

# A Markovian Perspective on the Classical Occupancy Problem with a Generalization to Pure Birth Processes

Jim van Mechelen

July, 2020

## Abstract

We study the classical occupancy problem from the viewpoint of its embedding Markov chain. We derive new expressions for the probability mass function and (complementary) distribution function in generalized form. Furthermore, we derive a completely novel sparse bidiagonal system of recursion relations for the (complementary) distribution function and provide its efficient matrix implementation.

Importantly, we generalize these results to the entire class of discrete-time pure birth processes.

**Keywords** sampling with replacement, classical occupancy problem (coupon collector's problem), discrete phase-type distributions, discrete-time pure birth processes

Master Thesis in Econometrics Presented for the Degree of Master of Science

*by*

Candidate: Jim van Mechelen

*before*

Supervisor: Dr. M. van de Velden

Assessor: Dr. A.J. Koning

Department of Econometrics, Erasmus University Rotterdam

Publicly defended on 24 September 2020.

© 2020 - present. All rights reserved. Jim van Mechelen (vmechelen{at}gmail{dot}com).

Copy for arXiv.

No part of this publication may be (re-)produced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without written permission of the author. For information regarding permissions, *contact the author*.

*To my mother  
Sari de Koning*

Luctor et Emergo

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Preliminaries</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1	Complete Homogeneous Symmetric Polynomial . . . . .	9
2.2	Stirling Numbers of the Second Kind . . . . .	10
2.2.1	Finite Differences . . . . .	10
<b>3</b>	<b>Pure Birth Processes in Discrete Time</b>	<b>12</b>
3.1	Notation and Definitions . . . . .	12
3.2	First Hitting Times . . . . .	14
3.3	Results . . . . .	15
3.3.1	Exact State Distribution . . . . .	15
3.3.2	Recurrence Relations for the Distribution Function . . . . .	18
3.3.3	Simulation . . . . .	21
3.4	Chapter Summary . . . . .	22
<b>4</b>	<b>Special Case: Classical Occupancy</b>	<b>23</b>
4.1	Problem Definition and Formulations . . . . .	26
4.2	Discrete-Time Markov Chain . . . . .	27
4.2.1	Eigendecomposition . . . . .	28
4.3	Results . . . . .	30
4.3.1	The Probability Mass Function . . . . .	30
4.3.2	The Other Multistep Transition Probabilities . . . . .	31
4.3.3	The Distribution Function . . . . .	34
4.3.4	Recurrence Relations for the Distribution Function . . . . .	36
4.4	Expectation and Variance . . . . .	38
4.5	The Randomized Occupancy Model . . . . .	40
4.5.1	Factorial and other Moments . . . . .	43
4.6	Chapter Summary . . . . .	44
<b>5</b>	<b>Conclusion and Discussion</b>	<b>45</b>
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Appendix</b>	<b>49</b>
6.1	Problem Variations . . . . .	49
6.1.1	The Complementary Occupancy Chain: Interchange of Transition and Stop Probabilities	
6.1.2	The Binomial Distribution . . . . .	52
6.2	Some Proofs . . . . .	55
6.2.1	Deferred Proofs of Results . . . . .	55
6.2.2	Other Results and Proofs . . . . .	57
6.3	Concrete Example of a Path . . . . .	60
6.4	Concrete Matrix Examples . . . . .	60

6.4.1	Sum and Difference Matrices . . . . .	60
6.4.2	Transition Matrix and Related Matrices . . . . .	61
6.4.3	Cumulative Distribution Matrix and Related Matrices . . . . .	63

# 1 Introduction

All empirical science starts with observation. Statistics, in particular, is the science concerned with assigning degrees of certainty or uncertainty to statements generalizing from a small number of observations, the sample, to all possible observations, the population.

Sampling comes in two main flavors: *with* and *without* replacement. In this thesis we shall concentrate on the first. For one, because sampling without replacement is well understood and holds few secrets.

Sampling with replacement has received renewed interest in recent decades following the rising popularity – some would say revolution – of non-parametric statistics and machine learning. Two prime examples are Efron (1979)’s bootstrap, and Breiman (2001)’s random forest. Sampling with replacement is a pivotal element in both Efron’s bootstrap procedure as well as Breiman’s random forest. Conceptually, sampling with replacement is not more complicated than sampling without replacement, however its probabilistic properties are quite more involved.

In this thesis we restrict our attention to an essential property of a sample obtained by sampling with replacement, namely: the number of distinct elements that the sample contains. This is the *classical occupancy problem*. We concern ourselves only with the exact distribution and not with its approximation or asymptotics.

The problem is a true classic of probability theory and traces its origins to DeMoivre (1711) who described it in terms of casting an  $n$ -faced die  $t$  times and asking how many, and with which probability,  $k$  distinct faces would be observed. Both Euler and Laplace studied generalizations of the problem (Todhunter, 1865).

The classical occupancy problem gets its current name from a twentieth century rephrasing in terms of an urn model (Feller (1968); Johnson and Kotz (1977); or seq. Section 4.1).

The classical occupancy problem can as well be motivated from its occurrence in natural phenomena and applications. Feller (1968, Ch. 1.2) lists sixteen variants of the problem ranging from the educational birthday problem to applications in physics, chemistry, biology and the distribution of the number of misprints in a book. In fact, the classical occupancy problem makes continual appearances in Feller’s classic text. Some further examples include the mathematical analysis of card shuffling, estimating population size in ecology, public health surveillance, and the likelihood of collisions in lotteries (Aigner and Ziegler, 2014; Aldous and Diaconis, 1986; Barabesi and Marcheselli, 2011; Chao, 1984; Williamson et al., 2009). Finally, in the context of a slightly more general model, Harkness (1969) lists five applications ranging from air battle theory to the spread of infectious disease.

Of theoretical interest is that, even though the order of the sampled elements is discarded by the statistician, sampling without replacement does not result in a uniformly random selection from the universe of multisets. This situation is reminiscent of a similar difference between the Maxwell-Boltzmann and Bose-Einstein statistics (Bose, 1924; Feller, 1968).

Notwithstanding these diverse manifestations and applications, the classical occupancy distribution does not appear to be a “household name” among statisticians. This thesis serves in part to ameliorate that situation.

A focal point in this thesis is that the classical occupancy problem permits a Markov chain

embedding. Some authors were aware of the Markovian nature<sup>1</sup> of the classical occupancy problem (e.g. Feller, 1968; Pólya, 1930; Rényi, 1962), but did not pursue this viewpoint further. The one notable exception is Uppuluri and Carpenter (1971). However, we believe that these authors did not exhaust the Markovian vantage point to its full potential.<sup>2</sup> We therefore pose our main research question as follows:

*What can we learn about the classical occupancy problem from a purely Markovian point of view?*

**More Generally.** Since the embedding Markov chain defines a discrete-time pure birth process, it is natural to ask if, and to what extent, results generalize to the entire class of discrete-time pure birth processes.

Pure birth processes occupy an important role in probability theory. They are widely applied in areas such as biology, and reliability theory, as well as the theory of phase-type distributions, which are a major class of probability distributions (cf. Neuts, 1975; O’Cinneide, 1989).

Within the phase-type literature pure birth processes play a prominent role as Cumani (1982) showed that phase-type distributions with acyclic generator matrices can be reduced to a canonical pure birth representation. The phase-type literature is primarily concerned with phase duration and to a lesser extent with the distribution of the process over its states given a fixed amount of time – even though these distributions are dual to each other, as we will see in the sequel.

## Thesis Outline

We now provide an outline for the remainder. Chapters 3 and 4 form the backbone of this thesis. Preceding these chapters we included a Preliminaries chapter in which we describe some of the main tools that we use throughout this thesis. These tools are the complete homogeneous symmetric polynomial, the  $r$ -Stirling numbers of the second kind as a special case, and their representation in terms of finite differences.

**Pure Birth Process.** Chapter 3 starts by introducing the general discrete-time pure birth process. In Section 3.2 we treat the duality between phase duration (first hitting times) and the probability distribution over process states.

The complete homogeneous symmetric polynomial is extensively used in the Results section (Section 3.3) when we derive the exact form of the probability mass function and distribution function over the process states in Theorems 1 and 2, respectively. These are the most general results that we derive in this thesis. Those theorems are then refined in Section 3.3.1 for the pure birth process having distinct transition probabilities.

Finally, we derive a completely novel system of recurrence relations for the distribution function in Section 3.3.2, and provide its matrix form in Proposition 5. We conclude with the description of a simple algorithm to simulate a pure birth process in Section 3.3.3.

**Classical Occupancy.** Chapter 4 centers completely on the classical occupancy problem and begins with a detailed introduction that explains how the classical occupancy problem is connected to sampling with replacement.

---

<sup>1</sup>By Markovian nature we mean its memoryless property, that is: the continuation of the process depends only on the current state.

<sup>2</sup>For example: lemmas are stated without proof, the distribution function is not treated, etc.



We collect various equivalent problem formulations in Section 4.1. The Markov chain embedding is introduced formally in the first part of Section 4.2.

Naturally, all results for the classical occupancy problem follow from substituting its specific parametrization – in terms of its transition probabilities – into the propositions of Chapter 3. However, we want to present an alternative route to the respective results by means of a matrix-algebraic derivation based on the eigendecomposition of the transition matrix. We derive this eigendecomposition in Section 4.2.1.

Having the eigendecomposition in hand, we derive our results specific to the classical occupancy problem in Section 4.3. We do so in explicit form, in terms of  $r$ -Stirling numbers, and as finite differences. Of particular interest are the initial-state conditioned versions for the probability mass function and distribution function, these are respectively Proposition 7 (Sec. 4.3.2) and Proposition 8 (Sec. 4.3.3).

Finally, in Section 4.5 we make a short digression into Harkness (1969)'s *randomized* occupancy model, and answer a question posed by Harkness affirmatively with expression (4.61).

We end this thesis with a Conclusion and Discussion. The Appendix contains two further problem variations, concrete examples, and some background results and proofs.

## 2 Preliminaries

This preliminary chapter serves to record in an organized manner some facts that form the foundation for the rest of this thesis. The prime concept is the complete homogeneous symmetric polynomial. We review its definition, some basic properties and the Stirling numbers of the second kind as a special case.

### 2.1 Complete Homogeneous Symmetric Polynomial

Let us begin by stating the classic expression defining the complete homogeneous symmetric polynomial, that is

$$h_d(X_0, X_1, \dots, X_k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\substack{c_0+c_1+\dots+c_k=d \\ c_j \geq 0}} X_0^{c_0} \cdot X_1^{c_1} \cdots X_k^{c_k}, \quad (2.1)$$

for all integers  $d \geq 0$  and zero otherwise (Broder, 1984; Macdonald, 1998). The polynomial is symmetric as it is invariant under permutation of the variables  $X_j$ , it is homogeneous because the sum of exponents in each term is constant, and complete as it contains all such terms.

An alternative, equivalent form is the following:

$$h_d(X_0, X_1, \dots, X_k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{0 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \dots \leq i_d \leq k} X_{i_1} \cdot X_{i_2} \cdots X_{i_d}, \quad (2.2)$$

for all integer  $d \geq 0$ , and zero otherwise.

We proceed with a few useful properties.

**Lemma 1.** *The complete homogeneous polynomial  $h_d(X_0, \dots, X_k)$  satisfies*

$$h_d(X_0, \dots, X_j, \dots, X_k) = X_j h_{d-1}(X_0, \dots, X_j, \dots, X_k) + h_d(X_0, \dots, X_{j-1}, X_{j+1}, \dots, X_k), \quad (2.3)$$

for any  $j = 0, 1, \dots, k$ .

The foregoing property (2.3) expresses that the symmetric polynomial,  $h_d(\cdot)$ , can be split in two parts: a part containing  $X_j$  and another excluding  $X_j$ . This may seem like a trivial observation, but is in fact the basis for many recurrence relations.

Repeated application of Lemma 1 on the same variable, yields the following corollary.

**Corollary 1.**

$$h_t(X_0, \dots, X_j, \dots, X_k) = \sum_{d=0}^{d'} X_j^d h_{t-d}(X_0, \dots, X_{j-1}, X_{j+1}, \dots, X_k), \quad d' \leq t. \quad (2.4)$$

The final property that we discuss is an explicit formula for the complete homogeneous symmetric polynomial when the variable set,  $\{X_0, X_1, \dots, X_k\}$ , contains only distinct values, i.e.  $X_i \neq X_j$  if  $i \neq j$ .

For such a collection of distinct real numbers, Sylvester's identity provides the following explicit, closed form.

**Lemma 2** (Sylvester's Identity). *Let a collection  $X_0, X_1, \dots, X_k \in \mathbb{R}$ , with  $X_i \neq X_j$  if  $i \neq j$ , be given, then the identity*

$$h_{t-k}(X_0, X_1, \dots, X_k) = \sum_{j=0}^k X_j^t \prod_{\substack{i=0 \\ i \neq j}}^k \frac{1}{X_j - X_i} \quad (2.5)$$

holds true.

*Proof.* See Bhatnagar (1999) and references therein. ■

These are the ingredients that we need in the first part of this thesis, that is Chapter 3.

## 2.2 Stirling Numbers of the Second Kind

Stirling numbers of the second kind have a combinatorial interpretation as counting the number of distinct unordered  $k$ -partitions of an  $n$ -set. However, when seen through the lens of the complete homogeneous symmetric polynomial they are the special case in which the set of variables  $S = \{X_0, X_1, \dots, X_k\}$  is taken equal to the set  $\{0, 1, \dots, k\}$  of consecutive integers.

The  $r$ -Stirling numbers are a generalization that takes the set  $S$  equal to  $\{r, r+1, \dots, k\}$  with  $0 \leq r \leq k$ . Broder (1984) provides an extensive treatment which includes their combinatorial interpretation.

The  $r$ -Stirling numbers of the second kind are thus defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ \begin{matrix} t \\ r, k \end{matrix} \right\} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} h_d(r, r+1, \dots, k) = \sum_{\substack{c_r + c_{r+1} + \dots + c_k = d \\ c_j \geq 0}} r^{c_r} \cdot (r+1)^{c_{r+1}} \dots k^{c_k} \\ &= \sum_{r \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \dots \leq i_d \leq k} i_1 \cdot i_2 \cdot \dots \cdot i_d, \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

with  $d = t - k \geq 0$ , and zero otherwise. The ordinary Stirling number of the second kind are recovered when  $r$  is taken equal to 0 or 1.

The ordinary Stirling numbers of the second kind obey the following relation<sup>1</sup>

$$n^t = \sum_{j=0}^n (n)_j \left\{ \begin{matrix} t \\ j \end{matrix} \right\}, \quad (2.7)$$

where  $(n)_j$  denotes the falling factorial  $n \cdot (n-1) \cdot \dots \cdot (n-j+1)$ . Furthermore, Stirling numbers of the second kind can be expressed as finite differences.

### 2.2.1 Finite Differences

The finite forward difference of a function  $f(\cdot)$  around  $\alpha$  with a positive increment  $\varepsilon$  is formally defined by

$$\Delta_\varepsilon [f(x)]_{x=\alpha} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(\alpha + \varepsilon) - f(\alpha). \quad (2.8)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>We generalize this identity for  $r$ -Stirling numbers of the second kind at the end of Section 4.3.2.

When the increment  $\varepsilon$  is equal to 1, we shall omit the subscript. We further distinguish the  $k$ th order finite forward difference, that is

$$\Delta^k [f(x)]_{x=\alpha} = \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} f(\alpha + j). \quad (2.9)$$

For classic, extensive treatments on finite differences, we refer to Boole (1860), Nørlund (1924) and Jordán (1965).

The Stirling numbers of the second kind are expressible as a finite difference in the following manner:

$$\left\{ \begin{matrix} t \\ k \end{matrix} \right\} = \frac{1}{k!} \Delta^k [x^t]_{x=0}. \quad (2.10)$$

Somewhat hidden in Carlitz (1980, Sec. 3) the  $r$ -Stirling numbers are expressed as a finite difference. The following explicit formula holds true

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ \begin{matrix} t \\ r, k \end{matrix} \right\} &= \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} (r + j)^t \\ &= \frac{1}{k!} \Delta^k [x^t]_{x=r} = \frac{1}{k!} \Delta^k [(r + x)^t]_{x=0}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

$r$ -Stirling numbers of the second kind and their representation as a finite difference are utilized in Chapter 4.

# 3 Pure Birth Processes in Discrete Time

*“Everything should be made as simple as possible, but no simpler.”*

Albert Einstein

In this chapter we derive our results in their greatest generality, which is as the probability distribution over the process states of a pure birth process in discrete time.

