

1.

a. The extinction probability  $\pi_0$  is the smallest positive solution of

$$\pi_0 = \frac{1}{5} + \frac{3}{5}\pi_0 + \frac{1}{5}\pi_0^2,$$

yielding  $\pi_0 = 1$ .

b. Similar as part a, but now we find  $\pi_0 = \frac{1}{2}$ .

c. The extinction probability  $\pi_0$  is the square of the answers in part a and b.

2. Here we have

$$\mu = \frac{1-\alpha}{3}(0+2+3) + \alpha = \frac{5-2\alpha}{3}.$$

a.  $E[X_n] = E[X_0]\mu^n = \left(\frac{5-2\alpha}{3}\right)^n$ .

b. The extinction probability  $\pi_0$  is the smallest positive solution of

$$\pi_0 = \frac{1-\alpha}{3}(1+\pi_0^2+\pi_0^3) + \alpha\pi_0,$$

yielding

$$\pi_0 = \sqrt{2} - 1.$$

c. Clearly,

$$E[X_0] = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^n = 2$$

so  $E[X_n] = 2 \left(\frac{5-2\alpha}{3}\right)^n$ . Further,

$$\pi_0 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^n (\sqrt{2}-1)^n = \frac{\sqrt{2}-1}{3-\sqrt{2}} \quad (< \sqrt{2}-1).$$

3.

a. By conditioning on the first event and using that all particles behave independently of each other, we get

$$\pi_0 = \frac{\mu}{\lambda+\mu} + \frac{\lambda}{\lambda+\mu}\pi_0^2,$$

the roots of which are 1 and  $\frac{\mu}{\lambda}$ . Hence, if  $\lambda \leq \mu$ , then  $\pi_0 = 1$ , and otherwise,  $\pi_0 = \frac{\mu}{\lambda}$ .

b. Clearly  $\{X_t, t \geq 0\}$  is a birth and death process with birth rates  $\lambda_n = n\lambda$  and death rates  $\mu_n = n\mu$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  and state 0 is an absorbing state.

4.

a.  $S_n$  is Poisson with mean  $n\mu$ .

b.

$$\begin{aligned} P(N(t) = n) &= P(N(t) \geq n) - P(N(t) \geq n + 1) \\ &= P(S_n \leq t) - P(S_{n+1} \leq t) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor t \rfloor} e^{-n\mu} \frac{(n\mu)^k}{k!} - \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor t \rfloor} e^{-(n+1)\mu} \frac{((n+1)\mu)^k}{k!}. \end{aligned}$$

5.

a. No. Suppose, for instance, that the interarrival times of the first renewal process are identically equal to 1. Let the second be a Poisson process with rate  $\lambda$ . If the first interarrival time of the process  $\{N(t), t \geq 0\}$  is equal to  $3/4$ , then we can be certain that the next one is less than or equal to  $1/4$ .

b. No. Use the same processes as in a for a counterexample. For instance, the first interarrival will equal 1 with probability  $e^{-\lambda}$ . The probability will be different for the next interarrival.

c. No, because of a or b.