

THEN ,

MOTE: Cournes of A sum to 11.

DEF. A IS A (LEFT) STOLIASTIC TRANSITION MATRIX $IF \underline{\Gamma} A = \underline{\Gamma}, \underline{\Gamma} = (1 | \dots |) AND$ AU ENTRIES OF À ARE MOONWEGATIVE (Aij 30). • THEN, $(A^k)_{ij} = \sum_{k_1} \sum_{k_{l-1}} A_{ik_l} A_{k_lk_l} \cdots A_{k_{l-1}j}$ is the proportion that more from j to i in Exactly he steps, cover stated AT j. (Ail, ... Alinj connesponos to envernoer them more ALONG PATH $j \rightarrow l_{\mu} \rightarrow l_{\mu} \rightarrow - \rightarrow l_{\mu} \rightarrow i$ DEF. V IS A FRODADILITY VELOUR IF IV = 1 AND AU ENTRIES OF Y ARE MONNECONTRE (VIZO), WE PENOTE SPACE OF AU PROBABULTY VELTONS (DUSTRUE UTIONS) BY P. IF INTEANY THE PROPORTIAN OF FISH IN LAWE I IS VI, THEN IL YEARS WATER IT IS (AKY);.

PROBADILISTIC INTEGRACTION:

No. Longo

Aij is the termition reconstruity pig = P(X = i | X = j) THAT AN INDIVIOUAL FISH IS AT STATE I AT TIME GIVEN IT IS AT STATE j AT TIME O (XL is THE PosiTION AT TIME k) "PROBABILITY" = PROPORTIONS OBSERVED OVER MANY (MOEPENDENT THALK (THIME OF COIN FORSES), THus A CONSEQUENCE OF THE SO-CALLED LAW OF VARIOR NUMBERS (FAM COIN HAS 50% PROBADILITY OF HOR T on Any one FUD SINCE OVER MANY REPEATED FUDS WE Observe 50% star up H on T in The Lang-Row). $\underline{x}(h) = A^{h} \underline{x}(0)$ is A Maner CHAIN WITH INTIA DISTRIBUTION X (0) (A PROBABILITY VELTON). x(k) = propositivy Any one Fish STRATE AT TIME 430 IS IN A PARPHIAR = PROPORTION OF EASEMBLE OF ALL FISH THAT IN PORTICURAR STRATE AT TIME 430 IS MARKOV BECAUSE TRAMITION PRUDABULTIES ONLY DEPEND ON CURRENT STATE, NOT ON THE RAST. For EK., IF FISH DO NOT RETURN TO THEIR PREMOUS STATE IMMEDIATELY, THE IS NOT MANNOV . Model

Lenne 21 03/07/12

, r	PLEASE	Consult	NOTES	w	FONOVIME	PACES ,	ALONG
$\langle \rangle$		DICUSSIO	in an	A	PARTCHARY IMPARTANT		TANT
	EXAMPLE OF A			nov	CHANN	(RANDOM	WHO C
		ON FINTE SET OF STATES), FOR THE REMAINDER					
	or	an piscu	sim an	(Arbor Cha	HALING _	(

