## A UNIQUENESS THEOREM FOR STATIONARY MEASURES OF ERGODIC MARKOV PROCESSES<sup>1</sup>

## By RICHARD ISAAC

## Hunter College

- 1. Summary. If  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$  are not identically zero  $\sigma$ -finite invariant measures for a measurable invertible ergodic transformation S on a measure space, and  $\beta_1(E) > 0$  implies  $\beta_2(E) > 0$  for measurable sets E, then  $\beta_2 = c\beta_1$  for some constant  $c \neq 0$  ([4], p. 35). In this paper a corresponding result will be proved for stationary measures of a Markov process (Theorem 1). Theorem 1 is a generalization of the corollary of [6], p. 863. In that paper, the authors impose conditions ensuring that the shift transformation has no wandering sets of positive measure, and then they use Hopf's theorem. In Section 3, some new and known results are seen to follow readily from Theorem 1. The recurrence condition introduced by Harris [5] is discussed, and Theorem 1 is used to give a new proof of the uniqueness theorem of [5] independent of the existence of stationary measures, and generalizing the theorem to  $\sigma$ -fields which are not necessarily separable.
- **2.** Introduction. We consider  $(X_n, n \ge 0)$ , a Markov process on  $(\Omega, \Sigma)$  having stationary transition probabilities.  $\alpha$  is called a *stationary measure* for the process if  $\alpha$  is not identically zero, is  $\sigma$ -finite and  $\int P(t, \cdot)\alpha(dt) = \alpha(\cdot)$  on  $\Sigma$ . Let  $\Omega_0$  be the set of unilateral sequences  $\omega = (\omega_0, \omega_1, \cdots)$ ,  $\omega_n \varepsilon \Omega$  and  $\Omega_1$  the set of bilateral sequences  $\omega = (\cdots \omega_{-1}, \omega_0, \omega_1, \cdots)$ . The  $X_n$  process may be represented on  $\Omega_0$  by giving  $X_0$  the distribution  $\alpha$  where  $\alpha$  is stationary ([2], p. 190). The stationarity of  $\alpha$  will permit the finiteness assumption to be relaxed. See, e.g., [6]. The process is strictly stationary [2] since  $\alpha$  is stationary, and the induced measure on  $\Omega_0$  cylinders, which we call  $\alpha_0$ , can be extended to a  $\sigma$ -field of  $\Omega_0$  sets, to be called  $\Sigma_0$ .

The strictly stationary process  $(X_n, n \ge 0)$  may be embedded in a process  $(X_n, -\infty < n < \infty)$ , the extended process ([2], p. 456). The extended process may be represented on  $\Omega_1$ ; the measure induced by  $\alpha$  on  $\Omega_1$  cylinders will be denoted by  $\alpha_1$  and can be extended to a  $\sigma$ -field of  $\Omega_1$  sets denoted by  $\Sigma_1$ . Notice that if  $E \subseteq \Omega_1$  is defined only by restrictions on  $\omega_n$ ,  $n \ge 0$ , then  $\alpha_1(E) = \alpha_0(E)$ .

Let T be the shift transformation: if  $\omega \in \Omega_0$  or  $\Omega_1$ , then  $(T\omega)_n = \omega_{n+1}$ . Then it is easy to see that  $\alpha_0$  and  $\alpha_1$  defined above are T-invariant:  $\alpha_0(T^{-1}E) = \alpha_0(E)$ ,  $\alpha_1(T^{-1}E) = \alpha_1(TE) = \alpha_1(E)$  for  $E \in \Sigma_0$ ,  $E \in \Sigma_1$  respectively. A stationary  $\alpha$  is called ergodic for the process  $(X_n, n \ge 0)$  if the  $\sigma$ -field of invariant events is trivial, that is, if  $V \in \Sigma_0$ , and  $T^{-1}V$  and V differ at most by an  $\alpha_0$ -null set, then  $\alpha_0(V) = 0$  or  $\alpha_0(V') = 0$ . If the extended process  $(X_n, -\infty < n < \infty)$  is

Received December 10, 1963; revised June 15, 1964

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Supported in part by NSF Grant GP-1542.

considered instead, the definition of ergodicity changes every "0" subscript above to "1". We will make use of the fact ([2], p. 458) that if  $\alpha$  is ergodic for the process  $(X_n, n \ge 0)$ , then  $\alpha$  is ergodic for the extended process  $(X_n, -\infty < n < \infty)$ , and conversely. This theorem will be tacitly invoked in the sequel.

