

SOJOURN TIME PROBLEMS

BY LAJOS TAKÁCS

Case Western Reserve University

It is supposed that in the time interval $(0, \infty)$ a stochastic process is alternately in states A and B . Denote by $\alpha_1, \beta_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2, \dots$ the lengths of the successive intervals spent in states A and B respectively. In this paper the distribution and the asymptotic distribution of the total time spent in state A (B) in the interval $(0, t)$ are determined in the case where $(\alpha_1, \beta_1), (\alpha_2, \beta_2), \dots$ are mutually independent and identically distributed vector variables.

1. Introduction. Let $\{\eta(u), 0 \leq u < \infty\}$ be a stochastic process with state space $A \cup B$ where A and B are disjoint sets. If $\eta(u) \in A$, then we say that the process is in state A at time u , and if $\eta(u) \in B$, then we say that the process is in state B at time u . Let us assume that in any finite interval $(0, t)$ the process changes states only a finite number of times with probability one. Let $\mathbf{P}\{\eta(0) \in A\} = 1$ and denote by $\alpha_1, \beta_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2, \dots$ the lengths of the successive intervals spent in states A and B respectively in the interval $(0, \infty)$. Denote by $\alpha(t)$ the total time spent in state A in the interval $(0, t)$ and by $\beta(t)$ the total time spent in state B in the interval $(0, t)$. Obviously $\alpha(t)$ and $\beta(t)$ are random variables and $\alpha(t) + \beta(t) = t$ for all $t \geq 0$.

In this paper we determine the distributions of $\alpha(t)$ and $\beta(t)$ in the general case, and the asymptotic distributions of $\alpha(t)$ and $\beta(t)$ in the case where $(\alpha_1, \beta_1), (\alpha_2, \beta_2), \dots, (\alpha_n, \beta_n), \dots$ are mutually independent and identically distributed vector random variables which belong to the domain of normal attraction of a two-dimensional distribution function. The case where $\{\alpha_n\}$ and $\{\beta_n\}$ are independent sequences has been considered earlier by the author [3].

2. The distributions of $\alpha(t)$ and $\beta(t)$. Let us introduce the notation $\gamma_n = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \dots + \alpha_n$ for $n = 1, 2, \dots$ and $\gamma_0 = 0$, furthermore, $\delta_n = \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \dots + \beta_n$ for $n = 1, 2, \dots$ and $\delta_0 = 0$.

THEOREM 1. If $0 < x \leq t$, then

$$(1) \quad \mathbf{P}\{\alpha(t) < x\} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} [\mathbf{P}\{\gamma_n < x, \delta_{n-1} \leq t - x\} - \mathbf{P}\{\gamma_n < x, \delta_n \leq t - x\}]$$

and if $0 \leq x < t$, then

$$(2) \quad \mathbf{P}\{\beta(t) \leq x\} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} [\mathbf{P}\{\delta_n \leq x, \gamma_n < t - x\} - \mathbf{P}\{\delta_n \leq x, \gamma_{n+1} < t - x\}].$$

PROOF. Since $\mathbf{P}\{\alpha(t) < x\} = 1 - \mathbf{P}\{\beta(t) \leq t - x\}$ for $0 \leq x \leq t$, it is sufficient to prove (2). For $0 \leq x < t$ denote by $\tau = \tau(t - x)$ the smallest $u \in [0, \infty)$ for

Received April 16, 1973; revised September 7, 1973.

¹ This research was supported by the Office of Naval Research.

AMS 1970 subject classifications. Primary 60G50; Secondary 60F05.

Key words and phrases. Sojourn times, exact distributions, limiting distributions, examples.

which $\alpha(u) = t - x$, provided that such a u exists. Then $\eta(\tau) \in \mathcal{A}$ and we have

$$(3) \quad \{\beta(t) \leq x\} \equiv \{\beta(\tau) \leq x\}.$$

This follows from the following identities

$$(4) \quad \{\beta(t) \leq x\} \equiv \{\alpha(\tau) \leq \alpha(t)\} \equiv \{\tau \leq t\} \equiv \{\alpha(\tau) + \beta(\tau) \leq t\} \equiv \{\beta(\tau) \leq x\}.$$

Here we used that $\alpha(t) + \beta(t) = t$ for all $t \geq 0$, and that $\alpha(t)$ and $\beta(t)$ are non-decreasing functions of t for $0 \leq t < \infty$.