As discrete time increments, a pure birth process accumulates certain (pre-defined) events, variously called “births”, “transitions”, or “successes”. The current process state, or stage,<sup>1</sup> equals the number of “births” that have occurred until that time. The current state of the process can at each discrete time-step ( $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ) increase by one or remain unchanged, but it can not decrease.

We denote the probability of a new “birth” at stage  $k$  by  $p_k$ . The probability of no birth during one unit of time equals  $1 - p_k$ . The subscript  $k$  indicates that these probabilities are allowed to depend on the state of the process, but that the transition probabilities are fixed and constant through time.

Perhaps the best known example of a discrete-time pure birth process is the number of successes in a sequence of independent and identical Bernoulli trials, commonly known as the binomial distribution.

**Chapter Outline.** We begin by formally defining the pure birth process in Section 3.1. We then describe the duality between the state distribution and the distribution of each state’s first hitting time in Section 3.2. Importantly, the first hitting times have a simple representation as the convolution of geometric distributions.

It is the duality between states and phases<sup>2</sup> that plays a crucial role when we derive the probability mass function and distribution function in Section 3.3.1. In Section 3.3.2 we derive our main practical contribution, which is a simple recursion relation for the cumulative distribution function, and subsequently obtain its matrix implementation. We conclude with a simple procedure for the simulation a pure birth process in Section 3.3.3.

## 3.1 Notation and Definitions

Discrete-time Markov chains are often depicted in a transition diagram. Pure birth processes have a particularly simple structure as evidenced from Figure 3.1.




Figure 3.1: Transition diagram of a discrete-time pure birth Markov process  $X_t$ .

<sup>1</sup>The words “stage” and “state” are used synonymously throughout this thesis.

<sup>2</sup>The word “phase” is used as a synonym for a state’s first hitting time.



In addition, we use the following notation for the Markov state probabilities (i.e. the probability that the process  $X_t$  is in a certain state):

- For the probability mass function, we write

$$f(k, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Pr(X_t = k \mid X_0 = 0, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}), \quad k \in S, \quad (3.4)$$

as well as the shorthand  $\Pr(X_t = k)$ .

- For the cumulative distribution function, we write

$$F(k, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Pr(X_t \leq k \mid X_0 = 0, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}), \quad k \in S, \quad (3.5)$$

as well as the shorthand  $\Pr(X_t \leq k)$ .

- Likewise, for the complementary distribution function, we write

$$\bar{F}(k, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Pr(X_t > k \mid X_0 = 0, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}), \quad k \in S, \quad (3.6)$$

as well as the shorthand  $\Pr(X_t > k)$ . Clearly,  $F(k, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) + \bar{F}(k, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) = 1$ . For convenience we also define  $\bar{F}^*(k, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Pr(X_t \geq k \mid X_0 = 0, \mathbf{p}_{n+1})$ .

When there is no risk for misinterpretation, we shall often omit the dependence on  $\mathbf{p}_{n+1}$  and  $\{X_0 = 0\}$  in the notation. When we speak of the “state distribution” or “stage distribution”, we consider the above as functions in their first argument, that is in  $k$ . When we wish to emphasize the argument in which the function is evaluated with respect to the other parameters being held fixed, we shall underline that variable. For example,  $F(k, \underline{t}, \mathbf{p}_{n+1})$  denotes the function  $F$  viewed as a function of  $t$  while holding the other parameters, i.e.  $k$  and  $\mathbf{p}_{n+1}$ , fixed.

## 3.2 First Hitting Times

There is a close relationship between the state distribution of the pure birth process  $\mathbf{X}$  and the distribution of each state’s first hitting time. Importantly, the first hitting time of any state  $k$  can be expressed as the sum of *independent* geometrically distributed variables. Letting  $T_k$  denote the first hitting time of state  $k$ , we have

$$T_k = G_{p_0} + G_{p_1} + \cdots + G_{p_{k-1}}, \quad (3.7)$$

where each summand is geometrically distributed, that is  $\Pr(G_p = t) = p(1-p)^{t-1}$ . The time the process spends in a state,  $G_p - 1$ , is often called waiting time (or sojourn time). The expectation and variance of  $T_k$  follow easily from the independence of the random variables. For reference, we provide them here:

$$\mathbb{E}[T_k] = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{1}{p_i}, \quad \mathbb{V}[T_k] = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{1-p_i}{p_i^2}. \quad (3.8)$$

A crucial observation is that the event  $\{T_k = t\}$  is equivalent to the joint event  $\{X_{t-1} = k-1\} \cap \{X_t = k\}$ , for any state  $k = 1, \dots, n$ . In simple terms, this equivalence expresses that in order to hit state  $k$  for the first time at time  $t$ , the process  $\mathbf{X}$  must be in state  $k-1$  at time  $t-1$  and transition to state  $k$  at time  $t$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(T_k = t) &= \Pr(\{X_{t-1} = k-1\} \cap \{X_t = k\}) \\ &= \Pr(X_{t-1} = k-1) \cdot \Pr(X_t = k \mid X_{t-1} = k-1) \\ &= \Pr(X_{t-1} = k-1) \cdot p_{k-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

for all  $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$  and  $t \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ . It then follows that the composite events  $\{T_k > t\}$  and  $\{X_t \leq k - 1\}$  are equivalent as well. Therefore, the distribution functions of  $T_k$  and  $X_t$  are related by

$$\Pr(T_k > t) = \Pr(X_t \leq k - 1), \quad \text{and} \quad \Pr(T_k \leq t) = \Pr(X_t > k - 1). \quad (3.10)$$

It follows that there are three distinct ways to express the complementary first hitting time distribution:<sup>4</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(T_k > t) &\stackrel{(1)}{=} \sum_{d=t+1}^{\infty} \Pr(T_k = d) && \text{(by definition)} \\ &\stackrel{(2)}{=} p_{k-1} \sum_{d=t}^{\infty} \Pr(X_d = k - 1) && \text{(by Eq. (3.9))} \\ &\stackrel{(3)}{=} \Pr(X_t \leq k - 1) = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \Pr(X_t = j). && \text{(by Eq. (3.10))} \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

### 3.3 Results

Having set the stage in the Preliminaries chapter and the foregoing sections, we are ready to present our results. The results concern the exact probability mass function and cumulative distribution function of the pure birth process state,  $X_t$ .<sup>5</sup>

#### 3.3.1 Exact State Distribution

In this section we derive the exact state distribution of the generic pure birth process in discrete time. We do so using a weighted path counting argument that results in the complete homogeneous symmetric polynomial.

**Paths and their Probability.** We start with a straightforward description of the probability of a path that the process  $X_t$  may take. Let the process start in state 0 at time  $t = 0$ , that is  $X_0 = 0$ . Without loss of generality, assume that the process has transitioned to state  $k$  in  $t$  discrete time steps, i.e.  $X_t = k$ .

Any path  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_t$  that ends in state  $k$ , must include the transitions  $0 \rightarrow 1, 1 \rightarrow 2, \dots, (k-1) \rightarrow k$  as a subpath. These transitions happen in  $k$  distinct time steps, leaving  $t - k$  time units to be distributed as stops over the states  $\{0, 1, \dots, k\}$ .

The transitions on this  $(0 \rightarrow k)$ -path contribute  $p_0 \cdot p_1 \cdots p_{k-1}$  probability weight to a path ending in state  $k$ . We denote a choice of  $t - k$  stops on this path by  $c_0, c_1, \dots, c_k$ , under the conditions  $c_0 + c_1 + \cdots + c_k = t - k$  and  $c_j \geq 0$  ( $j = 0, 1, \dots, k$ ).

Because each step that the process takes is independent of the previous steps (Markov property), the probability that the process takes this specific path, denoted  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_t^*$ , equals

$$\Pr(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_t = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_t^*) = p_0 \cdot p_1 \cdots p_{k-1} \cdot q_0^{c_0} \cdot q_1^{c_1} \cdots q_k^{c_k}. \quad (3.12)$$

Now, the event  $\{X_t = k\}$ , short for  $\{X_0 = 0\} \cap \{X_t = k\}$ , is the union of all paths starting in state 0 at time 0 and ending in state  $k$  at time  $t$ . These paths are mutually exclusive, therefore

---

<sup>4</sup>Note: the complementary first hitting time distribution function is often called *survival function*.

<sup>5</sup>The keen reader will be able to infer the results for the first hitting time distributions without much effort using relations (3.9), (3.10), and (3.11).



we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(X_t = k) &= \sum_{\text{all } (0 \rightarrow k)\text{-paths } \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_t} \Pr(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_t = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_t) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{c_0+c_1+\dots+c_k=t-k \\ c_j \geq 0}} p_0 \cdot p_1 \cdots p_{k-1} \cdot q_0^{c_0} \cdot q_1^{c_1} \cdots q_k^{c_k} \\
&= \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} p_j \sum_{\substack{c_0+c_1+\dots+c_k=t-k \\ c_j \geq 0}} q_0^{c_0} \cdot q_1^{c_1} \cdots q_k^{c_k}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Recognizing the sum in the bottom equation of (3.13) as the complete homogeneous symmetric polynomial  $h_{t-k}(q_0, q_1, \dots, q_k)$  (cf. Eq. (2.1) in the Preliminaries), we have proven the following theorem.

**Theorem 1** (General PBP: Probability Mass Function). *Let a discrete-time pure birth process be induced by a vector of transition probabilities,  $\mathbf{p}_{n+1}$ , as defined in Section 3.1; then the probability mass function of the process state,  $X_t$ , is given by*

$$f(\underline{k}, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) = h_{t-k}(q_0, q_1, \dots, q_k) \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} p_i, \tag{3.14}$$

for all  $k \in S = \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}$ , with  $h_{t-k}(\cdot)$  the complete homogeneous symmetric polynomial.

The distribution function is by definition equal to  $\Pr(X_t \leq k) = \sum_{j=0}^k f(j, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1})$ . However, as we see in the next theorem, the *complementary* distribution function, i.e.  $\Pr(X_t > k)$ , can be combined more satisfactorily with the classic theory of Markov chains with an absorbing state.<sup>6</sup>




Figure 3.2: Transition diagram of a truncated discrete-time Markov process with an absorbing state at  $k + 1$  instead of  $n$ .

**Theorem 2** (General PBP: Complementary Distribution Function). *Let a discrete-time pure birth process be induced by a vector of transition probabilities,  $\mathbf{p}_{n+1}$ , as defined in Section 3.1; then the complementary distribution function of the process state,  $X_t$ , is given by*

$$\bar{F}(\underline{k}, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) = h_{t-k-1}(q_0, q_1, \dots, q_k, 1) \prod_{i=0}^k p_i, \tag{3.15}$$

for all  $k \in S = \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$  and  $t \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}$ , with  $h_{t-k-1}(\cdot)$  the complete homogeneous symmetric polynomial.

<sup>6</sup>For an introduction to this topic, we refer to Kemeny and Snell (1976).

*Proof.* Consider the truncated Markov process of Figure 3.2 and denote it by  $\tilde{X}_t$ . Note that

$$\Pr(X_t = j) = \Pr(\tilde{X}_t = j) \quad (3.16)$$

holds for all  $j = 0, 1, \dots, k$  and  $t \geq 0$ . Furthermore, we have (by definition)

$$\sum_{j=0}^n \Pr(X_t = j) = \sum_{j=0}^k \Pr(X_t = j) + \sum_{j=k+1}^n \Pr(X_t = j) = 1, \quad (3.17)$$

and

$$\Pr(\tilde{X}_t = k+1) + \sum_{j=0}^k \Pr(\tilde{X}_t = j) = 1. \quad (3.18)$$

Therefore,

$$\Pr(\tilde{X}_t = k+1) = \sum_{j=k+1}^n \Pr(X_t = j) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bar{F}(k, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}), \quad (3.19)$$

as desired. ■

With Theorem 1 we gave a new natural proof of Chen and Guisong (2016)'s Theorem 2 – which they derived using generating functions in the context of the convolution of geometric distributions. That the resulting expression comprises the complete homogeneous symmetric polynomial seems to have gone unnoticed by these authors.

We were unable to find Theorem 2 in the literature. We wish to note that, even though Theorem 2 may seem unsurprising from the perspective of the embedding Markov chain, it yields new expressions when applied to the classical occupancy distribution (Chapter 4) and the binomial distribution (Appendix 6.1.2).

### Distinct Transition Probabilities

Now we refine Theorems 1 and 2 for the pure birth process having distinct transition probabilities, that is  $p_i \neq p_j$  if  $i \neq j$ . We derive explicit formulæ in this case by applying Sylvester's identity (Lemma 2) to the preceding theorems.

**Proposition 1** (PBP distinct transitions: Probability Mass Function). *Let a discrete-time pure birth process be induced by the transition probability vector,  $\mathbf{p}_{n+1}$  ( $\mathbf{q}_{n+1} = \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{p}_{n+1}$ ), containing only distinct elements in  $(0, 1)$ ; then the probability mass function of the process state,  $X_t$ , equals*

$$f(\underline{k}, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) = \left( \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} p_j \right) \sum_{j=0}^k q_j^{t-k} \prod_{\substack{i=0 \\ i \neq j}}^k \frac{1}{q_j - q_i}. \quad (3.20)$$

*Proof.* Applying Sylvester's identity to Theorem 1, the result is immediate. ■

Proposition 1 is equivalent to Sen and Balakrishnan (1999, Thm. 1), but the derivation is shortened to one line, and motivated in a natural way from the underlying pure birth Markov chain.

The next proposition extends this result to the cumulative distribution function.

**Proposition 2** (PBP distinct transitions: Cumulative Distribution Function). *Let a discrete-time pure birth process be induced by the transition probability vector,  $\mathbf{p}_{n+1}$  ( $\mathbf{q}_{n+1} = \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{p}_{n+1}$ ), containing only distinct elements in  $(0, 1)$ ; then the cumulative distribution function of the process state,  $X_t$ , equals*

$$F(\underline{k}, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) = \left( \prod_{j=0}^k p_j \right) \sum_{j=0}^k \frac{q_j^{t-k}}{1 - q_j} \prod_{\substack{i=0 \\ i \neq j}}^k \frac{1}{q_j - q_i}. \quad (3.21)$$

*Proof.* We proceed from the state-phase duality as summarized in (3.11). Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F(\underline{k}, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) &= \Pr(X_t \leq k \mid \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) = \Pr(T_{k+1} > t \mid \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) && \text{(by Eq. (3.11))} \\ &= \sum_{d=t+1}^{\infty} \Pr(T_{k+1} = d \mid \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) \\ &= p_k \sum_{d=t}^{\infty} \Pr(X_d = k \mid \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) && \text{(by Eq. (3.9))} \\ &= p_k \sum_{d=t}^{\infty} \left( \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} p_j \right) \sum_{j=0}^k q_j^{t-k} \prod_{\substack{i=0 \\ i \neq j}}^k \frac{1}{q_j - q_i} && \text{(by Proposition 1)} \quad (3.22) \\ &= \left( \prod_{j=0}^k p_j \right) \sum_{j=0}^k \left( \sum_{d=t}^{\infty} q_j^{d-k} \right) \prod_{\substack{i=0 \\ i \neq j}}^k \frac{1}{q_j - q_i} && \text{(rearrange terms)} \\ &= \left( \prod_{i=0}^k p_j \right) \sum_{j=0}^k \left( \frac{q_j^{t-k}}{1 - q_j} \right) \prod_{\substack{i=0 \\ i \neq j}}^k \frac{1}{q_j - q_i}, && \text{(geometric series)} \end{aligned}$$

as desired. ■

Though it is pleasant to have an explicit formula for the distribution function as in this case, the expression involving the complete homogeneous symmetric polynomial (Theorem 2) is perhaps more practical as it gives rise to a simple linear system of recurrence relations, as we see in the next section.

### 3.3.2 Recurrence Relations for the Distribution Function

A completely novel result that we present in this thesis is that the cumulative distribution function of any pure birth process obeys a *sparse bidiagonal system of linear recurrence relations* which is almost identical to the one that the probability mass function obeys (cf. recurrence relations in (3.3)). This sparse linear system makes exact and efficient computation feasible in large systems.

We present the result for the complementary distribution function here first because of its sparsity and its direct relation to Theorem 2.

**Proposition 3** (Complementary CDF: Recurrence Relation). *The complementary distribution function of the process state,  $X_t$ , of any pure birth process induced by the vector of transition probabilities,  $\mathbf{p}_{n+1}$ , with  $0 < p_i < 1$  ( $i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$ ), obeys the recurrence relations*

$$\overline{F}(k, t+1, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) = \begin{cases} p_k \overline{F}(k-1, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) + (1-p_k) \overline{F}(k, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) & \text{if } k \leq t; \\ 0 & \text{if } k > t; \end{cases} \quad (3.23)$$

for  $1 \leq k \leq n$  and  $t > 0$ .

