



---

Discrete-Time Conversion for Simulating Finite-Horizon Markov Processes

Author(s): Bennett L. Fox and Peter W. Glynn

Source: *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, Vol. 50, No. 5 (Oct., 1990), pp. 1457-1473

Published by: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2101955>

Accessed: 21/07/2010 03:40

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=siam>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



*Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## DISCRETE-TIME CONVERSION FOR SIMULATING FINITE-HORIZON MARKOV PROCESSES\*

BENNETT L. FOX† AND PETER W. GLYNN‡

**Abstract.** The expectations of certain integrals of functionals of continuous-time Markov chains over a finite horizon, fixed or random, are estimated via simulation. By computing conditional expectations given the sequence of states visited (and possibly other information), variance is reduced. This is discrete-time conversion. Efficiency is increased further by combining discrete-time conversion with stratification and splitting.

**Key words.** simulation, finite-horizon, continuous-time Markov chains, variance reduction

**AMS(MOS) subject classifications.** 60J25, 62M05, 90B99

**1. Introduction.** Estimating expected cumulative “reward,” possibly continuously discounted, up to a finite horizon  $\tau$  has practical interest. This and other examples in our paper are special cases of the following: estimating expectations of integrals of functionals  $f$  of a continuous-time Markov chain  $X$  with respect to a weight function  $G$ . Here  $f(s)$  is the “reward” rate when in state  $s$ . We deal with two general classes of such integrals. Both have the form

$$\int_0^\tau f(X(t))G(dt)$$

and differ only in the definition of  $\tau$ . By selecting  $f$  and  $G$  appropriately, many standard problems become special cases, as detailed in §§ 3 and 5. We estimate the expectations of these integrals via simulation. This is carried out *efficiently* via *discrete-time conversion*: computing conditional expectations given the sequence of states visited (and possibly other information). Section 2 shows that the less we condition on, the more variance  $\sigma^2$  is reduced. However, the work  $W$  to compute conditional expectations depends on what we condition on. Section 2 shows that we want to minimize  $\sigma^2 E[W]$ , even when the conditional expectation and the work to compute it are correlated. Especially in §§ 4 and 6, we discuss implementation and estimate the order of magnitude of the work involved.

Section 3 provides theory for random-time horizons, where  $\tau$  is the hitting time of a specified subset of the state space. We relate this to regenerative steady-state simulations. Section 5 provides theory for fixed-time horizons  $\tau$ . Proofs are deferred to the appendix.

The estimators in §§ 3 and 5 are springboards to significant improvements in §§ 4 and 6, respectively. New ideas (but not new theory) are introduced in §§ 4 and 6; these ideas make our theoretical results more important and more practical.

---

\* Received by the editors May 9, 1988; accepted for publication (in revised form) September 27, 1989.

† Department of Mathematics, University of Colorado, Campus Box 170, 1200 Larimer Street, Denver, Colorado 80204. Part of this research was carried out while the author was at Cornell University on leave from the University of Montreal. The research of this author was supported in part by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada. E-mail: bfox@cudenver.bitnet.

‡ Department of Operations Research, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305-4022. Part of this research was carried out while the author was at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. The research of this author was supported by National Science Foundation grant ECS-8404809 and by United States Army Research Office contract DAAG29-84-K-0030. E-mail: glynn@sierra.stanford.edu.

**2. Preliminaries.** As indicated in the introduction, much of this paper develops variance reduction techniques for continuous-time Markov chains based on appropriately “conditioning out” holding times. Such methods are but special cases of the general variance reduction technique known as conditional Monte Carlo.

To set the stage for a discussion of conditional Monte Carlo, we first mathematically characterize the efficiency of an estimator. Suppose that we wish to estimate a parameter  $\alpha$  that can be expressed as  $\alpha = ER$  for some random variable (r.v.)  $R$ . The parameter  $\alpha$  can be calculated by generating independent and identically distributed copies  $R_1, R_2, \dots$  of  $R$  and forming their sample mean. Let  $\beta(R_i)$  be the amount of computer time required to generate  $R_i$ . We assume (reasonably) that the pairs  $(R_i, \beta(R_i))$  are independent and identically distributed (iid), though  $R_i$  and  $\beta(R_i)$  may be correlated.

Given a computer budget  $t$ , the number of observations completed within the budget is

$$N(t) = \max \left\{ n \geq 0: \sum_{k=1}^n \beta(R_k) \leq t \right\}.$$

The sample mean  $r(t)$  formed with the above budget constraint is

$$r(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{N(t)} \sum_{k=1}^{N(t)} R_k; & N(t) \geq 1 \\ 0 & ; \quad N(t) = 0. \end{cases}$$

The (asymptotic) efficiency of the estimator  $r(t)$  is determined by how quickly  $r(t)$  converges to  $\alpha$  as the budget  $t$  goes to infinity. This rate of convergence is characterized by the central limit theorem for  $r(t)$ .

**THEOREM 1.** *Suppose that  $0 < E[\beta(R_i)] < \infty$  and that  $\sigma^2(R_i) \triangleq \text{var } R_i < \infty$ . Then,*

$$t^{1/2}(r(t) - \alpha) \Rightarrow (E[\beta(R_1)]\sigma^2(R_1))^{1/2}N(0, 1)$$

as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

This theorem is elementary only when  $\beta(R_1)$  is deterministic.

Theorem 1 suggests defining the asymptotic efficiency of the estimator  $r(t)$  as the reciprocal of  $E[\beta(R_1)]\sigma^2(R_1)$ ; Hammersley and Handscomb [1964, p. 51] suggest the same figure of merit without providing theoretical justification. Thus, the efficiency of a simulation algorithm increases when the product  $E[\beta(R_1)]\sigma^2(R_1)$  decreases. This permits obtaining an improved estimator in which either  $E[\beta(R_1)]$  or  $\sigma^2(R_1)$  is increased, so long as the product decreases.

We now apply these ideas to our discussion of conditional Monte Carlo. Suppose that  $R$  is an  $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable r.v. and let  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{H}$  be sub- $\sigma$ -fields of  $\mathcal{F}$  such that  $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ . Set  $R_{\mathcal{G}} = E[R|\mathcal{G}]$ ,  $R_{\mathcal{H}} = E[R|\mathcal{H}]$ . If  $E|R| < \infty$ , it is well known that  $\alpha = ER = ER_{\mathcal{G}} = ER_{\mathcal{H}}$ . Hence, competing estimators for  $\alpha$ , based on averaging replicates of  $R_{\mathcal{G}}$  and  $R_{\mathcal{H}}$ , can be considered; such estimators are known as conditional Monte Carlo estimators. Let  $r_{\mathcal{G}}(t)$ ,  $r_{\mathcal{H}}(t)$  be the estimators formed from sample means of iid copies of the r.v.s  $R_{\mathcal{G}}$  and  $R_{\mathcal{H}}$ , respectively. From Theorem 2.1, we find that the efficiencies of the estimators  $r(t)$ ,  $r_{\mathcal{G}}(t)$ , and  $r_{\mathcal{H}}(t)$  are the reciprocals of the products  $E[\beta(R)]\sigma^2(R)$ ,  $E[\beta(R_{\mathcal{G}})]\sigma^2(R_{\mathcal{G}})$ , and  $E[\beta(R_{\mathcal{H}})]\sigma^2(R_{\mathcal{H}})$ , respectively. The quantities  $E[\beta(R)]$ ,  $E[\beta(R_{\mathcal{G}})]$ , and  $E[\beta(R_{\mathcal{H}})]$  measure the mean computation time to generate the three types of observations. These quantities are hard to quantify precisely, since the computer time to generate an observation is implementation dependent (although their respective orders of magnitude can sometimes be estimated). On the other hand, we can order a priori the variances  $\sigma^2(R)$ ,  $\sigma^2(R_{\mathcal{G}})$ , and  $\sigma^2(R_{\mathcal{H}})$ , as the following

well-known proposition shows (see Chung [1974, Prob. 6, p. 305] for an equivalent statement).

PROPOSITION 1. *If  $\text{var } R < \infty$ , then  $\text{var } R_{\mathcal{G}} \leq \text{var } R_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \text{var } R$ .*

Proposition 1 states that conditioning on less reduces variance (by “integrating out” more randomness). An extreme case is  $\mathcal{G} = \{\Phi, \Omega\}$ ; here  $R_{\mathcal{G}} = ER$  has zero variance, but cannot be found exactly.

This last example illustrates the compromises in choosing the appropriate conditioning variables on which to apply the method of conditional Monte Carlo. The choice is a tradeoff between the amount of variance reduction obtained (as measured by  $\sigma^2(R_{\mathcal{G}})$ ) and the implementation difficulty inherent in computing the conditional expectation  $R_{\mathcal{G}}$  (as measured by  $E[\beta(R_{\mathcal{G}})]$ ). This need for compromise is a focus of our discussion in subsequent sections.

