Theory of Stochastic Processes
Vol. 12 (28), no. 3–4, 2006, pp. 151–186

D. S. SILVESTROV AND M. O. DROZDENKO

# NECESSARY AND SUFFICIENT CONDITIONS FOR WEAK CONVERGENCE OF FIRST-RARE-EVENT TIMES FOR SEMI-MARKOV PROCESSES. I

Necessary and sufficient conditions for weak convergence of first-rare-event times for semi-Markov processes with finite set of states are obtained. These results are applied to risk processes and give necessary and sufficient conditions for stable approximation of ruin probabilities including the case of diffusion approximation.

## 1. Introduction

Limit theorems for random functionals of similar first-rare-event times known under such names as first hitting times, first passage times, first record times, etc. were studied by many authors.

The case of Markov chains and semi-Markov processes with finite set of states is the most deeply investigated. We mention here the works by Simon and Ando (1961), Kingman (1963), Darroch and Seneta (1965, 1967), Keilson (1966, 1979), Korolyuk (1969), Korolyuk and Turbin (1970, 1976), Silvestrov (1970, 1971, 1974, 1980), Anisimov (1970, 1971a, 1971b), Turbin (1971), Masol and Silvestrov (1972), Zakusilo (1972a, 1972b) Kovalenko (1973), Latouch and Louchard (1978), Shurenkov (1980a, 1980b), Gut and Holst (1984), Brown and Shao (1987), Alimov and Shurenkov (1990a, 1990b), Hasin and Haviv (1992), Eleĭko and Shurenkov (1995), Kijima (1997), Gyllenberg and Silvestrov (1999, 2000a).

The case of Markov chains and semi-Markov processes with countable and an arbitrary phase space was treated in works by Gusak and Korolyuk (1971), Silvestrov (1974, 1980, 1981, 1995, 2000), Korolyuk and Turbin (1978, 1982), Kaplan (1979), Aldous (1982), Korolyuk D. and Silvestrov (1983, 1984), Kartashov (1987, 1991, 1995), Anisimov (1988), Silvestrov and Velikii (1988), Silvestrov and Abadov (1991, 1993), Motsa and Silvestrov (1996), Korolyuk V.V. and Korolyuk V.S. (1999).

We refer to the book by Silvestrov (2004) for the detailed list of references.

The main features for the most previous results is that they give sufficient conditions of convergence for such functionals. As a rule, those conditions involve assumptions, which imply convergence of distributions for sums of

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 60K15, 60F17, 60K20.
*Key words and phrases.* Weak convergence, semi-Markow processes, first-rare-event time, limit theorems, necessary and sufficient conditions.

i.i.d random variables distributed as sojourn times for the semi-Markov process (for every state) to some infinitely divisible laws plus some ergodicity condition for the imbedded Markov chain plus condition of vanishing probabilities of occurring rare event during one transition step for the semi-Markov process.

Our results are related to the model of semi-Markov processes with a finite set of states. In this paper, we consider the case of stable type asymptotics for distributions of sojourn times. Instead of conditions based on "individual" distributions of sojourn times, we use more general and weaker conditions imposed on distributions (of sojourn times) averaged by stationary distribution of the imbedded Markov chain. Moreover, we show that these conditions are not only sufficient but also necessary conditions for the weak convergence for first-rare-event times, and describe the class of all possible limiting laws not-concentrated in zero. The results presented in the paper give some kind of a "final solution" for limit theorems for first-rare-event times for semi-Markov process with a finite set of states.

The paper is organized in the following way. In Section 2, we formulate and prove our main Theorem 1, which describes the class all possible limiting distributions for first-rare-event times for semi-Markov processes and give necessary and sufficient of weak convergence to distributions from this class. Several lemmas describing asymptotical solidarity cyclic properties for sum-processes defined on Markov chains are used in the proof of Theorem 1. These lemmas and their proofs are collected in Section 3.

Applications to counting processes generating by the corresponding flows of rare events, random geometric sums as well as give necessary and sufficient conditions for stable approximation for non-ruin probabilities are given in the second part of the present paper.

## 2. Main results

Let $(\eta_n, \varkappa_n, \zeta_n),\ n = 0, 1, \dots$ be a Markov renewal process, i.e. a homogenous Markov chain with phase space $Z = X \times [0, +\infty) \times Y$ (here $X = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$, and $Y$ is some measurable space with $\sigma$–algebra of measurable sets $B_Y$) and transition probabilities,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathsf{P}\{\eta_{n+1} = j, \varkappa_{n+1} \le t, \zeta_{n+1} \in A/\eta_n = i, \varkappa_n = s, \zeta_n = y\} \\ &\quad = \mathsf{P}\{\eta_{n+1} = j, \varkappa_{n+1} \le t, \zeta_{n+1} \in A/\eta_n = i\} \\ &\quad = Q_{ij}(t, A),\ i, j \in X,\ s, t \ge 0,\ y \in Y, A \in B_Y. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The characteristic property, which specifies Markov renewal processes in the class of general multivariate Markov chains $(\eta_n, \varkappa_n, \zeta_n)$, is (as shown in (1)) that transition probabilities do depend only of the current position of the first component $\eta_n$.

As is known, the first component $\eta_n$ of the Markov renewal process is also a homogenous Markov chain with the phase space $X$ and transition probabilities $p_{ij} = Q_{ij}(+\infty, Y)$, $i, j \in X$.

Also, the first two components of Markov renewal process (namely $\eta_n$ and $\varkappa_n$) can be associated with the semi-Markov process $\eta(t)$, $t \geq 0$ defined as,

$$\eta(t) = \eta_n \quad \text{for} \quad \tau_n \leq t < \tau_{n+1}, \quad n = 0, 1, \ldots,$$

where $\tau_0 = 0$ and $\tau_n = \varkappa_1 + \ldots + \varkappa_n$, $n \geq 1$.

Random variables $\varkappa_n$ represent inter–jump times for the process $\eta(t)$. As far as random variables $\zeta_n$ are concerned, they are so-called, "flag variables" and are used to record "rare" events.

Let $D_\varepsilon$, $\varepsilon > 0$ be a family of measurable "small" in some sense subsets of $Y$. Then events $\{\zeta_n \in D_\varepsilon\}$ can be considered as "rare".

Let us introduce random variables

$$\nu_\varepsilon = \min(n \geq 1 : \zeta_n \in D_\varepsilon),$$

and

$$\xi_\varepsilon = \sum_{n=1}^{\nu_\varepsilon} \varkappa_n.$$

A random variable $\nu_\varepsilon$ counts the number of transitions of the imbedded Markov chain $\eta_n$ up to the first appearance of the "rare" event, while a random variable $\xi_\varepsilon$ can be interpreted as the first-rare-event time for the semi-Markov process $\eta(t)$.

Let us consider the distribution function of the first-rare-event time $\xi_\varepsilon$, under fixed initial state of the imbedded Markov chain $\eta_n$,

$$F_i^{(\varepsilon)}(u) = \mathsf{P}_i\{\xi_\varepsilon \leq u\}, \ u \geq 0.$$

Here and henceforth, $\mathsf{P}_i$ and $\mathsf{E}_i$ denote, respectively, conditional probability and expectation calculated under condition that $\eta_0 = i$.

We give necessary and sufficient conditions for weak convergence of distribution functions $F_i^{(\varepsilon)}(uu_\varepsilon)$, where $u_\varepsilon > 0$, $u_\varepsilon \to \infty$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$ is a non-random normalizing function, and describe the class of possible limiting distributions.

The problem is solved under the four general model assumptions.

The first assumption **A** guaranties that the last summand in the random sum $\xi_\varepsilon$ is negligible under any normalization $u_\varepsilon$, i.e. $\varkappa_{\nu_\varepsilon}/u_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{\mathsf{P}} 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$:

**A:** $\lim\limits_{t\to\infty} \overline{\lim\limits_{\varepsilon\to 0}} \, \mathsf{P}_i\{\varkappa_1 > t / \zeta_1 \in D_\varepsilon\} = 0, \ i \in X.$

Let us introduce the probabilities of occurrence of rare event during one transition step of the semi-Markov process $\eta(t)$,

$$p_{i\varepsilon} = \mathsf{P}_i\{\zeta_1 \in D_\varepsilon\}, \ i \in X.$$

The second assumption **B**, imposed on probabilities $p_{i\varepsilon}$, specifies interpretation of the event $\{\zeta_n \in D_\varepsilon\}$ as "rare" and guarantees the possibility for such event to occur:

**B:** $0 < \max_{1\leq i\leq m} p_{i\varepsilon} \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

The third assumption **C** is a standard ergodicity condition for the embedded Markov chain $\eta_n$:

**C:** $\eta_n, n = 0, 1, \ldots$ is an ergodic Markov chain with the stationary distribution $\pi_i$, $i \in X$.

Let us define a probability which is the result of averaging of the probabilities of occurrence of rare event in one transition step by the stationary distribution of the imbedded Markov chain $\eta_n$,

$$p_\varepsilon = \sum_{i=1}^m \pi_i p_{i\varepsilon}.$$

We will say that a positive function $w_\varepsilon$, $\varepsilon > 0$ is from a class $\mathbb{W}$ if $(\mathbf{a}_1)$ $w_\varepsilon \to \infty$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, $(\mathbf{a}_2)$ there exist a sequence $0 < \varepsilon_n \to 0$ such that $w_{\varepsilon_{n+1}}/w_{\varepsilon_n} \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$.

The fourth assumption **D** is some kind of regularity condition for the corresponding normalizing functions:

**D:** $u_\varepsilon$, $v_\varepsilon = p_\varepsilon^{-1} \in \mathbb{W}$.

Condition **D** is not restrictive. For example it holds if $u_\varepsilon$ and $v_\varepsilon$ are continuous functions of $\varepsilon$ satisfying $(\mathbf{a}_1)$.

Let us also introduce the distribution functions of a sojourn times $\varkappa_1$ for the semi-Markov processes $\eta(t)$,

$$G_i(t) = \mathsf{P}_i\{\varkappa_1 \leq t\},\ t \geq 0,\ i \in X,$$

and the distribution function, which is a result of averaging of distribution functions of sojourn times by the stationary distribution of the imbedded Markov chain $\eta_n$,

$$G(t) = \sum_{i=1}^m \pi_i G_i(t),\ t \geq 0.$$

Now we are in position to formulate the necessary and sufficient conditions for weak convergence of distribution functions of first-rare-event times $\xi_\varepsilon$.

Let $0 < \gamma \leq 1$ and $a > 0$. Let also $\Gamma(\alpha) = \int_0^\infty t^{\alpha-1}e^{-t}dt$ be the Gamma function.

The necessary and sufficient conditions of convergence, mentioned above, have the following form:

$\mathbf{E}_\gamma$**::** $\frac{t[1-G(t)]}{\int_0^t sG(ds)} \to \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma}$ as $t \to \infty$.

$\mathbf{F}_{a,\gamma}$**::** $\frac{\int_0^{u_\varepsilon} sG(ds)}{p_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon} \to a\frac{\gamma}{\Gamma(2-\gamma)}$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

We use the symbol $\Rightarrow$ to show weak convergence of distribution functions (pointwise convergence in points of continuity of the limiting distribution function).

The main result of the paper is the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.** *Let conditions* **A**, **B**, **C**, *and* **D** *hold. Then*:

- **(i)::** *The class of all possible non-concentrated in zero limiting distribution functions (in the sense of weak convergence) for the distribution functions of first-rare-event times* $F_i^{(\varepsilon)}(uu_\varepsilon)$ *coincides with the class of distribution functions* $F_{a,\gamma}(u)$ *with Laplace transforms* $\phi_{a,\gamma}(s) = \frac{1}{1+as^\gamma}$, $0 < \gamma \leq 1$, $a > 0$.
- **(ii)::** *Conditions* $\mathbf{E}_\gamma$ *and* $\mathbf{F}_{a,\gamma}$ *are necessary and sufficient for the following relation of weak convergence to hold (for some or every* $i \in X$*, respectively, in the statements of necessity and sufficiency),*

$$F_i^{(\varepsilon)}(uu_\varepsilon) \Rightarrow F_{a,\gamma}(u) \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0. \tag{2}$$

**Remark 1.** $F_{a,\gamma}(u)$, for $0 < \gamma \leq 1$ and $a > 0$, is the distribution function of a random variable $\xi(\rho)$, where ($\mathbf{b}_1$) $\xi(t)$, $t \geq 0$ is a non-negative homogeneous stable process with independent increments and the Laplace transform $\mathsf{E}e^{-s\xi(t)} = e^{-as^\gamma t}, s, t \geq 0$, ($\mathbf{b}_2$) $\rho$ is an exponentially distributed random variable with parameter 1, ($\mathbf{b}_3$) the random variable $\rho$ and the process $\xi(t)$, $t \geq 0$ are independent. In particular, $F_{a,1}(u)$ is an exponential distribution function with parameter $a$.

