# **Applied Stochastic Processes**

## Solution Sheet 1

### Solution 1.1

(a) We assumed that the moment generating function of X exists and is finite on an open neighbourhood I of 0. This implies that X is finite outside of a  $\mathbb{P}$ -null set.

Let  $t \in I$ . Then, there exists a positive  $\epsilon$  such that the open ball with center t and radius  $3\epsilon$  and the open ball with center 0 and radius  $2\epsilon$  are contained in I.

We first want to prove that  $(t, \omega) \mapsto X(\omega) e^{tX(\omega)}$  is integrable on  $[t - \epsilon, t + \epsilon] \times \Omega$ . By Fubini-Tonelli's theorem, it suffices to show that the successive integrations yield a finite value.

We prove that for  $t \in I$ ,  $Xe^{tX}$  is integrable, and without loss of generality, we assume that  $t \ge 0$  (the case where  $t \le 0$  is treated similarly). We have,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| X e^{tX} \right| &\leq \left( X^+ + X^- \right) e^{tX^+} \\ &\leq X^+ e^{tX^+} + X^- \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} e^{(t+\epsilon)X^+} + \frac{1}{\epsilon} e^{\epsilon X^-} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} e^{(t+\epsilon)X} + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \mathbf{1} \left( X \leqslant 0 \right) + \frac{1}{\epsilon} e^{-\epsilon X} + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \mathbf{1} \left( X \geqslant 0 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we define  $X^+ = \max\{X, 0\}$  and  $X^- = \max\{-X, 0\}$  so that  $X = X^+ - X^-$ . We used that for  $x \ge 0$ , we have  $x \le e^x$ . This shows that  $|Xe^{tX}|$  is integrable on  $\Omega$  for every t in I.

We now prove that  $t \mapsto \mathbb{E}\left[|Xe^{tX}|\right]$  is continuous on  $[t - \epsilon, t + \epsilon]$ . For that, we use the dominated convergence theorem. Without loss of generality, let us assume that t is strictly positive. Let  $0 < \delta \leq \epsilon' \leq \epsilon$  such that  $t - \epsilon' > 0$ . We have

$$\left|X\mathrm{e}^{(t+\delta)X}\right|\leqslant\frac{1}{\epsilon'}\mathrm{e}^{(t+2\epsilon')X}+\frac{1}{\epsilon'}\mathbf{1}\left(X\leqslant0\right)+\frac{1}{\epsilon'}\mathrm{e}^{-\epsilon'X}+\frac{1}{\epsilon'}\mathbf{1}\left(X\geqslant0\right)$$

which is integrable with respect to  $\mathbb{P}$  on  $\Omega$  and does not depend on  $\delta$ . Furthermore, it holds that,

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \left| X e^{(t+\delta)X} \right| = \left| X e^{tX} \right|, \ \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

The dominated convergence theorem then gives the continuity of the function  $t \mapsto \mathbb{E}\left[|Xe^{tX}|\right]$ . This function is therefore integrable on  $[t - \epsilon, t + \epsilon]$ . This gives that  $(t, \omega) \mapsto X(\omega)e^{tX(\omega)}$  is integrable on  $[t - \epsilon, t + \epsilon] \times \Omega$ .

We can now apply Fubini's theorem to the function  $s \mapsto \int_{t-\epsilon}^{s} \mathbb{E}\left[X e^{uX}\right] du$ . We get

$$\int_{t-\epsilon}^{s} \mathbb{E}\left[X e^{uX}\right] du = \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{t-\epsilon}^{s} X e^{uX} du\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[e^{sX}\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[e^{(t-\epsilon)X}\right], \ \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

By a similar argument as the one above, one can easily prove that  $t \mapsto \mathbb{E}\left[Xe^{tX}\right]$  is continuous on  $[t - \epsilon, t + \epsilon]$ . Therefore, the derivative with respect to s of the left-hand side is the term inside the integral. This yields the result: we have proved that f is differentiable on I, with derivative  $f'(t) = \mathbb{E}\left[Xe^{tX}\right]$ .

This argument can be reproduced to prove that f is n times differentiable for all integers n, with n-th derivative  $f^{(n)}(t) = \mathbb{E}\left[X^n e^{tX}\right]$ .

The derivative of F at 0 is then

$$F'(0) = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \left( \log \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathrm{e}^{tX} \right] \right) \right) \Big|_{t=0}$$
$$= \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ X \mathrm{e}^{tX} \right]}{\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathrm{e}^{tX} \right]} \Big|_{t=0}$$
$$= \mathbb{E} \left[ X \right].$$

Differentiating a second time with respect to t yields

$$F''(0) = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} \left( \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[X\mathrm{e}^{tX}\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{e}^{tX}\right]} \right) \Big|_{t=0}$$
$$= \left( \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[X^{2}\mathrm{e}^{tX}\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{e}^{tX}\right]} - \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[X\mathrm{e}^{tX}\right]^{2}}{\mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{e}^{tX}\right]^{2}} \right) \Big|_{t=0}$$
$$= \mathbb{E}\left[X^{2}\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[X\right]^{2}$$
$$= \operatorname{Var}(X).$$

(b) For a Poisson random variable with parameter  $\lambda$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{tX}\right] = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{tn} \mathbb{P}\left[X=n\right]$$
$$= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{tn} \frac{\lambda^n}{n!} e^{-\lambda}$$
$$= e^{-\lambda} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\left(e^t\lambda\right)^n}{n!}$$
$$= e^{\lambda \left(e^{t-1}\right)},$$

and so  $F(t) = \lambda (e^t - 1)$  for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . Differentiating once gives  $F'(t) = \lambda e^t$  for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , and then for all  $n \ge 2$  we have  $F^{(n)}(t) = \lambda e^t$ . Therefore for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $c_n = \lambda$ .