**3. Discrete-time conservation for random-time horizons: theory.** Let  $X = (X(t): t \geq 0)$  be a nonexplosive continuous-time Markov chain living on state space  $S$ , and let  $f$  be a real-valued function defined on  $S$ . For  $B \subseteq S$ , let  $T(B) = \inf \{t \geq 0: X(t) \in B, X(t-) \notin B\}$  be the first “hitting time” of the subset  $B$ . We further let  $G: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be a right-continuous (deterministic) nondecreasing function, which then acts as an “integrator.” In this section, we apply the method of conditional Monte Carlo to compute  $\alpha = E(I)$ , where

$$(1) \quad I = \int_{[0, T(B))} f(X(t))G(dt).$$

Grassmann (1983), for example, studies integrals of the general form (1). Assuming that  $f(x)$  is interpreted as the rate at which “cost” is incurred while the process occupies state  $x$ , the above estimation problem arises in several different settings.

SETTING 1. *If  $G(t) = t$ , then  $I$  corresponds to the total cost accumulated by the process  $X$  up to time  $T(B)$ .*

SETTING 2. *If  $G(t) = r^{-1}(1 - e^{-rt})$  where  $r > 0$ , then  $I$  corresponds to the  $r$ -discounted cost accumulated by  $X$  up to time  $T(B)$ .*

SETTING 3. *Given  $T \geq 0$ , suppose that the system is charged a cost that depends on the state occupied at time  $T$ . We assume that if the process hits  $B$  before  $T$ , no cost is charged to the system. If  $f(x)$  is the cost incurred when the system occupies state  $x$  at time  $T$ , then the expected cost  $\alpha = E[I]$ , where  $I$  takes the form (1) and  $G(t) = \mathbf{I}(t \geq T)$ . If  $f \equiv 1$ , then  $\alpha = P\{T(B) > T\}$ , so that  $\alpha$  is the right tail of the cumulative distribution function of  $T(B)$ .*

Although it may appear that the estimation problem considered here pertains only to finite-horizon problems, it turns out to be also relevant to the infinite-horizon steady state. If  $X$  is irreducible and positive recurrent on state space  $S$ , the process  $X$  is regenerative with respect to consecutive hitting times of any state  $z \in S$ . Assuming suitable moment hypotheses are in force, regenerative process theory [Çınlar (1975), § 9.2] shows that the steady-state rate  $\alpha$  at which cost accrues is given by the well-known ratio formula

$$\alpha = \frac{E_z[\int_{[0, T'(z))} f(X(s)) ds]}{E_z T'(z)}$$

where  $T'(z) = T(\{z\})$  and  $E_z(\cdot)$  is the expectation operator conditional on  $X(0) = z$ . Both the numerator and denominator have the form (1), so variance reduction techniques developed for (1) are applicable to regenerative steady-state simulation of  $X$  even though the numerator and denominator are correlated; e.g., see Fox and Glynn (1986), especially their formulas (15)–(18). Via Little’s law (e.g., see Glynn and Whitt

(1989)), this lets us estimate expected customer sojourn time in system in steady-state efficiently.

To apply conditional Monte Carlo to (1), we condition on the embedded chain  $Z = (Z_0, Z_1, \dots)$ , where  $Z_i \neq Z_{i-1}$  and  $Z_i$  is the state visited by  $X$  just after jump  $i$ . Let  $\tau_i$  be the time between jumps  $i$  and  $i + 1$ , so that  $S(n) = \tau_0 + \dots + \tau_n$  is the instant at which  $X$  makes its  $(n + 1)$ st jump. Put  $S(-1) = 0$  and let  $H(B) = \inf \{n \geq 1: Z_n \in B\}$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2) \quad I &= \sum_{n=0}^{H(B)-1} \int_{[S(n-1), S(n))} f(X(t))G(dt) \\
 &= \sum_{n=0}^{H(B)-1} f(Z_n)[G(S(n)-) - G(S(n-1)-)].
 \end{aligned}$$

Assuming that  $E \int_{[0, T(B))} |f(X(t))|G(dt) < \infty$ , we may take conditional expectations of both sides of (2) with respect to  $Z$ , yielding

$$(3) \quad E[I|Z] = \sum_{n=0}^{H(B)-1} f(Z_n)\{E[G(S(n)-)|Z] - E[G(S(n-1)-)|Z]\}.$$

Let  $Q = (Q(x, y): x, y \in S)$  be the generator of  $X$  and let  $\lambda(x) = -Q(x, x)$ . Continuous-time Markov chains have the convenient property that, conditional on  $Z$ , the holding times  $\tau_0, \tau_1, \dots$  are conditionally independent with conditional distributions  $P\{\tau_i \in dt|Z\} = f_{Z_0}(t) dt$ , where  $f_x(\cdot)$  is an exponential density with parameter  $\lambda(x)$ . Hence,

$$(4) \quad E[G(S(n)-)|Z] = \int_0^\infty G(t)(f_{Z_0} * \dots * f_{Z_n})(t) dt$$

for  $n \geq 0$ , where  $*$  denotes convolution. We do not need  $G(t^-)$  in the integrand because  $G(t) = G(t^-)$  for all but at most countably many  $t$ . Combining (3) and (4) yields an expression for  $I_Z \triangleq E[I|Z]$ , from which a conditional Monte Carlo estimator for  $\alpha$  can be obtained. We say that the resulting estimator is obtained by “discrete-time conversion” since the new estimator depends on  $X$  only through a discrete-time chain, so that the holding times need not be simulated.

As discussed in § 2, the efficiency of the estimator based on  $I_Z$  is determined by  $\text{var } I_Z$  and by  $E\beta(I_Z)$ . Depending on the problem, the variance difference  $\text{var } I - \text{var } I_Z$  can take on any value between zero and infinity, as the following example illustrates.

*Example 1.* Let  $X$  be a pure birth process on the nonnegative integers with constant birth rate equal to  $\lambda$ . Suppose  $X(0) = 0$ . If  $G(t) = t$ , then  $I = T'(n)$  and  $E[T'(n)|Z] = n/\lambda = ET'(n)$ , so  $\text{var } I_Z = 0$ . On the other hand,  $T'(n)$  is an Erlang- $n$  r.v. with scale parameter  $\lambda$ , so  $\text{var } I = n/\lambda^2$ . Hence, the variance reduction can be made either arbitrarily large or small, depending on how we choose  $n$  and  $\lambda$ .

Since we expect that the variance reduction will be (at least) moderate in most practical examples, the estimator based on  $I_Z$  is more efficient provided that the time required to compute the conditional expectation is at most moderately more than that to compute  $I$ . Note that  $I_Z$  requires simulation only of  $Z$ ; holding times need not be generated. Unfortunately, the convolution in (4) can be expensive to compute. However, for two important choices of  $G$ , the convolution (4) is relatively cheap to calculate. For such  $G$ 's, the discussion of § 2 shows that the discrete-time estimator  $I_Z$  is a clear winner over  $I$ .

SETTING 1 (continued). If  $G(t) = t$ , then (4) is just the expected value of the sum of  $n + 1$  independent exponential r.v.s with parameters  $\lambda(Z_0), \dots, \lambda(Z_n)$ . So, we obtain

$$E[G(S(n)-)|Z] = \sum_{k=0}^n 1/\lambda(Z_k) \text{ and}$$

$$E[I|Z] = \sum_{n=0}^{H(B)-1} f(Z_n)/\lambda(Z_n).$$

This estimator was first studied in a regenerative steady-state context by Hordijk, Iglehart, and Schassberger (1976), although it was not analyzed using the principle of conditional Monte Carlo. This estimator was further studied by Fox and Glynn (1986) in a steady-state context, where the ties to regenerative simulation were cut.

SETTING 2 (continued). Suppose  $G(t) = r^{-1}(1 - e^{-rt})$ . Note that

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-rt}(f_{Z_0} * \dots * f_{Z_n})(t) dt$$

is the Laplace transform (evaluated at  $r$ ) of the distribution of the sum of  $n$  independent exponential r.v.s. Hence,

$$E[G(S(n)-)|Z] = \frac{1}{r} \left( 1 - \prod_{k=0}^n \left( \frac{\lambda(Z_k)}{\lambda(Z_k) + r} \right) \right)$$

and

$$E[I|Z] = \sum_{n=0}^{H(B)-1} f(Z_n) \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \left( \frac{\lambda(Z_k)}{\lambda(Z_k) + r} \right) \frac{1}{(\lambda(Z_n) + r)}.$$

An estimator similar to the above was first described by Fox and Glynn (1989a) in an infinite-horizon setting.

For general  $G$ , the integral (4) is typically (much) more computationally expensive to calculate, diminishing the attractiveness of  $I_Z$  as an estimator of  $\alpha$ . This point is illustrated by our next example.