*Proof.* Starting with the latter condition ( $k > t$ ): the complementary distribution function must be zero as it is impossible for the process  $X_t$  to reach any state greater than  $t$ .

For the first condition ( $k \leq t$ ), we obtain two different expressions: one for the p.m.f.,  $f(k, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1})$ , in terms of the complementary c.d.f.; the other for the complementary c.d.f. when time is incremented by one unit. Upon combining these expressions the recurrence relation is established.

- By definition we have (in the state space):

$$f(k, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) = \overline{F}(k-1, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) - \overline{F}(k, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}). \quad (3.24)$$

- On the other hand, we have (in the time domain):

$$\overline{F}(k, t+1, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) = \overline{F}(k, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) + p_k f(k, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}), \quad (3.25)$$

as a consequence of relations (3.9) and (3.10).

- Hence, on substituting equation (3.24) into (3.25), we obtain

$$\overline{F}(k, t+1, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) = p_k \overline{F}(k-1, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) + (1-p_k) \overline{F}(k, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}), \quad (3.26)$$

as desired. ■

Note that, *mutatis mutandis* the same relations hold for  $\overline{F}^*(k, t, n) = \Pr(X_t \geq k | X_0 = 0)$ , as a consequence of  $\overline{F}^*(k, t, n) = \overline{F}(k-1, t, n)$  for  $1 \leq k \leq n$ .

Furthermore, the regular distribution function satisfies an almost identical system of recurrence relations, which we state next.

**Proposition 4** (CDF: Recurrence Relation). *The distribution function of the process state,  $X_t$ , of any pure birth process induced by the vector of transition probabilities,  $\mathbf{p}_{n+1}$ , with  $0 < p_i < 1$  ( $i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$ ), obeys the recurrence relations*

$$F(k, t+1, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) = \begin{cases} p_k F(k-1, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) + (1-p_k) F(k, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) & \text{if } k < t; \\ 1 & \text{if } k \geq t; \end{cases} \quad (3.27)$$

for  $1 \leq k \leq n$  and  $t > 0$ .

*Proof.* Virtually identical to the proof of Proposition 3 (nonetheless, provided in Appendix 6.2). ■

We prefer the system of recurrence relations for the complementary c.d.f. (Prop. 3) to the one for the c.d.f. (Prop. 4), because the former is *sparse* owing to its second condition ( $k > t$ ) being equal to zero.



### 3.3.3 Simulation

We conclude with a brief exposition on the simulation of a generic pure birth process.

Though naive sequential approaches are apparent, there exists a more efficient manner based on the representation of first hitting times as the sum of independent geometric random variables (cf. Eq. (3.7)).

In exploiting this latter representation, we are greatly aided by the simple way in which a geometric random variable can be simulated. Let  $U$  denote a uniform-randomly distributed random variable on the interval  $(0, 1)$ , then

$$G_p \leftarrow \left\lceil \frac{\log(U)}{\log(1-p)} \right\rceil \quad (3.30)$$

is geometrically distributed with success probability  $p$  (Devroye, 1986). Here  $\lceil x \rceil$  denotes the ceiling operation, which rounds the numeric argument  $x$  up to the smallest integer greater than or equal to  $x$ .

To simulate  $X_t$ , the idea is to successively generate new waiting times (including the transition), until the cumulative sum of simulated waiting times exceeds the given (“allotted”) time  $t$ . Now, say that this exceedance happens while the process is in state  $k$ , then the realization of the simulated process will be  $x_t = k$ . We make this precise in Algorithm 1.

---

**Algorithm 1:** Simulate Pure Birth Process  $X_t$ .

---

**input** :  $\mathbf{p}_{n+1}, t > 0$   
**output:** state  $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, n\}$

- 1  $i \leftarrow 0;$
- 2 **while**  $t > 0$  and  $i < n$  **do**
- 3      $U \leftarrow \text{Unif}(0, 1);$
- 4      $G \leftarrow \text{ceil}(\log(U)/\log(1 - \mathbf{p}_{n+1}(i)));$
- 5      $t \leftarrow t - G;$
- 6     **if**  $t \geq 0$  **then**
- 7          $i \leftarrow i + 1;$
- 8     **end**
- 9 **end**

---

Using this approach one needs to generate only  $\min(n, t)$  standard uniformly distributed random variables in the worst case.

## 3.4 Chapter Summary

In Chapter 3 we studied the probability distribution of the general discrete-time pure birth process on its state space. We defined the problem formally as a Markov chain in Section 3.1. The crucial duality with first hitting times was discussed in Section 3.2. Importantly, each state's first hitting time can be represented as a convolution of geometric distributions.

This convolution of geometric distributions was studied by Sen and Balakrishnan (1999), who in that context derived the exact probability mass function for the case having distinct success (transition) probabilities. This result was generalized to generic success probabilities by Chen and Guisong (2016, Sec. 3), thereby removing the distinctness condition.

Independently and using new methods, we derived the exact probability distribution of the generic discrete-time pure birth process in Section 3.3.1. Our derivation is based on the embedding Markov chain of Figure 3.1 combined with a weighted path counting argument that results in the complete homogeneous symmetric polynomial.

We then extended Chen and Guisong (2016)'s result to the cumulative distribution function for both generic and distinct transition probabilities in Theorem 1, Theorem 2, and Proposition 2, respectively. For the probability mass function, we provided a one-line proof in Proposition 1 by direct application of Sylvester's identity.

Finally, and practically perhaps most satisfying, the simple structure of the pure birth Markov chain lead us to the discovery and proof of a sparse bidiagonal system of recurrence relations which generate the complementary distribution function and make its precise and efficient calculation feasible in large systems: cf. Proposition 3 and Proposition 5.<sup>7</sup>

**Outlook for the remainder.** In the remainder of this thesis we give a detailed discussion of some special cases that follow from specification of the transition probabilities,  $\mathbf{p}_{n+1}$ . In short, we discuss: classical occupancy  $p_k = \frac{n-k}{n}$  (Chapter 4), randomized occupancy  $p_k = p \frac{n-k}{n}$  (Section 4.5), and the binomial distribution  $p_k \equiv p$  (Appendix 6.1).

The specific stipulation of the transition probabilities in these cases enables further simplifications and more specific conclusions, including compact expressions involving  $r$ -Stirling numbers of the second kind and finite differences.

Of course, all results for these special cases can be directly obtained by application of the theorems and propositions of this chapter and then simplifying the resulting expressions.

However, Chapter 4 approaches the classical occupancy problem from a different angle. Instead of employing the complete homogeneous symmetric polynomial as its main tool, it starts from the eigendecomposition of the transition matrix.

In sum, in the remainder we aim to illustrate the wider applicability of the state distribution of discrete-time pure birth processes.

---

<sup>7</sup>Numerical experimentation in Matlab shows that, for a randomly chosen transition probability vector,  $\mathbf{p}_{n+1}$ , with  $n = 50,000$  and  $t = 55,000$ , a direct implementation of Proposition 3 takes less than a few seconds to compute.

## 4 The Classical Occupancy Problem

*“Certainly, let us learn proving, but also let us learn guessing.”*

G. Pólya

Sampling is at the basis of statistics: most, if not all, of statistics can be viewed as asking if, and to which degree, statements about the sample can be generalized to the entire population.

Sampling without replacement is perhaps the most well known sampling procedure. Though the term is imprecise, we mean that each  $k$ -subset has equiprobability,  $1/\binom{n}{k}$ , of being selected in this process. We consider this “fair” as there is no preference for any subset or any one population element.

A common implementation is a sequential one, that is: select with equiprobability any one element from the population into the sample, then remove the selected item from the population permanently before the next stage. Select again with equiprobability from the reduced population and remove the selected element, and so on until  $k$  elements have been selected into the sample (and  $n - k$  remain in the reduced population). This process could, for example, yield the sample 11, 2, 5, 7, 3, 1. In statistics we generally do not care about the order in which the elements were sampled, and we simply forget the order. It is inherent to this method of sampling that any order of selected elements is equally likely, and therefore we denote the sample as a set:  $\{1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 11\}$ .

Sampling without replacement is conceptually simple and well understood. The closely related sampling with replacement is conceptually just as simple, but its probabilistic properties are quite more involved. This makes it an interesting topic for study.

We shall therefore be concerned with sampling *with replacement*. This name is not precise, and we should speak about *sequential* sampling with replacement. That is, at each stage all elements in the population have equiprobability of being selected. Say, we denote the population by  $[n] = \{1, 2, 3, \dots, n\}$ , then at any sampling stage each population element has probability  $1/n$  of being selected into the sample. This procedure is *sequential* by construction and naturally produces a tuple of selected elements. Contrary to sampling without replacement, this time repetitions of elements can, and are likely to, occur in the sample.

A natural property of sequential sampling with replacement is that it is equally probable to obtain the tuple (11, 2, 2, 3, 3, 1) as it is to obtain (2, 1, 3, 2, 3, 11), or any other permutation of these elements.

Forgetting the order of the elements in a tuple, but maintaining multiplicities, results in a multiset. In this example the multiset equals  $\{\{1, 2, 2, 3, 3, 11\}\}$ .

Though invariance of probability under permutation of the tuple’s elements is a desirable property, sampling with replacement gives us a little bit more. A tuple such as (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2) is equally likely to be sampled as, indeed, *any* tuple in the Cartesian product  $[n]^t$  (with  $t = 6$  here). Comparison of these tuples makes it immediately clear that sequential random sampling with replacement does not result in a uniformly random selection from the universe of multisets.<sup>1</sup>

And although, we generally do not care about the order of elements in a sampled tuple, in statistics we do care about their multiplicities: *k distinct population elements, in general,*

---

<sup>1</sup>Note: this discrepancy between uniformity over the universes of multisets vs. the universe of tuples, bears great resemblance to the difference between Maxwell-Boltzmann and Bose-Einstein statistics (cf. Feller, 1968).



contain more information about the population than  $k$  identical elements.

This realization leads us directly to the question which probability distribution sequential sampling with replacement induces on the number of distinct elements sampled in this manner.

Answering this question is our main task in this chapter. A precise answer gives us a better understanding of sampling with replacement in general and of this property in particular.

The distribution of the number of distinct elements in a tuple resulting from random sampling with replacement has been obtained in different contexts, the oldest known occurrence being DeMoivre (1711) (see also Todhunter, 1865). In the last century it received the name “classical occupancy distribution” which is derived from its multi-urn model formulation (Feller (1968); Johnson and Kotz (1977); seq. Sec. 4.1, Formulation 4).

In our opinion, the profound importance of the classical occupancy distribution is illustrated best by its statistical and combinatorial interpretations which we formulate precisely in Formulations 2 and 5 in Section 4.1.

**Positioning.** Sampling with replacement is a sequential process by construction. *A fortiori*, this process is a discrete-time Markov process.

To see this, let the number of distinct elements already sampled from a finite population,  $[n]$ , be denoted by  $k$ ; then the probability of sampling a yet unseen element equals  $p_k = \frac{n-k}{n}$ , as there are  $k$  already sampled elements and  $n - k$  unsampled ones in the population at that stage. Hence, the  $p_k$  can be viewed as transition probabilities of this process, and  $q_k = \frac{k}{n}$  the corresponding stop probabilities of each state. As such, the continuation of this process depends only on the current state  $k$  (Markov property).

Some authors noted the Markovian nature of the classical occupancy problem (e.g. Feller, 1968; Rényi, 1962). However, to the best of our knowledge, Uppuluri and Carpenter (1971) are the only reference taking this Markovian perspective as a starting point for their investigation. We believe that this vantage point can be exploited further, as we hope to illustrate with this thesis.

As the embedding Markov chain of the classical occupancy problem is a discrete-time pure birth chain with distinct transition probabilities, the results that we present in this chapter are all special cases of the results presented in Chapter 3, in particular of Propositions 1 and 2, and Propositions 3 and 5.

However, we shall derive our results here from a different point of departure, namely from the eigendecomposition of the transition matrix. This has the benefit of validating our earlier approach and providing the reader with a matrix-algebraic alternative to the previous combinatorial one.

**Outline and Results.** We begin by summarizing some equivalent problem formulations in Section 4.1. We define the embedding Markov chain formally in Section 4.2. The workhorse of this chapter is the eigendecomposition of the transition matrix of the embedding Markov chain. We derive it in Section 4.2.1.

The eigendecomposition is put to use in Section 4.3, to first derive the classic expressions for the probability mass function and distribution function. And then, to generalize these results to their initial-state conditioned versions in Section 4.3.2 and Section 4.3.3.

In Section 4.3.4 the recurrence relations for complementary c.d.f. are specifically adapted for the classical occupancy distribution in Proposition 10, and the corresponding matrix implementation is provided in Proposition 11.

In Section 4.4 we discuss the moments of the classical occupancy distribution and provide

a clean derivation of its expectation and variance based on Price (1946).

We conclude with a brief treatment of Harkness (1969)'s slightly more general *randomized* occupancy model. We answer affirmatively a question posed by its author on whether the expressions in the exponentiated transition matrix can be simplified.

## 4.1 Problem Definition and Formulations

In this section we give a concise overview of some of the formulations by which the classical occupancy problem may be defined.

The classical occupancy problem traces its origins to DeMoivre (1711, Problems 18 and 19). It is only fitting then to provide DeMoivre's formulation here first – not in the least place for its conceptual clarity.

**Formulation 1** (DeMoivre's Die). What is the probability of observing  $k$  different faces of an  $n$ -faced die, when it is rolled  $t$  times?

It is assumed that each face of the die has equiprobability of coming up, and further that each roll of the die is independent of the others.

A variant of this formulation, which gives the problem a central place in statistics, is the one that phrases it in terms of sampling with replacement.

**Formulation 2** (Sampling with Replacement). Given a finite population of size  $n$  from which  $t$  random draws with replacement are made, what is the probability of observing  $k$  distinct population elements?

The problem can also be conceptualized as an urn model, in the following manner.

**Formulation 3** (Single Urn Model). Initially an urn contains  $n$  white balls. When a ball is randomly drawn and it is white, a black ball is returned into the urn. When a black ball is randomly drawn, we return it to the urn. What is the probability of the urn containing  $k$  black balls after  $t$  draws?

The problem gets its current name from the following phrasing as a multi-urn model (Feller, 1968; Johnson and Kotz, 1977).

**Formulation 4** (Multiple Urn Model). Given  $n$  distinguishable urns of unbounded capacity, and  $t$  throws with distinguishable balls having equiprobability of ending up in any of the  $n$  urns, what is the probability of finding  $k$  urns occupied?

These formulations describe a sequential process, where at each stage a new, not yet seen, element is added to the current sample with evolving probability that depends only on the number of distinct elements already in the sample.

Finally, let  $[n]$  denote the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . And let  $[n]^t$  denote the  $t$ -fold Cartesian product of  $[n]$ .<sup>2</sup> Then the following is an enumerative combinatorial definition.

**Formulation 5** (Enumerative Combinatorial). What is the number of tuples in  $[n]^t$  that contain exactly  $k$  distinct elements?

Under uniform random sampling of the tuples in  $[n]^t$ , and defining the favorable cases as “tuple contains  $k$  distinct elements”, we obtain the classical occupancy distribution as the fraction of favorable cases to total cases.

---

<sup>2</sup>Note:  $A^t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_t) \mid a_1, a_2, \dots, a_t \in A\}$ .



The following system of recurrence relations is an equivalent representation of this Markov chain:

$$p_{i,j}^{(t+1)} = \begin{cases} 0^{t+1} & \text{if } i = j = 0; \\ \frac{j}{n} p_{i,j}^{(t)} + \frac{n-j+1}{n} p_{i,j-1}^{(t)} & \text{if } 0 < i \leq j \leq n \text{ and } j < t; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

for all  $i, j \in S = \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$  and  $t > 0$ ; and initially  $p_{i,i}^{(0)} = 1, i \in S$ .

Finally, we note that the process defined by  $Y_t = n - X_t$  is a Markov process as well.  $Y_t$  equals the number of unsampled elements from  $[n]$  at time  $t$ . This process starts in  $n$ , i.e.  $Y_0 = n$ , and then transitions to  $Y_1 = n - 1$ , et cetera. In essence it is the same chain as the one described by Eqs. (4.1), (4.2), and (4.3) with relabeled states.