Since $\beta(\tau) = \delta_n$ ($n = 0, 1, \dots$) if $\gamma_n < t - x \leq \gamma_{n+1}$, it follows from (3) that

$$(5) \quad \mathbf{P}\{\beta(t) \leq x\} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}\{\delta_n \leq x \text{ and } \gamma_n < t - x \leq \gamma_{n+1}\}$$

for $0 \leq x < t$ which proves (2).

If for each $t \geq 0$ we define $\omega(t)$ as a discrete random variable taking on positive integers only and satisfying the relation

$$(6) \quad \{\omega(t) \leq n\} \equiv \{\delta_n > t\}$$

for all $t \geq 0$ and $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, then we can write that

$$(7) \quad \mathbf{P}\{\alpha(t) < x\} = \mathbf{P}\{\gamma_{\omega(t-x)} < x\}$$

for $0 \leq x \leq t$. We note that $\mathbf{P}\{\omega(0) = 1\} = 1$.

If for each $t \geq 0$ we define $\rho(t)$ as a discrete random variable taking on non-negative integers only and satisfying the relation

$$(8) \quad \{\rho(t) < n\} \equiv \{\gamma_n \geq t\}$$

for all $t \geq 0$ and $n = 1, 2, \dots$, then we can write that

$$(9) \quad \mathbf{P}\{\beta(t) \leq x\} = \mathbf{P}\{\delta_{\rho(t-x)} \leq x\}$$

for $0 \leq x \leq t$. We note that $\mathbf{P}\{\rho(0) = 0\} = 1$.

3. The asymptotic distributions of $\alpha(t)$ and $\beta(t)$. Formulas (7) and (9) make it possible to determine the asymptotic distributions of $\alpha(t)$ and $\beta(t)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ if we know the asymptotic distribution of $\gamma_{\omega(t)}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ or the asymptotic distribution of $\delta_{\rho(t)}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. In our case the asymptotic distributions of $\alpha(t)$ and $\beta(t)$ can be determined by Theorem 2. In Theorem 2 and in the rest of the paper if we say that a family of distribution functions converges to a limiting distribution function then by this we mean that the distribution functions converge in every continuity point of the limiting distribution function.

THEOREM 2. *Let us suppose that either $0 < d < 1$, $D_1 > 0$, $D_2 > 0$ or $d \geq 1$, $D_1 = 0$, $D_2 > 0$. If*

$$(10) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \frac{\gamma_{\omega(t)} - D_1 t}{D_2 t^d} \leq x \right\} = \mathbf{P}\{\theta \leq x\},$$

then

$$(11) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \frac{\alpha(t) - M_1 t}{M_2 t^m} \leq x \right\} = R(x),$$

and if

$$(12) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \frac{\delta_{\rho(t)} - D_1 t}{D_2 t^d} \leq x \right\} = \mathbf{P}\{\theta \leq x\},$$

then

$$(13) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \frac{\beta(t) - M_1 t}{M_2 t^m} \leq x \right\} = R(x),$$

where the constants M_1, M_2, m and the distribution function $R(x)$ are given in the following table.

TABLE 1

d	M_1	M_2	m	$R(x)$
$d > 1$	1	$D_2^{-1/d}$	$\frac{1}{d}$	$\mathbf{P}\{-\theta^{-1/d} \leq x\}$
$d = 1$	0	1	1	$\mathbf{P} \left\{ \frac{D_2 \theta}{1 + D_2 \theta} \leq x \right\}$
$d < 1$	$\frac{D_1}{1 + D_1}$	$\frac{D_2}{(1 + D_1)^{1+d}}$	d	$\mathbf{P}\{\theta \leq x\}$

PROOF. Both (11) and (13) can be proved in a similar way. Let us prove (13). Let us define

$$(14) \quad u = t + D_1 t + x D_2 t^d$$

for $t \geq 0$. If x is such that $u \geq t$, then by (9) we have

$$(15) \quad \mathbf{P}\{\beta(u) \leq u - t\} = \mathbf{P}\{\delta_{\rho(t)} \leq D_1 t + x D_2 t^d\}.$$

If $d \geq 1$ and $x \geq 0$ or $d < 1$, $-\infty < x < \infty$, and t is sufficiently large, then $u \geq t$ is satisfied and $t \rightarrow \infty$ as $u \rightarrow \infty$. Thus we have

$$(16) \quad \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}\{\beta(u) \leq u - t\} = \mathbf{P}\{\theta \leq x\}$$

where $t = t(u)$, which satisfies $0 \leq t \leq u$ for sufficiently large u , can be obtained by (14).

