_y < H_0)} E_{(e, \varphi)} \left(I(A) (I\{t < H_0 \wedge H_y\} P_{(X_t, \varphi_t)}(H_y < H_0) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + I\{H_y \leq t < H_0\} + I\{H_y < H_0 \leq t\}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Lemma 4.1 Let r be a vector such that $V^{-1}Qr = 1$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} (i) \quad h_r(e, \varphi) &\equiv -e^{-\varphi V^{-1}Q} J_1 \Gamma_2 r(e) > 0, \quad (e, \varphi) \in E_0^+, \\ (ii) \quad \lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{P_{(e', \varphi')}(H_y < H_0)}{P_{(e, \varphi)}(H_y < H_0)} &= \frac{e^{-\varphi' V^{-1}Q} J_1 \Gamma_2 r(e')}{e^{-\varphi V^{-1}Q} J_1 \Gamma_2 r(e)}, \quad (e, \varphi), (e', \varphi') \in E_0^+. \end{aligned}$$

Proof: (i) For any $y \in \mathbb{R}$, let the matrices A_y and C_y be the components of the matrix $e^{-yV^{-1}Q}$ as given in (3.5), that is

$$e^{-yV^{-1}Q} = \begin{pmatrix} A_y & B_y \\ C_y & D_y \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, for any $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}$.

$$h_r(\cdot, \varphi) = -e^{-\varphi V^{-1}Q} J_1 \Gamma_2 r = - \begin{pmatrix} A_\varphi(r^+ - \Pi^- r^-) \\ C_\varphi(r^+ - \Pi^- r^-) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The outline of the proof is the following: first we show that the vector $A_\varphi(r^+ - \Pi^- r^-)$ has a constant sign by showing that it is a Perron-Frobenius vector of some positive matrix. Then, because $C_\varphi(r^+ - \Pi^- r^-) = C_\varphi A_\varphi^{-1} A_\varphi(r^+ - \Pi^- r^-)$ and because by Lemma 3.2, Theorem 3.3 and by Lemma 3.5 (vi) in Jacka et al. (2005) the matrix $C_\varphi A_\varphi^{-1}$ is positive, we conclude that the vector $C_\varphi(r^+ - \Pi^- r^-)$ has the same constant sign and that the function h_r has a constant sign. Finally, by Lemma 4.1 (ii) in Jacka et al. (2005), we conclude that h_r is always positive.

Therefore, all we have to prove is that the vector $A_\varphi(r^+ - \Pi^- r^-)$ has a constant sign for any $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}$. Let r be fixed vector such that $V^{-1}Qr = 1$. Then

$$e^{yV^{-1}Q}r = r + y1 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \begin{aligned} A_{-y}r^+ + B_{-y}r^- &= r^+ + y1^+ \\ C_{-y}r^+ + D_{-y}r^- &= r^- + y1^-. \end{aligned}$$

By (3.8), the matrix A_φ is invertible. Thus, because $1^+ = \Pi^- 1^-$, $(A_{-y} - \Pi^- C_{-y}) = (A_y - \Pi^- C_y)^{-1}$ and $(B_{-y} - \Pi^- D_{-y}) = -(A_{-y} - \Pi^- C_{-y})\Pi^-$,

$$\left(A_\varphi(A_y - \Pi^- C_y)^{-1} A_\varphi^{-1} \right) A_\varphi(r^+ - \Pi^- r^-) = A_\varphi(r^+ - \Pi^- r^-).$$

By Theorem 3.3 the matrix $A_\varphi(A_y - \Pi^- C_y)^{-1}$ is positive for any $\varphi \neq y$. By Lemma 3.2, Theorem 3.3 and by Lemma 3.5 (vi) in Jacka et al. (2005), the matrix A_φ^{-1} is also positive. Hence, the matrix $A_\varphi(A_y - \Pi^- C_y)^{-1} A_\varphi^{-1}$, $\varphi \neq y$, is positive and it has the Perron-Frobenius eigenvector which has a constant sign.

Suppose that $A_\varphi(r^+ - \Pi^- r^-) = 0$. Then, because A_φ is invertible, $(r^+ - \Pi^- r^-) = 0$. If $r^+ = \Pi^- r^-$ then r is a linear combination of the vectors g_k , $k = 1, \dots, m$ in the basis \mathcal{B} , but that is not possible because r is also in the basis \mathcal{B} and therefore independent from g_k , $k = 1, \dots, m$. Hence, the vector $A_\varphi(r^+ - \Pi^- r^-) \neq 0$ and by the last equation it is the eigenvector of the matrix $A_\varphi(A_{-y} - \Pi^- C_{-y})A_\varphi^{-1}$ which corresponds to its eigenvalue 1.

We want to show that 1 is the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of the matrix $A_\varphi(A_{-y} - \Pi^- C_{-y})A_\varphi^{-1}$. It follows from

$$\left(A_\varphi(A_y - \Pi^- C_y)^{-1} A_\varphi^{-1} \right) A_\varphi(I - \Pi^- \Pi^+) = A_\varphi(I - \Pi^- \Pi^+) e^{yG^+} \quad (4.10)$$

that if α is a non-zero eigenvalue of the matrix G^+ with some algebraic multiplicity, then $e^{\alpha y}$ is an eigenvalue of the matrix $A_\varphi(A_y - \Pi^- C_y)^{-1} A_\varphi^{-1}$ with the same algebraic multiplicity. Since all $n-1$ non-zero eigenvalues of G^+ have negative real parts, all eigenvalues $e^{\alpha_j y}$, $\alpha_j \neq 0$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, of $A_\varphi(A_y - \Pi^- C_y)^{-1} A_\varphi^{-1}$ have real parts strictly less than 1. Thus, 1 is the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of the matrix $A_\varphi(A_y - \Pi^- C_y)^{-1} A_\varphi^{-1}$ and the vector $A_\varphi(r^+ - \Pi^- r^-)$ is its Perron-Frobenius eigenvector, and therefore has a constant sign.