### 4.2.1 Eigendecomposition

In this section we derive the eigendecomposition of the transition matrix,  $P$ . This allows us to obtain powers of  $P$  from its diagonalization,  $P^t = U\Lambda^t U^{-1}$ , where  $\Lambda$  is a diagonal matrix of eigenvalues and  $U$  contains  $P$ 's right-eigenvectors as its columns. The topmost row of this matrix yields the classical occupancy distribution. The other rows provide the initial-state conditioned probabilities of the classical occupancy distribution.

The eigenvalues of  $P$  are simply the elements on its diagonal:

$$\lambda_j = \frac{j}{n}, \quad 0 \leq j \leq n. \quad (4.4)$$

We collect these in the diagonal matrix  $\Lambda \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{diag}(\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = n^{-1} \text{diag}(0, 1, \dots, n)$ .

Corresponding integer-valued eigenvectors were suggested by numerical experimentation. The following lemma makes this precise and provides a proof of this ‘‘educated guess’’.

**Lemma 3.** *Integer-valued, right-eigenvectors of  $P$  are given by the columns of the  $(n+1) \times (n+1)$  matrix  $U$ , defined by*

$$[U]_{i,k} = \begin{cases} \binom{n-i}{n-k} & \text{if } i \leq k; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

with  $0 \leq i, k \leq n$ .

*Proof.* Denote the matrix  $P = [\mathbf{p}_0, \mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_n]$ , likewise denote  $U = [\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n]$ .

We must verify that  $P\mathbf{u}_k = \lambda_k \mathbf{u}_k$  for all  $0 \leq k \leq n$ . We separate two cases: column  $k = 0$  and the remaining columns  $1 \leq k \leq n$ .

- *The case  $k = 0$ .* The eigenspace belonging to eigenvalue  $\lambda_0 = 0$ , follows from solving the system

$$P\mathbf{u}_0 = \lambda_0 \mathbf{u}_0 = \mathbf{0}. \quad (4.6)$$

We denote this system by  $[P \mid \mathbf{0}]$ . Because  $P$  is bidiagonal, this system is straightforwardly solved by Gaussian elimination (starting from the bottom right and working upward). The reduced row-echelon form equals

$$\left[ \begin{array}{cc|c} 1 & \mathbf{0}^\top & 0 \\ \mathbf{0} & O_{n \times n} & \mathbf{0} \end{array} \right]. \quad (4.7)$$

This system has infinitely many solutions of the form  $s[1, 0, 0, \dots, 0]^\top$  with  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ . Hence,  $\mathbf{u}_0 = [1, 0, 0, \dots, 0]^\top = \begin{bmatrix} n \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, 0, 0, \dots, 0]^\top$  spans the eigenspace belonging to eigenvalue  $\lambda_0 = 0$ .

- *The columns*  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . For the remaining eigenvalue-eigenvector pairs, we proceed with a direct demonstrative computation. Again, we must verify that

$$PU = U\Lambda, \quad (4.8)$$

with  $U$  as supposed and  $\Lambda = n^{-1} \text{diag}(0, 1, \dots, n)$  the diagonal matrix of ordered eigenvalues (that is Eq. (4.4)).

We reduce both sides of (4.8) to equivalent simpler statements. Starting with the left-hand side, we may re-express it explicitly for each column  $k$  ( $0 \leq k \leq n$ ), as:  $[PU]_{:,k} = P\mathbf{u}_k =$

$$\frac{1}{n} [u_{0,k}, u_{0,k} + (n-1)u_{1,k}, \dots, iu_{i,k} + (n-i)u_{i+1,k}, \dots, (k-1)u_{k-1,k} + (n-k+1)u_{k,k}, ku_{k,k}, \mathbf{0}_{n-k}^\top]^\top. \quad (4.9)$$

The right-hand side of (4.8) can be written in column-partition form as:

$$U\Lambda = \frac{1}{n} [\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{u}_1, 2\mathbf{u}_2, \dots, k\mathbf{u}_k, \dots, (n-1)\mathbf{u}_{n-1}, n\mathbf{u}_n]. \quad (4.10)$$

Now, consider any eigenvector  $\mathbf{u}_k$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . Comparing the elements on the left- and right-hand sides of (4.8), the demonstrandum is reduced to proving that

$$\frac{i}{n} \binom{n-i}{n-k} + \frac{(n-i)}{n} \binom{n-i-1}{n-k} = \frac{k}{n} \binom{n-i}{n-k} \quad (4.11)$$

for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$  given any  $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . Verifying this relation now becomes an algebraic exercise. Starting from the left-hand side, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} i \frac{(n-i)!}{(n-k)!(k-i)!} + (n-i) \frac{(n-i-1)!}{(n-k)!(k-i-1)!} &= i \frac{(n-i)!}{(n-k)!(k-i)!} + \frac{(n-i)!}{(n-k)!(k-i-1)!} \\ &= i \binom{n-i}{n-k} + (k-i) \binom{n-i}{n-k} \\ &= k \binom{n-i}{n-k}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

as desired, completing the proof. ■

A concrete example of  $U$  is provided in Appendix 6.4. One recognizes  $U$  as a Pascal matrix (Call and Velleman, 1993) oriented with ones on its diagonal and ones in its rightmost column.  $U$ 's inverse,  $U^{-1}$ , is identical apart from signs.

**Lemma 4.** *The integer-valued inverse of the right-eigenvector matrix  $U$  of  $P$  (Lemma 3) is given by*

$$[U^{-1}]_{i,j} = \begin{cases} (-1)^{j-i} \binom{n-i}{n-j} & \text{if } i \leq j; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4.13)$$

*Proof.* This result follows from direct multiplication with matrix  $U$  from Lemma 3. Additionally, we refer to Call and Velleman (1993) or Spivey and Zimmer (2008). ■

Combined, the eigenvalues in Eq. (4.4) and the eigenvector-matrices in Lemmas 3 and 4 yield  $P^t = U\Lambda^t U^{-1}$ , as a way to express  $p_{i,j}^{(t)}$  explicitly (as we do in the Results section).

We illustrate the usefulness of the eigendecomposition with the derivation of an elementary, but nonetheless fundamental, property of the Markov chain.

**Lemma 5** (Limit Distribution).

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} P^t = \left[ O_{(n+1) \times n} \mid \mathbf{1}_{n+1} \right]. \quad (4.14)$$

*Proof.* We will make use of the eigendecomposition,  $P^t = U\Lambda^t U^{-1}$ , and the observation that  $\Lambda$  is a diagonal matrix of which all elements are smaller than 1 except the bottom-right element. That is  $\lambda_j < 1$  for all  $0 \leq j < n$ , and  $\lambda_n = 1$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} P^t &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} U\Lambda^t U^{-1} \\ &= U \left( \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda^t \right) U^{-1} \\ &= U \operatorname{diag}(0, 0, \dots, 1) U^{-1} \\ &= \left[ O_{(n+1) \times n} \mid \mathbf{1}_{n+1} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

where  $O_{(n+1) \times n}$  denotes an  $(n+1) \times n$  matrix containing only zeros, and  $\mathbf{1}_{n+1}$  denotes a column vector containing  $n+1$  ones. ■

In other words, Lemma 5 states that the final state  $n$  is absorbing, and all other states are transient.

## 4.3 Results

In this section we derive the exact probability mass function and distribution function of the classical occupancy problem in their initial-state conditioned forms. Furthermore, we derive an efficient system of recurrence relations for the (complementary) distribution function.

### 4.3.1 The Probability Mass Function

We shall show that the probability mass function of the classical occupancy problem can be derived from the eigendecomposition of the transition matrix,  $P$ .

**Proposition 6** (Probability Mass Function). *The probability mass function of the classical occupancy problem is given by*

$$f(k, t, n) \stackrel{(1)}{=} \frac{1}{n^t} \binom{n}{k} \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} j^t \quad (4.16)$$

$$\stackrel{(2)}{=} \frac{\binom{n}{k}}{n^t} \left\{ \begin{matrix} t \\ k \end{matrix} \right\} \quad (4.17)$$

for  $0 \leq k \leq \min(n, t)$ ; and 0 otherwise.

*Proof.* Consider any column  $k$  in the zeroth row of the eigendecomposition of  $P^t$ , that is

$$\begin{aligned}
f(k, t, n) &= [P^t]_{0,k} \\
&= [U\Lambda^t U^{-1}]_{0,k} = [U]_{0,:} \Lambda^t [U^{-1}]_{:,k} \\
&= \frac{1}{n^t} \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{n-j}{n-k} \binom{n}{j} j^t. \quad (\text{cf. Eq. (6.57) in Apx. 6.4.2})
\end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

Then using

$$\binom{n-j}{n-k} \binom{n}{j} = \frac{\cancel{(n-j)!} n!}{(n-k)! (k-j)! \cancel{(n-j)!} j!} = \frac{n!}{(n-k)! k!} \frac{k!}{(k-j)! j!} = \binom{n}{k} \binom{k}{j},$$

and substituting this expression back into the expression (4.18), we obtain

$$f(k, t, n) = \frac{1}{n^t} \binom{n}{k} \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} j^t,$$

as desired in (4.16). To prove identity (4.17), we start from identity (4.16) and simplify as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
f(k, t, n) &= \frac{1}{n^t} \binom{n}{k} \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} j^t \\
&= \frac{1}{n^t} \frac{n!}{(n-k)! k!} \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} j^t \\
&= \frac{\binom{n}{k}}{n^t} \left\{ t \right\}_k, \quad (\text{by Eq. (2.10)})
\end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

as desired.<sup>3</sup> ■

Expression (4.16) is the classic expression as obtained by DeMoivre (1711) from inclusion-exclusion arguments (see also Feller (1968, Ch. 4.2)). Though the result itself is not new, we have not seen its derivation from the eigendecomposition of the transition matrix before.

Finally, from Eq. (4.19) we see that we can also write the expression as a finite difference:

$$f(k, t, n) = \frac{\binom{n}{k}}{n^t} \frac{1}{k!} \Delta^k [x^t]_{x=0}. \tag{4.20}$$

In the next section, we generalize Proposition 6 to its initial-state conditioned version.

### 4.3.2 The Other Multistep Transition Probabilities

Exponentiation of the transition matrix  $P$  directly yields the values of all multistep transition probabilities, including the initial-state conditioned ones:  $[P^t]_{r,k} = p_{r,k}^{(t)} = P(X_t = k | X_0 = r)$ .

In the context of DeMoivre's  $n$ -faced die (Formulation 1), these quantities can be interpreted as the probability of observing  $k$  distinct faces in a total  $t + s$  throws, after having observed  $r$  distinct faces in the first  $s$  throws. In other words, the probability  $p_{r,k}^{(t)}$  precisely captures

---

<sup>3</sup>Note: for  $t > 0$  the zeroth summand evaluates to zero, and the summation may therefore also start from  $j = 1$ ; for  $t = 0$  the zeroth summand evaluates to one as a result of the convention  $0^0 = 1$ , as is proper.



how the “prior probability”  $p_{0,k}^{(t+s)}$  needs to be updated to include the information right after throw  $s$ . From the matrix  $P^t$  we can read-off any  $p_{r,k}^{(t)}$ . These are simply interpreted as  $t$ -step initial-state conditioned probabilities.

The eigendecomposition that we derived in Section 4.2.1 directly yields explicit expressions for all these probabilities. We obtain “closed-form” expressions in this section as well, by recognizing the  $r$ -Stirling numbers of the second kind in the derived expressions (Broder, 1984; Carlitz, 1980). To our knowledge these probabilities have not been obtained in this form before.

Let us note, that these closed-form expressions can alternatively be obtained by using the techniques and results of Chapter 3. This follows from the observation that conditioning on the initial state results in a pure birth process again.

**Proposition 7** (Transition Probabilities). *The initial-state conditioned probability mass function of the classical occupancy problem is given by*

$$\Pr(X_t = k | X_0 = r) \stackrel{(1)}{=} \frac{1}{n^t} \binom{n-r}{n-k} \sum_{j=0}^{k-r} (-1)^{k-r-j} \binom{k-r}{j} (j+r)^t \quad (4.21)$$

$$\stackrel{(2)}{=} \frac{(n-r)_{k-r}}{n^t} \left\{ \begin{matrix} t+r \\ r, k \end{matrix} \right\} \quad (4.22)$$

for  $0 \leq r \leq k \leq \min(n, t)$ ; and 0 otherwise.

We give an algebraic proof of (4.21) first, taking the eigendecomposition of the transition matrix as our starting point. We then give a combinatorial proof of (4.22).

*Algebraic proof of (4.21).* Consider the eigendecomposition of  $P^t$ , that is,

$$\begin{aligned} p_{r,k}^{(t)} &= [P^t]_{r,k} = [U\Lambda^t U^{-1}]_{r,k} = [U]_{r,:} \Lambda^t [U^{-1}]_{:,k} \\ &= \frac{1}{n^t} \sum_{j=r}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{n-j}{n-k} \binom{n-r}{j-r} j^t && \text{(cf. Eq. (6.57) in Apx. 6.4.2)} \\ &= \frac{1}{n^t} \sum_{j=0}^{k-r} (-1)^{k-j-r} \binom{n-j-r}{n-k} \binom{n-r}{j} (j+r)^t. && \text{(reindex)} \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

Note that the product of binomial coefficients in each summand can be re-expressed as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{n-j-r}{n-k} \binom{n-r}{j} &= \frac{\cancel{(n-j-r)!}}{(k-j-r)!(n-k)! j! \cancel{(n-j-r)!}} \frac{(n-r)!}{1} \\ &= \frac{(n-r)!}{(n-k)!} \frac{1}{(k-r-j)! j!} \\ &= \frac{(n-r)!}{(n-k)!} \frac{1}{(k-r)!} \frac{(k-r)!}{(k-r-j)! j!} && \text{(introduce } (k-r)!) \\ &= \binom{n-r}{n-k} \binom{k-r}{j}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

Substituting this latter expression back into equation (4.23), we obtain

$$p_{r,k}^{(t)} = \frac{1}{n^t} \binom{n-r}{n-k} \sum_{j=0}^{k-r} (-1)^{k-r-j} \binom{k-r}{j} (j+r)^t. \quad (4.25)$$

as desired in expression (4.21). ■

Note that (4.21) is in the form of a finite difference (cf. Section 2.2.1). For the second expression, (4.22), we give a combinatorial proof, based on the probability weight of the  $t$ -step  $(r \rightarrow k)$ -path.

*Combinatorial proof of (4.22).* Each  $(r \rightarrow k)$ -path contains the consecutive transitions  $r \rightarrow (r+1)$ ,  $(r+1) \rightarrow (r+2)$ , ...,  $(k-1) \rightarrow k$ , which contribute probability weight

$$\frac{(n-r) \cdot (n-r-1) \cdots (n-k+1)}{n^{k-r}} = \frac{(n-r)_{(k-r)}}{n^{k-r}} \quad (4.26)$$

to each such path.<sup>4</sup>

This leaves  $t - k + r$  stops to be chosen on the path, under the restriction that each new stop must be further down the chain than the farthest stop already on the path. The sum of these probability weights over all possible stop configurations, equals

$$\frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{r \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \dots \leq i_d \leq k} i_1 \cdot i_2 \cdots i_d = \frac{1}{n^d} h_d(r, r+1, \dots, k) \quad (4.27)$$

with  $d = t - k + r$ . Now, using equation (2.6) from the Preliminaries, we can write (4.27) as

$$\frac{1}{n^{t-k+r}} h_{t-k+r}(r, r+1, \dots, k) = \frac{1}{n^{t-k+r}} \left\{ \begin{matrix} t+r \\ r, k \end{matrix} \right\}. \quad (4.28)$$

Finally, we combine the probability weight contributed by the transitions (4.26) and the stops (4.28), to obtain

$$p_{r,k}^{(t)} = \frac{(n-r)_{k-r}}{n^t} \left\{ \begin{matrix} t+r \\ r, k \end{matrix} \right\},$$

as desired in (4.22). ■

Since both expression (4.21) and (4.22) equal  $p_{r,k}^{(t)}$ , these distinct proofs show that the  $r$ -Stirling numbers of the second kind are given by the explicit formula

$$\left\{ \begin{matrix} t+r \\ r, k \end{matrix} \right\} = \frac{1}{(k-r)!} \sum_{j=0}^{k-r} (-1)^{k-r-j} \binom{k-r}{j} (j+r)^t, \quad (4.29)$$

and furthermore as the following finite difference:<sup>5</sup>

$$\left\{ \begin{matrix} t+r \\ r, k \end{matrix} \right\} = \frac{1}{(k-r)!} \Delta^{k-r} [x^t]_{x=r}. \quad (4.30)$$

Concluding this section, we record a new identity for  $r$ -Stirling numbers of the second kind which generalizes the well known classic identity (2.7).