**Remark 2.** Distribution function $F_{a,\gamma}(u)$, for $0 < \gamma \leq 1$ and $a > 0$, is continuous. Thus, weak convergence pointed out in the statement **(ii)** of Theorem 1 means that $F_i^{(\varepsilon)}(uu_\varepsilon) \to F_{a,\gamma}(u)$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$ for every $u \geq 0$.

*Proof.* We split the proof of Theorem 1 into several steps.

As the first step, we obtain an appropriate representation for the first-rare-event time $\xi_\varepsilon$ in the form of geometric type random sum of random variables connected with cyclic returns of the semi-Markov process $\eta(t)$ in a fixed state $i \in X$.

Let $\tau_i(n)$ be the number of transitions after which the imbedded Markov chain $\eta_n$ reaches a state $i \in X$ for the $n$-th time,

$$\tau_i(n) = \min\{k > \tau_i(n-1) : \eta_k = i\},\ n = 1, 2, \dots,$$

where $\tau_i(0) = 0$. For simplicity, we will also write $\tau_i(1)$ as $\tau_i$.

Let $\beta_i(n)$ be the duration of the $n$-th $i$-cycle between the moments of $(n-1)$-th and $n$-th return of the semi-Markov process $\eta(t)$ in the state $i$,

$$\beta_i(n) = \sum_{k=\tau_i(n-1)+1}^{\tau_i(n)} \varkappa_k,\ n = 1, 2, \dots.$$

For simplicity, we will also write $\beta_i(1)$ as $\beta_i$. The moments of return of the semi-Markov process $\eta(t)$ to a fixed state $i \in X$ are regenerative moments for this process. Due to this property, $\beta_i(n), n = 1, 2 \dots$ are independent and random variables identically distributed for $n \geq 2$. As far as the random variable $\beta_i(1)$ is concerned, it has the same distribution as $\beta_i(2)$ if the initial distribution of the imbedded Markov chain $\eta_n$ is concentrated in state $i$. Otherwise, the distribution of $\beta_i(1)$ can differ of the distribution $\beta_i(2)$.

Let us also introduce the random variable $\nu_{i\varepsilon}$ which counts the number of cycles ended before the moment $\nu_\varepsilon$,

$$\nu_{i\varepsilon} = \max\{n : \tau_i(n) \le \nu_\varepsilon\}.$$

Finally, let $\tilde{\beta}_{i\varepsilon}$ be a the duration of the residual sub-cycle between the moment of the last return of the semi-Markov process $\eta(t)$ in the state $i$ before the first-rare-event time $\xi_\varepsilon$ and the time $\xi_\varepsilon$,

$$\tilde{\beta}_{i\varepsilon} = \sum_{n=\tau_i(\nu_{i\varepsilon})+1}^{\nu_\varepsilon} \varkappa_n.$$

Now, the following representation, in the form of random sum, can be written down for the first-rare-event time $\xi_\varepsilon$,

$$\xi_\varepsilon = \sum_{n=1}^{\nu_{i\varepsilon}} \beta_i(n) + \tilde{\beta}_{i\varepsilon}. \tag{3}$$

It should be noted that the random index $\nu_{i\varepsilon}$ and summands $\beta_i(n), n = 1, 2, \ldots$, and $\tilde{\beta}_{i\varepsilon}$ are not independent random variables. However, they are conditionally independent with respect to indicator random variables $\chi_{i\varepsilon}(n) = \chi(\tau_i(n-1) < \nu_\varepsilon \le \tau_i(n)), n = 1, 2, \ldots$. It will be seen in the best way when we shall re-write the representation formula (3) in terms of Laplace transforms.

Let us introduce Laplace transforms of the first-rare-event time,

$$\Phi_{i\varepsilon}(s) = \mathsf{E}_i \exp\{-s\xi_\varepsilon\},\ s \ge 0,\ i \in X.$$

Let us denote $q_{i\varepsilon}$ the probability of occurrence the rare event during the first $i$-cycle,

$$q_{i\varepsilon} = \mathsf{P}_i\{\nu_\varepsilon \le \tau_i\},\ i \in X.$$

Let us also introduce the conditional Laplace transforms of the duration of the first $i$-cycle $\beta_i$ under condition $\nu_\varepsilon > \tau_i$ of non-occurrence of the rare event in the first $i$-cycle,

$$\psi_{i\varepsilon}(s) = \mathsf{E}_i\{\exp\{-s\beta_i\}/\nu_\varepsilon > \tau_i\},\ s \ge 0,$$

and the conditional Laplace transform of the duration of residual sub-cycle $\beta_{i\varepsilon}$ under condition that $\nu_\varepsilon \le \tau_i$ of occurrence of the rare event in the first $i$-cycle,

$$\widetilde{\psi}_{i\varepsilon}(s) = \mathsf{E}_i\{\exp\{-s\tilde{\beta}_{i\varepsilon}\}/\nu_\varepsilon \le \tau_i\},\ s \ge 0.$$

The Markov renewal process $(\eta_n, \varkappa_n, \zeta_n)$ regenerates at moments of return to every state $i$ and $\nu_\varepsilon$ is a Markov moment for this process. Due to these properties the representation formula (3) takes, in terms of Laplace transforms, the following form,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_{i\varepsilon}(s) &= \mathsf{E}_i \exp\{-s\xi_\varepsilon\} \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(1-q_{i\varepsilon})^n q_{i\varepsilon}\psi_{i\varepsilon}(s)^n\widetilde{\psi}_{i\varepsilon}(s) \\
&= \frac{q_{i\varepsilon}\widetilde{\psi}_{i\varepsilon}(s)}{1-(1-q_{i\varepsilon})\psi_{i\varepsilon}(s)} \\
&= \frac{\widetilde{\psi}_{i\varepsilon}(s)}{1+(1-q_{i\varepsilon})\frac{(1-\psi_{i\varepsilon}(s))}{q_{i\varepsilon}}}, \ s \geq 0. \qquad (4)
\end{aligned}$$

As the second step, we prove that the weak convergence for the first-rare-event times is invariant with respect to the choice of initial distribution of the imbedded Markov chain $\eta_n$.

At this stage we are interested in solidarity statements concerned the relation of weak convergence,

$$F_i^{(\varepsilon)}(uu_\varepsilon) \Rightarrow F(u) \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0, \qquad (5)$$

where $(\mathbf{c}_1)$ $F(u)$ is a distribution function concentrated on non-negative half-line but not concentrated in zero, and $(\mathbf{c}_2)$ $u_\varepsilon$ is a positive normalizing function such that $u_\varepsilon \to \infty$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

We shall prove that, under conditions **A**, **B** and **C**, (**d**) the assumption that relation (5) holds for some $i \in X$ implies that this relation holds for every $i \in X$ and, in this case, (**e**) the limiting distribution function $F(u)$ is the same for all $i \in X$.

In terms of Laplace transforms relation (5) is equivalent to the relation,

$$\Phi_{i\varepsilon}(s/u_\varepsilon) \to \Phi(s) \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0, \ s \geq 0, \qquad (6)$$

where (**f**) $\Phi(s)$ is a Laplace transform of some non-negative random variable, (**g**) $\Phi(s) < 1$ for $s > 0$ (this is equivalent to the requirement that the corresponding limiting distribution function is not concentrated in zero).

Thus, in order to prove the solidarity statement formulated above, we should prove that, under conditions **A**, **B** and **C**, (**h**) the assumption that relation (6) holds for some $i \in X$ implies that this relation holds for every $i \in X$ and, in this case, (**i**) the limiting Laplace transform $\Phi(s)$ is the same for all $i \in X$.

In what follows, we the use several lemmas describing asymptotical solidarity cyclic properties for functional defined on trajectories of Markov renewal processes $(\eta_n, \varkappa_n, \zeta_n)$.

It will be proved in Lemma 1 that conditions **B** and **C** imply the following asymptotic relation, for every $i \in X$,

$$q_{i\varepsilon} \sim \frac{p_\varepsilon}{\pi_i} \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0. \qquad (7)$$

Here and henceforth relation $a(\varepsilon) \sim b(\varepsilon)$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$ means that

$$a(\varepsilon)/b(\varepsilon) \to 1 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0.$$

It follows from (7) that, for every $i \in X$,

$$q_{i\varepsilon} \to 0 \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0. \tag{8}$$

It will be shown in Lemma 2, with the use of (7), that conditions **A**, **B**, and **C** implies the following asymptotic relation, for every $i \in X$,

$$\widetilde{\psi}_{i\varepsilon}(s/u_\varepsilon) \to 1 \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0, \ s \geq 0. \tag{9}$$

Relation (9) implies that, under conditions **A**, **B**, and **C**, for every $i \in X$,

$$\Phi_{i\varepsilon}(s/u_\varepsilon) \sim \frac{1}{1 + (1 - q_{i\varepsilon})\frac{(1-\psi_{i\varepsilon}(s/u_\varepsilon))}{q_{i\varepsilon}}} \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0, \ s \geq 0. \tag{10}$$

It follows from relations and (8) and (10) that, under conditions **A**, **B**, and **C**, relation (6) holds, for given $i \in X$, if and only if,

$$\frac{1 - \psi_{i\varepsilon}(s/u_\varepsilon)}{q_{i\varepsilon}} \to \varsigma(s) \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0, \ s \geq 0, \tag{11}$$

where $\varsigma(s)$ is a function such that (**j**) $\frac{1}{1+\varsigma(s)}$ is a Laplace transform of some non-negative random variable, and (**k**) $\varsigma(s) > 0$ for $s > 0$.

Obviously, that the limiting functions in relations (6) and (11) are connected by the following relation,

$$\Phi(s) = \frac{1}{1 + \varsigma(s)}, \ s \geq 0. \tag{12}$$

To simplify the following asymptotic analysis and to make it possible to use later powerful Tauberian theorems and theorems about regularly varying functions, we shall now try to replace the conditional Laplace transform $\psi_{i\varepsilon}(s)$ in the relation (11) by the unconditional Laplace transform of the duration of the first $i$-cycle $\beta_i$,

$$\psi_i(s) = \mathsf{E}_i \exp\{-s\beta_i\}, \ s \geq 0.$$

The Laplace transform $\psi_i(s)$ can obviously be represented in the following form,

$$\psi_i(s) = (1 - q_{i\varepsilon})\psi_{i\varepsilon}(s) + q_{i\varepsilon}\widehat{\psi}_{i\varepsilon}(s), \ s \geq 0, \tag{13}$$

where $\widehat{\psi}_{i\varepsilon}(s)$ is the conditional Laplace transform of the duration of the first $i$-cycle $\beta_i$ under condition $\nu_\varepsilon \leq \tau_i$ of occurrence of the rare event in the first $i$-cycle,

$$\widehat{\psi}_{i\varepsilon}(s) = \mathsf{E}_i\{\exp\{-s\beta_i\}/\nu_\varepsilon \leq \tau_i\}, \ s \geq 0.$$

Relation (13) can be re-written in the following form,

$$\frac{1 - \psi_i(s/u_\varepsilon)}{q_{i\varepsilon}} = (1 - q_{i\varepsilon})\frac{1 - \psi_{i\varepsilon}(s/u_\varepsilon)}{q_{i\varepsilon}} + q_{i\varepsilon}\frac{1 - \widehat{\psi}_{i\varepsilon}(s/u_\varepsilon)}{q_{i\varepsilon}}, \ s \geq 0. \tag{14}$$

It will be shown in Lemma 3 that conditions **A**, **B**, and **C** imply that, for every $i \in X$,

$$\widehat{\psi}_{i\varepsilon}(s/u_\varepsilon) \to 1 \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0, \ s \geq 0. \tag{15}$$

It follows from relation (15) that, under conditions **A**, **B**, and **C**, relation (11) holds, for given $i \in X$, if and only if,

$$\frac{1 - \psi_i(s/u_\varepsilon)}{q_{i\varepsilon}} \to \varsigma(s) \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0, \ s \geq 0, \tag{16}$$

where $\varsigma(s)$ is a function such that (**j**) $\frac{1}{1+\varsigma(s)}$ is a Laplace transform of some non-negative random variable, and (**k**) $\varsigma(s) > 0$ for $s > 0$.