For any measures m and n on  $\Sigma$ ,  $m \gg n$  means that m(E) > 0 whenever n(E) > 0 on  $\Sigma$ .  $m \equiv n$  means  $m \gg n$  and  $n \gg m$ . For any set U in any space, U' is its complement.

Throughout this paper, if  $\alpha$  is any stationary measure or n is any finite measure, the subscript "0" appended to  $\alpha$  or n always indicates the measure induced by  $\alpha$  or n on  $\Sigma_0$ , the subscript "1" appended to  $\alpha$  always indicates the measure induced by  $\alpha$  on  $\Sigma_1$ , as described above. It will be understood that the subscript "1" refers to the extended process.

**3.** The uniqueness theorem. In this section  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are assumed to be stationary measures for the process  $(X_n, n \ge 0)$ .

LEMMA 1. For each  $U \in \Sigma_0$ ,

(1) 
$$\alpha_0(U) = \int P(U \mid X_0 = t) \alpha(dt)$$

where the integrand is the conditional probability of U starting at  $X_0 = t$ .

PROOF. It is easily verified that the integral is countably additive on  $\Sigma_0$ . The proof is concluded by observing that for cylinders the integral defines  $\alpha_0$ .

Lemma 2.  $\alpha \gg \beta$  implies  $\alpha_0 \gg \beta_0$ .

PROOF.  $\alpha_0(U) = 0$  implies by (1) that  $P(U | X_0 = t) = 0$  a.e. ( $\alpha$ ) and so  $P(U | X_0 = t) = 0$  a.e. ( $\beta$ ). Hence  $\beta_0(U) = 0$ .

Notice that  $\alpha + \beta$  is also a stationary measure.

LEMMA 3. If  $\alpha \gg \beta$  and  $\alpha$  is ergodic, then  $\beta$  and  $\alpha + \beta$  are ergodic.

PROOF. Let V and V' be a decomposition of  $\Omega_0$  into two invariant sets. Then, say,  $\alpha_0(V) = 0$ , so by Lemma 2,  $\beta_0(V) = 0$ . Since  $\alpha \gg \alpha + \beta$ , the same reasoning shows that  $(\alpha + \beta)_0(V) = \alpha_0(V) + \beta_0(V) = 0$ .

LEMMA 4. If  $\alpha \gg \beta$  and  $\alpha$  is ergodic, then  $\alpha_1 \gg \beta_1$ .

PROOF. Suppose that there exists a set  $N \in \Sigma_1$ ,  $\alpha_1(N) = 0$  and  $\beta_1(N) > 0$ . Then  $\bigcup_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} T^n N = V$  is an invariant set and  $\alpha_1(V) = 0$ ,  $\beta_1(V) > 0$ . Now, we have that  $(\alpha + \beta)_1 = \alpha_1 + \beta_1$  on  $\Sigma_1$ . But then  $(\alpha + \beta)_1(V) > 0$  and  $(\alpha + \beta)_1(V') > 0$ . This contradicts the ergodicity of  $\alpha + \beta$  proved by Lemma 3.

THEOREM 1. If  $\alpha \gg \beta$  and  $\alpha$  is ergodic, then  $\beta = c\alpha$  for some constant c > 0.

Proof.  $\alpha_1$  and  $\beta_1$  are invariant under the invertible shift T which, in the language of [4], is ergodic. Moreover  $\alpha_1 \gg \beta_1$ . We may now use the known result on invariant measures ([4], p. 35) but for completeness we sketch the brief remainder of the proof. By the Radon-Nikodym theorem, the invariance of  $\alpha_1$  and  $\beta_1$  and a well-known change of variable formula ([7], p. 342) we obtain

(2) 
$$\beta_1(E) = \int_E f(\omega)\alpha_1(d\omega) = \int_{T^{-1}E} f(T\omega)\alpha_1(d\omega)$$

(3) 
$$\beta_1(T^{-1}E) = \int_{T^{-1}E} f(\omega)\alpha_1(d\omega).$$

(2) and (3) imply that  $f(T\omega) = f(\omega)$  a.e.  $(\alpha_1)$  and so f is invariant and by ergodicity reduces to a constant c > 0 a.e.  $(\alpha_1)$ . Thus  $\beta_1 = c\alpha_1$  and so  $\beta = c\alpha$ .