---

<sup>4</sup>Identical argument to the one used in Section 3.3.1.

<sup>5</sup>Note that this derivation is markedly different from that of Carlitz (1980).

As  $P$  is a row-stochastic matrix, each row of  $P^t$  sums to  $\frac{n^t}{n^t} = 1$ . This observation leads immediately to the following sum-identity for  $r$ -Stirling numbers of the second kind. That is, the full row-sums of  $n^t P^t$  are equal to

$$\sum_{j=r}^n (n)_j \left\{ \begin{matrix} t+r \\ r, j \end{matrix} \right\} = (n)_r n^{t-1} \quad (4.31)$$

for any row  $r = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n$ . The classic identity (2.7) follows immediately when we set  $r$  equal to 0.

### 4.3.3 The Distribution Function

In this section we derive the distribution function of the classical occupancy problem. We shall do so for all initial-state conditioned distributions at once.

We give a purely matrix-algebraic proof here based on the eigendecomposition of the transition matrix, and a simplifying result for the matrix of right-eigenvectors,  $U^{-1}$ . Appendix 6.2 contains a proof based on the state-phase duality (that we discussed in Section 3.2).

We record some auxiliary results first. By definition the distribution function is the sum of probability masses over states  $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k \leq n$ . It is therefore convenient to capture the sum operation in matrix form.

We introduce the upper-triangular matrix  $\Sigma$ , defined as follows:

$$[\Sigma]_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i \leq j; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases} \quad (4.32)$$

for  $0 \leq i, j \leq n$ . Where it appears, the matrix can be assumed conformable to the matrix on which it acts. The matrix  $\Sigma$  allows us to conveniently write  $P^t \Sigma$  for the cumulative row-sums of  $P^t$ .

Furthermore,  $\Sigma$ 's inverse is given by

$$[\Sigma^{-1}]_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j = i; \\ -1 & \text{if } j = i + 1; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4.33)$$

Appendix 6.4 contains examples of both matrices.

**Lemma 6.** *Let  $U_n^{-1}$  denote the  $(n+1) \times (n+1)$  right-eigenvector matrix of Lemma 4, then*

$$U_n^{-1} \Sigma = \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} U_{n-1}^{-1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \mathbf{0}^\top & 1 \end{array} \right]. \quad (4.34)$$

*Proof.* Consider the following cases:

1. For the bottom row, simply note that  $\sum_{i=0}^j 0 = 0$  (for all  $j = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$ ), and  $1 + \sum_{i=0}^n 0 = 1$ .
2. For the rightmost column, apply the Binomial Theorem:  $\sum_{i=0}^j (-1)^{j-i} \binom{j}{i} = (1-1)^{j-i} = 0$ .

3. For the topleft  $n \times n$  submatrix of  $U_n^{-1}\Sigma$ , note that each element  $(i, j)$  satisfies

$$\sum_{i=0}^j (-1)^{j-i} \binom{n-i}{n-j} = \binom{n-i-1}{n-j-1}, \quad 0 \leq j < n,$$

and equals zero for  $j = n$ . See e.g. Comtet (1974, Theorem E, p. 10) for a reference, and Appendix 6.4 for a concrete example.

This completes the proof. ■

This interesting result is also quite convenient. Applying it to the eigendecomposition of  $P^t$ , that is  $U\Lambda^t(U^{-1}\Sigma)$ , it shows for one, that the distribution function in matrix form is *not* more complicated than the probability mass function. And secondly, it yields explicit formulæ for the conditional distribution,  $\Pr(X_t \leq j \mid X_0 = r)$  for any  $0 \leq r \leq n$ .

**Proposition 8** (Cumulative Occupancy Distribution). *The initial-state conditioned cumulative distribution function of the classical occupancy problem is given by*

$$\Pr(X_t \leq k \mid X_0 = r) = \frac{n-k}{n^t} \binom{n-r}{n-k} \sum_{j=0}^{k-r} (-1)^{k-r-j} \binom{k-r}{j} \frac{(r+j)^t}{n-r-j} \quad (4.35)$$

for all integers  $0 \leq r \leq k < n$  and  $t \geq 0$ ;  $\Pr(X_0 \leq n \mid X_0 = k) = 1$  for all  $0 \leq k \leq n$ ; and 0 otherwise.

*Proof.* We start by considering the eigendecomposition of  $P^t$ . The cumulative row-sums of  $P^t$  may be expressed using the sum-matrix  $\Sigma$  (Eq. (4.32)), as follows

$$P^t \Sigma = U \Lambda^t U^{-1} \Sigma = U \Lambda^t V^{-1}, \quad (4.36)$$

with

$$V^{-1} = \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} U_{n-1}^{-1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \mathbf{0}' & 1 \end{array} \right], \quad (4.37)$$

as in Lemma 6.

Next, consider that  $\sum_{j=0}^k [P]_{r,j}^t$  equals matrix element  $[P^t \Sigma]_{r,k}$  which is the sought probability. We make the expression explicit as follows

$$\begin{aligned} [P^t \Sigma]_{r,k} &= [U \Lambda^t U^{-1} \Sigma]_{r,k} = [U \Lambda^t (U^{-1} \Sigma)]_{r,k} \\ &= [U]_{r,:} \Lambda^t [V^{-1}]_{:,k} \\ &= \frac{1}{n^t} \sum_{j=r}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{n-j-1}{n-k-1} \binom{n-r}{n-j} j^t. \end{aligned} \quad (4.38)$$

(We recommend that the reader views Eq. (6.60) in Appendix 6.4.2.)

Now consider the product of binomial coefficients in the last line of (4.38), and simplify as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\binom{n-j-1}{n-k-1} \binom{n-r}{n-j} &= \frac{\cancel{(n-j-1)!}}{(k-j)!(n-k-1)!} \frac{(n-r)!}{(j-r)!\cancel{(n-j-1)!}} \frac{1}{n-j} \\
&= \frac{(n-r)!}{(n-k-1)!} \frac{1}{(k-j)!(j-r)!} \frac{1}{n-j} \\
&= (n-k) \frac{(n-r)!}{(k-r)!(n-k)!} \frac{(k-r)!}{(k-j)!(j-r)!} \frac{1}{n-j} \\
&= (n-k) \binom{n-r}{n-k} \binom{k-r}{j-k} \frac{1}{n-j}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.39}$$

Next, substitute this expression into (4.38) and reindex the summation as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(X_t \leq k | X_0 = r) &= \frac{n-k}{n^t} \sum_{j=r}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{n-r}{n-k} \binom{k-r}{j-k} \frac{j^t}{n-j} \\
&= \frac{(n-k)}{n^t} \binom{n-r}{n-k} \sum_{j=r}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k-r}{j-r} \frac{j^t}{n-j} \\
&= \frac{(n-k)}{n^t} \binom{n-r}{n-k} \sum_{j=0}^{k-r} (-1)^{k-j-r} \binom{k-r}{j} \frac{(r+j)^t}{n-r-j}, \quad (\text{reindex: } j \leftarrow r+j),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.40}$$

which completes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

Finally, note that Eq. (4.40) is compactly expressible as the finite difference

$$\Pr(X_t \leq k | X_0 = r) = \frac{(n-r) \cdots (n-k)}{n^t} \frac{1}{(k-r)!} \Delta^{k-r} \left[ \frac{x^t}{n-x} \right]_{x=r}, \tag{4.41}$$

with the unconditional distribution function as a special case ( $r = 0$ ):

$$F(k, t, n) = \frac{\binom{n}{k+1}}{n^t} \frac{1}{k!} \Delta^k \left[ \frac{x^t}{n-x} \right]_{x=0}. \tag{4.42}$$

#### 4.3.4 Recurrence Relations for the Distribution Function

To make calculation of the distribution function feasible and thereby practically accessible, we derive an efficient algorithm for the calculation of the cumulative probabilities in this section.

We first derive a system of linear recurrence relations for the cumulative distribution function and subsequently a bidiagonal matrix version. These recurrence relations bear a striking resemblance to their direct analogues governing the probability mass function, i.e. the update rules in Eq. (4.3).

**Proposition 9** (CDF Recurrence). *The cumulative distribution function of the classical occupancy problem,  $F(k, t, n)$ , obeys the recurrence relations*

$$F(k, t+1, n) = \begin{cases} \frac{n-k}{n} F(k-1, t, n) + \frac{k}{n} F(k, t, n) & \text{if } k < t; \\ 1 & \text{if } k \geq t; \end{cases} \tag{4.43}$$

for all  $1 \leq k \leq n$  and  $t > 0$ .

*Proof.* Beginning with the latter case ( $k \geq t$ ), when  $t$  is smaller or equal to state  $k$  no probability mass has flowed further than state  $k$ , or, put another way, no path has reached a state further than  $k$  yet. All probability mass (in total equal to one) is therefore contained in the previous states.

For the case  $k < t$ , we proceed as follows:

- Note that by definition we have (in the state space)

$$f(k, t, n) = F(k, t, n) - F(k - 1, t, n).$$

- Furthermore, observe that (in the time domain)

$$F(k, t + 1, n) = F(k, t, n) - \frac{n - k}{n} f(k, t, n),$$

which after some rearranging becomes

$$f(k, t, n) = \frac{n}{n - k} \left( F(k, t, n) - F(k, t + 1, n) \right).$$

- Equating the righthand sides of the foregoing two expressions, i.e.

$$\frac{n}{n - k} \left( F(k, t, n) - F(k, t + 1, n) \right) = F(k, t, n) - F(k - 1, t, n),$$

and rearranging, we deduce

$$\frac{n}{n - k} F(k, t + 1, n) = \frac{k}{n - k} F(k, t, n) + F(k - 1, t, n),$$

which after multiplication by  $\frac{n - k}{n}$  becomes the desideratum. ■

The complementary c.d.f. obeys a virtually identical system of recurrence relations, which we state in the following proposition.

**Proposition 10** (Complementary CDF Recurrence). *The complementary cumulative distribution function of the classical occupancy problem,  $\overline{F}(k, t, n)$ , obeys the recurrence relations*

$$\overline{F}(k, t + 1, n) = \begin{cases} \frac{k}{n} \overline{F}(k, t, n) + \frac{n - k}{n} \overline{F}(k - 1, t, n) & \text{if } k \leq t; \\ 0 & \text{if } k > t; \end{cases} \quad (4.44)$$

for all  $1 \leq k < n$  and  $t > 0$ ; with  $\overline{F}(0, t, n) = 1$  for  $t > 0$ .

*Proof.* The proof is analogous to that of Proposition 9. To summarize:

- For  $k > t$ , observe that no path has reached state  $k$  yet, therefore this (cumulative) probability is zero.
- For  $k \leq t$ , write the p.m.f. in terms of the complementary c.d.f. in two ways, that is

$$\overline{F}(k - 1, t, n) - \overline{F}(k, t, n) \stackrel{(1)}{=} f(k, t, n) \stackrel{(2)}{=} \frac{n}{n - k} \left( \overline{F}(k, t + 1, n) - \overline{F}(k, t, n) \right),$$

and rearrange to isolate  $\overline{F}(k, t + 1, n)$ . ■

Again, we note the great similarity of this system of recurrence relations to the one describing the p.m.f. in Eq. (4.3). Note that the system of recurrence relations for the complementary c.d.f. has the benefit of being sparse – owing to the second case ( $k > t$ ) being equal to zero.



sum of these Bernoulli variables,  $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{i=1}^n B_i] = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[B_i] = n(1 - \frac{1}{n})^t$ , equals the expected number of non-sampled population elements,  $\mathbb{E}[Y_t] = n - \mathbb{E}[X_t]$ .

We find this derivation unsatisfying because of its indirectness and disregard for the true underlying distribution. Fortunately, Price (1946, Sec. 5) provides a simple and direct derivation of the expectation and variance of the classical occupancy distribution, that we wish to emulate here.

**Proposition 12.** *The expectation of the random variable  $X_t$  having the classical occupancy distribution (of Proposition 6) with parameters  $n, t$  equals*

$$\mathbb{E}[X_t | n] = n - n \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^t. \quad (4.47)$$

*Proof.* Let us introduce the notation  $\Pr(X_t = k | n)$  to denote the probability that the process  $X_t$  over population  $[n]$  is in state  $k$  at time  $t$ . The proof relies on a comparison of  $\Pr(X_t = k | n)$  with  $\Pr(\tilde{X}_t = k | n - 1)$ , in combination with  $\sum_{k=0}^n \Pr(X_t = k | n) = 1$ .

From equation (4.17) for the probability mass function of the classical occupancy distribution, we have

$$\Pr(X_t = k | n) = \frac{(n)_k}{n^t} \left\{ \begin{matrix} t \\ k \end{matrix} \right\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Pr(\tilde{X}_t = k | n - 1) = \frac{(n-1)_k}{(n-1)^t} \left\{ \begin{matrix} t \\ k \end{matrix} \right\}. \quad (4.48)$$

Note the Stirling number as a common factor in both expressions. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(n-1)^t}{(n-1)_k} \Pr(\tilde{X}_t = k | n - 1) &= \frac{n^t}{(n)_k} \Pr(X_t = k | n) \\ \therefore \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^t \Pr(\tilde{X}_t = k | n - 1) &= \frac{(n-1)_k}{(n)_k} \Pr(X_t = k | n) \\ \therefore \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^t \Pr(\tilde{X}_t = k | n - 1) &= \frac{n-k}{n} \Pr(X_t = k | n) \\ \therefore n \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^t \Pr(\tilde{X}_t = k | n - 1) &= (n-k) \Pr(X_t = k | n). \end{aligned} \quad (4.49)$$

Then sum both sides over  $k$ :

- For the right-hand side, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^n (n-k) \Pr(X_t = k | n) &= n \sum_{k=0}^n \Pr(X_t = k | n) - \sum_{k=0}^n k \Pr(X_t = k | n) \\ &= n - \mathbb{E}[X_t | n]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.50)$$

- And for the left-hand side, we have

$$n \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^t \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \Pr(\tilde{X}_t = k | n - 1) = n \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^t. \quad (4.51)$$

Solving for the expectation, we obtain  $\mathbb{E}[X_t | n] = n - n \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^t$ , as desired. ■



The variance can be obtained along the same lines, that is from

$$k(n-k) \Pr(X_t = k | n) = kn \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^t \Pr(\tilde{X}_t = k | n-1), \quad (4.52)$$

which after some manipulation, yields the expression

$$\mathbb{V}[X_t | n] = n \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^t + n(n-1) \left(1 - \frac{2}{n}\right)^t - n^2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{2t}. \quad (4.53)$$

We note that the approach suggested by Price (1946) can be used to recursively determine any moment in terms of lower order moments. It should also be mentioned that Weiss (1958) derived the raw moments of all orders, albeit in an algebraically more involved manner.

## 4.5 The Randomized Occupancy Model

There are many variations of the occupancy model in the literature (see e.g. Feller, 1968; Harkness, 1969; Holst, 1986; Johnson and Kotz, 1977). A common variation in the applied literature is the addition of a single and constant retention probability,  $p$ , for all urns. The following definition paraphrases Harkness (1969):

**Formulation 6** (Randomized Occupancy). Given  $n$  distinguishable urns of unbounded capacity, and  $t$  throws with distinguishable balls having equiprobability of ending up in any of the  $n$  urns, and each ball having probability  $p$  of occupying the urn, what is the probability of finding  $k$  urns occupied?

That is, each ball has probability  $1-p$  of “missing” the targeted urn, or “falling through” the urn. This model is a generalization of the classical occupancy problem, which itself is recovered as a special case when  $p = 1$ .

In contrast to Harkness (1969), we describe the model not in terms of empty urns,  $Y_t$ , but in terms of occupied urns,  $X_t = n - Y_t$ . We go a step further by simplifying the expressions for the probability mass function and distribution function, and *en passant* answer a question posed by Harkness (1969, Sec. 4) in his section on the Markovian representation of the problem.