(ii) The statement follows directly from the equality

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{P_{(e', \varphi')}(H_y < H_0)}{P_{(e, \varphi)}(H_y < H_0)} = \lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{G_0(\varphi', y)1(e')}{G_0(\varphi, y)1(e)},$$

where $G_0(\varphi, y)$ is the Green's function for the killed process defined and determined in Section 3, and from the representation of $G_0(\varphi, y)$ given by

$$G_0(\varphi, y)1 = \sum_{j, \alpha_j \neq 0} a_j e^{-\varphi V^{-1} Q} J_1 \Gamma_2 e^{y V^{-1} Q} f_j + c e^{-\varphi V^{-1} Q} J_1 \Gamma_2 r,$$

for some constants a_j , $j = 1, \dots, n$ and $c \neq 0$, where vectors f_j , $j = 1, \dots, n$, form a part of the basis \mathcal{B} in the space of all vectors on E and are associated with the eigenvalues α_j , $j = 1, \dots, n$, of the matrix G^+ . Since $Re(\alpha_j) < 0$ for all $\alpha_j \neq 0$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, it can be shown that for every j , $j = 1, \dots, n$, such that $\alpha_j \neq 0$, $e^{y V^{-1} Q} f_j \rightarrow 0$ as $y \rightarrow +\infty$, which proves the statement. For the details of the proof see Najdanovic (2003). \square

Proof of Theorem 2.1: By Lemmas 4.1 (ii) and 4.3 in Jacka et al. (2005), the function $h_r(e, \varphi)$ is positive and harmonic for the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$. Therefore, the measure $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_r}$ is well-defined.

For fixed $(e, \varphi) \in E_0^+$, $t \in [0, +\infty)$ and any $y \geq 0$, let Z_y be a random variable defined on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P_{(e, \varphi)})$ by

$$Z_y = \frac{1}{P_{(e, \varphi)}(H_y < H_0)} \left(I\{t < H_0 \wedge H_y\} P_{(X_t, \varphi_t)}(H_y < H_0) + I\{H_y \leq t < H_0\} + I\{H_y < H_0 \leq t\} \right).$$

By Lemma 4.1 (ii) and by Lemmas 4.1 (ii), 4.2 (i) and 4.3 in Jacka et al. (2005) the random variables Z_y converge to $\frac{h_r(X_t, \varphi_t)}{h_r(e, \varphi)} I\{t < H_0\}$ in $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P_{(e, \varphi)})$ as $y \rightarrow +\infty$. Therefore, by (4.9), for fixed $t \geq 0$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}_t$,

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} P_{(e, \varphi)}^{[y]}(A) = \lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} E_{(e, \varphi)} \left(I(A) Z_y \right) = P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_r}(A),$$

which, by Lemma 4.2 (ii) in Jacka et al. (2005), implies that the measures $(P_{(e, \varphi)}^{[y]}|_{\mathcal{F}_t})_{y \geq 0}$ converge weakly to $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_r}|_{\mathcal{F}_t}$ as $y \rightarrow \infty$. \square

5 The negative drift case: Proof of Theorem 2.2

Again, as in the oscillating case, we start with the limit of $P_{(e,\varphi)}^{[y]}(A)$ as $y \rightarrow +\infty$ by looking at $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{P_{(e',\varphi')}(H_y < H_0)}{P_{(e,\varphi)}(H_y < H_0)}$. First we prove an auxiliary lemma.

Lemma 5.1 *For any vector g on E $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} F(y)g = 0$.*

In addition, for any non-negative vector g on E $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} e^{-\alpha_{max}y} F(y)g = c J_1 f_{max}$ for some positive constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof: Let

$$g = \begin{pmatrix} g^+ \\ g^- \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } g^+ = \sum_{j=1}^n a_j f_j^+,$$

for some coefficients a_j , $j = 1, \dots, n$, where vectors f_j^+ , $j = 1, \dots, n$, form the basis in the space of all vectors on E^+ and are associated with the eigenvalues α_j , $j = 1, \dots, n$, of the matrix G^+ . Then, the first equality in the lemma follows from

$$F(y)g = \begin{pmatrix} e^{yG^+} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} g^+ \\ g^- \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{yG^+} g^+ \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \sum_{j=1}^n a_j \begin{pmatrix} e^{yG^+} f_j^+ \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad y > 0, \quad (5.11)$$

since, for $Re(\alpha_j) < 0$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, $e^{yG^+} f_j^+ \rightarrow 0$ as $y \rightarrow +\infty$.

Moreover, by Lemma 3.5 (iii) in Jacka et al. (2005), the matrix G^+ is an irreducible Q -matrix with the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue α_{max} and Perron-Frobenius eigenvector f_{max}^+ . Thus, for any non-negative vector g on E^+ , by Lemma 3.6 (ii) in Jacka et al. (2005),

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} e^{-\alpha_{max}y} e^{yG^+} g(e) = c f_{max}^+(e), \quad (5.12)$$

for some positive constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, from (5.11) and (5.12)

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} e^{-\alpha_{max}y} F(y)g = \lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \begin{pmatrix} e^{-\alpha_{max}y} e^{yG^+} g^+ \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = c \begin{pmatrix} f_{max}^+ \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = c J_1 f_{max}.$$

□

Now we find the limit $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{P_{(e',\varphi')}(H_y < H_0)}{P_{(e,\varphi)}(H_y < H_0)}$.

Lemma 5.2

- (i) $h_{f_{max}}(e, \varphi) \equiv e^{-\varphi V^{-1}Q} J_1 \Gamma_2 f_{max}(e) > 0$, $(e, \varphi) \in E_0^+$,
- (ii) $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{P_{(e',\varphi')}(H_y < H_0)}{P_{(e,\varphi)}(H_y < H_0)} = \frac{e^{-\varphi' V^{-1}Q} J_1 \Gamma_2 f_{max}(e')}{e^{-\varphi V^{-1}Q} J_1 \Gamma_2 f_{max}(e)}$, $(e, \varphi), (e', \varphi') \in E_0^+$.

Proof: (i) The function $h_{f_{max}}$ can be rewritten as

$$h_{f_{max}}(\cdot, \varphi) = e^{-\varphi V^{-1}Q} J_1 \Gamma_2 f_{max} = \begin{pmatrix} A_\varphi(I - \Pi^- \Pi^+) f_{max}^+ \\ C_\varphi(I - \Pi^- \Pi^+) f_{max}^+ \end{pmatrix}$$

where A_φ and C_φ are given by (3.5).