Examples. Consider the unrestricted random walk on the integers with transition probabilities

$$p_{i,i-1} = \frac{1}{3}$$
  $p_{i,i+1} = \frac{2}{3}$   $p_{ij} = 0$  otherwise.

Then  $\alpha(\{i\}) = 1$  for all i is a stationary measure as well as  $\beta(\{i\}) = 2^i$  for all i. Thus neither  $\alpha$  nor  $\beta$  are ergodic and there are invariant sets which are not trivial. This ties in with Blackwell's result ([1], p. 656) that there are non-trivial invariant sets if and only if there is a non-constant bounded solution to the equation:  $k_i = \frac{2}{3} k_{i+1} + \frac{1}{3} k_{i-1}$ . Since  $k_i = 0$  for  $i \leq 0$ , and for  $i \geq 1$ ,  $k_i = 2 (1 - (\frac{1}{2})^i)$  is a bounded non-constant solution, there are non-trivial invariant sets.

If  $p_{i,i+1} = 1$  for all i,  $p_{ij} = 0$  otherwise, we have an example of a process with a unique stationary measure  $\alpha(\{i\}) = 1$  for all i.  $\alpha$  is ergodic for the process, but the process is non-recurrent.

- 4. Applications. To apply Theorem 1, we need to have probabilistic sufficient conditions for ergodicity. "i.o." below means infinitely often. Consider
  - (C): there exists a  $\sigma$ -finite measure m on  $\Sigma$  such that m(E) > 0 implies

$$P(X_n \in E \text{ i.o. } | X_0 = t) = 1$$
 for all  $t \in \Omega$ .

(C) was introduced in [5] where, in case  $\Sigma$  is separable, it implies the existence and uniqueness of a stationary measure  $\alpha$ .

The next theorem is a generalization of Theorem 2 of [6], the proof of which is only roughly sketched there. Our proof follows those ideas.

THEOREM 2. Let (C) hold, and let  $\alpha$  be stationary for the process  $(X_n, n \geq 0)$ . Then  $\alpha$  is ergodic.

PROOF. Let  $V \subseteq \Omega_0$  be invariant, and let  $K = \{t: P(V \mid X_0 = t) > 0\}$ . If m(K) > 0, we show  $P(V \mid X_0 = t) = 1$  for almost every  $(m)t \in K$ . For, assume that there exists a set  $L \subseteq K$ , with  $P(V \mid X_0 = t) \le \delta < 1$  for  $t \in L$ , m(L) > 0. Without loss of generality, we may suppose that for some  $\epsilon > 0$  we also have  $\epsilon \le P(V \mid X_0 = t)$  for  $t \in L$ . For each fixed  $x_0 \in \Omega$ , almost every (with respect to conditional probability starting at  $x_0$ ) sequence  $\omega = (x_0, x_1, x_2, \cdots)$  has infinitely many elements of L appearing, by (C). We then obtain

$$P(V \mid X_0 = x_0, x_1 = X_1, \dots, X_n = x_n) = P(V \mid X_n = x_n) = P(V \mid X_0 = x_n),$$
 using the Markov property and the stationarity of transition probabilities. By

the martingale 0-1 law ([2], p. 324) the left-hand side and thus  $P(V \mid X_0 = x_n)$  converges to 0 or 1 with probability one as  $n \to \infty$ . For  $x_n \in L$ , we have  $P(V \mid X_0 = x_n) \ge \epsilon$  and this is true for infinitely many n. Thus  $\lim_{n\to\infty} P(V \mid X_0 = x_n) = 1$ , a contradiction since  $P(V \mid X_0 = t) \le \delta$  for  $t \in L$ . We have therefore shown that  $P(V \mid X_0 = t) = 1$  for almost every  $t \in K$ . Since m(K) > 0, it is easy to see, using (C), that  $P(V \mid X_0 = t) = 1$  for every  $t \in \Omega$ . Thus  $\alpha_0(V') = 0$ . If, on the contrary, m(K) = 0, then a repetition of the foregoing argument for the set  $K_1 = \{t : P(V' \mid X_0 = t) > 0\}$  proves that  $P(V' \mid X_0 = t) = 1$  for every  $t \in \Omega$ , and so  $\alpha_0(V) = 0$ .

COROLLARY 1. Assume only that (C) is satisfied for almost all (m)t, and that m is stationary. Then m is ergodic.

PROOF.  $m_0(V) = \int P(V \mid X_0 = t) m(dt)$  and the integrand is 0 or 1 a.e. (m) if V is invariant.