It will be shown in Lemma 4 that, under conditions **B** and **C**, (**l**) the assumption that relation (16) holds for some $i \in X$ implies that this relation holds for every $i \in X$ and, in this case, (**m**) the limiting function $\varsigma(s)$ is the same for all $i \in X$, (**n**) $\varsigma(s)$ is a cumulant of an infinitely divisible law concentrated on non-negative half-line and not concentrated in zero.

Note that, in this case, ($\mathbf{o}_1$) the function $\frac{1}{1+\varsigma(s)}$ is a Laplace transform of the random variable $\xi(\rho)$, where ($\mathbf{o}_2$) $\xi(t)$, $t \geq 0$ is a non-negative homogeneous process with independent increments and the Laplace transform $\mathsf{E}e^{-s\xi(t)} = e^{-\varsigma(s)t}$, ($\mathbf{o}_3$) $\rho$ is exponentially distributed random variable, with parameter 1, ($\mathbf{o}_4$) the random variable $\rho$ is independent of the process $\xi(t)$, $t \geq 0$, and ($\mathbf{o}_5$) $\varsigma(s) > 0$ for $s > 0$. These properties are consistent with requirements (**j**) and (**k**).

Let introduce the Laplace transforms for the sojourn times $\varkappa_1$,

$$\varphi_i(s) = \mathsf{E}_i e^{-s\varkappa_1} = \int_0^\infty e^{-st} G_i(dt), \ s \geq 0,$$

and the corresponding Laplace transform averaged by the stationary distribution of the imbedded Markov chain $\eta_n$,

$$\varphi(s) = \sum_{i=1}^m \pi_i \varphi_i(s) = \int_0^\infty e^{-st} G(dt), \ s \geq 0.$$

Finally, it will be shown in Lemma 5 that, under conditions **A**, **B**, and **C**, relation (16) holds, for given $i \in X$, if and only if,

$$\frac{1 - \varphi(s/u_\varepsilon)}{p_\varepsilon} \to \varsigma(s) \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0, \ s \geq 0, \tag{17}$$

where (**p**) $\varsigma(s)$ is a cumulant of an infinitely divisible law concentrated on non-negative half-line and not concentrated in zero.

Relation (17) is the final point in series the solidarity statements concerned the distributions of first-rare-event times and based on conditions **A**, **B**, and **C**.

The last third step in the proof is more or less standard. It is based on an accurate use of theorems about regularly varying functions, Tauberian and Abelian theorems applied to the Laplace transforms $\varphi(s)$, and the central criterium of convergence for sums of independent random variables. Here, conditions **D**, $\mathbf{E}_\gamma$, and $\mathbf{F}_{a,\gamma}$ are involved.

We prove, in Lemma 6, that, under condition **D**, (**r**) the limiting cumulant in relation (17) can only be of the form $\varsigma(s) = as^\gamma$, where $0 < \gamma \leq 1$ and $a > 0$, and that (**s**) conditions $\mathbf{E}_\gamma$, $\mathbf{F}_{a,\gamma}$ are necessary and sufficient for relation (17) to hold with the limiting cumulant $\varsigma(s) = as^\gamma$.

This completes the proof of Theorem 1. □

## 3. Cyclic conditions of convergence

In this section we prove Lemmas 1-6 used in the proof of Theorem 1. These lemmas present a series of so-called cyclic solidarity conditions of convergence connected with the first-rare-event times and, as we think, have their own value.

The first lemma describes asymptotic behavior of the probability of occurrence the rare event during one $i$-cycle.

**Lemma 1.** *Let conditions* **B**, **C** *hold. Then, for every* $i \in X$,

$$q_{i\varepsilon} \sim \frac{p_\varepsilon}{\pi_i} \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0. \tag{18}$$

*Proof.* Let us define the probabilities of occurrence the rare event before the first hitting of the imbedded Markov chain in the state $i$ under condition that the initial state of this Markov chain $\eta_0 = j$,

$$q_{ji\varepsilon} = \mathsf{P}_j\{\nu_\varepsilon \leq \tau_i\}, \ i, j \in X.$$

By the definition,

$$q_{ii\varepsilon} = q_{i\varepsilon}, \ i \in X. \tag{19}$$

The probabilities $q_{ji\varepsilon}, j \in X$ satisfy, for every $i \in X$, the following system of linear equations,

$$\begin{cases} q_{ji\varepsilon} = p_{j\varepsilon} + \sum\limits_{k \neq i} p_{jk}^{(\varepsilon)} q_{ki\varepsilon} \\ j \in X, \end{cases} \tag{20}$$

where

$$p_{jk}^{(\varepsilon)} = \mathsf{P}_j\{\eta_1 = k, \zeta_1 \notin D_\varepsilon\}, \ j, k \in X.$$

System (20) can be rewritten, for every $i \in X$, in the following matrix form,

$$\mathbf{q}_{i\varepsilon} = \mathbf{p}_\varepsilon + {}_i\mathbf{P}^{(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{q}_{i\varepsilon}, \tag{21}$$

where

$$\mathbf{q}_{i\varepsilon} = \begin{bmatrix} q_{1i\varepsilon} \\ \vdots \\ q_{mi\varepsilon} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{p}_\varepsilon = \begin{bmatrix} p_{1\varepsilon} \\ \vdots \\ p_{m\varepsilon} \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$ {}_i\mathbf{P}^{(\varepsilon)} = \begin{bmatrix} p^{(\varepsilon)}_{11} & \dots & p^{(\varepsilon)}_{1(i-1)} & 0 & p^{(\varepsilon)}_{1(i+1)} & \dots & p^{(\varepsilon)}_{1m} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ p^{(\varepsilon)}_{m1} & \dots & p^{(\varepsilon)}_{m(i-1)} & 0 & p^{(\varepsilon)}_{m(i+1)} & \dots & p^{(\varepsilon)}_{mm} \end{bmatrix}. $$

Let us show that the matrix $\mathbf{I} - {}_i\mathbf{P}^{(\varepsilon)}$ has the inverse matrix for all $\varepsilon$ small enough, and, therefore, the solution of the system (21) has the following form, for every $i \in X$,

$$ \mathbf{q}_{i\varepsilon} = \left[\mathbf{I} - {}_i\mathbf{P}^{(\varepsilon)}\right]^{-1} \mathbf{p}_\varepsilon. \tag{22} $$

Let us also introduce the matrix,

$$ {}_i\mathbf{P}^{(0)} = \begin{bmatrix} p_{11} & \dots & p_{1(i-1)} & 0 & p_{1(i+1)} & \dots & p_{1m} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ p_{m1} & \dots & p_{m(i-1)} & 0 & p_{m(i+1)} & \dots & p_{mm} \end{bmatrix}. $$

Let us introduce random variable $\delta_{ik}$ which is the number of visits of the imbedded Markov chain $\eta_n$ of the state $k$ up to the first visit to the sate $i$,

$$ \delta_{ik} = \sum_{n=1}^{\tau_i} \chi(\eta_{n-1} = k), \ i, k \in X. $$

As is known, due to the ergodicity of the Markov chain $\eta_n$, $(\mathbf{a}_1)$ $\mathsf{E}_j\delta_{ik} < \infty$ for all $j, i, k \in X$. Moreover, for every $i \in X$, there exists the inverse matrix,

$$ \left[\mathbf{I} - {}_i\mathbf{P}^{(0)}\right]^{-1} = \| \, \mathsf{E}_j\delta_{ik} \, \| \tag{23} $$

Let us also introduce random variable $\delta_{ik\varepsilon}$ which is the number of visits of the imbedded Markov chain $\eta_n$ of the state $k$ before the first visit to the sate $i$ or the occurrence of the first rare event,

$$ \delta_{ik\varepsilon} = \sum_{n=1}^{\tau_i \wedge \nu_\varepsilon} \chi(\eta_{n-1} = k), \ i, k \in X. $$

It follows from the definition of these random variables that $(\mathbf{a}_2)$ $0 \leq \delta_{ik\varepsilon} \leq \delta_{ik}$ and, therefore, $(\mathbf{a}_3)$ $\mathsf{E}_j\delta_{ik\varepsilon} \leq \mathsf{E}_j\delta_{ik} < \infty$ for all $j, i, k \in X$. Moreover, the matrix $[{}_i\mathbf{P}^{(\varepsilon)}]^n = \| \, \mathsf{P}_j\{\eta_n = k, \nu_\varepsilon \wedge \tau_i > n\} \, \|$ for $n \geq 1$, and, therefore,

$$ \left[\mathbf{I} - {}_i\mathbf{P}^{(\varepsilon)}\right]^{-1} = \mathbf{I} + {}_i\mathbf{P}^{(\varepsilon)} + ({}_i\mathbf{P}^{(\varepsilon)})^2 + \cdots = \| \, \mathsf{E}_j\delta_{ik\varepsilon} \, \| \tag{24} $$

Condition $\mathbf{B}$ implies that random variables $\nu_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{\mathsf{P}} \infty$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$ and therefore $(\mathbf{a}_4)$ random variables $\delta_{ik\varepsilon} \xrightarrow{\mathsf{P}} \delta_{ik}$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. It follows in from $(\mathbf{a}_2)$ and $(\mathbf{a}_4)$ that, for every $i, j, k \in X$,

$$ \mathsf{E}_j\delta_{ik\varepsilon} \to \mathsf{E}_j\delta_{ik} \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0. \tag{25} $$

One can prove that $(\mathbf{b}_1)$ the existence of the inverse matrix $\left[\mathbf{I} - {}_i\mathbf{P}^{(\varepsilon)}\right]^{-1}$ for all $\varepsilon$ small enough, and the convergence relation $(\mathbf{b}_2)$ $\left[\mathbf{I} - {}_i\mathbf{P}^{(\varepsilon)}\right]^{-1} \to$

$\left[\mathbf{I} - {}_i\mathbf{P}^{(0)}\right]^{-1}$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$ by the following simpler way. As was mentioned above, the inverse matrix $\left[\mathbf{I} - {}_i\mathbf{P}^{(0)}\right]^{-1}$ exists. This means that $(\mathbf{b}_3)$ $\det(\mathbf{I} - {}_i\mathbf{P}^{(0)}) \neq 0$. Condition $\mathbf{B}$ obviously implies that, $(\mathbf{b}_4)$ ${}_i\mathbf{P}^{(\varepsilon)} \to {}_i\mathbf{P}^{(0)}$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Thus, $\det(\mathbf{I} - {}_i\mathbf{P}^{(\varepsilon)}) \neq 0$ for all $\varepsilon$ small enough. Moreover, $(\mathbf{b}_4)$ implies $(\mathbf{b}_2)$, since the elements of the inverse matrix $\left[\mathbf{I} - {}_i\mathbf{P}^{(\varepsilon)}\right]^{-1}$ are continuous rational functions of the elements of the matrix $\mathbf{I} - {}_i\mathbf{P}^{(\varepsilon)}$. This rational function has a non-zero denominator that is $\det(\mathbf{I} - {}_i\mathbf{P}^{(\varepsilon)})$.