:: Review :: -State space (set of nodes), probability vectors $v \in P$ (distribution on state space), stochastic matrix A (entries are transition probabilities for an individual, become proportions that transition when considering large ensembles by LLN). -Markov property: transition probabilities only depend on current state, not on history of path taken to get there. For ex., if fish model modified such that fish will not return to previous lake right away, not Markov! Models with finite memory can be made Markov by enlarging the state space. :: Properties of A (Perron-Frobenius theorem) :: (0) A^k is transition matrix. In particular, if $x(0) \in A^k(x(0) \in A^k(x(0))$ Pf.: A^k has all positive entries and $r(A^k) = r(A^{k-1}) = \dots = r$. -Progressively draw spectrum with each step. (1) A always has eigenvalue 1 (possibly with multiplicity greater than 1). Corresponding eigenvectors can be normalized to be in P. Pf.: $rA = r \Rightarrow A^T$ has eigenvalue 1 \Rightarrow A has eigenvalue 1. *Eigenvector in P not shown.* (2) All eigenvalues of A must lie in closed unit disc of C (i.e., A has no eigenvalues of magnitude greater than 1, or A has spectral radius 1). Corresponding eigenvectors must have entires sum to 1. Pf.: First, A cannot have eigenvalue corresponding to unstable mode since otherwise $x(k) \rightarrow x(k)$ \infty, which contradicts (0). Second, $(r - rA) = 0 \Rightarrow 0 = (r - rA) \times i = (1 - \lambda ambda)r \times i$ $r \ge 0.$ (3) If A has all positive entries, then 1 is only eigenvalue on unit circle in C, and has algebraic multiplicity 1. Pf.: See Q3 for proof. *Algebraic multiplicity 1 not shown.* :: Stationary distributions :: -Def. Stationary distribution is $pi \in P$ such that Api = pi. -We are interested in stationary distributions because they are statistical equilibria of the system (for example, temperature in a room settles down to a fixed profile that depends on distance from floor--warmest air on top, coolest on bottom due to gravity). If system is in a statistically stationary state note that the random state of any one individual is *not* fixed in time, but the distribution of states is. Questions: *Q0: When does a stationary distribution \pi exist?

A: Always by (1). In fact, if $x(k) \to v \in P$, must be to a stationary distribution (v = pi).

*Q1: Is \pi unique?

A: Not necessarily. As we have seen, eigenvalue 1 can have algebraic multiplicity greater than 1. Counterexample: A = I means every probability vector is a stationary distribution. Problem is that that two sets of states never communicate with each other (can't get from one set of states to other). For example, A = [block 1; ...; block N] also allows for nonuniqueness. To overcome this, we impose *irreducibility* of A---for each fixed i,j, (A^k)_ij > 0 for some k (i.e., can eventually get from every state to every other state).

*Q2: If \pi unique, does $x(k) = (A^k)x(0)$ converges to \pi for every x(0)?

A: Not necessarily. Counterexample: $A = [0 \ 1; \ 1 \ 0]$. Then every $x(0) \setminus in P$ besides $x(0) = (1/2, 1/2)^T$ does not converge. Problem is periodicity. More generally, A = shift of identity also allows for periodicity, or A transition matrix of periodic random walk on even number of states. To overcome this, need *aperiodicity* of A---for each fixed i, there is a K such that $(A^k)_{ii} > 0$ for all k \geq K (i.e., returns to state i do not form a rigid pattern).

-Picture: Venn diagram. Irreducibility (uniqueness of \pi) \cap aperiodicity (convergence) = regularity (convergence to unique stationary distribution \pi). To deal with Q1, Q2, we impose irreducibility and aperiodicity. Equivalently, this is the condition of *regularity* of transition matrix.

-Def. A is regular if for some K geq 1, A^K has all entries strictly positive (that is, all states communicate in at most K steps). Then A^k has positive entries for all k geq K. Can show that A is regular iff it is irreducible and aperiodic (HW problem).

-Theorem. For regular A, we have a unique pi to which every initial state converges. In addition, A^k converges to ($pi \dots pi$). Pf.: Assuming A regular with K = 1 WLOG, uniqueness and convergence by (1)-(3). Consider x(0) = e_i for each i to get A^k --> ($pi \dots pi$).

*Q3: If A regular, how to find \pi? How fast does algorithm converge?

A: Power method. Start with any initial condition x(0), and evolve. Converges at rate given by second eigenvalue $\lambda = 0$. For a regular matrix A with K = 1, this can be estimated by $\lambda = 0$. The second eigenvalue (1 - n*min(A)) (in general, one has $\lambda = 0$. The second eigenvector of A - n*min(A)). Pf.: Eigenvector v corresponding to $\lambda = 0$. The second eigenvector of A - min(A)*B = (1 - n*min(A)) tilde{A} for B = [r; ...; r] and $\lambda = 0$. The second eigenvalues with magnitude less than 1, must have $\lambda = 0$. The second eigenvalues with magnitude less than 1, must have $\lambda = 0$. The second eigenvalues is that convergence must be at least as fast at (1 - n*min(A))*k.

*Q4: What do these distributional properties about the ensemble imply about any particular random path?