If $d > 1$, then $D_1 = 0$ and for $x > 0$ we obtain that

$$(17) \quad t = \left(\frac{u}{x D_2} \right)^{1/d} + o(u^{1/d})$$

as $u \rightarrow \infty$. Thus by (16)

$$(18) \quad \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \beta(u) \leq u - \left(\frac{u}{x D_2} \right)^{1/d} \right\} = \mathbf{P}\{\theta \leq x\}$$

for $x > 0$.

If $d = 1$, then $D_1 = 0$ and for $x \geq 0$ we obtain that

$$(19) \quad t = \frac{u}{1 + x D_2}$$

for $u \geq 0$. Thus by (16)

$$(20) \quad \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \beta(u) \leq \frac{uxD_2}{1 + xD_2} \right\} = \mathbf{P}\{\theta \leq x\}$$

for $x \geq 0$.

If $d < 1$, then $D_1 > 0$ and we obtain that

$$(21) \quad t = \frac{u}{1 + D_1} - \frac{x D_2}{1 + D_1} \left(\frac{u}{1 + D_1} \right)^d + o(u^d)$$

as $u \rightarrow \infty$. Thus by (16)

$$(22) \quad \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \beta(u) \leq \frac{D_1 u}{1 + D_1} + \frac{x D_2}{1 + D_1} \left(\frac{u}{1 + D_1} \right)^d \right\} = \mathbf{P}\{\theta \leq x\}.$$

The limit relations (18), (20), (22) prove (13).

Our next aim is to find the asymptotic distributions of $\gamma_{\omega(t)}$ and $\delta_{\rho(t)}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ in the case where $(\alpha_1, \beta_1), (\alpha_2, \beta_2), \dots, (\alpha_n, \beta_n), \dots$ are mutually independent and identically distributed vector random variables which belong to the domain of normal attraction of a two-dimensional distribution function $F(x, y)$. In this case we have

$$(23) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \frac{\gamma_n - A_1 n}{A_2 n^a} \leq x, \frac{\delta_n - B_1 n}{B_2 n^b} \leq y \right\} = F(x, y)$$

where the normalizing constants satisfy the conditions $\frac{1}{2} \leq a < 1, A_1 > 0, A_2 > 0$ or $a \geq 1, A_1 = 0, A_2 > 0$ and $\frac{1}{2} \leq b < 1, B_1 > 0, B_2 > 0$ or $b \geq 1, B_1 = 0, B_2 > 0$.

We shall use the following auxiliary theorem due to F. J. Anscombe [1].

LEMMA 1. *Let us suppose that $\nu(t)$ ($0 \leq t < \infty$) are discrete random variables taking on nonnegative integers only and that*

$$(24) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\nu(t)}{t} = c$$

in probability where c is a positive constant. Let $\zeta(n)$ ($n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$) be a sequence of real random variables for which

$$(25) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \frac{\zeta(n)}{b(n)} \leq x \right\} = Q(x)$$

and

$$(26) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}\{\max_{|n-m| < m\delta(\varepsilon)} |\zeta(n) - \zeta(m)| < \varepsilon b(m)\} = 1$$

for some $\delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that $\delta(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Then

$$(27) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \frac{\zeta(\nu(t))}{b([\nu t])} \leq x \right\} = Q(x)$$

regardless of whether $\{\nu(t)\}$ depends on $\{\zeta(n)\}$ or not.

F. J. Anscombe [1] demonstrated that if $\zeta(n)$ is the n th partial sum of a sequence of mutually independent and identically distributed random variables and if $0 < Q(0) < 1$, then (26) is satisfied and thus Lemma 1 is applicable. We can easily show that Lemma 1 is still applicable if $Q(0) = 0$ or $Q(0) = 1$.

THEOREM 3. *Let us suppose that (α_n, β_n) ($n = 1, 2, \dots$) are mutually independent, and identically distributed vector variables for which (23) holds with $a \geq 1$ and $b \geq 1$. Let*

$$(28) \quad \Phi(s, q) = \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty e^{-sz-ay} d_x d_y F(x, y)$$

for $\text{Re}(s) \geq 0$ and $\text{Re}(q) \geq 0$. Then

$$(29) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \frac{\gamma_{\omega(t)}}{A_2 B_2^{-a/b} t^{a/b}} \leq x \right\} = Q(x)$$

exists and

$$(30) \quad \int_0^\infty x^s dQ(x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-s)\Gamma(1+as/b)} \int_0^\infty x^s dV(x)$$

for sufficiently small $|\text{Re}(s)|$ where

$$(31) \quad V(s) = 1 - \frac{\log \Phi\left(\frac{1}{s}, 0\right)}{\log \Phi\left(\frac{1}{s}, 1\right)}$$

for $\text{Re}(s) > 0$.