Using relations (19) and (24) we get the following formula,

$$q_{i\varepsilon} = \sum_{k=1}^{m} \mathsf{E}_i \delta_{ik\varepsilon}\, p_{k\varepsilon}. \tag{26}$$

As is known, the following formula holds, since the Markov chain $\eta_n$ is ergodic,

$$\mathsf{E}_i \delta_{ik} = \frac{\pi_k}{\pi_i}, \ i, k \in X. \tag{27}$$

Using formulas (26) and (27) we get,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\left| q_{i\varepsilon} - \frac{p_\varepsilon}{\pi_i} \right|}{\frac{p_\varepsilon}{\pi_i}} &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{m} \left| \mathsf{E}_i \delta_{ik\varepsilon} - \frac{\pi_k}{\pi_i} \right| \cdot \frac{\pi_i p_{k\varepsilon}}{\sum_{j=1}^{m} \pi_j p_{j\varepsilon}} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{m} \left| \mathsf{E}_i \delta_{ik\varepsilon} - \frac{\pi_k}{\pi_i} \right| \cdot \frac{\pi_i}{\pi_k} \to 0 \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0. \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Relation (28) implies asymptotic relation (18). The proof of the lemma is complete. □

**Lemma 2.** *Let conditions* **A**, **B**, **C** *hold. Then, for any normalization function $0 < u_\varepsilon \to \infty$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, and for $i \in X$,*

$$\widetilde{\psi}_{i\varepsilon}(s/u_\varepsilon) \to 1 \ \textit{as}\ \varepsilon \to 0, \ s \geq 0. \tag{29}$$

*Proof.* Let us introduce the Laplace transforms,

$$\widetilde{\psi}_{ji\varepsilon}(s) = \mathsf{E}_j \exp\{-s\tilde{\beta}_{i\varepsilon}\}\chi(\nu_\varepsilon \leq \tau_i), \ s \geq 0, \ i, j \in X.$$

Obviously,

$$\widetilde{\psi}_{i\varepsilon}(s) = \frac{\widetilde{\psi}_{ii\varepsilon}(s)}{q_{i\varepsilon}}, \ s \geq 0, \ i \in X. \tag{30}$$

Let us also introduce the Laplace transforms,

$$p_{jk}^{(\varepsilon)}(s) = \mathsf{E}_j e^{-s\varkappa_1}\chi(\zeta_1 \notin D_\varepsilon, \eta_1 = k), \ s \geq 0, \ j, k \in X,$$

and

$$p_{j}^{(\varepsilon)}(s) = \mathsf{E}_j e^{-s\varkappa_1}\chi(\zeta_1 \in D_\varepsilon) = \widehat{\varphi}_{j\varepsilon}(s) p_{j\varepsilon}, \ s \geq 0, \ j \in X,$$

where

$$\widehat{\varphi}_{j\varepsilon}(s) = \mathsf{E}_j\{e^{-s\varkappa_1}/\zeta_1 \in D_\varepsilon\},\ s \geq 0,\ j \in X.$$

Functions $\widetilde{\psi}_{ji\varepsilon}(s/u_\varepsilon), j \in X$ satisfy, for every $s \geq 0$ and $i \in X$, the following system of linear equations,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \widetilde{\psi}_{ji\varepsilon}(s/u_\varepsilon) = p_j^{(\varepsilon)}(s/u_\varepsilon) + \sum\limits_{k \neq i} p_{jk}^{(\varepsilon)}(s)\widetilde{\psi}_{ki\varepsilon}(s/u_\varepsilon), \\ j \in X. \end{array} \right. \tag{31}$$

System (31) can be rewritten in the following equivalent matrix form

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{\Psi}}_i^{(\varepsilon)}(s/u_\varepsilon) = \mathbf{p}^{(\varepsilon)}(s/u_\varepsilon) + {}_i\mathbf{P}^{(\varepsilon)}(s/u_\varepsilon)\ \widetilde{\mathbf{\Psi}}_i^{(\varepsilon)}(s/u_\varepsilon) \tag{32}$$

where

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{\Psi}}_i^{(\varepsilon)}(s) = \begin{bmatrix} \widetilde{\psi}_{1i\varepsilon}(s) \\ \vdots \\ \widetilde{\psi}_{mi\varepsilon}(s) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{p}^{(\varepsilon)}(s) = \begin{bmatrix} p_1^{(\varepsilon)}(s) \\ \vdots \\ p_m^{(\varepsilon)}(s) \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$${}_i\mathbf{P}^{(\varepsilon)}(s) = \begin{bmatrix} p_{11}^{(\varepsilon)}(s) & \dots & p_{1(i-1)}^{(\varepsilon)}(s) & 0 & p_{1(i+1)}^{(\varepsilon)}(s) & \dots & p_{1m}^{(\varepsilon)}(s) \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ p_{m1}^{(\varepsilon)}(s) & \dots & p_{m(i-1)}^{(\varepsilon)} & 0 & p_{m(i+1)}^{(\varepsilon)}(s) & \dots & p_{mm}^{(\varepsilon)}(s) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let us show that, for every $s \geq 0$ and $i \in X$, matrix $\mathbf{I} -{}_i\mathbf{P}^{(\varepsilon)}(s/u_\varepsilon)$ has the inverse matrix for all $\varepsilon$ small enough, and, therefore, the solution of the system (32) has the following form,

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{\Psi}}_i^{(\varepsilon)}(s/u_\varepsilon) = \left[\mathbf{I} -\ {}_i\mathbf{P}^{(\varepsilon)}(s/u_\varepsilon)\right]^{-1} \mathbf{p}^{(\varepsilon)}(s/u_\varepsilon) \tag{33}$$

Condition **B** implies, in an obvious way, that, for every $s \geq 0$ and $j, k \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned} p_{jk}^{(\varepsilon)}(s/u_\varepsilon) &= \mathsf{E}_j \exp\{-s\varkappa_1/u_\varepsilon\}\chi(\zeta_1 \notin D_\varepsilon, \eta_1 = k) \\ &\to \mathsf{E}_j\chi(\eta_1 = k) = p_{jk} \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0. \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

Thus $(\mathbf{c}_1)$ ${}_i\mathbf{P}^{(\varepsilon)}(s/u_\varepsilon) \to {}_i\mathbf{P}^{(0)}$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, for every $s \geq 0$ and $i \in X$. It was shown in the proof of Lemma 2 that the inverse matrix $[\mathbf{I} -\ {}_i\mathbf{P}^{(0)}]^{-1}$ exists. Thus, $(\mathbf{c}_1)$ implies that $(\mathbf{c}_2)$ there exists, for every $s \geq 0$ and $i \in X$, the inverse matrix $[\mathbf{I} -\ {}_i\mathbf{P}^{(\varepsilon)}(s/u_\varepsilon)]^{-1}$ for all $\varepsilon$ small enough. Moreover, for every $s \geq 0$ and $i \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathbf{I} -\ {}_i\mathbf{P}^{(\varepsilon)}(s/u_\varepsilon)]^{-1} &= \|\Delta_{jik}^{(\varepsilon)}(s)\| \\ &\to [\mathbf{I} -\ {}_i\mathbf{P}^{(0)}]^{-1} = \|\mathsf{E}_j\delta_{ik}\| \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0. \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Taking in account formulas (30), (33) and the definition of $p_j^{(\varepsilon)}(s)$, we get, for every $s \geq 0$ and $i \in X$,

$$\widetilde{\psi}_{ii\varepsilon}(s/u_\varepsilon) = \sum_{k=1}^m \Delta_{iik}^{(\varepsilon)}(s)\widehat{\varphi}_{k\varepsilon}(s/u_\varepsilon)p_k(\varepsilon) \tag{36}$$

Condition **A** implies that, for every $s \geq 0$ and $k \in X$,

$$\widehat{\varphi}_{k\varepsilon}(s/u_\varepsilon) \to 1 \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0. \tag{37}$$

Indeed, using condition **A**, we get, for any $v > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon\to 0}(1 - \widehat{\varphi}_{k\varepsilon}(s/u_\varepsilon)) &\leq 1 - \exp\{-sv\} \\ &+ \overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon\to 0}\mathsf{P}_k\{\varkappa_1 > vu_\varepsilon/\zeta_1 \in D_\varepsilon\} \\ &= 1 - \exp\{-sv\} \to 0 \text{ as } v \to 0. \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Relations (35) and (37) imply that, for every $s \geq 0$ and $i, k \in X$,

$$\Delta^{(\varepsilon)}_{iik}(s)\widehat{\varphi}_{k\varepsilon}(s/u_\varepsilon) \to \mathsf{E}_i\delta_{ik} = \frac{\pi_k}{\pi_i} \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0. \tag{39}$$

Using relation (39) we get, for every $s \geq 0$ and $i, k \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\left|\widetilde{\psi}_{ii\varepsilon}(s/u_\varepsilon) - \frac{p_\varepsilon}{\pi_i}\right|}{\frac{p_\varepsilon}{\pi_i}} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{m}\left|\Delta^{(\varepsilon)}_{iik}(s)\widehat{\varphi}_{k\varepsilon}(s/u_\varepsilon) - \frac{\pi_k}{\pi_i}\right|\frac{\pi_i p_k(\varepsilon)}{\sum_{j=1}^{m}\pi_j p_{j\varepsilon}} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{m}\left|\Delta^{(\varepsilon)}_{iik}(s)\widehat{\varphi}_{k\varepsilon}(s/u_\varepsilon) - \frac{\pi_k}{\pi_i}\right|\frac{\pi_i}{\pi_k} \to 0 \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0. \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

Relation (40) means that, for every $s \geq 0$ and $i \in X$,

$$\widetilde{\psi}_{ii\varepsilon}(s/u_\varepsilon) \sim \frac{p_\varepsilon}{\pi_i} \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0. \tag{41}$$

Finally, relation (18) given in Lemma 1, formula (30), and relation (41), we get, for every $s \geq 0$ and $i \in X$,

$$\widetilde{\psi}_{i\varepsilon}(s/u_\varepsilon) = \frac{\widetilde{\psi}_{ii\varepsilon}(s/u_\varepsilon)}{q_{i\varepsilon}} \to 1 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0. \tag{42}$$

The proof is complete. □

**Lemma 3.** *Let conditions* **A**, **B**, **C** *hold. Then for any normalization function* $0 < u_\varepsilon \to \infty$ *as* $\varepsilon \to 0$, *and for* $i \in X$,

$$\widehat{\psi}_{i\varepsilon}(s/u_\varepsilon) \to 1 \;\; \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0, \;\; s \geq 0. \tag{43}$$

*Proof.* The following representation can be written, for every $i \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\psi}_{i\varepsilon}(s) &= q^{-1}_{i\varepsilon}\mathsf{E}_i\exp\{-s\beta_i\}\chi(\nu_\varepsilon \leq \tau_i) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{m} q^{-1}_{i\varepsilon}\mathsf{E}_i\exp\{-s(\sum_{n=1}^{\nu_\varepsilon}\varkappa_n + \sum_{n=\nu_\varepsilon+1}^{\tau_i}\varkappa_n)\}\chi(\nu_\varepsilon \leq \tau_i, \eta_{\nu_\varepsilon} = k) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{m} q^{-1}_{i\varepsilon}\mathsf{E}_i\exp\{-s\xi_\varepsilon\}\chi(\nu_\varepsilon \leq \tau_i, \eta_{\nu_\varepsilon} = k)\psi_k(s) \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, $\psi_k(s/u_\varepsilon) \to 1$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$ for every $s \geq 0$ and $k \in X$. Thus, for every $s \geq 0$ and $i \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\psi}_{i\varepsilon}(s/u_\varepsilon) &\sim \sum_{k=1}^{m} q_{i\varepsilon}^{-1}\mathsf{E}_i \exp\{-s\xi_\varepsilon/u_\varepsilon\}\chi(\nu_\varepsilon \leq \tau_i, \eta_{\nu_\varepsilon} = k) \\ &= q_{i\varepsilon}^{-1}\mathsf{E}_i \exp\{-s\xi_\varepsilon/u_\varepsilon\}\chi(\nu_\varepsilon \leq \tau_i) \\ &= \widetilde{\psi}_{i\varepsilon}(s/u_\varepsilon) \to 1 \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0. \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

The proof is complete. □

In what follows we assume that $\eta_0 = j$ and shall mark the corresponding processes based on the Markov renewal process $(\eta_n, \varkappa_n, \zeta_n)$ by the index $j$ in order to distinguish the cases with different initial states $\eta_0$.