A: Ergodicity--long-run time average of any chosen path equals \pi, which is the long-run ensemble average at a fixed time. In other words, for a regular Markov chain each path is representative of the entire ensemble. True even for periodic transition matrices (still need irreducibility in order get a unique \pi).

-Theorem. $\lim_{T \to \inf y} (1/T)^* \sum_{k \to \infty} x(k) = pi$.

Pf.: [?]

*Q5: What if we drop irreducibility? Can we still get unique \pi?

A: Sometimes. For example, $A = [1 \ 1; \ 0 \ 0]$ is transition matrix for an absorbing Markov chain. But if we had more than one absorbing state, this wouldn't be true (why?). In fact, nonuniqueness for stochastic matrices of form $A = [I \ B; \ 0 \ C]$ (absorbing Markov chains with absorbing states in I), where I has dimension greater than 1.

LECTINE 22
03/09/12
Africation To NETHORIC SCIENCE .
NET SOF A MORE , CONNECTED BY EDGES.
NET SOF A MORE , CONNECTED BY EDGES.
NET OF A DECEMBENT OF A MORE .
UNINFECTED DECEMBER .
(EG., EACEBOOL) (EG., THITTER, WWW).
WE WILL FOLKS ON DIRECTED NETHORISM.
DEF. AD BREAKLY MADRIE A OF ACTIONS OVER BY

$$A_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{IF THERE US A DIRECTED EDGE FROM j TO I
 $3 & \text{CONNECTED} & (freen) \\ 0 & \text{EVE} & (j = 1) \\ 0 & \text{EVE} & (j$$$

[1

ALL PROPERTIES OF METADOL LAW BE DIRECTLY
OBTIMINED FROM
$$A$$
. For EXAMPLE:
(i) IN-DECLERE OF MODE i : $d_i^{in} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ij}$ (Rew Sum)
(ii) OUT-DECLERE OF MODE i $d_i^{out} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ji}$ (LOWAN SUM)
(iii) $d_i^{out} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ik} A_{kj} = (A^{n})_{ij}$
(iii) $d_i^{out} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ik} A_{kj} = (A^{n})_{ij}$
 $N_{ij}^{(n)} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ik} A_{kj} = (A^{n})_{ij}$
 $T = \{1 \text{ IF } j \rightarrow k \rightarrow i \}$
 $d_i^{(n)} = (A^n)_{ij}$
 $\frac{d}{d_i} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ik} A_{kj} = (A^{n})_{ij}$
 $\frac{d}{d_i} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ik} A_{kj} = (A^{n})_{ij}$
 $\frac{d}{d_i} = (A^n)_{ij}$
 $\frac{d}{d_i} = (A^n)_{ij}$
 $\frac{d}{d_i} = (A^n)_{ij}$
 $\frac{d}{d_i} = (A^n)_{ij}$
(iv) A CYCLE OF LENCTH $T \geq 1$ IS ANY POTH
 $T \in LENOTH T THAT BEOINS OND ENDS AT
 $T = Same MODE$.
 $\frac{d}{d_i} = (A \cap T = 1)$ is nerveen $0$$

$$C^{(r)} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} N_{ii}^{(r)} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (A^{r})_{ii} = Tr(A^{r}).$$

SINCE A HAR JORDAN FORM
$$A = P \overline{D} P^{-1}$$
,
 $Tr(A^r) = Tr(P \overline{D}^r P^{-1}) = Tr(\overline{D}^r)$
 $= \lambda_1^r + \dots + \lambda_n^r$
WHERE $\lambda_{1,r-}, \lambda_n$ ARE THE BLOW UNLIES & A.
NOTE: WHEN CONTINUE CAREES, WE DISTINGUESH THE EXACT
DUME OF EDGES TENENSED. THAT IS,
 $I \bigcap_{3}^{2}$ HAS $\underline{3}$ cycles or Leworth $\underline{3}$
 $(1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 1, 2 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 2,$
AND $\underline{3} \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 3$).
PROSEDUME / ELECTRICATE CENTRICITY "
Q: GIVEN A DIRECTED METHODE, HOW INFORMANT ("CENTROL")
 $IS NODES I ?$
EX. (WWW)
 $intermediates and the methodes, DIRECTED EDGES ARE LINKS.$