PROOF. In proving this theorem we may assume without loss of generality that $A_2 = B_2 = 1$. Let

$$(32) \quad \Psi(s, q) = \mathbf{E}\{e^{-s\alpha_n - q\beta_n}\}$$

for $\text{Re}(s) \geq 0$ and $\text{Re}(q) \geq 0$. By (23) it follows that

$$(33) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[\Psi\left(\frac{s}{n^a}, \frac{q}{n^b}\right) \right]^n = \Phi(s, q)$$

and

$$(34) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \left[\Psi\left(\frac{s}{n^a}, \frac{q}{n^b}\right) - 1 \right] = \log \Phi(s, q)$$

for $\text{Re}(s) \geq 0$ and $\text{Re}(q) \geq 0$. We note that necessarily $\log \Phi(s, 0) = -As^{1/a}$ and $\log \Phi(0, q) = -Bq^{1/b}$ where A and B are positive constants.

For simplicity let us write $\xi(t) = \gamma_{\omega(t)}$ for $t \geq 0$ and denote by $I(A)$ the indicator variable of the event A , that is, $I(A) = 1$ if A occurs and $I(A) = 0$ if A does not occur. By (6) we have

$$(35) \quad \mathbf{E}\{e^{-s\xi(t)}\} = 1 - [1 - \Psi(s, 0)]M(t, s)$$

for $\text{Re}(s) \geq 0$ where

$$(36) \quad M(t, s) = \sum_{n=0}^\infty \mathbf{E}\{e^{-s\tau_n} I(\delta_n \leq t)\}.$$

If we express the sum in (36) in the form of an integral, then we can write that

$$(37) \quad M(t^b, st^{-a}) = t \int_0^\infty \mathbf{E}\{\exp[-st^{-a}\gamma_{[ut]}]I(\delta_{[ut]} \leqq t^b)\} du$$

for $\text{Re}(s) \geqq 0$ and $t > 0$.

We shall prove that if $\text{Re}(s) \geqq 0$, then

$$(38) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{M(t, st^{-a/b})}{t^{1/b}} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{M(t^b, st^{-a})}{t} = \mu(s)$$

exists and

$$(39) \quad \mu(s) = \int_0^\infty \mathbf{E}\{e^{-su} \gamma I(\delta \leqq u^{-b})\} du$$

where $\mathbf{P}\{\gamma \leqq x, \delta \leqq y\} = F(x, y)$.

For $\text{Re}(s) \geqq 0$ we have

$$(40) \quad |\mu(s)| \leqq \mu(0) = \int_0^\infty \mathbf{P}\{\delta \leqq u^{-b}\} du = \mathbf{E}\{\delta^{-1/b}\} = \frac{1}{B\Gamma(1 + 1/b)}$$

where the last equality follows from $\mathbf{E}\{e^{-s\delta}\} = e^{-Bs^{1/b}}$ for $\text{Re}(s) \geqq 0$.

Since by (34) $\lim_{q \rightarrow +0} [1 - \Psi(s, 0)]s^{-1/a} = A$, it follows from (35) and (38) that

$$(41) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}\{\exp[-s\xi(t)t^{-a/b}]\} = 1 - As^{1/a}\mu(s)$$

for $\text{Re}(s) \geqq 0$.

It remains to prove (38). First, let $s = 0$. Since

$$(42) \quad \int_0^\infty e^{-qt} dM(t, 0) = \frac{1}{1 - \Psi(0, q)}$$

for $\text{Re}(q) > 0$ and since $\lim_{q \rightarrow +0} [1 - \Psi(0, q)]q^{-1/b} = B$, it follows from a Tauberian theorem of O. Szász [2] that

$$(43) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{M(t, 0)}{t^{1/b}} = \frac{1}{B\Gamma(1 + 1/b)}.$$

This proves (38) for $s = 0$.

By (23) it follows that if $t \rightarrow \infty$, then the integrand in (37) tends to the integrand in (39) for $u > 0$ and $\text{Re}(s) \geqq 0$. Since (38) holds for $s = 0$, we can conclude that for any $K > 0$ and $\text{Re}(s) \geqq 0$ we have

$$(44) \quad \left| \int_K^\infty \mathbf{E}\{\exp[-st^{-a}\gamma_{[ut]}]I(\delta_{[ut]} \leqq t^b)\} du \right| \leqq \int_K^\infty \mathbf{P}\{\delta_{[ut]} \leqq t^b\} du \\ \rightarrow \int_K^\infty \mathbf{P}\{\delta \leqq u^{-b}\} du \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty,$$

and the extreme right member is arbitrarily close to 0 if K is sufficiently large. Thus by the dominated convergence theorem it follows that in (37) the integral tends to $\mu(s)$ for $\text{Re}(s) \geqq 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. This proves (38).