First we show that the vector $A_\varphi(I - \Pi^- \Pi^+) f_{max}^+$ is positive. By (3.8) the matrix A_φ is invertible and, by (3.8) and Lemma 3.5 (ii) and (iv) in Jacka et al. (2005), the matrix $(I - \Pi^- \Pi^+)$ is invertible. Therefore,

$$A_\varphi(A_{-y} - \Pi^- C_{-y}) A_\varphi^{-1} = A_\varphi(I - \Pi^- \Pi^+) e^{yG^+} (I - \Pi^- \Pi^+)^{-1} A_\varphi^{-1}.$$

By Theorem 3.3 the matrix $A_\varphi(A_{-y} - \Pi^- C_{-y})^{-1}$, $\varphi \neq y$, is positive and by Lemma 3.2, Theorem 3.3 and by Lemma 3.5 (vi) in Jacka et al. (2005), the matrix A_φ^{-1} is also positive. Hence, the matrix $A_\varphi(A_{-y} - \Pi^- C_{-y}) A_\varphi^{-1}$, $\varphi \neq y$ is positive and is similar to e^{yG^+} . Thus, $A_\varphi(A_{-y} - \Pi^- C_{-y}) A_\varphi^{-1}$ and e^{yG^+} have the same Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue and because the Perron-Frobenius eigenvector of e^{yG^+} is f_{max}^+ , it follows that $A_\varphi(I - \Pi^- \Pi^+) f_{max}^+$ is the Perron-Frobenius eigenvector of $A_\varphi(A_{-y} - \Pi^- C_{-y}) A_\varphi^{-1}$ and therefore positive. In addition,

$$C_\varphi(I - \Pi^- \Pi^+) f_{max}^+ = C_\varphi A_\varphi^{-1} A_\varphi(I - \Pi^- \Pi^+) f_{max}^+,$$

and by Lemma 3.2, Theorem 3.3 and by Lemma 3.5 (vi) in Jacka et al. (2005), the matrix $C_\varphi A_\varphi^{-1}$ is positive. Therefore, the function $h_{f_{max}}$ is positive.

(ii) By Lemmas 3.2, 5.1 and Theorem 3.3,

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{P_{(e', \varphi')}(H_y < H_0)}{P_{(e, \varphi)}(H_y < H_0)} = \lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{e^{-\varphi' V^{-1}Q} \Gamma \Gamma_2 F(y) \mathbf{1}(e')}{e^{-\varphi V^{-1}Q} \Gamma \Gamma_2 F(y) \mathbf{1}(e)}.$$

Since the vector $\mathbf{1}$ is non-negative and because $\Gamma \Gamma_2 J_1 f_{max} = J_1 \Gamma_2 f_{max}$, the statement in the lemma follows from Lemma 5.1. \square

The function $h_{f_{max}}$ has the property that the process $\{h_{f_{max}}(X_t, \varphi_t) I\{t < H_0\}, t \geq 0\}$ is a martingale under $P_{(e, \varphi)}$. We prove this in the following lemma.

Lemma 5.3 *The function $h_{f_{max}}(e, \varphi)$ is harmonic for the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and the process $\{h_{f_{max}}(X_t, \varphi_t) I\{t < H_0\}, t \geq 0\}$ is a martingale under $P_{(e, \varphi)}$.*

Proof: The function $h_{f_{max}}(e, \varphi)$ is continuously differentiable in φ and therefore by (3.6) in Jacka et al. (2005) it is in the domain of the infinitesimal generator \mathcal{G} of the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and $\mathcal{G}h_{f_{max}} = 0$. Thus, the function $h_{f_{max}}(e, \varphi)$ is harmonic for the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and the process $(h_{f_{max}}(X_t, \varphi_t))_{t \geq 0}$ is a local martingale under $P_{(e, \varphi)}$. It follows that the process $(h_{f_{max}}(X_{t \wedge H_0}, \varphi_{t \wedge H_0}) = h_{f_{max}}(X_t, \varphi_t) I\{t < H_0\})_{t \geq 0}$ is also a local martingale under $P_{(e, \varphi)}$ and, because it is bounded on every finite interval, that it is a martingale. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.2: The proof is exactly the same as the proof of Theorem 2.1 with the function $h_{f_{max}}$ substituting for h_r (and we therefore appeal to Lemma 5.2 rather than Lemma 4.1 for the desired properties of $h_{f_{max}}$). \square

6 The negative drift case: conditioning $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ to drift to $+\infty$

The process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ can also be conditioned first on the event that $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ hits large levels y regardless of crossing zero (that is taking the limit as $y \rightarrow \infty$ of conditioning $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on $\{H_y < +\infty\}$), and then the resulting process can be conditioned on the event that $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ stays non-negative. In this section we show that these two conditionings performed in the stated order yield the same result as the limit as $y \rightarrow +\infty$ of conditioning $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on $\{H_y < H_0\}$.

Let $(e, \varphi) \in E_0^+$ and $y > \varphi$. Then, by Lemma 3.5 (vii) in Jacka et al. (2005), the event $\{H_y < +\infty\}$ is of positive probability and the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ can be conditioned on $\{H_y < +\infty\}$ in the standard way.

For fixed $t \geq 0$ and any $A \in \mathcal{F}_t$,

$$P_{(e, \varphi)}(A \mid H_y < +\infty) = \frac{E_{(e, \varphi)}\left(I(A)P_{(X_t, \varphi_t)}(H_y < +\infty)I\{t < H_y\} + I(A)I\{H_y < t\}\right)}{P_{(e, \varphi)}(H_y < +\infty)}. \quad (6.13)$$

Lemma 6.1 For any $(e, \varphi), (e', \varphi') \in E_0^+$,

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{P_{(e', \varphi')}(H_y < +\infty)}{P_{(e, \varphi)}(H_y < +\infty)} = \frac{e^{-\alpha_{max}\varphi'} f_{max}(e')}{e^{-\alpha_{max}\varphi} f_{max}(e)}.$$

Proof: By Lemma 3.7 in Jacka et al. (2005), for $0 \leq \varphi < y$,

$$P_{(e, \varphi)}(H_y < +\infty) = P_{(e, \varphi - y)}(H_0 < +\infty) = \Gamma F(y - \varphi)1.$$

The vector 1 is non-negative. Hence, by Lemma 5.1 and because $\Gamma J_1 f_{max} = f_{max}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{P_{(e', \varphi')}(H_y < +\infty)}{P_{(e, \varphi)}(H_y < +\infty)} &= \lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{e^{-\alpha_{max}\varphi'} \Gamma e^{-\alpha_{max}(y - \varphi')} F(y - \varphi)1(e')}{e^{-\alpha_{max}\varphi} \Gamma e^{-\alpha_{max}(y - \varphi)} F(y - \varphi)1(e)} \\ &= \frac{e^{-\alpha_{max}\varphi'} f_{max}(e')}{e^{-\alpha_{max}\varphi} f_{max}(e)}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Let $h_{max}(e, \varphi)$ be a function on $E \times \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$h_{max}(e, \varphi) = e^{-\alpha_{max}\varphi} f_{max}(e).$$

Lemma 6.2 The function $h_{max}(e, \varphi)$ is harmonic for the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and the process $(h_{max}(X_t, \varphi_t))_{t \geq 0}$ is a martingale under $P_{(e, \varphi)}$.