Corollary 1 is essentially the result of Theorem 2 of [6].

COROLLARY 2. Under (C),  $P(X_n \in E \text{ i.o.} | X_0 = t) = 0$  for all t or 1 for all t, for each fixed  $E \in \Sigma$ .

Proof. The events considered are invariant.

As an application of Theorem 1, we derive a result in [6].

THEOREM 3. Let  $\alpha$  be stationary such that  $\alpha(E) > 0$  implies  $P(X_n \in E \text{ i.o. } | X_0 = t) = 1$  a.e.  $(\alpha)$ , and let  $\alpha \gg \beta$  where  $\beta$  is another stationary measure. Then  $\beta = c\alpha$  for some constant c > 0.

Proof. By Corollary 1 above,  $\alpha$  is ergodic. Apply Theorem 1.

DEFINITION. If m is any measure on  $\Sigma$ , the process is called m-irreducible if m(E) > 0 implies  $P(X_n \in E \text{ for some } n \mid X_0 = t) > 0$  for almost all (m)t.

Theorem 4. Let  $\alpha$  be a finite stationary measure and let the process be  $\alpha$ -irreducible. Then  $\alpha$  is ergodic.

PROOF. Let  $\alpha(E) > 0$ . Suppose there exists a set  $F \subseteq E$ ,  $\alpha(F) > 0$  with  $P(X_n \in E \text{ for at most finitely many } n \mid X_0 = t) > 0$  for each  $t \in F$ . Let  $B = \{\omega : \omega \in \Omega_0 ; X_n(\omega) \in E \text{ for at most finitely many } n; X_0(\omega) \in F\}$ . Then

$$\alpha_0(B) = \int P(B \mid X_0 = t) \alpha(dt) \ge \int_{\mathbb{R}} P(B \mid X_0 = t) \alpha(dt > 0.$$

Let  $E_0 = \{\omega : \omega \in \Omega_0 ; X_0(\omega) \in E\}$ . Then  $\alpha_0(E_0) = \alpha(E) > 0$ , and  $B \subseteq E_0$ ,  $\alpha_0(B) > 0$ , but for each  $\omega \in B$ ,  $T^n \omega \in E_0$  for at most finitely many n. This contradicts the strong recurrence theorem of ergodic theory ([4], p. 10). Thus we have shown that if  $\alpha(E) > 0$ ,  $P(X_n \in E \text{ i.o.} \mid X_0 = t) = 1$  for almost every  $(\alpha)t \in E$ . Let  $\widetilde{E} = \{t : P(X_n \in E \text{ i.o.} \mid X_0 = t) = 1\}$ .  $\alpha(\widetilde{E}) \ge \alpha(E) > 0$ . Notice also that  $\widetilde{E}$  is a closed set, that is,  $P(t, \widetilde{E}) = 1$  for every  $t \in \widetilde{E}$ . The assumption of  $\alpha$ -irreducibility proves that  $\alpha(\widetilde{E}) = 1$ . Indeed, if  $\alpha(\widetilde{E}') > 0$ , we must have  $P(X_n \in \widetilde{E}' \text{ for some } n \mid X_0 = t) > 0$  for some  $t \in \widetilde{E}$ , a contradiction because  $\widetilde{E}$  is closed. By Corollary 1,  $\alpha$  is ergodic.

The next sequence of results will investigate condition (C) which will be assumed henceforth. Theorem 7 generalizes the uniqueness result of [5]. The proof of uniqueness in [5] as well as the indication that Theorem 6 holds in

separable  $\sigma$ -fields used the existence theorem and the "process on A" approach whereas the proofs given here use neither.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that the measure m in (C) is a probability measure, since, given a  $\sigma$ -finite measure, a finite measure with the same sets of measure zero may always be constructed. Define  $(S^k m)$   $(E) = \int P^k(t, E) m(dt), k \ge 1$ , and  $(S^0 m)$  (E) = m(E).