SETTING 3 (continued). For  $G(t) = I(t \geq T)$ , we find that (4) involves calculating the tail of the distribution function (evaluated at  $T$ ) of the sum of  $n + 1$  independent exponential r.v.s. Since the parameters of the  $n + 1$  exponentials typically differ from one another, this distribution function is neither available in closed form nor easy to calculate numerically.

Because of the above computational difficulty in calculating (4), a different approach to discrete-time conversion may be preferable. Suppose that  $X$  is now a uniformizable continuous-time Markov chain and let  $\lambda = \sup \{ \lambda(x) : x \in S \}$ . For  $\theta \geq \lambda$ ,  $X$  can be represented as  $X(t) = Y_{N_\theta(t)}^\theta$ , where  $Y^\theta = (Y_0^\theta, Y_1^\theta, \dots)$  is a discrete-time Markov chain having transition matrix  $P(\theta) = \theta^{-1}(Q + \theta I)$  and  $N_\theta(\cdot)$  is a Poisson process, independent of  $Y^\theta$ , having rate  $\theta$ . We now develop a conditional Monte Carlo estimator for  $a$  based on the conditioning variables  $Y^\theta = (Y_0^\theta, Y_1^\theta, \dots)$ . Simulating the naive estimator  $I$  using the uniformized chain would waste work. Uniformization goes back to Jensen (1953). He recognized its potential to improve simulation efficiency. Even though uniformization increases variance, by Proposition 1, nevertheless uniformization pays when it reduces the product of expected work per run and variance per run, by Theorem 1.

Let  $\eta_0^\theta, \eta_1^\theta, \dots$  be the iid exponential ( $\theta$ ) interevent times of the Poisson process  $N_\theta$  and let  $T_n^\theta = \eta_0^\theta + \eta_1^\theta + \dots + \eta_n^\theta$  be the instant at which  $N_\theta$  makes its  $(n + 1)$ st jump. Put  $J_\theta(B) = \inf \{ n \geq 1 : Y_{n-1}^\theta \notin B, Y_n^\theta \in B \}$  and observe that

$$I = \sum_{n=0}^{J_\theta(B)-1} f(Y_n^\theta)[G(T_n^\theta-) - G(T_{n-1}^\theta-)].$$

Since the  $T_n^\theta$ 's are independent of  $Y^\theta$ , it follows that

$$(5) \quad E[I|Y^\theta] = \sum_{n=0}^{J_\theta(B)-1} f(Y_n^\theta)[EG(T_n^\theta-) - EG(T_{n-1}^\theta-)].$$

Noting that  $T_n^\theta$  is an Erlang r.v. with shape parameter  $n + 1$  and scale parameter  $\theta$ , we find that

$$(6) \quad EG(T_n^\theta -) = \int_0^\infty G(t) \frac{\theta^{n+1} t^n e^{-\theta t}}{n!} dt.$$

Combining (5) and (6) yields an expression for  $I_{Y^\theta} \triangleq E[I | Y^\theta]$ .

The principal advantage of  $I_{Y^\theta}$  over  $I_Z$  is that the computation of (6) is typically (much) cheaper than that of (4). For example, in (4), the convolution  $f_{Z_0} * \dots * f_{Z_n}$  must be evaluated numerically at many points before integrating numerically against  $G(t) dt$ , whereas in (6) the convolution is calculated analytically. In addition, for certain (practically important) choices of  $G$ , (6) can be calculated in closed form when (4) cannot.

SETTING 3 (continued). For  $G(t) = \mathbf{I}(t \geq T)$ , we have that (6) equals  $P\{T_n^\theta \geq T\} = P\{N_\theta(T) \leq n\}$ . Hence,

$$I_{Y^\theta} = \sum_{n=0}^{J_\theta(B)-1} f(Y_n^\theta) e^{-\theta T} \frac{(\theta T)^n}{n!}.$$

We now choose  $\theta$  optimally. Recall that  $Y^\theta$  can be obtained from  $Z$  by adding ‘‘null jumps.’’ More precisely,  $Y^\theta$  can be represented as

$$(7) \quad Y_n^\theta = \sum_{k=0}^\infty Z_k \mathbf{I}\left(\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \nu_j^\theta \leq n < \sum_{j=0}^k \nu_j^\theta\right)$$

where  $\nu_0^\theta, \nu_1^\theta, \dots$  are conditionally independent, given  $Z$ , and  $P\{\nu_k^\theta = l | Z\} = (1 - \lambda(Z_k)/\theta)^{l-1} \lambda(Z_k)/\theta$ . Here  $\nu_k^\theta$  is the number of discrete time units spent in  $Z_k$ .

Since  $J_\theta(B) = \sum_{k=0}^{H(B)-1} \nu_k^\theta$  and the  $\nu_k^\theta$ 's are stochastically increasing in  $\theta$ , clearly  $J_\theta(B)$  is stochastically increasing in  $\theta$ . Thus, the work required to compute (5) is minimized by taking  $\theta$  as small as possible, namely  $\theta = \lambda$ .

As for the variance of  $I_{Y^\theta}$ ,  $Y^\theta$  differs from  $Y^\lambda$  only in that it has more null jumps. In some sense,  $Y^\theta$  contains more information than  $Y^\lambda$  and hence Proposition 1 ought to apply, yielding the conclusion that  $\text{var } I_{Y^\theta}$  is minimized by taking  $\theta = \lambda$ . Our next theorem confirms this assertion.

**THEOREM 2.** *Suppose that  $\text{var } I < \infty$ . Then,  $\text{var } I_{Y^\lambda} \leq \text{var } I_{Y^\theta}$  for all  $\theta \geq \lambda$ .*

Hence, the efficiency of the estimator based on replicating  $I_{Y^\theta}$  is maximized by taking  $\theta = \lambda$ .

This leaves us with the question of when  $I_{Y^\lambda}$  is more efficient than  $I_Z$ . First, note that  $J_\lambda(B) \geq H(B)$  so that the number of summands in (3) is always less than the number in (5). Hence, the estimator based on  $I_{Y^\lambda}$  requires less work than does  $I_Z$  only when the integral (4) is significantly more expensive to compute than (6). For the variance comparison, it is clear that the sequence  $Z$  is a (deterministic) function of  $Y^\lambda$ , so that  $\sigma(Z) \subseteq \sigma(Y^\lambda)$ . Proposition 1 immediately yields the next result.

**THEOREM 3.** *Suppose that  $\text{var } I < \infty$ . Then,  $\text{var } I_Z \leq \text{var } I_{Y^\lambda}$ .*

With this result in hand, it is clear that  $I_Z$  is the discrete-time estimator of choice whenever the computation of (4) is not too much more expensive than that of (6). If this condition is not satisfied, the choice is fuzzier; we defer discussion to the next section on implementation issues.

**4. Discrete-time conversion for random-time horizons: implementation.** In this section, we first consider, in § 4.1, how to efficiently calculate (4) (a key to computing  $E[I | Z]$  in formula (3)) for general  $G$ . Next, in § 4.2, we consider how to implement formulas (5) and (6), which were based on conditioning on  $Y^\theta$ . For finite horizons,

whether or not it pays to uniformize depends on the problem (via Theorem 1). This carries over to infinite horizons. Subsection 4.3 considers steady-state sojourn time  $S$ . To estimate the expectation of a linear function of  $S$ , we do not uniformize. But for a nonlinear function, we do.

Fox (1990) and Fox and Young (1989) show how to generate  $Z$  (and hence  $Y^\theta$ ) quickly under certain conditions, as an alternative to future-event schedules. The techniques developed there reduce  $E\beta(I_Z)$  and  $E\beta(I_{Y^\theta})$ , increasing efficiency.

**4.1. Without uniformization.** It can be easily verified that when  $\lambda(Z_0), \dots, \lambda(Z_n)$  are distinct, the convolutions in (4) take the form

$$(8) \quad c_{0,n} \exp(-\lambda(Z_0)t) + \dots + c_{n,n} \exp(-\lambda(Z_n)t).$$

Furthermore, the coefficients  $c_{0,n}, \dots, c_{n,n}$  can be efficiently calculated from  $c_{0,n-1}, \dots, c_{n-1,n-1}$  (the coefficients associated with  $f_{Z_0} * \dots * f_{Z_{n-1}}$ ) in order  $n$  operations. With the initial condition  $c_{00} = \lambda(Z_0)$ , we recursively solve for the coefficients  $c_{0,n}, \dots, c_{n,n}$  appearing in (7) in order  $n^2$  operations. When the  $\lambda(Z_i)$ 's are not distinct, some terms in (7) get multiplied by (routinely determined) powers of  $t$  and other terms vanish. Again, in this case, the coefficients can be calculated recursively.