Proof: The function $h_{max}(e, \varphi)$ is continuously differentiable in φ and therefore by (3.6) in Jacka et al. (2005) it is in the domain of the infinitesimal generator \mathcal{G} of the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and $\mathcal{G}h_{max} = 0$. It follows that the function $h_{max}(e, \varphi)$ is harmonic for the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and that the process $(h_{max}(X_t, \varphi_t))_{t \geq 0}$ is a local martingale under $P_{(e, \varphi)}$. Since the function $h_{max}(e, \varphi)$ is bounded on every finite interval, the process $(h_{max}(X_t, \varphi_t))_{t \geq 0}$ is a martingale under $P_{(e, \varphi)}$. \square

By Lemmas 6.1 and 6.2 we prove

Theorem 6.1 For fixed $(e, \varphi) \in E_0^+$, let $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_{max}}$ be a measure defined by

$$P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_{max}}(A) = \frac{E_{(e, \varphi)}\left(I(A) h_{max}(X_t, \varphi_t)\right)}{h_{max}(e, \varphi)}, \quad t \geq 0, A \in \mathcal{F}_t.$$

Then, $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_{max}}$ is a probability measure and, for fixed $t \geq 0$,

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} P_{(e, \varphi)}(A \mid H_y < +\infty) = P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_{max}}(A), \quad A \in \mathcal{F}_t.$$

Proof: By the definition, the function h_{max} is positive. By Lemma 6.2, it is harmonic for the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and the process $(h_{max}(X_t, \varphi_t))_{t \geq 0}$ is a martingale under $P_{(e, \varphi)}$. Hence, $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_{max}}$ is a probability measure.

For fixed $(e, \varphi) \in E_0^+$ and $t \geq 0$ and any $y \geq 0$, let Z_y be a random variable defined on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P_{(e, \varphi)})$ by

$$Z_y = \frac{P_{(X_t, \varphi_t)}(H_y < +\infty)I\{t < H_y\} + I\{H_y < t\}}{P_{(e, \varphi)}(H_y < +\infty)}.$$

By Lemma 6.1 and by Lemmas 4.2 (i) and 4.3 in Jacka et al. (2005) the random variables Z_y converge to $\frac{h_{max}(X_t, \varphi_t)}{h_{max}(e, \varphi)}$ in $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P_{(e, \varphi)})$ as $y \rightarrow +\infty$. Therefore, by (6.13), for fixed $t \geq 0$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}_t$,

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} P_{(e, \varphi)}(A \mid H_y < +\infty) = \lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} E_{(e, \varphi)}\left(I(A) Z_y\right) = P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_{max}}(A).$$

\square

We now want to condition the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ under $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_{max}}$ on the event $\{H_0 = +\infty\}$. By Theorem 7.1, $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is Markov under $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_{max}}$ with the irreducible conservative Q -matrix $Q^{h_{max}}$ given by

$$Q^{h_{max}}(e, e') = \frac{f_{max}(e')}{f_{max}(e)}(Q - \alpha_{max}V)(e, e'), \quad e, e' \in E,$$

and, by the same theorem, the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ drifts to $+\infty$ under $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_{max}}$. We find the Wiener-Hopf factorization of the matrix $V^{-1}Q^{h_{max}}$.

Lemma 6.3 *The unique Wiener-Hopf factorization of the matrix $V^{-1}Q^{h_{max}}$ is given by $V^{-1}Q^{h_{max}} \Gamma^{h_{max}} = \Gamma^{h_{max}} G^{h_{max}}$, where, for any $(e, e') \in E \times E$,*

$$G^{h_{max}}(e, e') = \frac{f_{max}(e')}{f_{max}(e)} (G - \alpha_{max}I)(e, e') \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma^{h_{max}}(e, e') = \frac{f_{max}(e')}{f_{max}(e)} \Gamma(e, e').$$

In addition, if

$$G^{h_{max}} = \begin{pmatrix} G^{h_{max},+} & 0 \\ 0 & -G^{h_{max},-} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma^{h_{max}} = \begin{pmatrix} I & \Pi^{h_{max},-} \\ \Pi^{h_{max},+} & I \end{pmatrix},$$

then $G^{h_{max},+}$ is a conservative Q -matrix and $\Pi^{h_{max},+}$ is stochastic, and $G^{h_{max},-}$ is not a conservative Q -matrix and $\Pi^{h_{max},-}$ is strictly substochastic.

Proof: By the definition the matrices $G^{h_{max},+}$ and $G^{h_{max},-}$ are essentially non-negative. In addition, for any $e \in E^+$, $G^{h_{max},+}1(e) = 0$. Hence, $G^{h_{max},+}$ is a conservative Q -matrix. By Lemma 5.2 (i),

$$h_{f_{max}}^- = (\Pi^+ e^{-\varphi G^+} - e^{\varphi G^-} \Pi^+) f_{max}^+ = e^{-\alpha_{max}\varphi} (I - e^{\varphi(G^- + \alpha_{max}I)}) f_{max}^- > 0.$$

Since

$$\lim_{\varphi \rightarrow 0} \frac{(I - e^{\varphi(G^- + \alpha_{max}I)}) f_{max}^-}{\varphi} = -(G^- + \alpha_{max}I) f_{max}^-,$$

and $(I - e^{\varphi(G^- + \alpha_{max}I)}) f_{max}^- > 0$, it follows that $(G^- + \alpha_{max}I) f_{max}^- \leq 0$. Thus, $G^{h_{max},-}1^- \leq 0$ and so $G^{h_{max},-}$ is a Q -matrix. Moreover, if $(G^- + \alpha_{max}I) f_{max}^- = 0$ then $h_{f_{max}}(e, \varphi) = 0$ for $e \in E^-$ which is a contradiction to Lemma 5.2. Therefore, the matrix $G^{h_{max},-}$ is not conservative.