### Markov Chain Embedding

In the randomized occupancy model, the discrete-time Markov process  $X_t$  transitions from state  $k$  to state  $k+1$  when an unoccupied urn is randomly targeted *and* the ball is retained by the urn. These events are independent, hence their joint probability is

$$p_k = \frac{n-k}{n}p. \quad (4.54)$$

Equivalently, the stop probability in state  $k$  is

$$q_k = 1 - p_k = 1 - \frac{n-k}{n}p = \frac{n - (n-k)p}{n}. \quad (4.55)$$

Formally, we define the transition matrix as follows

$$[P]_{i,j} = \begin{cases} q_i = \frac{n - (n-j)p}{n} & \text{if } j = i; \\ p_i = \frac{(n-j)p}{n} & \text{if } j = i + 1; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases} \quad (4.56)$$

for all integer indices  $0 \leq i, j \leq n$ . These relations may equivalently be expressed in terms of the following recurrence relations:

$$p_{i,j}^{(t+1)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [P^{t+1}]_{i,j} = \begin{cases} (1-p)^{t+1} & \text{if } i = j = 0; \\ q_j p_{i,j}^{(t)} + p_{j-1} p_{i,j-1}^{(t)} & \text{if } 0 < i \leq j \leq n \text{ and } j < t; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases} \quad (4.57)$$

for  $i, j \in S = \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$  and  $t > 0$ ; and initially  $p_{i,i}^{(0)} = 1, i \in S$ .

### Representation as Mixture

Johnson and Kotz (1977, Sec. 3.3) express the randomized occupancy distribution as a binomial mixture of *classical* occupancy distributions. Taking this as our starting point, we obtain the following expression for the probability mass function

$$\begin{aligned} f(k, t; p, n) &= p_{0,k}^{(t)} = \binom{n}{k} \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} \left(1 - p + \frac{jp}{n}\right)^t && \text{(Johnson \& Kotz)} \\ &= \binom{n}{k} \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} \left(\frac{n - (n-j)p}{n}\right)^t && (4.58) \\ &= \binom{n}{k} \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} q_j^t. && \text{(by Eq. (4.55))} \end{aligned}$$

The cumulative distribution function can be obtained by means of the first hitting time formulation for state  $k$ , that is by using the methods of Section 3.2, in particular relations (3.10) and (3.11), as we demonstrate in the following proposition.

**Proposition 13** (CDF Randomized Occupancy). *The cumulative distribution function of the randomized occupancy problem is equal to*

$$F(k, t; p, n) = (n-k) \binom{n}{k} \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} \frac{q_j^t}{(n-j)} \quad (4.59)$$

for all integers  $0 \leq k \leq n$ ,  $t > 0$ , and any real  $0 < p \leq 1$ .

*Proof.* We have

$$\begin{aligned}
F(\underline{k}, t; p, n) &= p_k \sum_{d=t}^{\infty} f(k, \underline{d}; p, n) && \text{(as hitting time)} \\
&= p_k \sum_{d=t}^{\infty} \binom{n}{k} \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} q_j^d && \text{(by Eq. (4.58))} \\
&= p_k \binom{n}{k} \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} \sum_{d=t}^{\infty} q_j^d && \text{(reorder summation)} \\
&= p_k \binom{n}{k} \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} \frac{q_j^t}{1 - q_j} && \text{(geometric series)} \quad (4.60) \\
&= p \frac{(n-k)}{n} \binom{n}{k} \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} \frac{q_j^t}{p_j} && \text{(simplify)} \\
&= (n-k) \frac{p}{\cancel{\mathcal{X}}} \binom{n}{k} \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} \frac{\cancel{\mathcal{X}}}{p} \frac{q_j^t}{(n-j)} \\
&= (n-k) \binom{n}{k} \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} \frac{q_j^t}{(n-j)},
\end{aligned}$$

as desired. ■

We note the great similarity between Proposition 13 and Proposition 8. In fact, Eq. (4.35) can be recovered from Eq. (4.59) when we set  $p = 1$ , that is:  $q_j = j/n$ .

Proposition 13 can also be derived from the eigendecomposition of the transition matrix  $P$ . Or, *vice versa*, the eigenvalues and eigenvectors are strongly suggested by equation (4.58) (and Proposition 13). We record this assertion as an exact statement in the following proposition.

**Proposition 14.** *The eigendecomposition of the transition matrix of the randomized occupancy problem with parameters  $t, p, n$ , is given by*

$$P^t = U \Lambda^t U^{-1}$$

with

$$\Lambda = \frac{1}{n} \text{diag}(1 - p, n - (n-1)p, n - (n-2)p, \dots, n - p, n)$$

and

$$[U]_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \binom{n-i}{n-j} & \text{if } i \leq j; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases} \quad [U^{-1}]_{i,j} = \begin{cases} (-1)^{j-i} \binom{n-i}{n-j} & \text{if } i \leq j; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* In the same spirit as equation (4.4) and Lemmas 3 and 4 of Section 4.2. ■

Note that the eigenvalues are uniquely determined, but the eigenvectors are unique only upto nonzero scalar multiplication.

Proposition 14 directly answers the remark of Harkness (1969, Sec. 4) that “*Explicit ‘closed form’ expressions for these sums of a simpler nature do not seem to be possible to obtain.*”

(Harkness then continues with a discussion of approximations.) However, we obtain the following explicit formula for said probabilities

$$\Pr(X_t = k | X_0 = r) = p_{r,k}^{(t)} = \binom{n-r}{n-k} \sum_{j=0}^{k-r} (-1)^{k-r-j} \binom{k-r}{j} q_{j+r}^t, \quad (4.61)$$

for integer  $0 \leq r \leq k \leq \min(n, t)$ ; and 0 otherwise.<sup>6</sup>

### Recurrence Relation for Distribution Function

We conclude with a simple system of recurrence relations for the complementary c.d.f., just as we did before for the classical occupancy distribution.

**Proposition 15** (Complementary CDF: Recurrence). *The complementary cumulative distribution function of the randomized occupancy problem,  $\bar{F}(k, t; p, n)$ , obeys the recurrence relations*

$$\bar{F}(k, t+1; p, n) = \begin{cases} \frac{(n-k)p}{n} \bar{F}(k-1, t; p, n) + \frac{n-(n-k)p}{n} \bar{F}(k, t; p, n) & \text{if } k \leq t; \\ 0 & \text{if } k > t. \end{cases} \quad (4.62)$$

for all  $0 \leq k < n$ , and  $t > 0$ .

*Proof.* Proof is identical to Proposition 10 and Proposition 3, but nonetheless included in Appendix 6.2. ■

These recurrence relations are of interest because they provide a simple and efficient way to calculate the tail probabilities of the randomized occupancy distribution.

#### 4.5.1 Factorial and other Moments

In closing, we record some results from Harkness (1969, Sec. 3) pertaining to the the raw and factorial moments of the randomized occupancy model, thereby generalizing those that Weiss (1958) obtained for the classical occupancy distribution.

Harkness derived the factorial moments of the process  $Y_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} n - X_t$  using generating functions, to arrive at

$$\mathbb{E}[(Y_t)_k] = (n)_k \left(1 - \frac{kp}{n}\right)^t, \quad (4.63)$$

in polished form. The raw moments then follow directly as

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_t^k] = \sum_{j=0}^k \left\{ \begin{matrix} k \\ j \end{matrix} \right\} (n)_k \left(1 - \frac{kp}{n}\right)^t, \quad (4.64)$$

by slight adaptation of Harkness (1969, Eq. 10), or from identity (2.7). Hence, the expectation and variance of the randomized occupancy distribution are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Y_t] &= n \left(1 - \frac{p}{n}\right)^t, & \mathbb{E}[X_t] &= n - n \left(1 - \frac{p}{n}\right)^t, \\ \mathbb{V}[Y_t] &= \mathbb{V}[X_t] = n \left(1 - \frac{p}{n}\right)^t + n(n-1) \left(1 - \frac{2p}{n}\right)^t - n^2 \left(1 - \frac{p}{n}\right)^{2t}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.65)$$

Note that when we set  $p = 1$ , we obtain the expectation and variance of the classical occupancy distribution, i.e. expressions (4.47) and (4.53).

---

<sup>6</sup>The reader may want to compare Eq. (4.61) to Eq. (4.21) of Proposition 7.

## 4.6 Chapter Summary

In Chapter 4 we refined all results of Chapter 3 for the specific parametrization of the classical (and randomized) occupancy problem(s). In contrast to the approach taken in Chapter 3, which employed the complete homogeneous symmetric polynomial, the main tool in Chapter 4 was the eigendecomposition of the transition matrix. From the eigendecomposition we derived all transition probabilities in explicit form, in terms of  $r$ -Stirling numbers of the second kind, and as appropriately attuned finite differences. In doing so, we generalized the classic and well known expressions for the probability mass function and distribution function to their initial-state conditioned versions in Propositions 7 and 8, respectively.

Furthermore, in Proposition 10 we derived a completely new sparse linear system of recurrence relations for the complementary distribution function. We provided its matrix implementation in Proposition 11.<sup>7</sup>

We treated the randomized occupancy model of Harkness (1969), and showed that the Markovian perspective has relevance for that problem as well. Most evidently by answering a question raised by Harkness as to whether it is possible to simplify the expressions for the elements in the exponentiated transition matrix,  $p_{r,k}^{(t)}$ . We were able to answer this question affirmatively in Eq. (4.61).

Finally, for completeness and to unify the vast but scattered literature, the respective moments of the classical and randomized occupancy distribution were discussed. In particular, for the classical occupancy model we provided the elegant derivation of Price (1946).

Appendix 6.4 contains concrete examples of the matrices  $P$ ,  $U$ ,  $U^{-1}$ ,  $U^{-1}\Sigma$  and  $C$ .

**Discussion.** Even though all results of this chapter can be derived using the combinatorial approach of Chapter 3, we took a contrasting matrix-algebraic approach here to illustrate that more than one road leads to Rome.

We thus demonstrated the capabilities of the matrix-algebraic Markovian approach. This approach leads naturally to a generalization of the classic expressions, namely to their initial-state conditioned versions. Thereby generalizing and extending the work of Uppuluri and Carpenter (1971), Johnson and Kotz (1977), Harkness (1969), and Feller (1968) on this problem.

The simple system of recurrence relations for the distribution function will perhaps find greatest practical use, for example to obtain fast and precise tail probabilities. Apart from its practicality, its matrix implementation in particular takes a strikingly simple and elegant<sup>8</sup> form in Proposition 11.

---

<sup>7</sup>Propositions 10 and 11 are the natural adaptations of Propositions 3 and 5 from Chapter 3.

<sup>8</sup>Caveat lector: beauty is in the eye of the beholder.

# 5 Conclusion and Discussion

Our primary interest in this thesis was a property of sampling with replacement, namely: the distribution of the number of distinct elements one obtains after sampling a finite population a given number of times with replacement. This problem is known as the classical occupancy problem.

We approached this problem by asking what a purely Markovian perspective on it would yield in terms of greater understanding and new results. By Markovian perspective we mean the formulation of the problem as a discrete-time Markov chain.

We took this route because (1) the Markovian structure is apparent, but (2) the only paper taking this position as a starting point, Uppuluri and Carpenter (1971), did not exhaust this vantage point to its full potential.

Given our Markovian starting position, we advanced in three directions.

**Probability Mass Function.** We derived the known classic expressions for the probability mass function in a new manner using the eigendecomposition of the transition matrix. We generalized these expressions to their initial-state conditioned versions, expressing these in terms of  $r$ -Stirling numbers, and as finite differences. We are not aware of these latter results having been obtained before.

**Cumulative Distribution Function.** The cumulative distribution function has historically received less attention than the probability mass function. We instead made it a focal point.

Using the eigendecomposition, we derived the distribution function immediately in its general, initial-state conditioned form. Which we compactly expressed as an appropriately evaluated finite difference.

However, our main (practical) novelty is the system of recurrence relations that we derived for the complementary distribution function in Proposition 10, and its matrix form in Proposition 11. With this sparse linear system, exact computation of tail probabilities for large  $n$  and  $t$  becomes feasible.

We believe that these results constitute an appreciable advance in the current knowledge of the classical occupancy problem.

**Generalization to Pure Birth Processes.** Chapter 3 is entirely concerned with the generalization of these results to general discrete-time pure birth processes.

To understand its relation to the literature, we first precisely described the dual of the state distribution, that is in terms of each state's first hitting time. Crucially, the first hitting times can be represented as a convolution of geometric distributions.

Sen and Balakrishnan (1999) derived the exact form of the probability mass function of this convolution for distinct geometric distributions. In the same context, Chen and Guisong (2016, Sec. 3) generalized this result to the convolution of generic geometric distributions, removing the distinctness condition.

We gave a new, elementary proof of both results based on a combinatorial path-counting argument combined with the complete homogeneous symmetric polynomial.

We then extended the results of the aforementioned authors to the distribution function, for both generic and distinct transition probabilities in Theorem 2 and Proposition 2, respectively.

Finally, we proved in Proposition 3 that the simple system of recurrence relations for the classical occupancy distribution holds *mutatis mutandis* for the entire class of discrete-time

pure birth distributions. We consider this to be a notable result.

We thus demonstrated that a Markovian viewpoint combined with the right mathematical instruments – the complete homogeneous symmetric polynomial and the eigendecomposition of the transition matrix – yields new results for a classic problem of probability theory.

In general, we hope that our work has contributed to a better understanding of sampling with replacement and pure birth processes in discrete time. Additionally, we hope that our treatment has unified part of the vast but scattered literature on the exact distribution of the classical occupancy problem, and the diverse tools that have been proposed by various authors.

Concluding this thesis, we wish to suggest some directions for future research.

First, much of this work carries over to continuous-time pure birth processes. By considering a convolution of exponential distributions instead of geometric distributions, the Markov embedding becomes one in continuous time. One could ask how much of the elementary nature of our approach remains intact in continuous time.

Second, the description of the process  $\mathbf{X}$  in terms of the evolution of its stages, has a dual in the collection of each state's first hitting time, say  $\mathbf{T}$ . We have fruitfully exploited that duality in this thesis, most evidently in the case of the distribution function. It would be interesting to see if this duality can be further exploited. For example, in terms of their moments.

# Bibliography

- Aigner, M. and Ziegler, G. M. (2014), Shuffling cards, *in* ‘Proofs from THE BOOK’, 5th edn, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, chapter 30, pp. 205–214.
- Aldous, D. and Diaconis, P. (1986), ‘Shuffling cards and stopping times’, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **93**(5), 333–348.
- Barabesi, L. and Marcheselli, M. (2011), ‘Parameter estimation in the classical occupancy model’, *Statistical Methods & Applications* **20**(3), 305–327.
- Bhatnagar, G. (1999), ‘A short proof of an identity of sylvester’, *Internat. J. Math. & Math. Sci.* **22**(2), 431–435.
- Boole, G. (1860), *A treatise on the calculus of finite differences*, Macmillan and Company.
- Bose, S. N. (1924), ‘Plancks gesetz und lichtquantenhypothese’, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **26**, 178–181.
- Breiman, L. (2001), ‘Random forests’, *Machine learning* **45**(1), 5–32.
- Broder, A. Z. (1984), ‘The  $r$ -stirling numbers’, *Discrete Mathematics* **49**, 241–259.
- Call, G. S. and Velleman, D. J. (1993), ‘Pascal’s matrices’, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **100**(4), 372–376.
- Carlitz, L. (1980), ‘Weighted stirling numbers of the first and second kind–i’, *Fibonacci Quarterly* **18**(2), 147–162.
- Chao, A. (1984), ‘Nonparametric estimation of the number of classes in a population’, *Scandinavian Journal of statistics* pp. 265–270.
- Chen, X. and Guisong, C. (2016), ‘Exact distribution of the convolution of negative binomial random variables’, *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods* **46**(6), 2851–2856.
- Comtet, L. (1974), *Advanced Combinatorics: The Art of Finite and Infinite Expansions*, Springer Science.
- Cumani, A. (1982), ‘On the canonical representation of homogeneous markov processes modelling failure-time distributions’, *Microelectronics Reliability* **22**(3), 583–602.
- DeMoivre, A. (1711), ‘De mensura sortis, seu, de probabilitate eventuum in ludis a casu fortuito pendentibus’, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London* **27**(329), 213–264.
- Devroye, L. (1986), *Nonuniform random variate generation*, 1st edn, Springer.
- Efron, B. (1979), ‘Bootstrap methods: Another look at the jackknife’, *Ann. Statist.* **7**(1), 1–26.
- Feller, W. (1968), *An Introduction to Probability Theory and its Applications*, Vol. 1, 3rd edn, John Wiley & Sons.