To numerically evaluate (4), we use the recursive algorithm described above to find the symbolic representation of the convolution and then numerically evaluate the product of the convolution with  $G(t)$  on a suitably defined grid of points.

In some cases, it may pay to look for (and exploit) common subsequences of  $\lambda(Z_i)$ 's across runs to avoid computing all convolutions for all runs from scratch.

**4.2. With uniformization.** Relation (5) can be written in the form

$$(9) \quad E[I | Y^\theta] = \sum_{k=0}^{H(B)-1} f(Z_k) [b(\chi_k^\theta, \theta) - b(\chi_{k-1}^\theta, \theta)]$$

where

$$\chi_k^\theta = \sum_{j=0}^k v_j^\theta,$$

and

$$b(n, \theta) = \int_0^\infty G(t) \theta^{n+1} \frac{e^{-\theta t} t^n}{n!} dt.$$

We check whether  $b(n, \theta)$  has already been computed (and stored) from some previous run. If it has, we use it. If it has not, let  $\bar{n}$  be the maximum  $j$  for which  $b(j, \theta)$  has been previously computed. We can then recursively calculate  $b(\bar{n} + 1, \theta)$  through  $b(n, \theta)$  from  $b(\bar{n}, \theta)$ , by using the following ideas:

(i) On a grid  $t_1 < \dots < t_m$ , we assume that the quantities

$$\Delta_{i\bar{n}} = G(t_i) \theta^{\bar{n}+1} \frac{e^{-\theta t_i} t_i^{\bar{n}}}{\bar{n}!} (t_i - t_{i-1})$$

( $1 \leq i \leq m, t_0 = 0$ ) are already computed and stored. Choose  $t_m$  so that the integral to its right is negligible.

(ii) For  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , we compute  $\Delta_{i\bar{n}+1}, \dots, \Delta_{in}$  recursively, using

$$\Delta_{i,j+1} = \Delta_{ij} \frac{\theta t_i}{(j+1)}$$

and the initial condition  $\Delta_{i\bar{n}}$  from (i).

(iii) We use  $\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \Delta_{ij}$  as a numerical approximation to  $b(j, \theta)$ ,  $\bar{n} < j \leq n$ .

Similar ideas are compatible with more sophisticated numerical integration methods.



Returning to (9), we note that the  $\nu_i^\theta$ 's can be generated (by "inversion") as geometric variates with parameter  $\lambda(Z_i)/\theta$ , in computation time independent of  $\lambda(Z_i)/\theta$ ; e.g., see Bratley, Fox, and Schrage [1987, § 5.4.5]. Sometimes null-jump sequences can start only in certain states; for example, in the M/M/1 queue only from the state corresponding to an empty system. This condition is detected automatically when  $\lambda(Z_i) = \theta$ .

In certain applications (particularly, those in which  $\inf \{\lambda(x) : x \in S\} \ll \theta$ ), the  $\nu_i^\theta$ 's may well account for most of the variance of  $E[I | Y^\theta]$ . This suggests that it may pay to generate multiple  $Y^\theta$  sequences from a single  $Z$  by inserting (say  $k$ ) conditionally independent copies of  $\nu_0^\theta, \dots, \nu_{H(B)-1}^\theta$  into  $Z$ . Generating such a copy is usually trivial relative to the work to generate  $Z$ , because each null-jump sequence is generated in  $O(1)$  time (with a small implicit constant). We then use

$$\sum_{r=0}^{H(B)-1} f(Z_r) \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k [b(\chi_{ri}^\theta, \theta) - b(\chi_{r-1,i}^\theta, \theta)]$$

to estimate  $\alpha$ , where  $\chi_{ri}^\theta = \sum_{j=0}^r \nu_{ji}^\theta$  and  $\nu_{ji}^\theta$  is the  $i$ th copy of  $\nu_j^\theta$ . Our (overall) estimator of  $\alpha$  is the average of such iid estimators generated for a given computer budget. Fox and Glynn (1990) show how to choose  $k$  to maximize efficiency as a special case of their results on splitting.

**4.3. Steady-state sojourn times.** Consider estimating the expectation of a function  $g$  of system sojourn time  $S$  for customers in steady state. When  $g$  is linear, we use Little's law as detailed in § 3; in this case, it does not pay to uniformize. When  $g$  is nonlinear, however, this problem does not have a form analogous to (1), even via Little's law, unless the state space is expanded to keep track of customer entry and exit times.

Nonetheless, we can still convert to discrete time (and not expand the state space). We note for each customer the difference  $d$  between the transition numbers when he leaves the system and when he enters it. When the chain is *uniformized*, clearly  $E[g(S) | d] = E[g(e(d))]$  where  $e$  is an Erlang variate with shape parameter  $d$ . Without uniformization, finding  $E[g(S) | Z]$  requires recording each customer's path through the system, numerically computing the density of each customer's sojourn time (via a convolution as in § 4.1) at many grid points, and numerically computing the corresponding expectations; this is much harder.

**5. Discrete-time conversion for deterministic-time horizons: theory.** Our goal in this section is to use discrete-time conversion to estimate  $\alpha = E[I]$ , where

$$(10) \quad I = \int_{[0, T]} f(X(t)) G(dt).$$

We assume that  $X$  is a nonexplosive continuous-time Markov chain on state space  $S$ ,  $f$  is a real-valued function defined on  $S$ ,  $T$  is deterministic, and  $G$  is a (deterministic) nondecreasing right-continuous function on  $[0, \infty)$ . Such estimation problems arise in a number of different settings.

SETTING 4. *Suppose that we interpret  $f(x)$  as the rate at which cost accrues when the process occupies state  $x$ . If  $G(t) = t$ , we find that  $I$  is the total cost accumulated over the horizon  $[0, T]$ .*

SETTING 5. *Suppose  $G(t) = r^{-1}(1 - e^{-rt})$  ( $r > 0$ ) and that  $f$  is interpreted as in Setting 4. Then,  $I$  is the  $r$ -discounted cost over the horizon  $[0, T]$ .*

SETTING 6. *Suppose that the system is charged an amount  $f(x)$  if the process  $X$  occupies state  $x$  at time  $T$ . Then, the expected cost  $\alpha$  charged to the system is given by  $\alpha = E[I]$ , where  $G(t) = \mathbf{I}(t \geq T)$ .*

Based on the discussion of § 3, ideally we would like to obtain our discrete-time estimator for  $\alpha$  by conditioning on  $Z$ , at least if  $E[I|Z]$  is not hard to compute relative to alternative estimators. The following proposition will help us compute our conditional expectations.

PROPOSITION 2. *Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a  $\sigma$ -field and suppose that*

$$E \int_{[0,T]} |f(X(t))| G(dt) < \infty.$$

Then,

$$E[I|\mathcal{G}] = \int_{[0,T]} E[f(X(t))|\mathcal{G}] G(dt).$$

To apply this proposition to the calculation of  $E[I|Z]$ , observe that

$$f(X(t)) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f(Z_n) \mathbf{I}\{S_{n-1} \leq t < S_n\}$$

so that

$$E[f(X(t))|Z] = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f(Z_n) \int_0^t \int_{t-u}^{\infty} f_{Z_n}(v) dv (f_{Z_0} * \dots * f_{Z_{n-1}})(u) du.$$

Hence, by Proposition 2,

$$(11) \quad E[I|Z] = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f(Z_n) \int_{[0,T]} \int_0^t \exp(-\lambda(Z_n)(t-u))(f_{Z_0} * \dots * f_{Z_{n-1}})(u) du G(dt).$$

Several difficulties with  $I_Z \triangleq E[I|Z]$  are apparent. First,  $I_Z$  depends on the entire history of  $Z$  and therefore requires an infinite amount of time to compute (exactly). Second, the summands that define  $Z$  involve difficult double integrals that do not simplify significantly, even for well-chosen  $G$ .

SETTING 4 (continued). *Here  $G(t) = t$  so that the double integral in (11) becomes*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \int_0^t \int_{t-u}^{\infty} f_{Z_n}(v) dv (f_{Z_0} * \dots * f_{Z_{n-1}})(u) du dt \\ &= \int_0^T \int_0^T \int_0^{\infty} \mathbf{I}(u \leq t \leq u+v) f_{Z_n}(v) dv (f_{Z_0} * \dots * f_{Z_{n-1}})(u) du dt \\ &= \int_0^T \int_0^{\infty} \int_0^T \mathbf{I}(u \leq t \leq u+v) dt f_{Z_n}(v) dv (f_{Z_0} * \dots * f_{Z_{n-1}})(u) du \\ &= \int_0^T \int_0^{T-u} v f_{Z_n}(v) dv (f_{Z_0} * \dots * f_{Z_{n-1}})(u) du \\ (12) \quad &+ \int_0^T \int_{T-u}^{\infty} (T-u) f_{Z_n}(v) dv (f_{Z_0} * \dots * f_{Z_{n-1}})(u) du \\ &= \int_0^T \int_0^{\infty} v f_{Z_n}(v) dv (f_{Z_0} * \dots * f_{Z_{n-1}})(u) du \\ &- \int_0^T \int_{T-u}^{\infty} (v-T+u) f_{Z_n}(v) dv (f_{Z_0} * \dots * f_{Z_{n-1}})(u) du \\ &= \lambda(Z_n)^{-1} \int_0^T (f_{Z_0} * \dots * f_{Z_{n-1}})(u) du \\ &- \lambda(Z_n)^{-1} \int_0^T \exp(-\lambda(Z_n)(T-u))(f_{Z_0} * \dots * f_{Z_{n-1}})(u) du. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, unless the convolutions can be rapidly calculated (perhaps as in § 4.1),  $I_Z$  appears impractical.