By (40) it follows that the right-hand side of (41) tends to 1 as $s \rightarrow +0$. Thus by the continuity theorem of Laplace-Stieltjes transforms we can conclude that the limiting distribution

$$(45) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}\left\{\frac{\xi(t)}{t^{a/b}} \leqq x\right\} = Q(x)$$

exists, and

$$(46) \quad \int_0^\infty e^{-sx} dQ(x) = 1 - As^{1/a}\mu(s)$$

for $\operatorname{Re}(s) \geq 0$. However, we can also obtain $Q(x)$ in another way.

By (35) we have

$$(47) \quad q \int_0^\infty e^{-qt} \mathbf{E}\{e^{-s\xi(t)}\} dt = 1 - \frac{1 - \Psi(s, 0)}{1 - \Psi(s, q)}$$

for $\operatorname{Re}(s) \geq 0$ and $\operatorname{Re}(q) > 0$. Now let ν be a positive real random variable which is independent of the process $\{\xi(t), 0 \leq t < \infty\}$ and for which $\mathbf{P}\{\nu \leq x\} = 1 - e^{-x}$ if $x \geq 0$. Then by (47) we have

$$(48) \quad \mathbf{E}\{e^{-s\xi(\nu/q)}\} = 1 - \frac{1 - \Psi(s, 0)}{1 - \Psi(s, q)}$$

for $\operatorname{Re}(s) \geq 0$ and $q > 0$. By (34) and (48) we get

$$(49) \quad \lim_{q \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{E}\{\exp[-sq^{a/b}\xi(\nu/q)]\} = 1 - \lim_{q \rightarrow 0} \frac{[1 - \Psi(sq^{a/b}, 0)]q^{-1/b}}{[1 - \Psi(sq^{a/b}, q)]q^{-1/b}} \\ = 1 - \frac{\log \Phi(s, 0)}{\log \Phi(s, 1)} = V\left(\frac{1}{s}\right)$$

for $\operatorname{Re}(s) \geq 0$ where we used the definition (31).

If ξ, ν_1, ν_2 are mutually independent random variables for which $\mathbf{P}\{\xi \leq x\} = Q(x)$ and $\mathbf{P}\{\nu_1 \leq x\} = \mathbf{P}\{\nu_2 \leq x\} = 1 - e^{-x}$ for $x \geq 0$, then by (49) we have

$$(50) \quad \mathbf{P}\{\xi\nu_1^{-1}\nu_2^{a/b} \leq x\} = V(x)$$

for $x > 0$. Hence it follows that

$$(51) \quad \mathbf{E}\{\xi^s\}\mathbf{E}\{\nu_1^{-s}\}\mathbf{E}\{\nu_2^{as/b}\} = \int_0^\infty x^s dV(x)$$

for sufficiently small $|\operatorname{Re}(s)|$. This proves (30). From (30) we can obtain $Q(x)$ by Mellin's inversion formula.

In the particular case when $a = b$ we have

$$(52) \quad \int_0^\infty x^s dQ(x) = \frac{\sin \pi s}{\pi s} \int_0^\infty x^s dV(x)$$

for sufficiently small $|\operatorname{Re}(s)|$, and hence it follows by inversion that

$$(53) \quad \frac{dQ(x)}{dx} = \frac{V(xe^{\pi i}) - V(xe^{-\pi i})}{2\pi i x}$$

for $x > 0$ where the definition of $V(x)$ is extended by analytical continuation to the complex plane cut along the negative real axis from 0 to ∞ .

In the particular case when γ and δ are independent random variables, that is, $F(x, y) = \mathbf{P}\{\gamma \leq x\}\mathbf{P}\{\delta \leq y\}$ we have

$$(54) \quad Q(x) = \mathbf{P}\{\gamma\delta^{-a/b} \leq x\}.$$

This follows easily from (46). Conversely, we can prove that if (54) is true, then γ and δ are necessarily independent random variables.