- Harkness, W. (1969), The classical occupancy problem revisited, Technical Report 11, Department of Statistics, Penn. State University.
- Holst, L. (1986), ‘On birthday, collectors’, occupancy and other classical urn problems’, *International Statistical Review* pp. 15–27.
- Johnson, N. L. and Kotz, S. (1977), *Urn Models and Their Applications*, New York, NY (USA) Wiley.
- Jordán, K. (1965), *Calculus of finite differences*, Vol. 33, American Mathematical Society.
- Kemeny, J. G. and Snell, J. (1976), *Finite Markov Chains*, 2nd edn, Springer.
- Macdonald, I. G. (1998), *Symmetric functions and Hall Polynomials*, Vol. 12, American Mathematical Soc.
- Neuts, M. F. (1975), ‘Probability distributions of phase-type’, *Liber Amicorum Professor Emeritus H. Florin* pp. 173–206.
- Nørlund, N. E. (1924), *Vorlesungen über Differenzenrechnung*, Springer.
- O’Cinneide, C. A. (1989), ‘On non-uniqueness of representations of phase-type distributions’, *Communications in Statistics. Stochastic Models* **5**(2), 247–259.
- Pólya, G. (1930), ‘Eine wahrscheinlichkeitstheoretische Aufgabe in der Kundenwerbung’, *ZAMM* **10**(1), 96–97.
- Price, G. (1946), ‘Distributions derived from the multinomial expansion’, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **53**(2), 59–74.
- Rényi, A. (1962), ‘Three new proofs and a generalization of a theorem of Irving Weiss’, *Magyar Tud. Akad. Mat. Kutató Int. Közl* **7**(1-2), 203–214.
- Sen, A. and Balakrishnan, N. (1999), ‘Convolution of geometrics and a reliability problem’, *Statistics & Probability Letters* **43**(4), 421–426.
- Spivey, M. Z. and Zimmer, A. M. (2008), ‘Symmetric polynomials, pascal matrices, and stirling matrices’, *Linear Algebra and its Applications* **428**(4), 1127–1134.
- Todhunter, I. (1865), *A History of the Mathematical Theory of Probability: from the time of Pascal to that of Laplace*, Vol. 1, MacMillan.
- Uppuluri, V. and Carpenter, J. (1971), ‘A generalization of the classical occupancy problem’, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* **34**(2), 316–324.
- Weiss, I. (1958), ‘Limiting distributions in some occupancy problems’, *Ann. Math. Stat.* **29**(3), 878–884.
- Williamson, P. P., Mays, D. P., Abay Asmerom, G. and Yang, Y. (2009), ‘Revisiting the classical occupancy problem’, *The American Statistician* **63**(4), 356–360.



indexed as  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ .

The  $r$ -Stirling numbers of the second kind are indispensable in this case to express the p.m.f. and c.d.f. in closed form.

Again, treating the probability weight contributed by the transitions and the stops separately, and writing the latter's contribution in terms of  $r$ -Stirling numbers of the second kind, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\widehat{X}_t = k \mid \widehat{X}_0 = r) &= \frac{1}{n^t} \left( \prod_{j=r}^{k-1} j \right) h_{t-k+r}(n-r, n-r-1, \dots, n-k) \\ &= \frac{1}{n^t} \frac{(k-1)!}{(r-1)!} \left\{ \begin{matrix} t-k+n \\ n-k, n-r \end{matrix} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

for  $1 \leq r \leq k \leq n$ ,  $t > 0$ ; and 0 otherwise.

We obtain the unconditional p.m.f. straightforwardly from (6.3) by setting  $r = 1$ . The expression becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{f}(k, t, n) &= \frac{(k-1)!}{n^t} h_{t-k+1}(n-1, n-2, \dots, n-k) \\ &= \frac{(k-1)!}{n^t} \left\{ \begin{matrix} t-k+n \\ n-k, n-1 \end{matrix} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.4)$$

for  $1 \leq k \leq n$  and  $t > 0$ .

The complementary c.d.f. can be obtained by truncating the chain in Figure 6.1 by making state  $k+1$  absorbing, the resulting expression for the unconditional c.d.f. ( $\widehat{X}_0 = 1$ ) then becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\widehat{F}}(k, t, n) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Pr(\widehat{X}_t > k \mid \widehat{X}_0 = r) \\ &= \frac{k!}{n^t} h_{t-k}(n, n-1, \dots, n-k) \\ &= \frac{k!}{n^t} \left\{ \begin{matrix} t-k+n \\ n-k, n \end{matrix} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.5)$$

for  $1 \leq k < n$  and  $t > 0$ . The c.d.f. follows from  $\widehat{F}(k, t, n) = 1 - \overline{\widehat{F}}(k, t, n)$ .

Furthermore, note the following relation:

$$n^t \overline{\widehat{F}}(k, t, n) = k! h_{t-k}(n, n-1, n-2, \dots, n-k) = (n+1)^t \widehat{f}(k+1, t, n+1), \quad (6.6)$$

which when summed over  $k$ , can conveniently be used to derive the expectation of  $\widehat{X}_t$  (cf. the method of Price (1946) in Section 4.4).

Finally, note, with regard to the absorption probabilities in the rightmost column of the transition matrix  $\widehat{P}^t$ , that the elements in the second to penultimate rows are *not expressible* straightforwardly in terms of  $r$ -Stirling numbers. To be precise, those numbers are  $\widehat{p}_{i,n}^{(t)} = [\widehat{P}^t]_{i,n}$  with  $i = 2, 3, \dots, n-1$ . (These terms miss at least one integer for them to form a sequence of *consecutive integers* in their numerators.)

We now proceed with a short treatment of some recurrence relations for these absorption probabilities, before concluding this section with a few words about the chain's first hitting times.

## Recurrence Relations for the Absorption Probabilities

In this subsection we derive some simple recurrence relations for the elements in the rightmost column of  $\widehat{P}^t$ , that is for probabilities  $\widehat{p}_{k,n}^{(t)}$  with  $k = 2, 3, \dots, n-1$ , as these are not trivial.

We begin by noting that  $\widehat{p}_{1,n}^{(t+1)}$  can be expressed in terms of  $\widehat{p}_{1,n}^{(t)}$  and  $\widehat{p}_{2,n}^{(t)}$  as follows

$$\widehat{p}_{1,n}^{(t+1)} = \widehat{p}_{1,1}\widehat{p}_{1,n}^{(t)} + \widehat{p}_{1,2}\widehat{p}_{2,n}^{(t)}. \quad (6.7)$$

The left hand side can be also expressed as

$$\widehat{p}_{1,n}^{(t+1)} = \widehat{p}_{1,n}^{(t)} + \widehat{p}_{n-1,n}\widehat{p}_{1,n-1}^{(t)}. \quad (6.8)$$

Equating these expressions and isolating  $\widehat{p}_{2,n}^{(t)}$ , we obtain the expression

$$\widehat{p}_{2,n}^{(t)} = \widehat{p}_{1,n}^{(t)} + (n-1)\widehat{p}_{1,n-1}^{(t)}, \quad (6.9)$$

after some manipulation. This reasoning generalizes to all states  $k = 2, 3, \dots, n$ . Hence the following lemma.

**Lemma 7.** *Denote by  $\widehat{p}_{i,j}$  the transition probabilities of the Markov chain defined in equation (6.2); then the recurrence relation,*

$$\widehat{p}_{k,n}^{(t)} = \widehat{p}_{k-1,n}^{(t)} + \frac{n-1}{k-1}\widehat{p}_{k-1,n-1}^{(t)} \quad (6.10)$$

holds true for all  $k = 2, 3, \dots, n$ , and  $t \geq 1$ .

*Proof.* Take any  $k \in \{2, 3, \dots, n\}$ .

- On the one hand, we have

$$\widehat{p}_{k-1,n}^{(t+1)} = \widehat{p}_{k-1,k-1}\widehat{p}_{k-1,n}^{(t)} + \widehat{p}_{k-1,k}\widehat{p}_{k,n}^{(t)}. \quad (6.11)$$

- On the other hand, it holds true that

$$\widehat{p}_{k-1,n}^{(t+1)} = \widehat{p}_{k-1,n}^{(t)} + \widehat{p}_{n-1,n}\widehat{p}_{k-1,n-1}^{(t)}. \quad (6.12)$$

- Hence, when we equate the right-hand sides of these expressions and isolate  $\widehat{p}_{k,n}^{(t)}$ , the desideratum is obtained as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{p}_{k,n}^{(t)} &= \frac{(1 - \widehat{p}_{k-1,k-1})\widehat{p}_{k-1,n}^{(t)} + \widehat{p}_{n-1,n}\widehat{p}_{k-1,n-1}^{(t)}}{\widehat{p}_{k-1,k}} \\ &= \frac{\widehat{p}_{k-1,k}\widehat{p}_{k-1,n}^{(t)} + \widehat{p}_{n-1,n}\widehat{p}_{k-1,n-1}^{(t)}}{\widehat{p}_{k-1,k}} \\ &= \widehat{p}_{k-1,n}^{(t)} + \frac{\widehat{p}_{n-1,n}\widehat{p}_{k-1,n-1}^{(t)}}{\widehat{p}_{k-1,k}} \\ &= \widehat{p}_{k-1,n}^{(t)} + \frac{n-1}{k-1}\widehat{p}_{k-1,n-1}^{(t)}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.13)$$

■

Lemma 7 provides a simple recurrence relation, which expresses the conditional absorption probability,  $\hat{p}_{k,n}^{(t)}$ , in terms of  $\hat{p}_{k-1,n}^{(t)}$ , and a probability that can be readily read-off from equation (6.3),  $\hat{p}_{k-1,n-1}^{(t)}$ .

We may alternatively express this recurrence relation as in the following corollary.

**Corollary 2.**

$$\hat{p}_{k,n}^{(t)} = \hat{p}_{1,n}^{(t)} + (n-1) \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{j} \hat{p}_{j,n-1}^{(t)}, \quad (6.14)$$

for all  $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$  and  $t \geq 1$ .

*Proof.* Idea: unravel equation (6.10) of Lemma 7 step-by-step. That is, start with

$$\hat{p}_{k,n}^{(t)} = \hat{p}_{k-1,n}^{(t)} + \frac{n-1}{k-1} \hat{p}_{k-1,n-1}^{(t)},$$

and keep substituting into the first term on the right-hand side of the expression, each time with  $k$  reduced by one. Finally, re-index the summation. ■

### First Hitting Times

The first hitting time of state  $k$ ,  $\widehat{T}_k$ , of the complementary occupancy process,  $\widehat{X}_t$ , can be represented as a sum of independent geometrically distributed random variables, as follows

$$\widehat{T}_k = G_{\frac{1}{n}} + G_{\frac{2}{n}} + \dots + G_{\frac{k-1}{n}}, \quad (6.15)$$

with each summand geometrically distributed with success (i.e. transition) probability  $p$ , i.e.  $G_p \sim \text{Geo}(p)$ ,  $0 < p \leq 1$ . From this representation, we immediately obtain its expectation and variance as:

$$\mathbb{E}[\widehat{T}_k] = n \left( 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \dots + \frac{1}{k-1} \right) = n \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{j} = nH_{k-1}. \quad (6.16)$$

$$\mathbb{V}[\widehat{T}_k] = n \left( \frac{n-1}{1^2} + \frac{n-2}{2^2} + \dots + \frac{n-k+1}{(k-1)^2} \right) = n \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{n-j}{j^2}. \quad (6.17)$$

### 6.1.2 The Binomial Distribution

In this section we discuss the distribution that arises when we sample uniformly at random (i.e. with equiprobability) from the power set of the population  $[n]$ , denoted  $\mathcal{P}([n])$ , and defined as the collection of all subsets of  $[n]$ .

The universe  $\mathcal{P}([n])$  has cardinality  $2^n$ .  $\mathcal{P}([n])$  contains  $\binom{n}{k}$  different  $k$ -subsets of  $[n]$ . The identity

$$\sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} = 2^n \quad (6.18)$$



denote the complementary partial sum, that is the partial sum of the “last”  $n - k$  binomial coefficients, then  $\overline{S}(k, n)$  obeys the linear recurrence relations:

$$\overline{S}(k, n) = \begin{cases} 2\overline{S}(k, n-1) & \text{if } k = 0; \\ \overline{S}(k, n-1) + \overline{S}(k-1, n-1) & \text{if } 1 < k < n; \\ 1 & \text{if } k = n; \end{cases} \quad (6.24)$$

with  $\overline{S}(0, 0) = 2^0 = 1$ .

In other words, the complementary partial sum,  $\overline{S}(k, n)$ , satisfies the exact same recurrence relation as its summands (the binomial coefficients), with only exception its boundary  $k = 0$  for  $n \geq 1$ .

*Proof by visual inspection.* Recall Pascal’s triangle:

$$\begin{array}{rcccccccc} n = 0 : & & & & & & & & 1 \\ n = 1 : & & & & & & & & 1 & 1 \\ n = 2 : & & & & & & & & 1 & 2 & 1 \\ n = 3 : & & & & & & & & 1 & 3 & 3 & 1 \\ n = 4 : & & & & & & & & 1 & 4 & 6 & 4 & 1 \\ n = 5 : & & & & & & & & 1 & 5 & 10 & 10 & 5 & 1 \\ n = 6 : & & & & & & & & 1 & 6 & 15 & 20 & 15 & 6 & 1 \\ n = 7 : & & & & & & & & 1 & 7 & 21 & 35 & 35 & 21 & 7 & 1 \end{array} \quad (6.25)$$

Now observe the first few rows of the *complementary partial sum* triangle:

$$\begin{array}{rcccccccc} n = 0 : & & & & & & & & 1 \\ n = 1 : & & & & & & & & 2 & 1 \\ n = 2 : & & & & & & & & 4 & 3 & 1 \\ n = 3 : & & & & & & & & 8 & 7 & 4 & 1 \\ n = 4 : & & & & & & & & 16 & 15 & 11 & 5 & 1 \\ n = 5 : & & & & & & & & 32 & 31 & 26 & 16 & 6 & 1 \\ n = 6 : & & & & & & & & 64 & 63 & 57 & 42 & 22 & 7 & 1 \\ n = 7 : & & & & & & & & 128 & 127 & 110 & 99 & 64 & 29 & 8 & 1 \end{array} \quad (6.26)$$

From this latter triangle we see that each element is the sum of the ones above it, just as we have for Pascal’s triangle (middle condition of (6.24)). The left and right borders are also easily verified to be powers of two (top condition), or identical to one (bottom condition). Moreover, the difference of two adjacent terms in the same row equals the corresponding element in Pascal’s triangle. ■

When the triangle in (6.26) is read from right to left, one finds that for the partial sum  $S(k, n)$  itself a similar result holds:

$$S(k, n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = 0; \\ S(k, n-1) + S(k-1, n-1) & \text{if } 1 < k < n; \\ 2S(k, n-1) & \text{if } k = n; \end{cases} \quad (6.27)$$

with  $S(0, 0) = 2^0 = 1$ .

## State-Phase Duality

Finally, let us note the form that the state-phase duality (Section 3.2) takes for this problem. We may in this case consider a truncated variant of the Markov chain in Eq. (6.20) with an absorbing state at any  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n - 1$  instead of  $n$ . The resulting expressions for the complementary c.d.f. then become

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(X_n > k) &= \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{j=k+1}^n \binom{n}{j} && \text{(by definition on state space)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=k}^{n-1} \frac{1}{2^j} \binom{j}{k}, && \text{(as hitting time)} \end{aligned} \quad (6.28)$$

and equivalently for the complementary partial sums:

$$\bar{S}(k, n) = \sum_{j=k+1}^n \binom{n}{j} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=k}^{n-1} 2^{n-j} \binom{j}{k}. \quad (6.29)$$

## 6.2 Some Proofs

This section contains some proofs that were left out of the main text. For completeness they are provided here.

### 6.2.1 Deferred Proofs of Results

Proof of Proposition 4 (Chapter 3).

**Proposition** (CDF Recurrence). *The distribution function of any pure birth process  $X_t$  induced by the vector of transition probabilities,  $\mathbf{p}_{n+1}$ , with  $0 < p_i < 1$  ( $i = 0, 1, \dots, n - 1$ ), obeys the recurrence relations*

$$F(k, t + 1, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) = \begin{cases} p_k F(k - 1, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) + (1 - p_k) F(k, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) & \text{if } k < t; \\ 1 & \text{if } k \geq t; \end{cases} \quad (6.30)$$

for  $1 \leq k \leq n$  and  $t > 0$ .

*Proof.* Starting with the latter condition ( $k \geq t$ ): in this case the distribution function must equal 1 as no path has reached any state greater than  $t$ .

For the first condition ( $k < t$ ), we obtain two different expressions: one for the p.m.f.,  $f(k, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1})$ , in terms of the complementary c.d.f.; the other for the complementary c.d.f. when time is incremented by one unit. Upon combining these expressions the recurrence relation is obtained.

- By definition we have

$$f(k, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) = F(k, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) - F(k - 1, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}). \quad (6.31)$$

- On the other hand, we have

$$F(k, t + 1, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) = F(k, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) - p_k f(k, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}), \quad (6.32)$$

as a consequence of relations (3.9) and (3.10).