Let us introduce, for every $i, j \in X$, the following "cyclic" stochastic process,

$$\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{[tq_{i\varepsilon}^{-1}]+1} \frac{\beta_i(n)}{u_\varepsilon}, \ t \geq 0. \tag{45}$$

Note that $\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t)$ is a step sum-process with independent increments. Indeed, by the definition, random variables $\beta_i(n), n = 1, 2, \ldots$ are independent and,

$$\mathsf{E}\exp\{-s\beta_i(n)\} = \begin{cases} \psi_{ji}(s) & \text{for } n = 1, \\ \psi_{ii}(s) & \text{for } n \geq 2, \end{cases} \tag{46}$$

where

$$\psi_{ji}(s) = \mathsf{E}_j \exp\{-s\beta_i\}, \ s \geq 0, \ i, j \in X.$$

We are interested to prove some solidarity statements concerned two asymptotic relations.

The first one is the following relation of weak convergence,

$$\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t), \ t \geq 0 \Rightarrow \xi(t), \ t \geq 0 \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0, \tag{47}$$

where (**d**) $\xi(t), t \geq 0$ is a non-zero and non-decreasing and stochastically continuous process with the initial value $\xi(0) = 0$.

The second one is the following asymptotic relation,

$$\frac{1 - \psi_i(s/u_\varepsilon)}{q_{i\varepsilon}} \to \varsigma(s) \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0, s \geq 0, \tag{48}$$

where (**e**) $\varsigma(s) > 0$ for $s > 0$.

The following lemma presents the variant of so-called solidarity proposition concerned weak convergence for cyclic step sum-processes $\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t)$.

**Lemma 4.** *Let conditions* **B**, **C** *hold and* $\eta_0 = j$. *Then*: ($\boldsymbol{\alpha}$) *the assumption that the relation of weak convergence* (47) *holds for some* $i, j \in X$ *implies that this relation holds for every* $i, j \in X$*;* ($\boldsymbol{\beta}$) *the limiting process* $\xi(t), t \geq 0$ *in* (47) *is the same for any* $i, j \in X$*;* ($\boldsymbol{\gamma}$) $\xi(t), t \geq 0$ *is a non-zero and non-decreasing homogenous process with independent increments;* ($\boldsymbol{\delta}$) *relation*

(47) *holds for given* $i, j \in X$ *if and only if relation* (48) *holds for the same* $i$*;* ($\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$) *the limiting function* $\varsigma(s)$ *in* (48) *is the same for any* $i \in X$*;* ($\boldsymbol{\zeta}$) $\varsigma(s)$ *is a cumulant of the process* $\xi(t), t \geq 0$, *i.e.* $\mathsf{E}e^{-s\xi(t)} = e^{-\varsigma(s)t}$, $s, t \geq 0$*;* ($\boldsymbol{\eta}$) *under condition* $\mathbf{D}$*, conditions* $\mathbf{E}_\gamma$ *and* $\mathbf{F}_{a,\gamma}$ (*with replacement of function* $p_\varepsilon$ *by* $q_{i\varepsilon}$ *in these conditions*)*, imposed on the distribution of random variable* $\beta_i$*, are necessary and sufficient for relation* (48) *to hold;* ($\boldsymbol{\theta}$) *cumulant* $\varsigma(s) = as^\gamma$ *in this case.*

*Proof.* Let us first prove that (**f**) the assumption that (47) holds for given $i, j \in X$ implies that this relation holds for the same $i$ and every $j \in X$, moreover the limiting process $\xi(t), t \geq 0$ does not depend on $j$.

Indeed, the pre-limiting process $\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t)$ can be represented in the form of the following sum,

$$\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t) = \beta_i(1)/u_\varepsilon + \xi'_{i\varepsilon}(t),\ t \geq 0, \tag{49}$$

where

$$\xi'_{i\varepsilon}(t) = \sum_{n=2}^{[tq_{i\varepsilon}^{-1}]+1} \beta_i(n)/u_\varepsilon,\ t \geq 0.$$

The random variable $\beta_i(1)/u_\varepsilon$ and the process $\xi'_{i\varepsilon}(t), t \geq 0$ are independent. The distribution of random variable $\beta_i(1)/u_\varepsilon$ depends on $j$ while the finite-dimensional distributions of process $\xi'_{i\varepsilon}(t), t \geq 0$ do not depend on $j$. But, the random variables $\beta_i(1)/u_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{\mathsf{P}} 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, for every $j \in X$, or, equivalently, ($\mathbf{f}_1$) the random variables $\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t) - \xi'_{i\varepsilon}(t) \xrightarrow{\mathsf{P}} 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, for every $t > 0$ and $j \in X$. Thus, the assumption that (47) holds for given $i, j \in X$ implies the weak convergence of the process $\xi'_{ji\varepsilon}(t), t \geq 0$ to the same limiting process. This convergence, due to ($\mathbf{f}_1$), implies that ($\mathbf{f}_2$) the process $\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t), t \geq 0$ weakly converge to the same limiting process, for every $j \in X$, moreover, the finite-dimensional distributions of the limiting process do not depend on $j$ since it is so for the pre-limiting process $\xi'_{i\varepsilon}(t), t \geq 0$.

Let us now prove that (**g**) the assumption that (47) holds for given $i, j \in X$ implies that this relation holds for the same $j$ and every $i \in X$, moreover the limiting process $\xi(t), t \geq 0$ does not depend on $i$.

Note that two partial solidarity propositions (**f**) and (**g**), formulated above, imply the solidarity statements ($\boldsymbol{\alpha}$) and ($\boldsymbol{\beta}$) formulated in Lemma 4.

To prove the proposition (**g**), let us introduce, for $j \in X$, the following step sum-processes based on sojourn times for semi-Markov process $\eta(t)$,

$$\xi_{j\varepsilon}(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{[tp_\varepsilon^{-1}]} \frac{\varkappa_n}{u_\varepsilon},\ t \geq 0, \tag{50}$$

Let us also introduce, for $i, j \in X$, the processes $\mu_{ji\varepsilon}(t)$ which counts the number of transitions for the semi-Markov process $\eta(t)$ that occurs in $[tq_{i\varepsilon}^{-1}] + 1$ cycles,

$$\mu_{ji\varepsilon}(t) = p_\varepsilon \tau_i([tq_{i\varepsilon}^{-1}] + 1),\ t \geq 0.$$

The process $\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t)$ can be represented, for every $i, j \in X$, in the form of superposition of the processes introduced above,

$$\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t) = \xi_{j\varepsilon}(\mu_{ji\varepsilon}(t)), \ t \geq 0. \tag{51}$$

Let now consider the following relation of weak convergence for the processes $\xi_{j\varepsilon}(t)$,

$$\xi_{j\varepsilon}(t), t \geq 0 \Rightarrow \xi(t), t \geq 0 \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0, \tag{52}$$

where (**d**) $\xi(t), t \geq 0$ is non-zero, non-decreasing, and stochastically continuous process with the initial value $\xi(0) = 0$.

Let us now prove that ($\mathbf{g}_1$) relation (47) holds, for given $i, j \in X$, if and only if the relation (52) holds, for the same $j$, moreover the limiting process $\xi(t), t \geq 0$ can be taken the same in both relations.

Note that ($\mathbf{g}_1$) implies (**g**). Indeed, due to "iff" character, the relation (52) for given $j \in X$ implies that (47) should hold for the same $j$ and every $i \in X$, and with the same limiting process. Moreover, the limiting process in (52) does not depend on $i$ since the pre-limiting process $\xi_{j\varepsilon}(t), t \geq 0$ does not depend on $i$.

We display the proof of ($\mathbf{g}_1$) for one-dimensional distributions. The proof for multi-dimensional distributions is similar.

Let us first prove that ($\mathbf{g}_2$) the weak convergence of random variables $\xi_{j\varepsilon}(t)$ in (52), assumed to hold for every $t > 0$ and given $j \in X$, implies the weak convergence of random variables $\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t)$ in (47) for every $t > 0$, the same $j$ and every $i \in X$, moreover the limiting random variable $\xi(t)$ can be taken the same in both relations.

The process $\mu_{ji\varepsilon}(t)$ can be represented, for every $i, j \in X$, in the form of sum-process with independent increments,

$$\mu_{ji\varepsilon}(t) = p_\varepsilon([q_{i\varepsilon}^{-1}] + 1) \sum_{n=1}^{[tq_{i\varepsilon}^{-1}]+1} \frac{\alpha_i(n)}{[q_{i\varepsilon}^{-1}] + 1}, t \geq 0, \tag{53}$$

where $\alpha_i(n) = \tau_i(n) - \tau_i(n-1), n = 1, 2, \ldots$. Indeed, the random variables $\alpha_i(n), n \geq 1$ are independent and,

$$\mathsf{E} \exp\{-s\alpha_i(n)\} = \begin{cases} \vartheta_{ji}(s) & \text{for } n = 1, \\ \vartheta_{ii}(s) & \text{for } n \geq 2, \end{cases} \tag{54}$$

where

$$\vartheta_{ji}(s) = \mathsf{E}_j \exp\{-s\alpha_i(1)\}, \ s \geq 0, \ i, j \in X.$$

Since the Markov chain $\eta_n$ is ergodic, $\mathsf{E}_i \alpha_i(1) = \pi_i^{-1}$. Thus, using the standard weak law of large numbers for i.i.d. random variables with finite mean, the asymptotic relation (18) given in Lemma 1, and representation (53), we get, for every $t > 0$ and $i, j \in X$,

$$\mu_{ji\varepsilon}(t) \xrightarrow{\mathsf{P}} \pi_i t \mathsf{E}_i \alpha_i(1) = t \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0. \tag{55}$$

Let us choose an arbitrary $t > 0$ and a sequence $0 < c_n < t, n = 1, 2, \ldots$ such that $c_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

By the definition, the processes $\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t)$, $\xi_{j\varepsilon}(t)$, and $\mu_{ji\varepsilon}(t)$ are non-negative and non-decreasing. Taking into account this fact and the representation (51), we get, for every $t > 0$, $i, j \in X$, any real-valued $x$, and $n \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{P}\{\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t) > x\} &= \mathsf{P}\{\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t) > x, \mu_{ji\varepsilon}(t) \leq t + c_n\} \\ &+ \mathsf{P}\{\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t) > x, \mu_{ji\varepsilon}(t) > t + c_n\} \\ &\leq \mathsf{P}\{\xi_{j\varepsilon}(t + c_n) > x\} \\ &+ \mathsf{P}\{\mu_{ji\varepsilon}(t) > t + c_n\}. \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

Let $U_t$ be the set of continuity points the distribution functions of the limiting random variables $\xi(t)$ and $\xi(t \pm c_n), n = 1, 2, \ldots$ in (52). This set is the real line $R$ except at most a countable set of points.

Using the estimate (56), relation (55), and the assumptions that relation (52) holds for one-dimensional distributions, for every $t > 0$ and given $j \in X$, and that the limiting process $\xi(t)$ in (52) is stochastically continuous, we get, for every $t > 0$, the same $j$, and every $i \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}} \mathsf{P}\{\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t) > x\} &\leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \overline{\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}}(\mathsf{P}\{\xi_{j\varepsilon}(t + c_n) > x\} \\ &+ \mathsf{P}\{\mu_{ji\varepsilon}(t) > t + c_n\}) \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} P\{\xi(t + c_n) > x\} \\ &= \mathsf{P}\{\xi(t) > x\}, \ x \in U_t, \end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

or, equivalently,

$$\underline{\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}} \mathsf{P}\{\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t) \leq x\} \geq P\{\xi(t) \leq x\}, \ x \in U_t. \tag{58}$$

We can also employ the following estimate, for every $t > 0$, $i, j \in X$, any real $x$, and $n \geq 1$,

$$\mathsf{P}\{\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t) \leq x\} \leq \mathsf{P}\{\xi_{j\varepsilon}(t - c_n) \leq x\} + \mathsf{P}\{\mu_{ji\varepsilon}(t) \leq t - c_n\}. \tag{59}$$

Then, using the estimate (59), relation (55), and the assumptions that relation (52) holds for one-dimensional distributions, for every $t > 0$ and given $j \in X$, and that the limiting process $\xi(t)$ in (52) is stochastically continuous, we get, for every $t > 0$, the same $j$, and every $i \in X$,

$$\overline{\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}} \mathsf{P}\{\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t) \leq x\} \leq \mathsf{P}\{\xi(t) \leq x\}, \ x \in U_t. \tag{60}$$

Relations (58) and (60) implies that $\mathsf{P}\{\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t) \leq x\} \to \mathsf{P}\{\xi(t) \leq x\}$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, $x \in U_t$, Since the set $U_t$ is dense in $R$, this relation implies that, for every $t > 0$, given $j$ (for which relation (52) is assumed to hold) and every $i \in X$,

$$\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t) \Rightarrow \xi(t) \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0. \tag{61}$$

Let us now prove that ($\mathbf{g}_3$) the weak convergence of random variables $\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t)$ in (47), assumed to hold for every $t > 0$ and given $i, j \in X$, implies the weak convergence of random variables $\xi_{j\varepsilon}(t)$ in (47) for every $t > 0$ and the same $j$, moreover the limiting random variable $\xi(t)$ can be taken the same in both relations.