The matrices $G^{h_{max}}$ and $\Gamma^{h_{max}}$ satisfy the equality $V^{-1}Q^{h_{max}} \Gamma^{h_{max}} = \Gamma^{h_{max}} G^{h_{max}}$, which, by Lemma 3.4 in Jacka et al. (2005), gives the unique Wiener-Hopf factorization of the matrix $V^{-1}Q^{h_{max}}$. Furthermore, by Lemma 3.5 (iv) in Jacka et al. (2005), $\Pi^{h_{max},+}$ is a stochastic and $\Pi^{h_{max},-}$ is a strictly substochastic matrix. \square

Finally, we prove the main result in this section

Theorem 6.2 *Let $P_{(e,\varphi)}^{h_{f_{max}}}$ be as defined in Theorem 2.2. Then, for any $(e, \varphi) \in E_0^+$ and any $t \geq 0$,*

$$P_{(e,\varphi)}^{h_{max}}(A | H_0 = \infty) = P_{(e,\varphi)}^{h_{f_{max}}}(A), \quad A \in \mathcal{F}_t.$$

Proof: By Theorem 7.1 the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ under $P_{(e,\varphi)}^{h_{max}}$ drifts to $+\infty$. Since in the positive drift case the event $\{H_0 = +\infty\}$ is of positive probability, for any $t \geq 0$ and any $A \in \mathcal{F}_t$,

$$P_{(e,\varphi)}^{h_{max}}(A | H_0 = \infty) = \frac{E_{(e,\varphi)}^{h_{max}} \left(I(A) P_{(X_t, \varphi_t)}^{h_{max}}(H_0 = +\infty) I\{t < H_0\} \right)}{P_{(e,\varphi)}^{h_{max}}(H_0 = +\infty)}, \quad (6.14)$$

where $E_{(e,\varphi)}^{h_{max}}$ denotes the expectation operator associated with the measure $P_{(e,\varphi)}^{h_{max}}$.

By Lemma 3.7 in Jacka et al. (2005) and by Lemma 6.3, for $\varphi > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{(e,\varphi)}^{h_{max}}(H_0 = +\infty) &= 1 - \frac{e^{\alpha_{max}\varphi}}{f_{max}(e)} \sum_{e' \in E} \Gamma e^{-\varphi G}(e, e') J_2 1(e') f_{max}(e') \\ &= \frac{1}{h_{max}(e, \varphi)} \left(e^{-\alpha_{max}\varphi} f_{max} - \Gamma F(-\varphi) f_{max} \right)(e) \\ &= \frac{h_{f_{max}}(e, \varphi)}{h_{max}(e, \varphi)}, \end{aligned} \tag{6.15}$$

where $h_{f_{max}}$ is as defined in Lemma 5.2. Similarly, for $e \in E^+$,

$$P_{(e,0)}^{h_{max}}(H_0 = +\infty) = \frac{f_{max}^+ - \Pi^- f_{max}^-(e)}{f_{max}^+(e)} = \frac{h_{f_{max}}(e, 0)}{h_{max}(e, 0)}.$$

Therefore, the statement in the theorem follows from Theorem 6.1, (6.14) and (6.15). \square

We summarize the results from this section: in the negative drift case, making the h -transform of the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ by the function $h_{max}(e, \varphi) = e^{-\alpha_{max}\varphi} f_{max}(e)$ yields the probability measure $P_{(e,\varphi)}^{h_{max}}$ such that $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is Markov under $P_{(e,\varphi)}^{h_{max}}$ and that $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ has a positive drift under $P_{(e,\varphi)}^{h_{max}}$. The process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ under $P_{(e,\varphi)}^{h_{max}}$ is also the limiting process as $y \rightarrow +\infty$ in conditioning $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ under $P_{(e,\varphi)}$ on $\{H_y < +\infty\}$. Further conditioning $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ under $P_{(e,\varphi)}^{h_{max}}$ on $\{H_0 = +\infty\}$ yields the same result as the limit as $y \rightarrow +\infty$ of conditioning $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on $\{H_y < H_0\}$. In other words, the diagram in Figure 1 commutes.

7 The negative drift case: conditioning $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ to oscillate

In this section we condition the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ with a negative drift to oscillate, and then condition the resulting oscillating process to stay non-negative.

Let $P_{(e,\varphi)}^h$ denote the h -transform of the measure $P_{(e,\varphi)}$ by a positive superharmonic function h for the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$. We want to find a function h such that $P_{(e,\varphi)}^h$ is honest; the process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is Markov under $P_{(e,\varphi)}^h$ and the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ oscillates under $P_{(e,\varphi)}^h$. These desired properties of the function h necessarily imply that it has to be harmonic.

First we find a form of a positive and harmonic function for the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ such that the process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is Markov under $P_{(e,\varphi)}^h$.

Lemma 7.1 *Suppose that a function h is positive and harmonic for the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and that the process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is Markov under $P_{(e,\varphi)}^h$. Then h is of the form*

$$h(e, \varphi) = e^{-\lambda\varphi} g(e), \quad (e, \varphi) \in E \times \mathbb{R},$$




Figure 1: Conditioning of the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on the events $\{H_y < H_0\}$, $y \geq 0$, in the negative drift case.

for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and some vector g on E .

Proof: By the definition of $P_{(e, \varphi)}^h$, for any $(e, \varphi) \in E \times \mathbb{R}$ and $t \geq 0$,

$$P_{(e, \varphi)}^h(X_s = e, 0 \leq s \leq t) = \frac{h(e, \varphi + v(e)t)}{h(e, \varphi)} P_{(e, \varphi)}(X_s = e, 0 \leq s \leq t).$$

Since the process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is Markov under $P_{(e, \varphi)}^h$, the probability $P_{(e, \varphi)}^h(X_s = e, 0 \leq s \leq t)$ does not depend on φ . Thus, the right-hand side of the last equation does not depend on φ . Since $P_{(e, \varphi)}(X_s = e, 0 \leq s \leq t)$ also does not depend on φ because $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is Markov under $P_{(e, \varphi)}$, it follows that the ratio $\frac{h(e, \varphi + v(e)t)}{h(e, \varphi)}$ does not depend on φ . This implies that h satisfies

$$h(e, \varphi + y) = \frac{h(e, \varphi) h(e, y)}{h(e, 0)}, \quad e \in E, \varphi, y \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (7.16)$$

Let $e \in E$ be fixed. Since the function h is positive, we define a function $k_e(\varphi)$ by

$$k_e(\varphi) = \log \left(\frac{h(e, \varphi)}{h(e, 0)} \right), \quad \varphi \in (0, +\infty).$$

Then, by (7.16), the function k_e is additive. In addition, it is measurable because the function h is measurable as a harmonic function. Therefore, it is linear (see Aczel (1966)). It follows that the function h is exponential, that is

$$h(e, \varphi) = h(e, 0) e^{\lambda(e)\varphi}, \quad (e, \varphi) \in E_0^+$$

for some function $\lambda(e)$ on E .