$$\frac{1}{1024} : Let χ_i penote the importance (controlly)
of werpage i . Denote $\chi = (\chi_1, ..., \chi_n)^T$.
• Controlling χ_i^- should depend on
(i) If we pases that lime to i
(ii) How control these limburg pages for Appendix and
themselves (Importance Begets Importance).
(iii) How many other pages these limbortance).
(iii) How many other pages these limbortance $fages$
 $\chi_i^- = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{A_{ij}}{100T} \chi_j^-$
(iii)
Let $T_{ij}^- = \frac{A_{ij}}{10T} \implies T_{ij} \ge 0$ for an ijj and
 $(\pm T)_i^- \sum_{j=1}^{n} T_{ji} = 1$ since
 \int_0^{00T} then monumes A_{ij} .$$

50, CENTERNIN X SATISFIES

$$x = T x$$
,

I.E., STATIONARY DISTRIBUTION OF MARNER CATAIN DEPREMANED BY TI

> T TRANS 1700 MATRIX.

TO REMEDY TOHS, LETS CIVE EVERY MODE A LATTLE BIT OF CENTRALING FOR FREE "

$$\chi_{i} = \chi \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{A_{ij}}{J_{\alpha i}} \chi_{j} \right) + (1-\chi) \frac{1}{n}$$

$$\int \frac{1}{\sqrt{j}} \int \frac{1}{\sqrt{j}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{j}} \chi_{j} + (1-\chi) \frac{1}{n}$$

$$\int \frac{1}{\sqrt{j}} \int \frac{1}{\sqrt{j}} \frac{1}{$$

Damping Factor.

$$= \chi = \alpha T \chi + (l-\alpha) \frac{1}{n} t^{T}$$

$$= \alpha T \chi + (l-\alpha) \frac{1}{n} r r^{T}$$

$$= \alpha T \chi + (l-\alpha) \frac{1}{n} r r^{T}$$

$$= \alpha T \chi + (l-\alpha)$$

$$= \alpha T \chi + (l-\alpha)$$

$$= (1-\alpha) r \chi = (l-\alpha)$$

$$= r \chi = l$$

$$= r \chi \neq l .$$

$$\underline{x} = \alpha T \underline{x} + (1-\alpha) \frac{1}{n} r^{T} (\underline{r} \underline{x})$$

$$= \left[\alpha T + (1-\alpha) \frac{1}{n} \underline{r}^{T} \underline{r} \right] \underline{x}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} n \\ 1 \\ \dots \\ 1$$

can
$$T_{PR} = \alpha T + (1-\alpha) + rT_{r}^{T}$$
.
 $T_{THS} = \alpha T + (1-\alpha) + rT_{r}^{T}$.
 $T_{THS} = \alpha T + (1-\alpha) + reastrow matrix
 $T_{THS} = \alpha T + (1-\alpha) + rT_{r}^{T}$.
 $T_{THS} = \alpha T + (1-\alpha) + rT_{r}^{T}$.
 $S_{1NCE} = T_{HE} = samest = enormy = 1s = AT$.
 $S_{1NCE} = T_{HE} = samesT = enormy = 1s = AT$.
 $U_{EAST} = AT = U_{ARUE} = AS = (1-\alpha) + rT_{r}^{T}$.$

• The can be thought of AS AN INTERPORTATION
(1.6, A MUXTURE) OF THE TRANSITION MOTION
T MITH THE TRANSITION MATRIX
$$\frac{1}{n} \stackrel{T}{=} \stackrel{T}{=} \stackrel{T}{=} \stackrel{I}{=} \stackrel{T}{=} \stackrel{I}{=} \stackrel{T}{=} \stackrel{I}{=} \stackrel{I}{=} \stackrel{T}{=} \stackrel{I}{=} \stackrel{I}{=} \stackrel{I}{=} \stackrel{T}{=} \stackrel{I}{=} \stackrel{I}{=$$

pet. PAOR RANN. OF
$$i$$
 is \underline{T}_{i} , where $\underline{T} \in \mathbf{P}$
is the unave solve of $\underline{X} = T_{\mathbf{PR}} \cdot \underline{X}$.