Let us choose an arbitrary $t > 0$ and a sequence $0 < d_n < t, n = 1, 2, \ldots$ such that $d_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

Using again that the processes $\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t)$, $\xi_{j\varepsilon}(t)$, and $\mu_{ji\varepsilon}(t)$ are non-negative and non-decreasing, and the representation (51), we get, for every $t > 0$, given $i, j \in X$, any real-valued $x$, and $n \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{P}\{\xi_{j\varepsilon}(t) > x\} &= \mathsf{P}\{\xi_{j\varepsilon}(t) > x, \mu_{ji\varepsilon}(t + d_n) > t\} \\ &+ \mathsf{P}\{\xi_{j\varepsilon}(t) > x, \mu_{ji\varepsilon}(t + d_n) \leq t\} \\ &\leq \mathsf{P}\{\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t + d_n) > x\} \\ &+ \mathsf{P}\{\mu_{ji\varepsilon}(t + d_n) \leq t\}. \end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

Let $V_t$ be the set of continuity points for the distribution functions of the limiting random variables $\xi(t)$ and $\xi(t \pm d_n), n = 1, 2, \ldots$ in (47). This set is the real line $R$ except at most a countable set of points.

Using the estimate (62), relation (55), and the assumptions that relation (47) holds for one-dimensional distributions, for every $t > 0$ and given $i, j \in X$, and that the limiting process $\xi(t)$ in (47) is stochastically continuous, we get, for every $t > 0$ and the same $j$,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0}} \mathsf{P}\{\xi_{j\varepsilon}(t) > x\} &\leq \lim_{n \to \infty} \overline{\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0}} (\mathsf{P}\{\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t + d_n) > x\} \\ &+ \mathsf{P}\{\mu_{ji\varepsilon}(t + d_n) \leq t\}) \\ &= \lim_{n \to \infty} P\{\xi(t + d_n) > x\} \\ &= \mathsf{P}\{\xi(t) > x\}, \ x \in V_t, \end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

or, equivalently,

$$\underline{\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0}} \mathsf{P}\{\xi_{j\varepsilon}(t) \leq x\} \geq P\{\xi(t) \leq x\}, \ x \in V_t. \tag{64}$$

We can also employ the following estimate, for every $t > 0$, $i, j \in X$, any real-valued $x$ and $n \geq 1$,

$$\mathsf{P}\{\xi_{j\varepsilon}(t) \leq x\} \leq \mathsf{P}\{\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t - d_n) \leq x\} + \mathsf{P}\{\mu_{ji\varepsilon}(t - d_n) \leq t\}. \tag{65}$$

Then, using the estimate (65), relation (55), and the assumptions that relation (47) holds for one-dimensional distributions, for every $t > 0$ and for given $i, j \in X$, and that the limiting process $\xi(t)$ in (47) is stochastically continuous, we get, for every $t > 0$ and the same $j$,

$$\overline{\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0}} P\{\xi_{j\varepsilon}(t) \leq x\} \leq P\{\xi(t) \leq x\}, \ x \in V_t. \tag{66}$$

Relations (64) and (66) implies that $\mathsf{P}\{\xi_{j\varepsilon}(t) \leq x\} \to \mathsf{P}\{\xi(t) \leq x\}$ as $\varepsilon \to 0, x \in V_t$. Since the set $V_t$ is dense in $R$, this relation implies that, for every $t > 0$ and given $j$ (for which relation (47) is assumed to hold),

$$\xi_{j\varepsilon}(t) \Rightarrow \xi(t) \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0. \tag{67}$$

The proof of statements ($\boldsymbol{\alpha}$) and ($\boldsymbol{\beta}$) formulated in Lemma 4 is complete.

As was mention above $\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t) - \xi'_{i\varepsilon}(t) \xrightarrow{\mathsf{P}} 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, for every $t \geq 0$, and, therefore, the weak convergence for the processes $\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t), t \geq 0$ and $\xi'_{i\varepsilon}(t), t \geq 0$ is equivalent.

The statement ($\boldsymbol{\gamma}$) follows directly from the definition of the sum-process $\xi'_{i\varepsilon}(t), t \geq 0$ since the random variables $\beta_i(n), n \geq 2$ are independent and identically distributed and $\xi'_{i\varepsilon}(t), t \geq 0$ is the homogeneous step sum-process with independent increments. As is known, the class of possible limiting processes (in the sense of weak convergence) for such step sum-process coincides with the class of stochastically continuous homogeneous processes with independent increments.

Moreover, as is known, the weak convergence of finite-dimensional distributions follows in this case from the weak convergence of one-dimensional distributions. The statements ($\boldsymbol{\delta}$) and ($\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$) follows, in an obvious way, from the following formula,

$$\mathsf{E}\exp\{-s\xi'_{i\varepsilon}(t)\} = \psi_i(s/u_\varepsilon)^{[tq_{i\varepsilon}^{-1}]}, \ s,t \geq 0, \ i \in X. \tag{68}$$

Indeed, (68) implies that, for given $t > 0$ and $i \in X$, the random variables $\xi'_{i\varepsilon}(t)$ converge weakly to some non-zero limiting random variable if and only if relation (48) holds and, in this case,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{E}\exp\{-s\xi'_{i\varepsilon}(t)\} &= \psi_i(s/u_\varepsilon)^{[tq_{i\varepsilon}^{-1}]} \\ &\sim \exp\{-(1-\psi_i(s/u_\varepsilon))tq_{i\varepsilon}^{-1}\} \\ &\to \exp\{-\varsigma(s)t\} \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0, \ s \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

where $\varsigma(s) > 0$ for $s > 0$.

Since, according the remarks above, the random variable $\xi(t)$ has, for every $t > 0$, an infinitely divisible distribution, and $\varsigma(s)t$ is the cumulant of this random variable. this proves the statement ($\boldsymbol{\zeta}$).

The proof of two last statements ($\boldsymbol{\eta}$) and ($\boldsymbol{\theta}$) of Lemma 4 are given in Lemma 6. □

**Remark 3.** The proof presented above shows that the only property of the quantities $q_{i\varepsilon}$ and $p_\varepsilon$, used in the proof of Lemma 4, is (**h**) $0 < q_{i\varepsilon}/\pi_i \sim p_\varepsilon \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0, \ i \in X$. Lemma 4 and its proof remain to be valid if any functions $q_{i\varepsilon}$ and $p_\varepsilon$, satisfying the assumption (**h**), would be used in the formulas (45) and (50) defining, respectively, the processes $\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t), t \geq 0$ and $\xi_{j\varepsilon}(t), t \geq 0$, and in the expression $(1-\psi_i(s/u_\varepsilon))/q_{i\varepsilon}$ used in the asymptotic relation (48). In this case, conditions **A** and **B** in Lemma 4 can be replaced by the simpler assumption (**h**) while condition **C** should remain.

The proof of Lemma 4 is based on the proposition about equivalence of weak convergence of the cyclic step sum-processes $\xi_{ji\varepsilon}(t)$, $t \geq 0$ introduced in (45) and the step sum-processes $\xi_{j\varepsilon}(t)$, $t \geq 0$ introduced in (50).

Let us now formulate the proposition about equivalence of the relation of weak convergence (52) for processes $\xi_{j\varepsilon}(t), t \geq 0$ and the following asymptotic relation formulated in terms of averaged Laplace transforms $\varphi(s)$,

$$\frac{1 - \varphi(s/u_\varepsilon)}{p_\varepsilon} \to \varsigma(s) \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0, \ s \geq 0, \tag{70}$$

where (**k**) $\varsigma(s) > 0$ for $s > 0$.

**Lemma 5.** *Let conditions* **B**, **C** *hold, and* $\eta_0 = j$. *Then*: ($\boldsymbol{\iota}$) *the relation of weak convergence* (47) *holds, for given* $i, j \in X$, *if and only if the relation of weak convergence* (52) *holds, for the same* $j$, ($\boldsymbol{\kappa}$) *the limiting process* $\xi(t), t \geq 0$ *is the same in relations* (47) *and* (52); ($\boldsymbol{\lambda}$) *the assumption that the relation of weak convergence* (52) *holds for some* $j \in X$ *implies that this relation holds for every* $j \in X$; ($\boldsymbol{\mu}$) *the limiting process* $\xi(t), t \geq 0$ *in* (52) *is the same for any* $j \in X$; ($\boldsymbol{\nu}$) $\xi(t), t \geq 0$ *is a non-zero and non-decreasing homogenous process with independent increments;* ($\boldsymbol{\xi}$) *relation* (52) *holds for given* $j \in X$ *if and only if relation* (70) *holds;* ($\boldsymbol{\pi}$) *the limiting function* $\varsigma(s)$ *in* (70) *is a cumulant of the process* $\xi(t), t \geq 0$, *i.e.* $\mathsf{E}e^{-s\xi(t)} = e^{-\varsigma(s)t}, \ s, t \geq 0$; ($\boldsymbol{\rho}$) *under condition* **D**, *conditions* $\mathbf{E}_\gamma$ *and* $\mathbf{F}_{a,\gamma}$ *are necessary and sufficient for relation* (70) *to hold;* ($\boldsymbol{\sigma}$) *cumulant* $\varsigma(s) = as^\gamma$ *in this case.*

*Proof.* The statements ($\boldsymbol{\iota}$) – ($\boldsymbol{\nu}$) have been already verified in the proof of Lemma 4.

Let us introduce conditional distribution functions for sojourn times $\varkappa_n$ for the semi-Markov process $\eta(t)$,

$$G_{ij}(t) = \mathsf{P}\{\varkappa_1 \leq t/\eta_0 = i, \eta_1 = j\}, \ t \geq 0, \ i, j \in X.$$

Obviously

$$Q_{ij}(t) = p_{ij}G_{ij}(t), \ t \geq 0, \ i, j \in X,$$

and

$$G_i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} Q_{ij}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} p_{ij}G_{ij}(t), \ t \geq 0, \ i, j \in X,$$

Note that one can choose $G_{ij}(t)$ as arbitrary distribution functions concentrated on the positive half-line if $p_{ij} = 0$. This does not affect transition probabilities $Q_{ij}(t)$ and distribution functions $G_i(t)$.

As is known from the theory of semi-Markov Processes that the sojourn times $\varkappa_n$ are conditionally independent with respect to the values of the imbedded Markov chain $\eta_n$. More precisely this means that, for any $t_1, \ldots, t_n \geq 0, i_0, i_1, \ldots, i_n, n = 1, 2, \ldots$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathsf{P}\{\varkappa_1 \leq t_1, \ldots, \varkappa_k \leq t_n/\eta_0 = i_0, \ldots, \eta_n = i_n\} \\ &\qquad = G_{i_0 i_1}(t_1) \times \cdots \times G_{i_{n-1} i_n}(t_n). \end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

As in the proof of Lemma 4, we assume that $\eta_0 = j$.