Hence, the function h is continuously differentiable in φ which implies by (3.6) in Jacka et al. (2005) that the Q -matrix of the process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ under $P_{(e,\varphi)}^h$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Q^h(e, e') &= \frac{h(e', \varphi)}{h(e, \varphi)} Q + \frac{\frac{\partial h}{\partial \varphi}(e, \varphi)}{h(e, \varphi)} V(e, e') \\ &= \frac{h(e', 0)}{h(e, 0)} e^{(\lambda(e) - \lambda(e'))\varphi} Q + \lambda(e) V(e, e), \quad e, e' \in E. \end{aligned}$$

But, because $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is Markov under $P_{(e,\varphi)}^h$, Q^h does not depend on φ . This implies that $\lambda(e) = -\lambda = \text{const}$.

Finally, putting $g(e) = h(e, 0)$, $e \in E$, proves the theorem. \square

The following theorem characterizes all positive harmonic functions for the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ with the properties stated at the beginning of the section.

Theorem 7.1 *There exist exactly two positive harmonic functions h for the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ such that the measure $P_{(e,\varphi)}^h$ is honest and that the process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is Markov under $P_{(e,\varphi)}^h$. They are given by*

$$h_{\max}(e, \varphi) = e^{-\alpha_{\max}\varphi} f_{\max}(e) \quad \text{and} \quad h_{\min}(e, \varphi) = e^{-\beta_{\min}\varphi} g_{\min}(e).$$

Moreover,

- (i) if the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ drifts to $+\infty$ then $h_{\max} = 1$ and the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ under $P_{(e,\varphi)}^{h_{\min}}$ drifts to $-\infty$;
- (ii) if the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ drifts to $-\infty$ then $h_{\min} = 1$ and the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ under $P_{(e,\varphi)}^{h_{\max}}$ drifts to $+\infty$;
- (iii) if the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ oscillates then $h_{\max} = h_{\min} = 1$.

Proof: We give a sketch of the proof. For the details see Najdanovic (2003).

Let a function h be positive and harmonic for the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and let the process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be Markov under $P_{(e,\varphi)}^h$. Then by Lemma 7.1 the function h is of the form

$$h(e, \varphi) = e^{-\lambda\varphi} g(e), \quad (e, \varphi) \in E \times \mathbb{R},$$

for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and some vector g on E .

Since the function h is harmonic for the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ it satisfies the equation $\mathcal{G}h = 0$ where \mathcal{G} is the generator of the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ given by (3.6) in Jacka et al. (2005). Hence, $\mathcal{G}h = (Q + V \frac{d}{d\varphi})h = 0$ and $h(e, \varphi) = e^{-\lambda\varphi} g(e)$ imply that $V^{-1}Qg = \lambda g$, that is λ is an eigenvalue and g its associated eigenvector of the matrix $V^{-1}Q$. In addition, by Lemma 3.6 (i) in Jacka et al. (2005) the only positive eigenvectors of the matrix $V^{-1}Q$ are f_{\max} and g_{\min} . Hence, $h(e, \varphi) = e^{-\alpha_{\max}\varphi} f_{\max}(e)$ or $h(e, \varphi) = e^{-\beta_{\min}\varphi} g_{\min}(e)$.

The equality $\mathcal{G}h = 0$ implies that the process $(h(X_t, \varphi_t))_{t \geq 0}$ is a local martingale. Since the function $h(e, \varphi) = e^{-\lambda\varphi}g(e)$ is bounded on every finite interval, the process $(h(X_t, \varphi_t))_{t \geq 0}$ is a martingale. It follows that the measure $P_{(e, \varphi)}^h$ is honest.

Let Q^h be the Q -matrix of the process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ under $P_{(e, \varphi)}^h$. It can be shown that the eigenvalues of the matrix $V^{-1}Q^{h_{min}}$ coincide with the eigenvalues of the matrix $V^{-1}(Q - \beta_{min}I)$, and that the eigenvalues of the matrix $V^{-1}Q^{h_{max}}$ coincide with the eigenvalues of the matrix $V^{-1}(Q - \alpha_{max}I)$. These together with (3.8) in Jacka et al. (2005) prove statements (i)-(iii). \square

By Theorem 7.1 (ii) there does not exist a positive function h harmonic for the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ such that $P_{(e, \varphi)}^h$ is honest, that the process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is Markov under $P_{(e, \varphi)}^h$ and that the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ oscillates under $P_{(e, \varphi)}^h$ (we recall that initially the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ drifts to $-\infty$ under $P_{(e, \varphi)}$). However, we can look for a positive space-time harmonic function h for the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ that has the desired properties.

Lemma 7.2 *Suppose that a function h is positive and space-time harmonic for the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and that the process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is Markov under $P_{(e, \varphi)}^h$. Then h is of the form*

$$h(e, \varphi, t) = e^{-\alpha t} e^{-\beta \varphi} g(e), \quad (e, \varphi) \in E \times \mathbb{R},$$

for some $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and some vector g on E .

Proof: By the definition of $P_{(e, \varphi)}^h$, for any $(e, \varphi) \in E \times \mathbb{R}$ and $t \geq 0$, and any $s \geq 0$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$P_{(e, \varphi, t)}^h(X_{t+s} = e, \varphi_{t+s} \in \varphi + y) = \frac{h(e, \varphi + y, t + s)}{h(e, \varphi, t)} P_{(e, \varphi, t)}(X_{t+s} = e, \varphi_{t+s} \in \varphi + y). \quad (7.17)$$

Since the process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is Markov under $P_{(e, \varphi)}^h$, we have

$$P_{(e, \varphi, t)}^h(X_{t+s} = e, \varphi_{t+s} \in \varphi + y) = P_{(e, 0, 0)}^h(X_s = e, \varphi_s \in y).$$

And similarly

$$P_{(e, \varphi, t)}(X_{t+s} = e, \varphi_{t+s} \in \varphi + y) = P_{(e, 0, 0)}(X_s = e, \varphi_s \in y).$$

Therefore, it follows from (7.17) that the ratio $\frac{h(e, \varphi + y, t + s)}{h(e, \varphi, t)}$ does not depend on φ and t . This implies that h satisfies

$$h(e, \varphi + y, t + s) = \frac{h(e, \varphi, t) h(e, y, s)}{h(e, 0, 0)}, \quad e \in E, \varphi, y \in \mathbb{R}, t, s \geq 0. \quad (7.18)$$

Since the function h is positive, we define a function $k(e, \varphi, t)$ by

$$k(e, \varphi, t) = \log \left(\frac{h(e, \varphi, t)}{h(e, 0, 0)} \right), \quad (e, \varphi, t) \in E_0^+ \times [0, +\infty).$$