### Solution 1.2

The density of the Gamma $(k, \lambda)$  distribution is  $f_{\Gamma(k,\lambda)}(t) = \lambda^k \frac{t^{k-1}}{(k-1)!} e^{-\lambda t}$  for t > 0. We prove by induction that this is the density of  $S_k$  for all natural integers.

Basis: First,  $S_1 = T_1$  is exponentially distributed with parameter  $\lambda$  with density  $g(t) = \lambda e^{-\lambda t}$ , so  $S_1$  has a Gamma $(1, \lambda)$  distribution.

Induction step: Assume  $S_k$  is Gamma $(k, \lambda)$ -distributed and calculate the density for  $S_{k+1}$  (using independence of  $T_{k+1}$  and  $S_k$ , and convolution):

$$g^{*(k+1)}(t) = g * g^{*k}(t) = \int_0^t \lambda e^{-\lambda(t-s)} \lambda^k \frac{s^{k-1}}{(k-1)!} e^{-\lambda s} ds$$
$$= \lambda^{k+1} e^{-\lambda t} \int_0^t \frac{s^{k-1}}{(k-1)!} ds = \lambda^{k+1} \frac{t^k}{k!} e^{-\lambda t}$$

Hence  $S_{k+1}$  is  $\operatorname{Gamma}(k+1,\lambda)$ -distributed and the induction is complete.

Remarks:

• Gamma( $\nu, \lambda$ ) distribution is defined for general parameters  $\nu, \lambda > 0$  and has density

$$\lambda^{\nu} \frac{t^{\nu-1}}{\Gamma(\nu)} \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda t}, \quad t > 0,$$

where  $\Gamma(\nu) = \int_0^\infty t^{\nu-1} e^{-t} dt$  is the gamma function.

- For  $\nu = k \in \mathbb{N}$  this is also called the Erlang-k distribution.
- We can calculate the characteristic function of the  $\text{Gamma}(k, \lambda)$  distribution via the characteristic function of  $\text{Exp}(\lambda)$ :

$$\varphi_{T_1}(u) = \mathbb{E}\left[e^{iuT_1}\right] = \int_0^\infty \lambda e^{-(\lambda - iu)t} dt = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda - iu},$$
$$\varphi_{S_k}(u) = \mathbb{E}\left[e^{iu\sum_{j=1}^k T_j}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{j=1}^k e^{iuT_j}\right] \stackrel{\text{iid}}{=} \mathbb{E}\left[e^{iuT_1}\right]^k = \left(\frac{\lambda}{\lambda - iu}\right)^k.$$

#### Solution 1.3

(a) For all r > 0 we have

$$\{D > r\} \subset \{N(B_r) = 0\} \subset \{D \ge r\}$$

$$\tag{1}$$

Thus, we have on the one hand

$$\mathbb{P}[D > r] \le \mathbb{P}[N(B_r) = 0] = e^{-\lambda \pi r^2}$$
(2)

and on the other hand

$$\mathbb{P}[D > r] = \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}[D \ge r + 1/n] \ge \limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}[N(B_{r+1/n}) = 0]$$
$$= \limsup_{n \to \infty} e^{-\lambda \pi (r+1/n)^2} = e^{-\lambda \pi r^2},$$
(3)

yielding  $\mathbb{P}[D > r] = e^{-\lambda \pi r^2}$ . Hence, the distribution function F and density f of D are given by

$$F(r) = 1 - e^{-\lambda \pi r^2}$$
 and  $f(r) = 2\lambda \pi r e^{-\lambda \pi r^2}$ ,  $r > 0.$  (4)

(b) Note that  $B_R \setminus B_r$  and  $B_r$  are disjoint sets, whence  $N(B_R \setminus B_r)$  and  $N(B_r)$  are independent. Hence, we have

$$f(R,r) = \mathbb{P}\left[N(B_R \setminus B_r) = 0 \,|\, N(B_r) = 1\right] = \mathbb{P}\left[N(B_R \setminus B_r) = 0\right] = e^{-\lambda \pi (R^2 - r^2)}.$$
 (5)

This immediately implies that

$$\lim_{R \searrow 0} \lim_{r \searrow 0} f(R, r) = \lim_{r \searrow 0} \lim_{R \searrow r} f(R, r) = e^0 = 1.$$
(6)

Intuitively, f(R, r) is the probability that no point lies in the annulus  $B_R \setminus B_r$  given that 1 point lies in the small circle  $B_r$ . As the number of points in disjoints sets are independent, the conditioning doesn't matter. Moreover, the expected number of points in each set is equal to  $\lambda$  times its area. Hence as the area shrinks to 0, the expected number of points in the area goes to 0 and the probability that no point lies in the area goes to 1.