It follows from relation (71) that the process $\xi_{j\varepsilon}(t)$ has, for every $j \in X$, the same finite-dimensional distribution as the following process $\breve{\xi}_{j\varepsilon}(t)$ (we use the symbol $\stackrel{d}{=}$ to show this stochastic equality),

$$\xi_{j\varepsilon}(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{[tp(\varepsilon)^{-1}]} \frac{\varkappa_n}{u_\varepsilon}, t \geq 0 \stackrel{d}{=} \breve{\xi}_{j\varepsilon}(t),\ t \geq 0, \tag{72}$$

where

$$\breve{\xi}_{j\varepsilon}(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{[tp(\varepsilon)^{-1}]} \frac{\varkappa_n(\eta_{n-1}, \eta_n)}{u_\varepsilon},\ t \geq 0, \tag{73}$$

and

- ($\mathbf{i}_1$) $\{\eta_n, n = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ is a Markov chain with a state space $X$ and the matrix of transition probabilities $\|p_{ij}\|$;
- ($\mathbf{i}_2$) $\varkappa_n(i,j), i, j \in X, n \geq 1$ are mutually independent random variables;
- ($\mathbf{i}_3$) $\mathsf{P}\{\varkappa_n(i,j) \leq t\} = G_{ij}(t), t \geq 0$ for $i, j \in X$, $n \geq 1$;
- ($\mathbf{i}_4$) the set of random variables $\{\varkappa_n(i,j), i, j \in X, n \geq 1\}$ and the Markov chain $\{\eta_n, n = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ are independent.

It follows from the stochastic equality (72) that ($\mathbf{j}$) the relation of weak convergence (51), treated in Lemma 4, is equivalent to the following relation,

$$\breve{\xi}_{j\varepsilon}(t), t \geq 0 \Rightarrow \xi(t), t \geq 0 \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0, \tag{74}$$

where ($\mathbf{d}$) $\xi(t), t \geq 0$ is a non-zero and non-decreasing and stochastically continuous process with the initial value $\xi(0) = 0$.

Let us define, for every $j, i, k \in X$, the counting random variables for the random sequence $\bar{\eta}_n = (\eta_{n-1}, \eta_n), n = 1, 2, \ldots$,

$$\nu_{jn}(i,k) = \sum_{r=1}^{n} \chi\{(\eta_{r-1}, \eta_r) = (i,k)\},\ n = 0, 1, \ldots.$$

It follows from the defining properties ($\mathbf{i}_1$) - ($\mathbf{i}_4$) listed above that the process $\breve{\xi}_{j\varepsilon}(t)$ has, for every $j \in X$, the same finite-dimensional distribution as the following process $\tilde{\xi}_{j\varepsilon}(t)$,

$$\breve{\xi}_{j\varepsilon}(t), t \geq 0 \stackrel{d}{=} \tilde{\xi}_{j\varepsilon}(t),\ t \geq 0, \tag{75}$$

where

$$\tilde{\xi}_{j\varepsilon}(t) = \sum_{(i,k) \in \widetilde{X}} \sum_{n=1}^{\nu_{j[tp_\varepsilon^{-1}]}(i,k)} \frac{\varkappa_n(i,k)}{u_\varepsilon},\ t \geq 0. \tag{76}$$

and

$$\widetilde{X} = \{(i,k) \in X : p_{ik} > 0\}.$$

Note that the definition of the process $\tilde{\xi}_{j\varepsilon}(t)$ takes into account that random variables $\nu_{jn}(i,k) = 0, n = 0, 1, \ldots$ with probability 1 if $p_{ik} = 0$.

The stochastic equalities (72) and (75) let us replace the processes $\xi_{j\varepsilon}(t)$ by the processes $\tilde{\xi}_{j\varepsilon}(t)$ when studying their weak convergence.

It follows from the stochastic equality (75) that (**k**) the relation of weak convergence (51), treated in Lemma 5, is also equivalent to the following relation,

$$\tilde{\xi}_{j\varepsilon}(t), t \geq 0 \Rightarrow \xi(t), t \geq 0 \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0, \tag{77}$$

where (**d**) $\xi(t), t \geq 0$ is a non-zero and non-decreasing and stochastically continuous process with the initial value $\xi(0) = 0$.

Let us also introduce the following step sum-processes,

$$\hat{\xi}_{\varepsilon}(t) = \sum_{(i,k)\in \widetilde{X}} \sum_{n=1}^{[t\pi_i p_{ik} p_\varepsilon^{-1}]} \frac{\varkappa_n(i,k)}{u_\varepsilon}, \ t \geq 0. \tag{78}$$

We are also interested in the following relation of weak convergence,

$$\hat{\xi}_{\varepsilon}(t), \ t \geq 0 \Rightarrow \xi(t), \ t \geq 0 \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0, \tag{79}$$

where (**d**) $\xi(t), t \geq 0$ is a non-zero and non-decreasing and stochastically continuous process with the initial value $\xi(0) = 0$.

Let us prove the equivalence of relations (77) and (79). This means that (**l**) the relation (77) holds for some $j \in X$ if and only if the relation (79) holds, and, moreover, the limiting process can be taken the same in both relations.

We display the proof for one-dimensional distributions. The proof for multi-dimensional distributions is similar.

Let us prove that ($\mathbf{l}_1$) the assumption that relation (79), assumed to hold for every $t > 0$, implies that relation (77) holds for every $t > 0$ and $j \in X$, moreover the limiting random variable $\xi(t)$ can be taken the same in both relations.

The law of large numbers for ergodic Markov chains implies that, for every $t > 0$ and $j, i, k \in X$,

$$\frac{\nu_{j[tp(\varepsilon)^{-1}]}(i,k)}{p_\varepsilon^{-1}} \xrightarrow{\mathsf{P}} \pi_i p_{ik} t \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0. \tag{80}$$

Let us choose an arbitrary $t > 0$ and a sequence $0 < c_n < t, n = 1, 2, \ldots$ such that $c_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

The processes

$$\sum_{n=1}^{[tp_\varepsilon^{-1}]} \varkappa_n(i,k)/u_\varepsilon, \qquad t \geq 0$$

and $p_\varepsilon \nu_{j[tp_\varepsilon^{-1}]}(i,k), \ t \geq 0$ are non-negative and non-decreasing, for every $j, i, k \in X$. Taking into account this fact, and representation (76), we get, for every $t > 0$, $j \in X$, any real-valued $x$, and $n \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{P}\{\tilde{\xi}_{j\varepsilon}(t) > x\} &= \mathsf{P}\{\tilde{\xi}_{j\varepsilon}(t) > x, \bigcap_{(i,k)\in\widetilde{X}} A^{(\varepsilon)}_{jik}(t, t + c_n)\} \\ &+ \mathsf{P}\{\tilde{\xi}_{j\varepsilon}(t) > x, \bigcup_{(i,k)\in\widetilde{X}} \bar{A}^{(\varepsilon)}_{jik}(t, t + c_n)\} \\ &\leq \mathsf{P}\{\hat{\xi}_{\varepsilon}(t + c_n) > x\} \\ &+ \sum_{(i,k)\in\widetilde{X}} \mathsf{P}\{\bar{A}^{(\varepsilon)}_{jik}(t, t + c_n)\}, \end{aligned} \tag{81}$$

where

$$A^{(\varepsilon)}_{jik}(t, s) = \{\nu_{j[tp_\varepsilon^{-1}]}(i, j) \leq s\pi_i p_{ik} p_\varepsilon^{-1}\},\ t, s > 0,\ j, i, k \in X.$$

Note that (80) implies that, for every $0 < t < s$ and $j \in X$, $(i, k) \in \widetilde{X}$,

$$\mathsf{P}\{A^{(\varepsilon)}_{jik}(s, t)\} + \mathsf{P}\{\bar{A}^{(\varepsilon)}_{jik}(t, s)\} \to 0 \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0. \tag{82}$$

Let $Y_t$ be the set of continuity points for the distribution functions of the limiting random variables $\xi(t)$ and $\xi(t \pm c_n), n = 1, 2, \ldots$ in (79). This set is the real line $R$ except at most a countable set of points.

Using the estimate (81), relation (82), and the assumptions that relation (79) holds for one-dimensional distributions, for every $t > 0$, and that the limiting process $\xi(t)$ in (79) is stochastically continuous, we get, for every $t > 0$ and $j \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}} P\{\tilde{\xi}_{j\varepsilon}(t) > x\} &\leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \overline{\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}} (\mathsf{P}\{\hat{\xi}_{\varepsilon}(t + c_n) > x\} \\ &+ \sum_{(i,k)\in\widetilde{X}} \mathsf{P}\{\bar{A}^{(\varepsilon)}_{jik}(t, t + c_n)\}) \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} P\{\xi(t + c_n) > x\} \\ &= \mathsf{P}\{\xi(t) > x\},\ x \in Y_t, \end{aligned} \tag{83}$$

or, equivalently,

$$\underline{\lim}_{\varepsilon\to 0} \mathsf{P}\{\tilde{\xi}_{j\varepsilon}(t) \leq x\} \geq P\{\xi(t) \leq x\},\ x \in Y_t. \tag{84}$$

Similarly, we can get, for every $t > 0$ and $j \in X$,

$$\overline{\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}} P\{\tilde{\xi}_{j\varepsilon}(t) \leq x\} \leq \mathsf{P}\{\xi(t) \leq x\},\ x \in Y_t. \tag{85}$$

Relations (84) and (85) implies that $\mathsf{P}\{\tilde{\xi}_{j\varepsilon}(t) \leq x\} \to \mathsf{P}\{\xi(t) \leq x\}$ as $\varepsilon \to 0, x \in Y_t$, for every $j \in X$. Since the set $Y_t$ is dense in $R$, this relation implies that, for every $t > 0$ and $j \in X$,

$$\tilde{\xi}_{j\varepsilon}(t) \Rightarrow \xi(t) \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0. \tag{86}$$

We omit details in the proof of an inverse proposition that ($\mathbf{l}_2$) the assumption that relation (77), assumed to hold for every $t > 0$ and given $j \in X$, implies that relation (79) holds for every $t > 0$ and, moreover the limiting random variable $\xi(t)$ can be taken the same in both relations.

Let us choose an arbitrary $t > 0$ and a sequence $0 < d_n < t, n = 1, 2, \ldots$ such that $d_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

Analogously to (81), we get the following "inverse" to (81) estimate, for any every $t > 0$, real-valued $x$ and $n \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{P}\{\hat{\xi}_\varepsilon(t) > x\} &= \mathsf{P}\{\hat{\xi}_\varepsilon(t) > x, \bigcap_{(i,k)\in\widetilde{X}} \bar{A}^{(\varepsilon)}_{jik}(t + d_n, t)\} \\ &+ \mathsf{P}\{\hat{\xi}_\varepsilon(t) > x, \bigcup_{(i,k)\in\widetilde{X}} A^{(\varepsilon)}_{jik}(t + d_n, t)\} \\ &\leq \mathsf{P}\{\tilde{\xi}_{j\varepsilon}(t + d_n) > x\} \\ &+ \sum_{(i,k)\in\widetilde{X}} \mathsf{P}\{A^{(\varepsilon)}_{jik}(t + d_n, t)\}, \end{aligned} \tag{87}$$

Let $Z_t$ be the set of continuity points for the distribution functions of the limiting random variables $\xi(t)$ and $\xi(t \pm d_n), n = 1, 2, \ldots$ in (77). This set is the real line $R$ except at most a countable set of points.

Using the estimate (87), relation (82), and the assumptions that relation (77) holds for one-dimensional distributions, for every $t > 0$ and given $j \in X$, and that the limiting process $\xi(t)$ in (77) is stochastically continuous, we get, for every $t > 0$ and $x \in Z_t$,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}} P\{\hat{\xi}_\varepsilon(t) > x\} &\leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \overline{\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}} (\mathsf{P}\{\tilde{\xi}_{j\varepsilon}(t + d_n) > x\} \\ &+ \sum_{(i,k)\in\widetilde{X}} \mathsf{P}\{A^{(\varepsilon)}_{jik}(t + d_n, t)\}) \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} P\{\xi(t + d_n) > x\} \\ &= \mathsf{P}\{\xi(t) > x\}. \end{aligned} \tag{88}$$

The continuation of the proof for the proposition ($\mathbf{l}_2$) is analogous to those given above in the proof of the proposition ($\mathbf{l}_1$).