To prove this last statement let us suppose that the vector variable (γ, δ) and ν_1 and ν_2 are mutually independent. Let $\mathbf{P}\{\gamma \leq x, \delta \leq y\} = F(x, y)$ with Laplace-Stieltjes transform $\Phi(s, q)$ defined by (28), and $\mathbf{P}\{\nu_1 \leq x\} = \mathbf{P}\{\nu_2 \leq x\} = 1 - e^{-x}$ for $x \geq 0$. Then we have

$$(55) \quad \mathbf{P}\{\gamma\nu_1^{-1} \leq x, \delta\nu_2^{-1} \leq y\} = \Phi\left(\frac{1}{x}, \frac{1}{y}\right)$$

for $x > 0$ and $y > 0$. Hence we can deduce that

$$(56) \quad \mathbf{P}\{\gamma\delta^{-a/b}\nu_1^{-1}\nu_2^{a/b} \leq x\} = \frac{axV'(x)}{[1 - V(x)]}$$

for $x > 0$ where $V(x)$ is given by (31). If we compare (50) and (56), then we can conclude that

$$(57) \quad \frac{axV'(x)}{1 - V(x)} = V(x)$$

is a necessary and sufficient condition for the validity of (54). The general solution of (57) is

$$(58) \quad V(x) = \frac{Cx^{1/a}}{1 + Cx^{1/a}}$$

for $x > 0$ where C is a positive constant. This implies that

$$(59) \quad \Phi(s, q) = \exp[-A(s^{1/a} + Cq^{1/b})]$$

for $\text{Re}(s) \geq 0$ and $\text{Re}(q) \geq 0$. Hence it follows that $C = B/A$ and that γ and δ are independent.

Finally, the asymptotic distribution of $\alpha(t)$ is given by (11) where now $d = a/b$, $D_1 = 0$, $D_2 = A_2B_2^{-a/b}$, and $\mathbf{P}\{\theta \leq x\} = Q(x)$.

We note that in a similar way we can prove that

$$(60) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}\left\{\frac{\delta_{\rho(t)}}{B_2A_2^{-b/a}t^{b/a}} \leq x\right\} = Q^*(x)$$

exists and

$$(61) \quad \int_0^\infty x^s dQ^*(x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-s)\Gamma(1+bs/a)} \int_0^\infty x^s dV^*(x)$$

for sufficiently small $|\text{Re}(s)|$ where

$$(62) \quad V^*(s) = \frac{\log \Phi(1, 0)}{\log \Phi(1, 1/s)}$$

for $\text{Re}(s) > 0$. The asymptotic distribution of $\beta(t)$ is given by (13) where now $d = b/a$, $D_1 = 0$, $D_2 = B_2A_2^{-b/a}$, and $\mathbf{P}\{\theta \leq x\} = Q^*(x)$.

We observe that

$$(63) \quad V^*(x) = 1 - V(x^{-a/b})$$

for $x > 0$.

The following theorem contains the case $a \geq 1$, $\frac{1}{2} \leq b < 1$ as a particular case.

THEOREM 4. *If $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n, \dots$ are mutually independent and identically distributed random variables for which*

$$(64) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \frac{\gamma_n}{A_2 n^a} \leq x \right\} = \mathbf{P}\{\gamma \leq x\}$$

where $a \geq 1$ and $A_2 > 0$, and if

$$(65) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\delta_n}{n} = B_1$$

in probability where $B_1 > 0$, then we have

$$(66) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \frac{\gamma_{\omega(t)} B_1^a}{A_2 t^a} \leq x \right\} = \mathbf{P}\{\gamma \leq x\}.$$

PROOF. By (6) and (65) it follows that

$$(67) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\omega(t)}{t} = \frac{1}{B_1}$$

in probability. Thus (66) immediately follows from Lemma 1.

In this case the asymptotic distribution of $\alpha(t)$ is given by (11) where now $d = a$, $D_1 = 0$, $D_2 = A_2 B_1^{-a}$ and $\mathbf{P}\{\theta \leq x\} = \mathbf{P}\{\gamma \leq x\}$.

The following theorem contains the case $b \geq 1$, $\frac{1}{2} \leq a < 1$ as a particular case.

THEOREM 5. *If $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_n, \dots$ are mutually independent and identically distributed random variables for which*

$$(68) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \frac{\delta_n}{B_2 n^b} \leq x \right\} = \mathbf{P}\{\delta \leq x\}$$

where $b \geq 1$ and $B_2 > 0$, and if

$$(69) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\gamma_n}{n} = A_1$$

in probability where $A_1 > 0$, then we have

$$(70) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \frac{\delta_{\rho(t)} A_1^b}{B_2 t^b} \leq x \right\} = \mathbf{P}\{\delta \leq x\}.$$

PROOF. By (8) and (69) it follows that

$$(71) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\rho(t)}{t} = \frac{1}{A_1}$$

in probability. Thus (70) immediately follows from Lemma 1.