THEOREM 5.  $P(X_n \in E \text{ i.o. } | X_0 = t) = 0 \text{ for all } t \text{ or } P(X_n \in E \text{ i.o. } | X_0 = t) = 1 \text{ for all } t \text{ according as } (S^k m) (E) = 0 \text{ for all } k \ge 0 \text{ or } (S^k m) (E) > 0 \text{ for some } k \ge 0.$ 

PROOF. If  $(S^k m)$  (E) > 0 for some k, then  $P^k(t, E) \ge \epsilon$ , say, on the set K, m(K) > 0. By (C),  $P(X_n \in K \text{ i.o.} \mid X_0 = t) = 1$  for all  $t \in \Omega$ , and it then easily follows that  $P(X_n \in E \text{ i.o.} \mid X_0 = t) = 1$  for all  $t \in \Omega$ . If  $(S^k m)$  (E) = 0 for all k,  $P^k(t, E) = 0$  a.e. (m) for each k and  $P(X_n \text{ is never in } E \mid X_0 = t) = 1$  a.e. (m). By the preceding Corollary 2,  $P(X_n \in E \text{ i.o.} \mid X_0 = t) = 0$  for all t.

Let us notice that  $\alpha \gg m$  for any stationary  $\alpha$ , since  $P(X_n \ \varepsilon \ E \ i.o. \ | \ X_0 = t) = 1$  for all t if m(E) > 0, whereas if  $\alpha(E) = 0$ ,  $P(X_n \ \varepsilon \ E \ i.o. \ | \ X_0 = t) = 0$  a.e.  $(\alpha)$ . Let  $\{a_n\}$  be a sequence of positive numbers with sum 1 and define  $n(\cdot) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k(S^k m) \ (\cdot)$  on  $\Sigma$ . Then, by the preceding theorem, n(E) = 0 or n(E) > 0 according as  $P(X_n \ \varepsilon \ E \ i.o. \ | \ X_0 = t) = 0$  or 1. Also remark that  $\alpha \gg n$  if  $\alpha$  is any stationary measure.

THEOREM 6. Let  $\alpha$  be stationary. Then  $\alpha(E) > 0$  implies  $P(X_n \in E \text{ i.o. } | X_0 = t) = 1$  for all t.

PROOF. Consider the extended process  $(X_n, -\infty < n < \infty)$ . Let  $V \subseteq \Omega_1$ ,  $V = (X_n \, \varepsilon \, E' \text{ for all } n)$ . V is invariant and so differs from the event  $W = (X_n \, \varepsilon \, E' \text{ for all } n \geq 0)$  by an  $\alpha_1$ -null event ([2], p. 459). By the remarks about n, we may assume that n(E) = 0, otherwise the conclusion of the theorem follows. Theorem 5 then makes it clear that  $n_0(W) = 1$ . Hence, since  $\alpha \gg n$ , as in Lemma 2 it is clear that  $\alpha_0 \gg n_0$ , so  $\alpha_0(W) > 0$ . Since W depends only on  $n \geq 0$ ,  $\alpha_0(W) = \alpha_1(W) > 0$ . This proves that  $\alpha_1(V) > 0$  and by ergodicity  $\alpha_1(V') = 0$ . Thus  $\alpha_0(W') = 0$ . But since  $W' = (X_n \, \varepsilon \, E \text{ for some } n \geq 0)$ ,  $\alpha_0(W') \geq \alpha(E) > 0$ , a contradiction. Thus the hypothesis that n(E) = 0 must be rejected and the theorem is proved.

Corollary 1. For any stationary  $\alpha$ ,  $\alpha \equiv n$ .

COROLLARY 2. If  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are stationary, then  $\alpha \equiv \beta$ .

Theorem 7. There exists at most one stationary measure  $\alpha$  for the process.

PROOF. By Theorem 2 any stationary measure  $\alpha$  is ergodic. If  $\beta$  is another stationary measure,  $\alpha \equiv \beta$  by Corollary 2 above, and, a fortiori,  $\alpha \gg \beta$ . Now apply Theorem 1.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Blackwell, D. (1955). On transient Markov processes with a countable number of states and stationary transition probabilities. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **26** 654-658.
- [2] Doob, J. L. (1953). Stochastic Processes. Wiley, New York.
- [3] FELLER, W. (1960). Probability Theory and its Applications, 2d ed., Wiley, New York.
- [4] Halmos, P. R. (1956). Lectures on Ergodic Theory, Math. Soc. Jap.

- [5] HARRIS, T. E. (1956). The existence of stationary measures for certain Markov processes. Proc. Third Berkeley Symp. Math. Statist. Prob. 2 113-124.
- [6] Harris, T. E. and Robbins, H. (1953). Ergodic theory of Markov chains admitting an infinite invariant measure. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* **39** 860-864.
- [7] Loève, M. (1955). Probability Theory. Van Nostrand, New York.
- [8] Nelson, E. (1958). The adjoint Markoff process. Duke Math. J. 25 671-690.