Similar difficulties arise when we wish to calculate  $I_Z$  for the estimators that arise in Settings 5 and 6. Therefore, we now consider alternatives. We now assume that  $X$  is uniformizable with  $\lambda = \sup \{\lambda(x) : x \in S\} < \infty$ . The analogue of (5) is given by

$$(13) \quad E[I | Y^\theta] = f(Y_0^\theta) \int_{[0, T]} e^{-\theta t} G(dt) + \frac{1}{\theta} \sum_{n=1}^\infty f(Y_n^\theta) \int_{[0, T]} \frac{\theta^{n+1} t^n e^{-\theta t}}{n!} G(dt).$$

The inner (convolution) integral that appears in (12) is analytically calculated here: it becomes Erlang. Also, for certain  $G$ , the conditional expectation  $I_{Y^\theta} = E[I | Y^\theta]$  simplifies further.

SETTING 4 (continued). For  $G(t) = t$ , we get

$$\int_0^T \frac{\theta^{n+1} t^n e^{-\theta t}}{n!} dt = \sum_{k=n+1}^\infty e^{-\theta T} \frac{(\theta T)^k}{k!}$$

and so

$$(14) \quad \begin{aligned} E[I | Y^\theta] &= \frac{1}{\theta} \sum_{n=0}^\infty f(Y_n^\theta) \sum_{k=n+1}^\infty e^{-\theta T} \frac{(\theta T)^k}{k!} \\ &= T \sum_{k=0}^\infty \sum_{n=0}^k f(Y_n^\theta) e^{-\theta T} \frac{(\theta T)^k}{(k+1)!}. \end{aligned}$$

Gross and Miller (1984) find (14) by a different route.

SETTING 5 (continued). For  $G(t) = r^{-1}(1 - e^{-rt})$ , we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \frac{\theta^{n+1} t^n e^{-\theta t}}{n!} e^{-rt} dt &= \left(\frac{\theta}{\theta+r}\right)^{n+1} \int_0^T \frac{(\theta+r)^{n+1} t^n e^{-(\theta+r)t}}{n!} dt \\ &= \left(\frac{\theta}{\theta+r}\right)^{n+1} \sum_{k=n+1}^\infty e^{-(\theta+r)T} \frac{((\theta+r)T)^k}{k!} \end{aligned}$$

so

$$E[I | Y^\theta] = \sum_{n=0}^\infty f(Y_n^\theta) \frac{\theta^n}{(\theta+r)^{n+1}} \sum_{k=n+1}^\infty e^{-(\theta+r)T} \frac{((\theta+r)T)^k}{k!}.$$

SETTING 6 (continued). For  $G(t) = \mathbf{I}(t \geq T)$ , we obtain

$$E[I | Y^\theta] = \sum_{n=0}^\infty f(Y_n^\theta) e^{-\theta T} \frac{(\theta T)^n}{n!}.$$

Just as in § 3, the choice  $\theta = \lambda$  minimizes both the average work  $E[\beta(I_{Y^\theta})]$  and the variance  $\text{var } I_{Y^\theta}$ . The arguments are identical to those of § 3.

A major difficulty with the estimators is that, as in the case of  $I_Z$ , they depend on the entire history of  $Y^\theta$ . One (obvious) solution terminates the simulation of  $Y^\theta$  after a certain fixed number of transitions (say  $m$ ) and deletes those terms from the estimators that depend on  $Y_n^\theta$  for  $n \geq m$ . For several (practically important)  $G$ 's, the resulting (truncation) error can be bounded if  $f$  is bounded using bounds on Poisson tails in Fox and Glynn (1988). If  $f$  is not bounded, it seems difficult or impossible to get useful error bounds. In any case, Fox and Glynn (1989b) show that such termination

strategies are also undesirable in terms of their (theoretical) large-sample convergence rate. It is shown there that even if the termination index is chosen to depend optimally on the budget  $t$ , the resulting estimator will converge (slightly) more slowly than  $t^{-1/2}$  in the budget  $t$ . This contrasts with the estimators discussed in § 2, where Theorem 1 establishes a (canonical) convergence rate of  $t^{-1/2}$  for the estimator  $r(t)$ . Consequently, we now discuss variants of the above estimators that avoid this difficulty.

Suppose that we enrich the conditioning  $\sigma$ -field so that it also contains information on the number of events of  $N_\theta$  completed by time  $V \cong T$ . While this will clearly increase the variance of the estimator (see Proposition 1), we would expect that the resulting estimator will depend on the history of  $Y^\theta$  only up through the  $N_\theta(V)$ th transition. This decreases the work required to calculate the estimator. In particular, the time required to (exactly) calculate the estimator will now be finite, whereas the time to calculate  $I_{Y^\theta}$  is infinite.

Let  $\mathcal{G}_{\theta, V}$  be the  $\sigma$ -field generated by  $Y^\theta$  and  $N_\theta(V)$ . Then, for  $t \leq V$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} E[f(X(t)) | Y^\theta, N_\theta(V) = m] &= \sum_{j=0}^m E[f(X(t)) \mathbf{I}\{N_\theta(t) = j\} | Y^\theta, N_\theta(V) = m] \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^m f(Y_j^\theta) P\{N_\theta(t) = j | Y^\theta, N_\theta(V) = m\} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^m f(Y_j^\theta) P\{N_\theta(t) = j | N_\theta(V) = m\}. \end{aligned}$$

We used the independence of  $Y^\theta$  and  $N_\theta$  in the last step. But

$$P\{N_\theta(t) = j | N_\theta(V) = m\} = \binom{m}{j} \left(\frac{t}{V}\right)^j \left(\frac{V-t}{V}\right)^{m-j}.$$

Hence, in light of Proposition 2, we obtain

$$(15) \quad E[I | \mathcal{G}_{\theta, V}] = \sum_{j=0}^{N_\theta(V)} f(X_j^\theta) \int_{[0, T]} \left(\frac{N_\theta(V)}{j}\right) \left(\frac{t}{V}\right)^j \left(\frac{V-t}{V}\right)^{N_\theta(V)-j} G(dt).$$

The estimator  $I_{\mathcal{G}_{\theta, V}} \triangleq E[I | \mathcal{G}_{\theta, V}]$  can be calculated in finite time. The question naturally arises as to which choice of  $\theta$  and  $V$  minimizes the variance of  $I_{\mathcal{G}_{\theta, V}}$ . As in § 3, the choice  $\theta = \lambda$  minimizes the variance for any (fixed) value of  $V$ . The next proposition states that the variance of  $I_{\mathcal{G}_{\theta, V}}$  is nonincreasing in  $V$ .

PROPOSITION 3. *If  $\text{var } I < \infty$ , then  $\text{var } E[I | \mathcal{G}_{\theta, V}]$  is nonincreasing in  $V \cong T$ .*

This result seems to suggest that we should choose  $V$  as large as possible. This, however, has the effect of increasing the expected time required to compute  $I_{\mathcal{G}_{\theta, V}}$ . Assuming (reasonably) that the average work increases proportionately to  $V$ , this suggests choosing  $V$  to minimize  $Vc(V)$  over  $V \cong T$ , where  $c(V) = \text{var } I_{\mathcal{G}_{\theta, V}}$ . Noting that the  $\sigma$ -field generated by  $Y^\theta$  is contained in  $\mathcal{G}_{\theta, V}$ , we may conclude that  $c(V) \cong \text{var } I_{Y^\theta}$  for all  $V$ . Hence,  $Vc(V) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $V \rightarrow \infty$ , so that we are unlikely to find a minimizing value of  $V$  (much) larger than  $T$ . Since the minimizing  $V$  is (probably) close to  $T$ , we therefore suggest setting  $V = T$  to avoid the (expensive) trial runs necessary to find the optimal choice of  $V$ . Henceforth, we take  $V = T$  and  $\theta = \lambda$ .

Given this choice of  $V$ , (15) simplifies further when  $G$  is appropriately chosen.