Then, by (7.18),

$$k(e, \varphi + y, t + s) = k(e, \varphi, t) + k(e, y, s), \quad e \in E, \varphi, y \in \mathbb{R}, t, s \geq 0.$$

Let $t = s = 0$. Then

$$k(e, \varphi + y, 0) = k(e, \varphi, 0) + k(e, y, 0), \quad e \in E, \varphi, y \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Hence, $k(e, \varphi, 0)$ is additive in φ and is measurable because the function h is measurable as a harmonic function. It follows (see Aczel (1966)) that $k(e, \varphi, 0)$ is linear in φ , that is

$$k(e, \varphi, 0) = \beta(e) \varphi$$

for some function β on E . Similarly, for $\varphi = y = 0$, we have

$$k(e, 0, t + s) = k(e, 0, t) + k(e, 0, s),$$

which implies that

$$k(e, 0, t) = \alpha(e) t$$

for some function α on E . Putting the pieces together, we obtain

$$k(e, \varphi, t) = \alpha(e) t + \beta(e) \varphi, \quad (e, \varphi, t) \in E_0^+ \times [0, +\infty).$$

Then it follows from the definition of the function $k(e, \varphi, t)$ that

$$h(e, \varphi, t) = h(e, 0, 0) e^{\alpha(e)t} e^{\beta(e)\varphi}, \quad (e, \varphi, t) \in E_0^+ \times [0, +\infty)$$

for some functions α and β on E .

Hence, the function h is continuously differentiable in φ and t which implies by (3.7) in Jacka et al. (2005) that the Q -matrix of the process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ under $P_{(e, \varphi)}^h$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Q^h(e, e') &= \frac{h(e', \varphi, t)}{h(e, \varphi, t)} Q + \frac{\frac{\partial h}{\partial \varphi}(e, \varphi, t)}{h(e, \varphi, t)} V(e, e') + \frac{\frac{\partial h}{\partial t}(e, \varphi, t)}{h(e, \varphi, t)} I(e, e') \\ &= \frac{h(e', 0, 0)}{h(e, 0, 0)} e^{(\alpha(e') - \alpha(e))t} e^{(\beta(e') - \beta(e))\varphi} Q + \beta(e) V(e, e) \\ &\quad + \alpha(e) I(e, e), \quad e, e' \in E. \end{aligned}$$

But, because $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is Markov under $P_{(e, \varphi)}^h$, Q^h does not depend on φ and t . This implies that $\alpha(e) = -\alpha = \text{const.}$ and $\beta(e) = -\beta = \text{const.}$

Finally, putting $g(e) = h(e, 0, 0)$, $e \in E$, proves the theorem. \square

Theorem 7.2 *All positive space-time harmonic functions h for the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ continuously differentiable in φ and t such that $P_{(e, \varphi)}^h$ is honest and that $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is Markov under $P_{(e, \varphi)}^h$ are of the form*

$$h(e, \varphi, t) = e^{-\alpha t} e^{-\beta \varphi} g(e), \quad (e, \varphi, t) \in E \times \mathbb{R} \times [0, +\infty),$$

where, for fixed $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, α is the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue and g is the right Perron-Frobenius eigenvector of the matrix $(Q - \beta V)$.

Moreover, there exists unique $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} (\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0} \text{ under } P_{(e, \varphi)}^h \text{ drifts to } +\infty & \quad \text{iff} \quad \beta < \beta_0 \\ (\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0} \text{ under } P_{(e, \varphi)}^h \text{ oscillates} & \quad \text{iff} \quad \beta = \beta_0 \\ (\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0} \text{ under } P_{(e, \varphi)}^h \text{ drifts to } -\infty & \quad \text{iff} \quad \beta > \beta_0, \end{aligned}$$

and β_0 is determined by the equation $\alpha'(\beta_0) = 0$, where $\alpha(\beta)$ is the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of $(Q - \beta V)$.

Proof: We again give a sketch of the proof. For the details see Najdanovic (2003).

Let a function h be positive and space-time harmonic for the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and let the process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be Markov under $P_{(e, \varphi)}^h$. Then by Lemma 7.2 the function h is of the form

$$h(e, \varphi, t) = e^{-\alpha t} e^{-\beta \varphi} g(e), \quad (e, \varphi, t) \in E \times \mathbb{R} \times [0, +\infty),$$

for some $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and some vector g on E .

Since the function h is harmonic for the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ it satisfies the equation $\mathcal{A}h = 0$ where \mathcal{A} is the generator of the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ given by (3.7) in Jacka et al. (2005). Hence, $\mathcal{A}h = (Q + V \frac{d}{d\varphi} + \frac{d}{dt})h = 0$ and $h(e, \varphi, t) = e^{-\alpha t} e^{-\beta \varphi} g(e)$ imply that $(Q - \beta V)g = \alpha g$, that is α is an eigenvalue and g its associated eigenvector of the matrix $(Q - \beta V)$. In addition, By Lemma 3.1 in Jacka et al. (2005) the matrix $(Q - \beta V)$ is irreducible and essentially non-negative. By the Perron-Frobenius theorem the only positive eigenvector of an irreducible and essentially non-negative matrix is its Perron-Frobenius eigenvector. Thus, α and g are Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue and eigenvector, respectively, of the matrix $(Q - \beta V)$.

The equation $\mathcal{A}h = 0$ implies that the process $h(X_t, \varphi_t, t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a local martingale. Since the function $h(e, \varphi, t) = e^{-\alpha t} e^{-\beta \varphi} g(e)$ is bounded on every finite interval, the process $h(X_t, \varphi_t, t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a martingale. It follows that the measure $P_{(e, \varphi)}^h$ is honest.