- Hence, on substituting equation (6.31) into (6.32), we obtain

$$\overline{F}(k, t + 1, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) = p_k \overline{F}(k - 1, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}) + (1 - p_k) \overline{F}(k, t, \mathbf{p}_{n+1}), \quad (6.33)$$

as desired. ■

In the same spirit we prove Proposition 15 (Section 4.5) here for the complementary c.d.f. of the *randomized* occupancy model.

**Proposition** (Complementary CDF: Recurrence). *The complementary cumulative distribution function of the randomized occupancy problem,  $\overline{F}(k, t; p, n)$ , obeys the recurrence relations*

$$\overline{F}(k, t + 1; p, n) = \begin{cases} \frac{(n - k)p}{n} \overline{F}(k - 1, t; p, n) + \frac{n - (n - k)p}{n} \overline{F}(k, t; p, n) & \text{if } k \leq t; \\ 0 & \text{if } k > t. \end{cases} \quad (6.34)$$

for  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , and  $t > 0$ .

*Proof.* Starting with the second case,  $k > t$ : it is impossible for the Markov process to reach any state greater than  $t$ , hence this (cumulative) probability is equal to zero.

For the other case,  $k \leq t$ , we obtain two different expressions involving the p.m.f. in terms of the c.d.f., and substitute one into the other.

- We have by definition

$$f(k, t; p, n) = \overline{F}(k - 1, t; p, n) - \overline{F}(k, t; p, n). \quad (6.35)$$

- On the other hand, we have

$$\overline{F}(k, t + 1; p, n) = \overline{F}(k, t; p, n) + p_k f(k, t; p, n). \quad (6.36)$$

- Substituting the first equation into the second and rearranging terms, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{F}(k, t + 1; p, n) &= p_k \overline{F}(k - 1, t; p, n) + (1 - p_k) \overline{F}(k, t; p, n) \\ &= \frac{(n - k)p}{n} \overline{F}(k - 1, t; p, n) + \frac{n - (n - k)p}{n} \overline{F}(k, t; p, n), \end{aligned} \quad (6.37)$$

as desired. ■

## 6.2.2 Other Results and Proofs

A short collection of interesting results with proofs, which could not be included in the main text.

### Hitting Time Derivation of the Classical Occupancy Distribution Function

As we saw in Section 3.2, when deriving the distribution function of  $X_t$  it is convenient to utilize its dual, that is the first hitting time distribution (in particular: relations (3.10), (3.11)). We shall mimic the proof of Theorem 2 (Chapter 3).

Let us recall some facts from that section in an appropriately adapted form for the classical occupancy problem. Let the process  $X_t$  start in any state  $0 \leq r < k$ , then we have for the first hitting time of state  $k$  that

$$T_{r:k} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} G_{\frac{n-r}{n}} + G_{\frac{n-1}{n}} + \dots + G_{\frac{n-k+1}{n}}, \quad (6.38)$$

and

$$\Pr(T_{r:k+1} > t) = \Pr(X_t \leq k \mid X_0 = r). \quad (6.39)$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\Pr(T_{r:k+1} = t) = \frac{n-k}{n} \Pr(X_{t-1} = k \mid X_0 = r). \quad (6.40)$$

With these expressions in hand, we are ready to state the following result.

**Proposition 16** (Occupancy Distribution). *The initial-state conditioned cumulative distribution function of the classical occupancy problem is given by*

$$\Pr(X_t \leq k \mid X_0 = r) = \frac{n-k}{n^t} \binom{n-r}{n-k} \sum_{j=0}^{k-r} (-1)^{k-r-j} \binom{k-r}{j} \frac{(r+j)^t}{n-r-j} \quad (6.41)$$

for all integers  $0 \leq r \leq k < n$ ,  $0 \leq t$ ;  $\Pr(X_0 \leq n \mid X_0 = k) = 1$  for all  $0 \leq k \leq n$ ; and 0 otherwise.

*Proof.* Let us briefly recall the well known manner in which an infinite geometric series can be expressed:

$$\sum_{d=t+1}^{\infty} \lambda^d = \frac{\lambda^{t+1}}{1-\lambda} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq \lambda < 1. \quad (6.42)$$

Then starting from the premiss, we derive the desideratum as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(X_t \leq k | X_0 = r) &= \Pr(T_{r:k+1} > t) = \sum_{d=t+1}^{\infty} \Pr(T_{r:k+1} = d) \\
&= \frac{n-k}{n} \sum_{d=t+1}^{\infty} \Pr(X_{d-1} = k | X_0 = r) && \text{(subst. (6.40))} \\
&= \frac{n-k}{n} \sum_{d=t}^{\infty} \binom{n-r}{n-k} \sum_{j=0}^{k-r} (-1)^{k-r-j} \binom{k-r}{j} \left(\frac{j+r}{n}\right)^d && \text{(subst. (4.21))} \\
&= \frac{n-k}{n} \binom{n-r}{n-k} \sum_{j=0}^{k-r} (-1)^{k-r-j} \binom{k-r}{j} \sum_{d=t}^{\infty} \left(\frac{j+r}{n}\right)^d && \text{(reorder summation)} \\
&= \frac{n-k}{\mathcal{X}} \binom{n-r}{n-k} \sum_{j=0}^{k-r} (-1)^{k-r-j} \binom{k-r}{j} \frac{\mathcal{X} (r+j)^t}{n^t n-r-j} && \text{(use (6.42))} \\
&= \frac{n-k}{n^t} \binom{n-r}{n-k} \sum_{j=0}^{k-r} (-1)^{k-r-j} \binom{k-r}{j} \frac{(r+j)^t}{n-r-j}. && \text{(6.43)}
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, an explicit formula for the unconditional cumulative occupancy distribution is obtained as a special case by taking  $r = 0$ :

$$F(k, t, n) = \frac{1}{n^t} \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{n-j-1}{n-k} \binom{n}{j} j^t = \frac{\binom{n}{k+1}}{n^t} \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} \frac{j^t}{n-j}. \quad (6.44)$$

Proposition 16 thus generalizes the known expression for the c.d.f. (cf. Feller, 1968) to all initial-state conditioned distribution functions,  $\Pr(X_t \leq k | X_0 = r)$ . Recalling expression (2.9) from the Preliminaries, we are able to compactly express the c.d.f. as a  $k$ th order finite difference,

$$F(k, t, n) = \frac{\binom{n}{k+1}}{n^t} \frac{1}{k!} \Delta^k \left[ \frac{x^t}{n-x} \right]_{x=0}, \quad (6.45)$$

underscoring the simplicity of expression (6.41). And more generally,

$$\Pr(X_t = k | X_0 = r) = \frac{\binom{n-r}{k-r+1}}{n^t} \frac{1}{(k-r)!} \Delta^{k-r} \left[ \frac{x^t}{n-x} \right]_{x=r}. \quad (6.46)$$

### CDF in terms of Conditionals

Perhaps one of the most interesting proofs that is not included in the main text, is the following. The result is notable and its derivation a handy algebraic manipulation.

Recall that the cumulative distribution function  $F$  is defined as the sum of probability masses over states  $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k$ , i.e.

$$F(k, t, n) = \sum_{j=0}^k p_{0,j}^{(t)} = \sum_{j=0}^k f(j, n, t) = \frac{1}{n^t} \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{n}{j} \left\{ \frac{t}{j} \right\}. \quad (6.47)$$

From matrix manipulation of the eigendecomposition we are able to obtain an equivalent expression for  $F$  as the sum of initial-state conditioned probability masses of a classical occupancy distributed random variable *over a smaller population*, namely  $[n - 1] = \{1, 2, \dots, n - 1\}$ .

First, we need the following auxiliary result.

**Corollary 3.** *The inverse of  $U_n^{-1}\Sigma$  is given by*

$$\Sigma_n^{-1}U_n = \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} U_{n-1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \mathbf{0}' & 1 \end{array} \right] \quad (6.48)$$

*Proof.*  $(U_n\Sigma)A = I_n$  if and only if  $A = (U_n\Sigma)^{-1} = \Sigma^{-1}U_n$ . ■

This is a direct corollary of Lemma 6. Summarizing, we have:

$$U_n^{-1}\Sigma = \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} U_{n-1}^{-1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \mathbf{0}' & 1 \end{array} \right], \quad \Sigma^{-1}U_n = \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} U_{n-1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \mathbf{0}' & 1 \end{array} \right]. \quad (6.49)$$

And therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} P_n^t\Sigma &= U_n\Lambda_n^tU_n^{-1}\Sigma \\ &= \left(\Sigma\Sigma^{-1}\right)U_n\Lambda_n^tU_n^{-1}\Sigma && \text{(identity matrix)} \\ &= \Sigma\left(\Sigma^{-1}U_n\right)\Lambda_n^t\left(U_n^{-1}\Sigma\right) \\ &= \Sigma\left[\begin{array}{c|c} U_{n-1}^{-1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \mathbf{0}' & 1 \end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c|c} \Lambda_{n-1}^{-1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \mathbf{0}' & 1 \end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c|c} U_{n-1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \mathbf{0}' & 1 \end{array}\right] && \text{(by Eq. (6.49))} \\ &= \Sigma\left[\begin{array}{c|c} U_{n-1}\Lambda_{n-1}^tU_{n-1}^{-1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \mathbf{0}' & 1 \end{array}\right] && (6.50) \\ &= \frac{(n-1)^t}{n^t}\Sigma\left[\begin{array}{c|c} U_{n-1}\frac{n^t}{(n-1)^t}\Lambda_{n-1}^tU_{n-1}^{-1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \mathbf{0}' & \frac{n^t}{(n-1)^t} \end{array}\right] && \text{(multiplying by 1)} \\ &= \frac{(n-1)^t}{n^t}\Sigma\left[\begin{array}{c|c} P_{n-1}^t & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \mathbf{0}' & \frac{n^t}{(n-1)^t} \end{array}\right] \\ &= \left[ \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^t \Sigma P_{n-1}^t \mid \mathbf{1} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The *pointe* is that  $(\Sigma^{-1}U) \Lambda (U^{-1}\Sigma)$  is a the transition matrix of a reduced (smaller population) Markov chain,  $\tilde{P}$ , on which left-multiplication by  $\Sigma$  has the effect of taking the cumulative sum column-wise from bottom to top. Hence, the following proposition.

**Proposition 17.** *Let  $X_t$  and  $\tilde{X}_t$  denote random variables with classical occupancy distributions over populations  $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  and  $[n - 1] = \{1, 2, \dots, n - 1\}$ , respectively. Then the cumulative distribution function of  $X_t$  equals*

$$\Pr(X_t \leq k) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^t \sum_{j=0}^k \Pr(\tilde{X}_t = k \mid \tilde{X}_0 = j), \quad (6.51)$$

for all  $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$  and  $t > 0$ .

*Proof.* See foregoing derivation (6.50) and consider the top row. ■

## 6.3 Concrete Example of a Path

Denote a realization of the process  $\mathbf{X}$  as the tuple, or vector:  $[X_0, X_1, X_2, \dots, X_d]^\top$ . For example, a realization of this process, denoted  $\mathbf{x}_t$ , may look like

$$\mathbf{x}_{11} = [0, 1, 2, 2, 3, 4, 5, 5, 5, 6, 7, 8]^\top.$$

This is just one possible realization of a process  $\mathbf{X}$  which transitioned in  $t = 11$  steps from state 0 to state 8 with one stop in state 2 and two stops in state 5, and zero stops in all other states. If the population (or alphabet) would equal  $[n] = \{1, 2, 3, 4, \dots, 10\}$ , the probability of this path would be equal to

$$\Pr(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}_{11}) = \frac{n(n-1) \cdot 2 \cdot (n-2)(n-3)(n-4) \cdot 5 \cdot 5 \cdot (n-5)(n-6)(n-7)(n-8)}{n^{11}},$$

with  $n = 10$ . It is immediately clear that each  $t$ -step ( $0 \rightarrow k$ )-path always needs to contain all transitions between 0 and  $k$ . There is however, “freedom” in the choice of stops over states  $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  when  $t > k$ . It is exactly there that Stirling numbers of the second kind come into play.

The dual representation of path  $\mathbf{x}_{11}$ , is as a collection of the waiting times per state (excluding the last), concretely

$$\mathbf{w}_{0:7} = [0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 2, 0, 0]^\top, \tag{6.52}$$

that represent the time spent in each state.

## 6.4 Concrete Matrix Examples

### 6.4.1 Sum and Difference Matrices

A  $10 \times 10$  sum matrix:

$$\Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{6.53}$$

Its square:

$$\Sigma^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{6.54}$$

Its inverse, a  $10 \times 10$  difference matrix:

$$\Sigma^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6.55)$$

### 6.4.2 Transition Matrix and Related Matrices

A  $10 \times 10$  transition matrix  $P$  corresponding to the classical occupancy chain:

$$P = \frac{1}{9} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 9 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 8 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 7 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 6 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 4 & 5 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 5 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 6 & 3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 7 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 8 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 9 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6.56)$$

Examples of a  $10 \times 10$  upper-triangular, downward-pointing Pascal matrix and its inverse:

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} \binom{9}{0} & \binom{9}{1} & \binom{9}{2} & \binom{9}{3} & \binom{9}{4} & \binom{9}{5} & \binom{9}{6} & \binom{9}{7} & \binom{9}{8} & \binom{9}{9} \\ 0 & \binom{8}{0} & \binom{8}{1} & \binom{8}{2} & \binom{8}{3} & \binom{8}{4} & \binom{8}{5} & \binom{8}{6} & \binom{8}{7} & \binom{8}{8} \\ 0 & 0 & \binom{7}{0} & \binom{7}{1} & \binom{7}{2} & \binom{7}{3} & \binom{7}{4} & \binom{7}{5} & \binom{7}{6} & \binom{7}{7} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \binom{6}{0} & \binom{6}{1} & \binom{6}{2} & \binom{6}{3} & \binom{6}{4} & \binom{6}{5} & \binom{6}{6} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \binom{5}{0} & \binom{5}{1} & \binom{5}{2} & \binom{5}{3} & \binom{5}{4} & \binom{5}{5} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \binom{4}{0} & \binom{4}{1} & \binom{4}{2} & \binom{4}{3} & \binom{4}{4} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \binom{3}{0} & \binom{3}{1} & \binom{3}{2} & \binom{3}{3} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \binom{2}{0} & \binom{2}{1} & \binom{2}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \binom{1}{0} & \binom{1}{1} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \binom{0}{0} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (6.57)$$

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 9 & 36 & 84 & 126 & 126 & 84 & 36 & 9 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 8 & 28 & 56 & 70 & 56 & 28 & 8 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 7 & 21 & 35 & 35 & 21 & 7 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 6 & 15 & 20 & 15 & 6 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 5 & 10 & 10 & 5 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 4 & 6 & 4 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 3 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (6.58)$$

$$U^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -9 & 36 & -84 & 126 & -126 & 84 & -36 & 9 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & -8 & 28 & -56 & 70 & -56 & 28 & -8 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -7 & 21 & -35 & 35 & -21 & 7 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -6 & 15 & -20 & 15 & -6 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -5 & 10 & -10 & 5 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -4 & 6 & -4 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -3 & 3 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -2 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (6.59)$$

$$U^{-1}\Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -8 & 28 & -56 & 70 & -56 & 28 & 8 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -7 & 21 & -35 & 35 & -21 & 7 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -6 & 15 & -20 & 15 & -6 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -5 & 10 & -10 & 5 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -4 & 6 & -4 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -3 & 3 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -2 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6.60)$$

### 6.4.3 Cumulative Distribution Matrix and Related Matrices

A  $9 \times 9$  complementary cumulative distribution matrix,  $C$  (cf. Section 4.3.4, Eq. (4.45)):

$$C = \frac{1}{9} \begin{bmatrix} 9 & 8 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 7 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 6 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 5 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 4 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 5 & 3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 6 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 7 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 8 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6.61)$$

The matrices of eigenvectors of  $C$ :

$$V = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & -8 & -28 & -56 & -70 & -56 & -28 & -8 \\ 0 & 1 & 7 & 21 & 35 & 35 & 21 & 7 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 6 & 15 & 20 & 15 & 6 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 5 & 10 & 10 & 5 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 4 & 6 & 4 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 3 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (6.62)$$

$$V^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & -7 & 21 & -35 & 35 & -21 & 7 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -6 & 15 & -20 & 15 & -6 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -5 & 10 & -10 & 5 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -4 & 6 & -4 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -3 & 3 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -2 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6.63)$$