SETTING 4 (continued). *For  $G(t) = t$ , consider*

$$\int_0^T \binom{m}{j} \left(\frac{1}{T}\right)^j \left(\frac{T-t}{T}\right)^{m-j} dt.$$

The integrand is a beta density (up to a proportionality constant) over  $[0, T]$ , from which we conclude that the integral is  $T/(m+1)$ . So,

$$E[I | \mathcal{G}_{\lambda, T}] = T \sum_{j=0}^{N_{\lambda}(T)} f(Y_j^{\lambda}) / (N_{\lambda}(T) + 1).$$

SETTING 5 (continued). If  $G(t) = r^{-1}(1 - e^{-rt})$ , then § 6.4 shows how to compute the set of required integrals with no numerical integration in  $O(L^2)$  time, where  $L$  is the largest Poisson variate generated over all runs.

SETTING 6 (continued). Since  $X(T) = Y^{\lambda}(N_{\lambda}(T))$ , it follows that when  $G(t) = \mathbf{I}(t \geq T)$ ,  $I$  is  $\mathcal{G}_{\lambda, T}$  measurable so that  $E[I | \mathcal{G}_{\lambda, T}] = I$ . Hence, conditioning on  $\mathcal{G}_{\lambda, T}$  just leads us back to the naive estimator  $I$ .

We conclude this section with the introduction of an estimator that replaces holding time r.v.s with their means, yet cannot be represented as a conditional expectation of the form  $E[I | \mathcal{G}]$ . Nevertheless, we classify the following estimator as a discrete-time estimator, because continuous holding time r.v.s are integrated out.

Our discussion is specific to  $G(t) = t$ . We return to formula (12) and note that it equals

$$\lambda(Z_n)^{-1} (P\{S_{n-1} \leq T | Z\} - P\{S_{n-1} \leq T, S_n > T | Z\}) = \lambda(Z_n)^{-1} P\{S_n \leq T | Z\}.$$

By (11), we get

$$E[I | Z] = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{f(Z_n)}{\lambda(Z_n)} P\{S_n \leq T | Z\}.$$

Taking expectations of both sides of the above equation gives

$$E[I] = E \sum_{n=0}^{\tilde{N}(T)-1} \frac{f(Z_n)}{\lambda(Z_n)},$$

where  $\tilde{N}(T) = \min \{n \geq 0: S_n > T\}$ . This suggests considering an estimator for the expected total reward over  $[0, T]$ , based on replicates of the r.v.  $I_d$ , where

$$(16) \quad I_d = \sum_{n=0}^{\tilde{N}(T)-1} \frac{f(Z_n)}{\lambda(Z_n)}.$$

We claim that  $I_d$  typically cannot be represented as  $E[I | \mathcal{G}]$  for some  $\sigma$ -field  $\mathcal{G}$ . This necessarily implies that  $I_d$  is distinct from  $E[I | \mathcal{G}_{\lambda, T}]$ . We prove this claim by providing an example in which  $\text{var } I_d > \text{var } I$ . If  $I_d$  were a conditional expectation of  $I$ , this would violate Proposition 1. To obtain the example, just take  $f \equiv 1$  so that  $I = T$ . Then,  $\text{var } I = 0$  but  $\text{var } I_d > 0$ .

We include the estimator  $I_d$  in our paper because it turns out that  $I_d$  is sometimes more efficient than  $I_{\mathcal{G}_{\lambda, T}}$ , though it is not a conditional expectation. To calculate  $I_{\mathcal{G}_{\lambda, T}}$  requires generating  $Y_0^{\lambda}, Y_1^{\lambda}, \dots, Y_{N_{\lambda}(T)}^{\lambda}, N_{\lambda}(T)$ , from which  $I_d$  is easily extracted as a (deterministic) function of  $Z_0, Z_1, \dots, Z_{\tilde{N}(T)}, \tilde{N}(T)$ . Although such extraction is not the best way to compute  $I_d$ , it shows that  $I_d$  is never worse than  $I_{\mathcal{G}_{\lambda, T}}$  in terms of work.

Furthermore,  $I_d$  sometimes beats  $I_{\mathcal{G}_{\lambda, T}}$  in terms of variance, as our next example illustrates. Suppose  $S = \{0, 1\}$  and  $\lambda(0) = 1, \lambda(1) = 0$ , so that state 1 is absorbing. Take  $f(0) = 1, f(1) = 0$ , and note that  $I_d = \mathbf{I}(\tilde{N}(T) > 0), I_{\mathcal{G}_{\lambda, T}} = T / (N_1(T) + 1)$ . Then,  $\text{var } I_d = e^{-t} - e^{-2t}$ . Note that as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$T^{1/2} \left( \frac{T}{N_1(T) + 1} - 1 \right) = \left( \frac{T}{N_1(T) + 1} \right) \left( \frac{T - N_1(T)}{\sqrt{T}} \right) \Rightarrow N(0, 1).$$

Establishing uniform integrability is easy, from which we conclude that

$$E(T/(N_1(T)+1)-1)^2 \sim 1/T$$

as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . Since  $E[I_{\mathcal{G}_{\lambda,T}}] = 1 - e^{-t}$ , it follows that  $\text{var } I_{\mathcal{G}_{\lambda,T}} \sim 1/T$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence,  $\text{var } I_d \ll \text{var } I_{\mathcal{G}_{\lambda,T}}$  for large  $T$ .

**6. Discrete-time conversion for fixed-time horizons: implementation.** Whereas for random-time horizons the estimator  $E[I|Z]$  is sometimes competitive, for fixed-time horizons  $E[I|Z]$  seems very unlikely to be competitive with the improvements of  $E[I|\mathcal{G}_{\lambda,T}]$  presented here. For the case  $G(t) = t$ , the estimator  $I_d$  of § 5 might be competitive with these improvements; that estimator is straightforward to implement.

Our first improvement of  $E[I|\mathcal{G}_{\theta,T}]$  stratifies  $N_\theta(T)$ . Let  $\delta = \theta T$ . Section 5 indicates that picking  $\theta = \lambda$  is good, but here we allow any  $\theta \geq \lambda$  for flexibility. Stratum one is the integers  $0, \dots, K_\delta$ , and stratum two is the remaining positive integers. We choose  $K_\delta$  so that  $P\{N_\theta(T) \leq K_\delta\}$  is near one. Next, we integrate  $N_\theta(T)$  out of stratum one. Although the second stratum has an estimator conditioned on  $N_\theta(T)$  as well as  $Y^\theta$ , the variance of the overall estimator relative to that of  $E[I|\mathcal{G}_{\theta,T}]$  is small. Our overall estimator  $\tilde{\alpha}$  is unbiased. Unlike  $E[I|Y^\theta]$ , it can be computed exactly with a finite amount of work. Let  $\hat{\alpha}_1(t)$  average iid copies of  $\tilde{\alpha}$  generated with computer budget  $t$ . Clearly,  $\hat{\alpha}_1(t)$  converges at the canonical rate  $t^{-1/2}$  to  $\alpha$ . Let  $\hat{\alpha}_2(t)$  average iid copies of  $E[I|\sigma(Y^\theta, N_\theta(T))]$  and assume (reasonably) that the expected work to generate  $\tilde{\alpha}$  is at most the expected work to generate  $E[I|\sigma(Y^\theta, N_\theta(T))]$ . Neglecting rounding in stratification,  $\text{var } \hat{\alpha}_1(t) \leq \text{var } \hat{\alpha}_2(t)$ , as holds whenever we stratify proportionally; e.g., see Bratley, Fox, and Schrage [(1987), § 2.4]. Grassmann (1982) *poststratifies* (13). That is, the actual number of jumps in each run is random. His stratum  $i$  corresponds to exactly  $i$  jumps in  $[0, T]$ . He weights the average of statistics across runs with exactly  $i$  jumps by the (known) probability of  $i$  jumps, summing from  $i$  equal 0 to  $\infty$ . With any finite number of runs, an infinite number of strata remain empty. This biases his estimator. Nevertheless, his work partly motivates ours. Aggregating strata, especially in the tails, would usually leave no empty strata. When no stratum is empty, poststratification gives larger variance than proportional (pre)stratification according to Cochran [(1977), p. 135]. So poststratification gives bias or larger variance, perhaps both.