In this case the asymptotic distribution of $\beta(t)$ is given by (13) where now $d = b$, $D_1 = 0$, $D_2 = B_2 A_1^{-b}$ and $\mathbf{P}\{\theta \leq x\} = \mathbf{P}\{\delta \leq x\}$.

THEOREM 6. *If (α_n, β_n) ($n = 1, 2, \dots$) are mutually independent and identically distributed vector variables for which (23) holds with $\frac{1}{2} \leq a < 1$ and $\frac{1}{2} \leq b < 1$, then*

$$(72) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \frac{A_1 \delta_{\rho(t)} - B_1 t}{A_1^{-d} t^d} \leq x \right\} = Q(x)$$

exists where $d = \max(a, b)$,

$$(73) \quad \begin{aligned} Q(x) &= \mathbf{P}\{A_1 B_2 \delta \leq x\} && \text{for } b > a, \\ &= \mathbf{P}\{A_1 B_2 \delta - B_1 A_2 \gamma \leq x\} && \text{for } b = a, \\ &= \mathbf{P}\{-B_1 A_2 \gamma \leq x\} && \text{for } b < a, \end{aligned}$$

and $\mathbf{P}\{\gamma \leq x, \delta \leq y\} = F(x, y)$.

PROOF. By (23) it follows that

$$(74) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \frac{A_1 \delta_n - B_1 \gamma_n}{n^d} \leq x \right\} = Q(x)$$

where $d = \max(a, b)$ and $Q(x)$ is given by (73).

By (8) and (23) it follows that

$$(75) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \frac{\rho(t) - t/A_1}{A_2 A_1^{-(1+a)} t^a} \leq x \right\} = \mathbf{P}\{-\gamma \leq x\},$$

and

$$(76) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\rho(t)}{t} = \frac{1}{A_1}$$

in probability. If we apply Lemma 1 to the random variables $\zeta(n) = A_1 \delta_n - B_1 \gamma_n$ ($n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$), and $\{\rho(t), 0 \leq t < \infty\}$, then we obtain that

$$(77) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \frac{A_1 \delta_{\rho(t)} - B_1 \gamma_{\rho(t)}}{(t/A_1)^d} \leq x \right\} = Q(x).$$

It remains to show that (77) implies (72). This follows from the inequalities

$$(78) \quad A_1 \delta_{\rho(t)} - B_1 \gamma_{\rho(t)+1} \leq A_1 \delta_{\rho(t)} - B_1 t \leq A_1 \delta_{\rho(t)} - B_1 \gamma_{\rho(t)}$$

for $t \geq 0$ and from the fact that

$$(79) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\alpha_{\rho(t)+1}}{t^a} = 0$$

in probability. The relation (79) follows from the inequality

$$(80) \quad \mathbf{P} \left\{ \frac{\alpha_{\rho(t)+1}}{t^a} > \varepsilon \right\} \leq \mathbf{P} \left\{ \left| \rho(t) - \frac{t}{A_1} \right| > K t^a \right\} + 2K t^a \mathbf{P}\{\alpha_1 > t^a \varepsilon\}$$

which holds for $\varepsilon > 0$ and $K > 0$. Since $\mathbf{P}\{\alpha_1 \leq x\}$ belongs to the domain of normal attraction of a stable distribution function with characteristic exponent $1/a$, it follows that

$$(81) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}\{\alpha_1 > t^a \varepsilon\} (t^a \varepsilon)^{1/a} = c$$

where c is a nonnegative constant. ($c = 0$ if $a = \frac{1}{2}$.) This implies that the second term on the right-hand side of (80) tends to 0 as $t \rightarrow \infty$. If $t \rightarrow \infty$ and $K \rightarrow \infty$, then by (75) the first term on the right-hand side of (80) tends to 0. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, this implies (79). This completes the proof of the theorem.

Now the asymptotic distribution of $\beta(t)$ is given by (13) where $d = \max(a, b)$, $D_1 = B_1$, $D_2 = 1/A_1^d$ and $P\{\theta \leq x\} = Q(x)$ is given by (73).