THIS IS THE OPICIANAL ALCONITHIN EMPLOYED BY GOOGLE TO RAMA WEBPACES, WITH & TAKEN TO BE 0.85.

Reman.

1) STARBAL MITH ANY
$$\chi(0) \in P$$
 At AN UNTIAL
GUESS,
 $\chi(k) = T_{PR} \chi(0) \xrightarrow{k \to \infty} T$
2) T_{FR} is transition matrix of RANDON when
 w wells pages ($w/$ prob. χ or following one
 w wells pages ($w/$ prob. χ or following one
 w wells pages ($w/$ prob. χ or following one
 w wells pages ($w/$ prob. χ or following one
 w the unks unpoking at random vs . prob.
 $(-\chi or otimpine to A RANDOM vs. prob.
 $(-\chi or otimpine to A RANDOM vs. prob.
 $(-\chi or otimpine to A RANDOM vs. prob.
 $(-\chi or otimpine to A RANDOM vs. prob.
 $(-\chi or otimpine to A RANDOM vs. prob.
 $(-\chi or otimpine to A RANDOM vs. prob.
 $(-\chi or otimpine to A RANDOM vs. prob.
 $(-\chi or otimpine to A RANDOM vs. prob.
 $(-\chi or otimpine to A RANDOM vs. prob.
 $(-\chi or otimpine to A RANDOM vs. prob.
 $(-\chi or otimpine to A RANDOM vs. prob.
 $(-\chi or otimpine to A RANDOM vs. prob.
 $(-\chi or otimpine to A RANDOM vs. prob.
 $(-\chi or otimpine to A RANDOM vs. prob.
 $(-\chi or otimpine to A RANDOM stranse to A RANDOM stranse to A RANDOM vs.
 $(-\chi or otimpine to A RANDOM stranse to A RANDER Vs.
 $(-\chi or otimpine to B random stranse to A RANDER Vs.
 $(-\chi or otimpine to B random stranse to A RANDER Vs.
 $(-\chi or otimpine to B random stranse to A RANDER Vs.
 $(-\chi or otimpine to B random stranse to A RANDER Vs.
 $(-\chi or otimpine to B random stranse to A RANDER Vs.
 $(-\chi or otimpine to B random stranse to A RANDER Vs.
 $(-\chi or otimpine to B random stranse to A RANDER Vs.
 $(-\chi or otimpine to B random stranse to A RANDER Vs.
 $(-\chi or otimpine to B random stranse to A RANDER Vs.
 $(-\chi or otimpine to B random stranse to A RANDER Vs.
 $(-\chi or otimpine to B random stranse to A RANDER Vs.
 $(-\chi or otimpine to B random stranse to A RANDER Vs.$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$

WE COMPUTE IT WINE THE POWER METHOD (SINCE IT IS TYPICOMY IMPROVISION TO FIND THE ELCENVELOOUS OF A WORKE MATRIX LINE TPR FOR N >>1 !) "

Power METHOD:

(1) CHOOSE INTAL CUESS FOR PAGERAAM, SAY
$$\underline{X}(0) \in \mathbb{P}$$
.
(2) ITERATE $\underline{X}(h) = T_{pn} \underline{X}(0)$.
FOR h HARVE ENDLESS, $\underline{X}(h) \simeq \underline{T}$.

$$\begin{split} |\lambda_2| &\leq (1 - n \min(T_{PR})_{ij}) \\ &\stackrel{ij}{\geq} (1 - \alpha) \frac{1}{n} \\ &\leq (1 - n \cdot \frac{(1 - \alpha)}{n}) \\ &\leq [\alpha] &\leq p_{AMAAA} \quad \text{Factor}. \end{split}$$

so,
$$\|\underline{x}(h) - \underline{T}\| \leq cons T \cdot \underline{x} \|\lambda_2\|^{h} \leq cons T \cdot \underline{x} \|\lambda_2\|^{h}$$

 $T_{pepender on \underline{x}(b)}$.