In § 6.3, we increase the efficiency of the first-stratum estimator above via *splitting*. Though the expected work per run increases, the product of expected work per run and output variance per run decreases—just what we want according to Theorem 1. Call  $\hat{\alpha}_3(t)$  the resulting (unbiased) overall estimator of  $\alpha$ . We get  $\text{var } \hat{\alpha}_3(t) \leq \text{var } \hat{\alpha}_1(t)$ . The variance decrease can be dramatic. We already introduced a version of splitting in § 4.2. Here is another version. First, we partition stratum one into  $\Phi = \{0, 1, \dots, K_\phi\}$  and  $\Delta = \{K_\phi + 1, \dots, K_\delta\}$  where  $|\Phi| \gg |\Delta|$  but  $P\{N_\theta(T) \in \Delta\}$  is (still) near one. If  $\delta$  is large, we pick  $K_\phi$  a few standard deviations to the left of the mean (i.e.,  $K_\phi = \delta - c_1\delta^{1/2}$  where  $c_1 = 4$ , say) and  $K_\delta$  a few standard deviations right of the mean (i.e.,  $K_\delta = \delta + c_2\delta^{1/2}$  where  $c_2 = 4$ , say); thus,  $|\Phi| = O(\delta)$  but  $|\Delta| = O(\delta^{1/2})$ . When the simulation reaches  $Y_{K_\phi}$ , we split it into (say)  $k$  subruns all starting at  $Y_{K_\phi}$  and going on to  $K_\delta$ . We can nest the version of splitting described in § 4.2 inside this procedure.

Section 6.4 shows how to compute the integrals in (15) for general  $G$ . When  $G(t) = t$  or  $G(t) = \mathbf{I}\{T \geq t\}$ , then these integrals are available in simple closed form as § 5 shows.

If the chain's generator is piecewise constant, then an estimator of the form  $E[I|\mathcal{G}_{\theta,T}]$  applies to each piece, with the final state for piece  $i$  becoming the initial state for piece  $i + 1$ . Since except for the last piece we need to know the final state,

integrating  $N_\theta(T)$  out of stratum one works only for the last piece. In each piece we simulate a stationary process, whereas to get  $I$  we must simulate a nonstationary process. This makes  $I$  a less efficient estimator relative to  $E[I|\mathcal{G}_{\theta,T}]$  than in the stationary case. Poisson arrivals with a piecewise-constant intensity to a system which is otherwise a stationary continuous-time Markov chain produce a piecewise-constant generator.

**6.1. Telescoping null-jump sequences.** Analogously to what was done in § 4.2, we re-express  $Y^\theta$  as  $\{Z_0, \nu_0^\theta - 1, Z_1, \nu_1^\theta - 1, \dots\}$  and rewrite  $E[I|Y^\theta]$  and  $E[I|\sigma(Y^\theta, N_\theta(T))]$  accordingly.

$$(17) \quad E[I|Y^\theta] = f(Z_0) \int_{[0,T]} e^{-\theta t} G(dt) + \theta^{-1} f(Z_0) [\nu_0^\theta - 1] c(0, \theta) + \theta^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^\infty f(Z_n) \nu_n^\theta c(n, \theta)$$

where

$$(18) \quad c(n, \theta) = \int_{[0,T]} \frac{\theta^{n+1} t^n e^{-\theta t}}{n!} G(dt)$$

$$(19) \quad E[I|\sigma(Y^\theta, N_\theta(T))] = \sum_{j=0}^\infty f(Z_j) \nu_j^\theta d(j, N_\theta(T)) \mathbf{I}\{\chi_{j+1}^\theta \leq N_\theta(T)\} + f(Z_m) [N_\theta(T) - \chi_m^\theta] d(m, N_\theta(T)) \cdot \mathbf{I}\{\chi_m^\theta \leq N_\theta(T) < \chi_{m+1}^\theta\}$$

where

$$(20) \quad d(j, l) = \int_{[0,T]} \binom{l}{j} \binom{t}{T}^j \left(\frac{T-t}{T}\right)^{l-j} G(dt)$$

and  $\chi_j^\theta = \sum_{k=0}^j \nu_k^\theta$ . Section 4.2 discusses computation of integrals almost the same as  $c(n, \theta)$ , after an integration by parts. Section 6.4 shows how to compute the  $d(j, l)$ 's recursively for general  $G$ . Section 5 shows, for example, that  $d(j, l) = T/(l+1)$  when  $G(t) = t$ .

**6.2. Stratification.** Integrating the Poisson variate out of the first stratum gives

$$(21) \quad \sum_{i=0}^{K_\delta} E[I|Y, N_\theta(T) = i] P\{N_\theta(T) = i | N_\theta(T) \leq K_\delta\} = q^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^{K_\delta} \sum_{j=0}^i f(Y_j^\theta) d(j, i) e^{-\delta} \delta^i / i!$$

$$(22) \quad = q^{-1} \sum_{j=0}^{K_\delta} f(Y_j^\theta) e_j$$

where

$$(23) \quad q = P\{N_\theta(T) \leq K_\delta\}$$

$$(24) \quad e_j = \sum_{l=j}^{K_\delta} d(j, l) e^{-\delta} \delta^l / l!$$

$$(25) \quad = e_{j+1} + d(j, j) [e^{-\delta} \delta^j / j!], \quad j < K_\delta.$$

We compute the  $e_j$ 's recursively starting from  $j = K_\delta$ . The (bracketed) "Poisson" terms are computed recursively starting from  $j = \lfloor \delta \rfloor$  as in Fox and Glynn (1988). To simulate (22), use (19) with  $d(j, N_\theta(T))$  replaced by  $e_j$  and  $N_\theta(T)$  replaced by  $K_\delta$ . This handles stratum one.

To handle stratum two, we force  $N_\theta(T)$  to fall there and use (19) multiplied by  $1/(1-q)$ . Devroye (1986) gives an  $O(1)$  average-time rejection algorithm to generate variates from Poisson right tails that, with (hypothetical) infinite-precision computers, requires no right-hand truncation of the tail; its worst-case time is unbounded. Now we suggest an alternative which is sometimes more attractive. For several important  $G$ 's and bounded  $f$ , the (close) upper bounds on Poisson-tail masses in Fox and Glynn (1988) let us find a truncation point  $M_\delta$  such that the mass to its right is negligible. This suggests forcing  $N_\theta(T)$  to fall between  $K_\delta + 1$  and  $M_\delta$  and using "inversion" to generate  $N_\theta(T)$  thus conditioned. Most of the Poisson probabilities required for "inversion" are already computed in (25), since  $K_\delta/M_\delta \approx 1$ . Since most of the mass between  $K_\delta + 1$  and  $M_\delta$  is concentrated at  $K_\delta + 1$ , straightforward "inversion" appears competitive even for average time. Correspondence on this point with Bruce Schmeiser was helpful. Alternatively, "inversion" can be implemented with the alias method; e.g., see Bratley, Fox, and Schrage [(1987), § 5.2.8]. This takes  $O(1)$  marginal time per variate after a one-time  $O(M_\delta - K_\delta)$  setup. Clearly,  $M_\delta - K_\delta = O(\delta^{1/2})$ .

With  $S$  runs altogether, proportional stratification uses (22) on  $\lfloor qS \rfloor$  runs and stratum two on  $\lfloor (1-q)S \rfloor$  runs. On the remaining runs, it selects stratum one with probability proportional to  $qs - \lfloor qS \rfloor$  and stratum two with probability proportional to  $(1-q)S - \lfloor (1-q)S \rfloor$ . If an exact algorithm to generate from Poisson tails is used, no bias results. Ignoring rounding, we get lower variance than by averaging iid copies of  $E[I | \sigma(Y^\theta, N_\theta(T))]$ —even without the additional variance reduction obtained by integrating  $N_\theta(T)$  out of stratum one. If the output variances and expected unit sampling costs for each stratum were known, we could get even higher efficiency by modifying the strata sampling allocations accordingly; e.g., see Bratley, Fox, and Schrage [(1987), § 2.4]. We could estimate these quantities after every run and adaptively allocate subsequent runs to strata accordingly; we will treat this elsewhere.

**6.3. Splitting.** We separate the sum (22) into two terms. In the first term (say  $V_1$ ) the summation goes from 0 to  $K_\varphi$ . Call the other term  $V_2$ . The weights  $e_j$  in  $V_1$  add up to just slightly more than those in  $V_2$  for many important  $G$  such as  $G(t) = t$ . It may be that  $V_2$  is insensitive to  $Y_{K_\varphi+1}$ . More importantly, it takes  $O(\delta)$  work to get  $Y_{K_\varphi+1}$  but only  $O(\delta^{1/2})$  to compute  $V_2$  thereafter.

We now *split*. For each  $V_1$  we take (say)  $b$  copies of  $V_2$ , conditionally independent given  $Y_{K_\varphi+1}$ . Call these replicates  $V_{21}, V_{22}, \dots, V_{2b}$ . Thus, (22) and

$$\tilde{V}_b = V_1 + b^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^b V_{2j}$$

have the same expectation. Our overall estimator of that expectation averages of iid copies of  $\tilde{V}_b$ . Fox and Glynn (1990) show, in a more general setting, how to pick  $b$  to maximize efficiency in the sense of Theorem 1.