4. Examples. First, let us suppose that (23) holds with $a = b = 1/\alpha$ where $0 < \alpha < 1$, $A_1 = B_1 = 0$, $A_2 > 0$, $B_2 > 0$ and that

$$(82) \quad \Phi(s, q) = e^{-s^\alpha - q^\alpha}$$

for $\operatorname{Re}(s) \geq 0$ and $\operatorname{Re}(q) \geq 0$ where $\Phi(s, q)$ is defined by (28). Then by (31) we have

$$(83) \quad V(x) = \frac{x^\alpha}{1 + x^\alpha}$$

for $x \geq 0$ and (29) holds with

$$(84) \quad \frac{dQ(x)}{dx} = \frac{x^\alpha \sin \alpha\pi}{\pi x(1 + 2x^\alpha \cos \alpha\pi + x^{2\alpha})}$$

for $x > 0$. This follows from (53). Thus by Theorem 2 we obtain that

$$(85) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} P\left\{\frac{\alpha(t)}{t} \leq x\right\} = Q\left(\frac{B_2 x}{A_2(1-x)}\right)$$

for $0 \leq x \leq 1$.

Second, let us suppose that (23) holds with $a = b = 1/\alpha$ where $0 < \alpha < 1$, $A_1 = B_1 = 0$, $A_2 > 0$, $B_2 > 0$ and that

$$(86) \quad \Phi(s, q) = e^{-(s+q)^\alpha}$$

for $\operatorname{Re}(s+q) \geq 0$ where $\Phi(s, q)$ is defined by (28). Then by (31) we have

$$(87) \quad V(x) = 1 - \frac{1}{(1+x)^\alpha}$$

for $x \geq 0$ and (29) holds with

$$(88) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{dQ(x)}{dx} &= \frac{\sin \alpha\pi}{\pi x(x-1)^\alpha} && \text{for } x > 1, \\ &= 0 && \text{for } x \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

This follows from (53). Thus by Theorem 2 we obtain that

$$(89) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} P\left\{\frac{\alpha(t)}{t} \leq x\right\} = Q\left(\frac{B_2 x}{A_2(1-x)}\right)$$

for $0 \leq x \leq 1$.

We note that in the second example by (62) we obtain that

$$(90) \quad V^*(x) = \frac{x^\alpha}{(1+x)^\alpha}$$

for $x \geq 0$ and thus (60) holds with

$$(91) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{dQ^*(x)}{dx} &= \frac{\sin \alpha\pi}{\pi x^{1-\alpha}(1-x)^\alpha} && \text{for } 0 < x < 1, \\ &= 0 && \text{for } x \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Now by Theorem 2 we obtain that

$$(92) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \frac{\beta(t)}{t} \leq x \right\} = Q^* \left(\frac{A_2 x}{B_2(1-x)} \right)$$

for $0 \leq x \leq 1$. Of course (89) and (92) are merely different versions of the same limit theorem.

Third, let us suppose that (23) holds with $a = b = \frac{1}{2}$, $A_1 > 0$, $B_1 > 0$, $A_2 > 0$, $B_2 > 0$ and that $F(x, y)$ is a two-dimensional normal distribution function of type

$$(93) \quad N(\|\delta\|, \|\begin{smallmatrix} r & 1 \\ 1 & r \end{smallmatrix}\|).$$

Then by (72) and (13) we obtain that

$$(94) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \frac{\beta(t) - \frac{B_1 t}{A_1 + B_1}}{\left(\frac{A_1}{A_1 + B_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} t^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq x \right\} = \mathbf{P} \left\{ \frac{A_1 B_2 \delta - B_1 A_2 \gamma}{A_1^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq x \right\}$$

where the random variables γ and δ have a two-dimensional normal distribution of type (93). By (94) we can write also that

$$(95) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \frac{\beta(t) - M_1 t}{M_2 t^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq x \right\} = \Phi(x)$$

where $M_1 = B_1/(A_1 + B_1)$,

$$(96) \quad M_2 = \frac{(A_1^2 B_2^2 + B_1^2 A_2^2 - 2r A_1 B_1 A_2 B_2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(A_1 + B_1)^{\frac{1}{2}}},$$

and $\Phi(x)$ is the normal distribution function of type $N(0, 1)$.

REFERENCES

[1] ANSCOMBE, F. J. (1952). Large-sample theory of sequential estimation. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **48** 600-607.
 [2] SZÁSZ, O. (1929). Verallgemeinerung und neuer Beweis einige Sätze Tauberscher Art. *Sitzungsber. der Bayer. Akad. der Wiss. Math.-Phys. Kl.* 325-340.
 [3] TAKÁCS, L. (1959). On a sojourn time problem in the theory of stochastic processes. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **93** 531-540.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS
 CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY
 CLEVELAND, OHIO 44106