Let, for fix $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, $h(e, \varphi, t) = e^{-\alpha(\beta)t} e^{-\beta \varphi} g(\beta)(e)$, where $\alpha(\beta)$ and $g(\beta)$ are Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue and right eigenvector, respectively, of the matrix $(Q - \beta V)$. Let μ_β denote the invariant measure of the process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ under $P_{(e, \varphi)}^h$, and let $g^{left}(\beta)$ denote the left eigenvector of the matrix $(Q - \beta V)$. Then it can be shown that $\mu_\beta V 1 = g^{left}(\beta) V g(\beta)$. Since $g^{left}(\beta)(e)g(\beta)(e) > 0$ for every $e \in E$, Lemma 3.9 and (3.8) in Jacka et al. (2005) imply the statement in the second part of the theorem. \square

By Theorem 7.2, there exists exactly one positive space-time harmonic function h for the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ with the desired properties and it is given by

$$h_0(e, \varphi, t) = e^{-\alpha_0 t} e^{-\beta_0 \varphi} g_0(e), \quad (e, \varphi, t) \in E \times \mathbb{R} \times [0, +\infty).$$

For fixed $(e, \varphi) \in E_0^+$, let a measure $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0}$ be defined by

$$P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0}(A) = \frac{E_{(e, \varphi)}\left(I(A) h_0(X_t, \varphi_t, t)\right)}{h_0(e, \varphi, 0)}, \quad A \in \mathcal{F}_t, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (7.19)$$

and let $E_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0}$ denote the expectation operator associated with the measure $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0}$. Then, the process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ under $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0}$ is Markov with the Q -matrix Q^0 given by

$$Q^0(e, e') = \frac{g_0(e')}{g_0(e)}(Q - \alpha_0 I - \beta_0 V)(e, e'), \quad e, e' \in E. \quad (7.20)$$

and, by Theorem 7.2, the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ under $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0}$ oscillates.

The aim now is to condition $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ under $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0}$ on the event that $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ stays non-negative. The following theorem determines the law of this new conditioned process.

Theorem 7.3 For fixed $(e, \varphi) \in E_0^+$, let a measure $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0, h_r^0}$ be defined by

$$P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0, h_r^0}(A) = \frac{E_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0}\left(I(A) h_r^0(X_t, \varphi_t) I\{t < H_0\}\right)}{h_r^0(e, \varphi)}, \quad A \in \mathcal{F}_t, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where the function h_r^0 is given by $h_r^0(e, y) = e^{-yV^{-1}Q^0} J_1 \Gamma_2 r^0(e)$, $(e, y) \in E \times \mathbb{R}$, and $V^{-1}Q^0 r^0 = 1$. Then, $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0, h_r^0}$ is a probability measure.

In addition, for $t \geq 0$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}_t$,

$$P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0, h_r^0}(A) = \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0}(A \mid H_y < H_0) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0}(A \mid H_0 > T),$$

and

$$P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0, h_r^0}(A) = P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_r^0}(A),$$

where $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_r^0}$ is as defined in Theorem 2.2 in Jacka et al. (2005).

Proof: By definition (7.19) of the measure $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0}$, for $t \geq 0$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}_t$,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0, h_r^0}(A) &= \frac{E_{(e, \varphi)}\left(I(A) h_0(X_t, \varphi_t, t) h_r^0(X_t, \varphi_t) I\{t < H_0\}\right)}{h_0(e, \varphi, 0) h_r^0(e, \varphi)} \\ &= \frac{E_{(e, \varphi)}\left(I(A) h_{r^0}(X_t, \varphi_t, t) I\{t < H_0\}\right)}{h_{r^0}(e, \varphi, t)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $h_{r,0}(e, \varphi, t) = h_0(e, \varphi, t) h_r^0(e, \varphi) = e^{-\alpha_0 t} e^{-\beta_0 \varphi} G_0 e^{-\varphi V^{-1} Q^0} J_1 \Gamma_2^0 r^0(e)$ is as defined in Theorem 2.2 in Jacka et al. (2005). By Lemma 5.1 (i) in Jacka et al. (2005), the function $h_{r,0}(e, \varphi, t)$ is positive and by Lemma 5.5 in Jacka et al. (2005), the function $h_{r,0}(e, \varphi, t)$ is space-time harmonic for the process $(X_t, \varphi_t, t)_{t \geq 0}$. Thus, $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0, h_r^0}$ is a probability measure, and by the definition of the measure $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_r, 0}$ in Theorem 2.2 in Jacka et al. (2005),

$$P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0, h_r^0}(A) = P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_r, 0}(A), \quad A \in \mathcal{F}_t, \quad t \geq 0.$$

In addition, by (3.8) and Lemma 3.11 in Jacka et al. (2005), the Q -matrix Q^0 of the process $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ under $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0}$ is conservative and irreducible and the process $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ under $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0}$ oscillates. Thus, by Theorem 2.1 and by Theorem 2.1 in Jacka et al. (2005), $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0, h_r^0}$ denotes the law of $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ under $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0}$ conditioned on $\{H_0 = +\infty\}$, and for any $t \geq 0$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}_t$,

$$P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0, h_r^0}(A) = \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0}(A | H_y < H_0) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0}(A | H_0 > T).$$

□

We summarize the results in this section: in the negative drift case, making the h -transform of the process $(X_t, \varphi_t, t)_{t \geq 0}$ with the function $h_0(e, \varphi) = e^{-\alpha_0 \varphi} e^{-\beta_0 \varphi} g_0(e)$ yields the probability measure $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0}$ such that $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ under $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0}$ is Markov and that $(\varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ under $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0}$ oscillates. Then the law of $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ under $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0}$ conditioned on the event $\{H_0 = +\infty\}$ is equal to $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0, h_r^0} = P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_r, 0}$. On the other hand, by Theorem 2.2 in Jacka et al. (2005), under the condition that all non-zero eigenvalues of the matrix $V^{-1} Q^0$ are simple, $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_r, 0}$ is the limiting law as $T \rightarrow +\infty$ of the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ under $P_{(e, \varphi)}^{h_0}$ conditioned on $\{H_0 > T\}$. Hence, under the condition that all non-zero eigenvalues of the matrix $V^{-1} Q^0$ are simple, the diagram in Figure 2 commutes.

References

- [1] Aczel, J. (1966) *Lectures on functional equations and their applications*. Academic Press, New York.
- [2] Bertoin, J. and Doney, R. A. (1994). On conditioning a random walk to stay non-negative. *Ann. Prob.* Vol. 22, No. 4, 2152-2167.
- [3] Jacka, S. D., Lazic, Z., Warren, J. (2005). Conditioning an additive functional of a Markov chain to stay non-negative I: survival for a long time. Submitted to *J. Appl. Prob.*




Figure 2: Conditioning of the process $(X_t, \varphi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ on the events $\{H_0 > T\}, T \geq 0$, in the negative drift case.

- [4] Najdanovic, Z. (2003). Conditioning a Markov chain upon the behaviour of an additive functional. PhD thesis, University of Warwick.
- [5] Seneta, E. (1981). *Non-negative Matrices and Markov Chains*. New York Heidelberg Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

Authors:

Saul D. Jacka, Department of Statistics, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, S.D.Jacka@warwick.ac.uk

Zorana Lazić, Department of Mathematics, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, Z.Lazic@warwick.ac.uk

Jon Warren, Department of Statistics, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, J.Warren@warwick.ac.uk