Because stratum one gets almost all the weight, it is probably not worth extending splitting to stratum two.

**6.4. Computing the  $d(j, l)$ 's.** Let

$$I(j, l) = \int_{[0, T]} (t/T)^j (1-t/T)^l G(dt).$$



Since

$$I(j, l+1) = I(j, l) - I(j+1, l),$$

we get

$$(26) \quad d(j, l+1) = [(l+1)/(l+1-j)]d(j, l) - [(j+1)/(l+1-k)]d(j+1, l+1)$$

where

$$d(l, l) = I(l, 0)$$

$$I(0, 0) = G(T-) - G(O-).$$

Thus, given  $d(l, l)$  for  $l = 0, 1, \dots, L$ , we compute  $d(j, l)$  for  $j \neq l$  and  $0 \leq j, l \leq L$  from (26) recursively with  $O(L^2)$  work and memory. So at most  $L + 1$  numerical integrations are needed. Since the integrand for  $I(l, l)$  is just  $(t/T)(1 - t/T)$  times the integrand for  $I(l-1, l-1)$ , ideas similar to those in § 4.2 expedite computation of  $\{I(l, l): l = 0, \dots, L\}$ .

When  $G(dt) = e^{-rt} dt$ , then

$$d(0, 0) = (1 - e^{rT})/r$$

and integrating by parts gives  $d(l, l) = (l/rT)d(l-1, l-1) - e^{-rT}/r$ . So no numerical integration is needed for continuous discounting.

If the accurate but approximate “inversion” method for generating variates from Poisson tails suggested in § 6.2 is used, pick  $L = M_\delta$ . If an exact method is used, generate all the Poisson variates needed over all runs at the start; the largest of these is  $L$ .

**Appendix.**

*Proof of Theorem 1.* If  $\sigma^2(R_i) = 0$ , the result is immediate since  $r(t) = \alpha$  almost surely. If  $\sigma^2(R_i) > 0$ , then the classical central limit theorem implies that

$$n^{1/2} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n R_k - \alpha \right) \Rightarrow \sigma(R_1) N(0, 1)$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Classical renewal theory shows that  $N(t)/t \rightarrow 1/E[\beta(R_1)]$  almost surely as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Apply a random time change theorem [Billingsley (1968), p. 146] to get

$$N(t)^{1/2}(r(t) - \alpha) \Rightarrow \sigma(R_1) N(0, 1)$$

as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . A converging-together argument (e.g., see Billingsley [(1968), p. 25]) yields the theorem.

*Proof of Theorem 2.* For  $\theta \geq \lambda$ , we will find a  $\sigma$ -field  $\mathcal{H}_\theta$  such that  $\sigma(Y^\lambda) \subseteq \mathcal{H}_\theta$  and

$$E[I | \mathcal{H}_\theta] = E[I | Y^\theta].$$

Then, Proposition 1 implies that  $\text{var}(E[I | \mathcal{H}_\theta]) \geq \text{var} I_{Y^\lambda}$  and so, once we construct a suitable  $\mathcal{H}_\theta$ , we have proved that setting  $\theta = \lambda$  minimizes variance.

That construction begins with an independent and identically distributed sequence  $(\eta_i: i \geq 1)$  of Bernoulli variates, independent of  $Y^\theta$  and  $N_\theta$ , each with  $P\{\eta_i = 1\} = \lambda/\theta$ . We use it to thin null jumps of  $Y^\theta$  to obtain  $Y^\lambda$ . The  $i$ th null jump is retained if and only if  $\eta_i = 1$ .

Now, we set  $\mathcal{H}_\theta = \sigma(Y^\theta, \eta_1, \eta_2, \dots)$ . Since  $I$  is a (measurable) function of  $Y^\theta$  and  $N_\theta$ , we get

$$E[I | Y^\theta, \eta_1, \eta_2, \dots] = E[I | Y^\theta]$$

using (3) on page 308 of Chung (1974), with  $\mathcal{F}_1 = \sigma(Y^\theta, N_\theta)$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_2 = \sigma(Y^\theta)$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_3 = \sigma(\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots)$ , completing the proof.

*Proof of Proposition 2.* The right-hand side, namely  $\int_{[0, T]} E[f(X(t)) | \mathcal{G}] G(dt)$ , is a  $\mathcal{G}$ -measurable r.v. Also, if  $A \in \mathcal{G}$ , then Fubini implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_A \int_{[0, T]} E[f(X(t)) | \mathcal{G}] G(dt) P(d\omega) &= \int_{[0, T]} \int_A E[f(X(t)) | \mathcal{G}] P(d\omega) G(dt) \\ &= \int_{[0, T]} \int_A f(X(t)) P(d\omega) G(dt) \\ &= \int_A \int_{[0, T]} f(X(t)) G(dt) P(d\omega). \end{aligned}$$

Using the defining relation for conditional expectations, we see that the proposition is proved.

*Proof of Proposition 3.* Suppose that  $t_2 > t_1 \cong T$ . Note that  $N_\theta(t_2) - N_\theta(t_1)$  is independent of  $\mathcal{G}_{\theta, t_1}$  and  $\sigma(N_\theta(s) : s \leq t_1)$ . Hence, we get

$$E[I | \mathcal{G}_{\theta, t_1}] = E[I | \mathcal{G}_{\theta, t_1}, N_\theta(t_2) - N_\theta(t_1)]$$

from (3) on page 308 of Chung (1974), with  $\mathcal{F}_1 = \sigma(N_\theta(s) : s \leq t_1) \vee \mathcal{G}_{\theta, t_1}$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_2 = \mathcal{G}_{\theta, t_1}$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_3 = \sigma(N_\theta(t_2) - N_\theta(t_1))$ , noting that  $I$  is  $\mathcal{F}_1$  measurable. But  $\mathcal{G}_{\theta, t_2} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{\theta, t_1} \vee \sigma(N_\theta(t_2) - N_\theta(t_1))$ , so  $\text{var } E[I | \mathcal{G}_{\theta, t_2}] \leq \text{var } E[I | \mathcal{G}_{\theta, t_1}, N_\theta(t_2) - N_\theta(t_1)] = \text{var } E[I | \mathcal{G}_{\theta, t_1}]$ , by Proposition 1.

**Acknowledgments.** We thank the referees for their helpful comments.

#### REFERENCES

- P. BILLINGSLEY, *Convergence of Probability Measures*, John Wiley, New York, 1968.
- P. BRATLEY, B. L. FOX, AND L. E. SCHRAGE, *A Guide to Simulation*, second edition, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1987.
- K. L. CHUNG, *A Course in Probability Theory*, Academic Press, New York, 1974.
- E. ÇINLAR, *Introduction to Stochastic Processes*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1975.
- W. G. COCHRAN, *Sampling Techniques*, John Wiley, New York, 1977.
- L. DEVROYE, *A simple tail-of-Poisson random variate generator*, unpublished manuscript, 1986.
- B. L. FOX, *Generating Markov-chain transitions quickly: I*, ORSA J. Computing, 2 (1990), pp. 126-135.
- B. L. FOX AND P. W. GLYNN, *Discrete-time conversion for simulating semi-Markov processes*, Oper. Res. Lett., 5 (1986), pp. 191-196.
- , *Computing Poisson probabilities*, Comm. ACM, 31 (1988), pp. 440-445.
- , *Simulating discounted costs*, Management Sci., 35 (1989a), pp. 1297-1315.
- , *Replication schemes for limiting expectations*, Probability in the Engineering and Informational Sciences, 3 (1989b), pp. 299-318.
- , *Splitting as conditional Monte Carlo*, Technical report, in preparation, 1990.
- B. L. FOX AND A. R. YOUNG, *Generating Markov-chain transitions quickly: II*, Technical report, University of Colorado at Denver, 1989.
- P. W. GLYNN AND W. WHITT, *Indirect estimation via  $L = \lambda W$* , Oper. Res., 37 (1989), pp. 82-103.
- W. GRASSMANN, *Simulating transient solutions of Markov systems*, unpublished manuscript, 1982.
- , *Calculating mean and variance of time integrals using randomization*, Technical report 82, Dept. of Operations Research, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, 1983.
- D. GROSS AND D. R. MILLER, *The randomization technique as a modeling tool and solution procedure for transient Markov processes*, Oper. Res., 32 (1984), pp. 343-361.
- J. M. HAMMERSLEY AND D. C. HANDSCOMB, *Monte Carlo Methods*, Methuen, London, 1984.
- A. HORDIJK, D. L. IGLEHART, AND R. SCHAASBERGER, *Discrete-time methods of simulating continuous-time Markov chains*, Adv. Appl. Prob., 8 (1976), pp. 772-788.
- A. JENSEN, *Markoff chains as an aid in the study of Markoff processes*, Skandinavisk Actuarietidskrift, 36 (1953), pp. 87-91.