

## A class of infinitesimal generators of one-dimensional Markov processes

### II. Invariant measures

By H. LANGER and W. SCHENK

(Received Feb. 23, 1978)

(Revised March 23, 1979)

It was shown in [4] that an operator of the form (1) below with boundary conditions of Feller-Wentzell type is the infinitesimal generator of a strongly continuous nonnegative contraction (s. c. n. c.) semigroup  $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$  in  $C=C([0, 1])^*$  or a subspace of  $C$ . In this note we continue the study of these operators. The main result is that the semigroup  $(T_t^*)_{t \geq 0}$  or the corresponding Markov process have a unique invariant measure  $\mu_0$  with  $\text{supp } \mu_0 = [0, 1]$  if only the boundary conditions are "not too degenerated". This seems to be rather evident as the operator (1) contains a diffusion term  $D_m D_x$ . However the analytical proof of this fact we could give (Theorem 5) is not so short. Further it is shown that  $\mu_0$  is in  $(0, 1)$  absolutely continuous with respect to the measure  $m$ .

In a following note we shall continue the study of this class of Markov processes along the lines of [6]. In particular, we shall investigate the limit behavior of the transition probabilities if  $t \rightarrow \infty$  and derive Kolmogorov's equations for the densities of the transition probabilities (with respect to  $\mu_0$ ). As an important tool, the extension of the semigroup  $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$  to  $L^2(\mu_0)$  (with scalar product denoted by  $[\cdot, \cdot]$ ) is considered. The explicit expressions of  $[Af, f]$  and its real and imaginary parts, given at the end of this paper, will play an essential role in this investigation.

We thank the referee for many valuable suggestions and, in particular, for correcting an error in our original proof of Lemma 3.

#### 1. Preliminaries.

Let  $m, b$  and the family of measures  $n_x, x \in [0, 1]$ , have the same properties as in [4], [5] that is  $m$  is a strongly increasing continuous function

---

<sup>\*</sup>) In [4] only real spaces have been considered, here, however,  $C$  is supposed to be complex. It is easy to see ([5], p. 106), that the statements quoted above are true for the corresponding complex spaces.