Let now introduce the step sum-process,

$$\breve{\xi}^*_\varepsilon(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{[tp(\varepsilon)^{-1}]} \frac{\varkappa^*_n(\eta'_n, \eta''_n)}{u_\varepsilon},\ t \geq 0, \tag{89}$$

where

($\mathbf{m}_1$) $\{\bar{\eta}^*_n = (\eta'_n, \eta''_n), n = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ a sequence of i.i.d. random vectors which takes values $(i, j)$ with probabilities $\pi_i p_{ij}$ for $i, j \in X$;

($\mathbf{m}_2$) $\varkappa^*_n(i, j), i, j \in X, n \geq 1$ are mutually independent random variables;

($\mathbf{m}_3$) $\mathsf{P}\{\varkappa_n^*(i,j) \leq t\} = G_{ij}(t), t \geq 0$ for $i,j \in X$, $n \geq 1$;

($\mathbf{m}_4$) the set of random variables $\{\varkappa_n^*(i,j), i,j \in X, n \geq 1\}$ and the random sequence $\{\bar{\eta}_n, n = 1,2,\ldots\}$ are independent.

We are interested in the following relation of weak convergence,

$$\breve{\xi}_\varepsilon^*(t),\ t \geq 0 \Rightarrow \xi(t),\ t \geq 0 \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0, \tag{90}$$

where ($\mathbf{d}$) $\xi(t), t \geq 0$ is a non-zero and non-decreasing and stochastically continuous process with the initial value $\xi(0) = 0$.

Let us define, for every $i,k \in X$, the counting random variables for the random sequence $\bar{\eta}_n^* = (\eta_n', \eta_n''), n = 1,2,\ldots$,

$$\nu_n^*(i,k) = \sum_{r=1}^{n} \chi\{(\eta_r', \eta_r'') = (i,k)\},\ n = 0,1,\ldots.$$

It follows from the defining properties ($\mathbf{m}_1$) - ($\mathbf{m}_4$) listed above that the process $\breve{\xi}_\varepsilon^*(t)$ has, for every $j \in X$, the same finite-dimensional distribution as the following process $\tilde{\xi}_\varepsilon^*(t)$,

$$\breve{\xi}_\varepsilon^*(t), t \geq 0 \ \stackrel{d}{=}\ \tilde{\xi}_\varepsilon^*(t),\ t \geq 0, \tag{91}$$

where

$$\tilde{\xi}_\varepsilon^*(t) = \sum_{(i,k) \in \widetilde{X}} \sum_{n=1}^{\nu^*_{[tp_\varepsilon^{-1}]}(i,k)} \frac{\varkappa_n^*(i,k)}{u_\varepsilon},\ t \geq 0. \tag{92}$$

It follows from stochastic equality (92) that ($\mathbf{n}$) the relation of weak convergence (90) is equivalent to the following relation,

$$\tilde{\xi}_\varepsilon^*(t),\ t \geq 0 \Rightarrow \xi(t),\ t \geq 0 \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0, \tag{93}$$

where ($\mathbf{d}$) $\xi(t), t \geq 0$ is a non-zero and non-decreasing and stochastically continuous process with the initial value $\xi(0) = 0$.

Let us also introduce the following step sum-processes,

$$\hat{\xi}_\varepsilon^*(t) = \sum_{(i,k) \in \widetilde{X}} \sum_{n=1}^{[t\pi_i p_{ik} p_\varepsilon^{-1}]} \frac{\varkappa_n^*(i,k)}{u_\varepsilon},\ t \geq 0. \tag{94}$$

Let us also consider the following relation of weak convergence,

$$\hat{\xi}_\varepsilon^*(t),\ t \geq 0 \Rightarrow \xi(t),\ t \geq 0 \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0, \tag{95}$$

where ($\mathbf{d}$) $\xi(t), t \geq 0$ is a non-zero and non-decreasing and stochastically continuous process with the initial value $\xi(0) = 0$.

We state that these relations (93) and (95) are equivalent. This means that ($\mathbf{o}$) the assumption that relation (93) holds if and only if relation (95), moreover the limiting stochastic process $\xi(t), t \geq 0$ can be taken the same in both relations.

By the definition, $\chi\{(\eta'_r, \eta''_r) = (i,k)\}$, $r = 1, 2, \ldots$ are i.i.d. random variables taking value 1 and 0 with probabilities $\pi_i p_{ik}$ and $1 - \pi_i p_{ik}$. Thus, by the standard weak law of large number, for every $t > 0$ and $i, k \in X$,

$$\frac{\nu^*_{[tp_\varepsilon^{-1}]}(i,k)}{p_\varepsilon^{-1}} \xrightarrow{\mathsf{P}} \pi_i p_{ik} t \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0. \tag{96}$$

The careful analysis of the proof of the proposition (**j**) about the equivalence of the relations of weak convergence (77), for processes $\tilde{\xi}_\varepsilon(t), t \geq 0$, and (79), for processes $\hat{\xi}_\varepsilon(t), t \geq 0$, shows that conditions ($\mathbf{i}_2$) - ($\mathbf{i}_4$) were used in this proof plus the asymptotic relation (80), which is a weak law of large numbers for the corresponding frequency random variables for the random sequence $\eta_n$. Condition ($\mathbf{i}_1$) was used together with condition **C** only as conditions providing the asymptotic relation (80).

These remarks let us state that the proof given for the proposition (**l**) can be just replicated in order to prove the proposition (**o**). Indeed, conditions ($\mathbf{m}_2$) - ($\mathbf{m}_4$) replace, in this case, conditions ($\mathbf{i}_2$) - ($\mathbf{i}_4$), and the asymptotic relation (96), implied by the condition ($\mathbf{m}_1$), replaces the asymptotic relation (80).

Now let us use the following stochastic equality that obviously follows from comparison of conditions ($\mathbf{i}_2$) - ($\mathbf{i}_4$) and ($\mathbf{m}_2$) - ($\mathbf{m}_4$),

$$\hat{\xi}_\varepsilon(t), t \geq 0 \stackrel{d}{=} \hat{\xi}^*_\varepsilon(t), \ t \geq 0. \tag{97}$$

The propositions (**l**) and (**o**) combined with the stochastic equalities (72), (75), (91), and (97) implies that (**p**) the assumption that relation of weak convergence (51), treated in Lemma 5, holds if and only if the relation (90) holds, moreover the limiting stochastic process $\xi(t)$ can be taken the same in both relations.

We are now in position to make the last step in the proof. Conditions ($\mathbf{m}_2$) - ($\mathbf{m}_4$) imply that $\varkappa^*_n(\eta'_n, \eta''_n), n = 1, 2, \ldots$ are i.i.d. random variables. Moreover, the corresponding distribution has the following form,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{P}\{\varkappa^*_1(\eta'_1, \eta''_1) \leq t\} &= \sum_{i,k \in X} G_{ik}(t) \pi_i p_{ik} \\ &= \sum_{i \in X} \pi_i \sum_{j \in X} G_{ik}(t) p_{ik} \\ &= \sum_{i \in X} \pi_i G_i(t) = G(t), \ t \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{98}$$

The statements ($\boldsymbol{\xi}$) and ($\boldsymbol{\pi}$) follows, in an obvious way, from the proposition (**p**). Indeed, $\breve{\xi}^*_\varepsilon(t), t \geq$ is the step sum-process based on i.i.d. random variables, and, therefore,

$$\mathsf{E}\exp\{-s\breve{\xi}^*_\varepsilon(t)\} = \varphi(s/u_\varepsilon)^{[tp_\varepsilon^{-1}]}, \ s, t \geq 0. \tag{99}$$

Relation (99) implies that, for given $t > 0$ the random variables $\breve{\xi}^*_\varepsilon(t)$ converge weakly to some non-zero limiting random variable if and only if relation (70) holds and, in this case,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{E}\exp\{-s\breve{\xi}^*_\varepsilon(t)\} &= \varphi(s/u_\varepsilon)^{[tp_\varepsilon^{-1}]} \\ &\sim \exp\{-(1-\varphi(s/u_\varepsilon))tp_\varepsilon^{-1}\} \\ &\to \exp\{-\varsigma(s)t\} \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0,\ s \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{100}$$

where $\varsigma(s) > 0$ for $s > 0$.

The random variable $\xi(t)$ has, for every $t > 0$, an infinitely divisible distribution, as a week limit of sums of i.i.d. random variables, and $\varsigma(s)t$ is the cumulant of $\xi(t)$.

The statements ($\boldsymbol{\rho}$) and ($\boldsymbol{\sigma}$) of Lemma 5 are proved in Lemma 6. □

**Remark 4.** The proof presented above shows that the only property of the quantities $p_\varepsilon$, used in the proof of Lemma 5, was (**r**) $0 < p_\varepsilon \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Lemma 5 and its proof remain to be valid if any function $p_\varepsilon$, satisfying the assumption (**r**), will be used in the formulas (45) and (50) defining, respectively, the process $\xi_{j\varepsilon}(t), t \geq 0$, and in the expression $(1-\varphi(s/u_\varepsilon))/p_\varepsilon$ used in the asymptotic relation (70). In this case, condition **B** in Lemma 5 can be replaced by the simpler assumption (**r**)

**Remark 5.** The proof presented above can be applied to any sum-process of conditionally independent random variables $\breve{\xi}^*_\varepsilon(t)$, $t \geq 0$ defined by formula (89) under the assumption that ($\mathbf{s}_1$) conditions ($\mathbf{m}_2$) - ($\mathbf{m}_4$) hold. Condition ($\mathbf{m}_1$) can be replaced by a general assumption that ($\mathbf{s}_2$) $\{\bar{\eta}^*_n = (\eta'_n, \eta''_n), n = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ is a sequence of random vectors taking values in the space $X \times X$ such that the weak law of large numbers in the form of the asymptotic relation (96). Also, ($\mathbf{s}_3$) the positivity of $\pi_i$ is not needed, and ($\mathbf{s}_4$) any function satisfying assumption (**r**) can be taken as $p_\varepsilon$. Under the assumptions ($\mathbf{s}_1$) - ($\mathbf{s}_4$), the asymptotic relation (70) is necessary and sufficient condition for weak convergence of processes $\breve{\xi}^*_\varepsilon(t), t \geq 0$. The limiting process is a non-negative homogeneous process with independent increments with the cumulant $\varsigma(s)$ which appears in (70). Moreover, under condition **D**, conditions $\mathbf{E}_\gamma$ and $\mathbf{F}_{a,\gamma}$ are necessary and sufficient for relation (70) to hold, and cumulant $\varsigma(s) = as^\gamma$ in this case.

In conclusion, let us make some bibliographical remarks concerned the solidarity statements formulated in Lemmas 4 and 5. It should be noted that the solidarity statements, similar to statements ($\boldsymbol{\iota}$) – ($\boldsymbol{\nu}$), given in Lemma 5, can be found, for example, in Loève (1955), Chung Kai Lai (1960), Pyke and Schanflie (1964), Silvestrov (1970, 1974), Silvestrov and Poleščuk (1974), and Pyke (1999).

However, other solidarity statements given in Lemmas 4 and 5 in the form of necessary and sufficient conditions imposed on cyclic or averaged characteristics, as well as their extensions formulated in Remarks 4 – 6, were not pointed out in the literature.

Let us now complete the proof of Theorem 1 and Lemmas 4 and 5, by clarifying the role of conditions $\mathbf{D}$, $\mathbf{E}_\gamma$ and $\mathbf{F}_{a,\gamma}$. In the main, Lemma 6 formulated below combines the statements known in the literature, in particular, those given in Feller (1966). Some new element is the form of conditions, which unites both the case of degenerated and stable convergence and give a convenient description of the balancing condition connecting functions $u_\varepsilon$ and $p_\varepsilon$.

Let introduce the step sum-process with i.i.d. random summands,

$$\xi_\varepsilon(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{[tp_\varepsilon^{-1}]} \xi_n/u_\varepsilon, \ t \geq 0.$$

where $\xi_n, n = 1, 2, \dots$ are i.i.d. non-negative random variables with the Laplace transform,

$$\mathsf{E}\exp\{-s\xi_1\} = \varphi(s) = \int_0^\infty e^{-st}G(dt), \ s \geq 0.$$

**Lemma 6.** *Let condition* $\mathbf{D}$ *holds. Then,* ($\boldsymbol{\tau}$) *the processes* $\xi_\varepsilon(t), t \geq 0$ *weakly converge to a non-zero and non-negative process if and only if relation* (70) *holds;* ($\boldsymbol{\upsilon}$) *the limiting process, is in this case, a non-negative homogeneous process with independent increments with the Laplace transform* $\mathsf{E}e^{-s\xi(t)} = e^{-\varsigma(s)t}$, $s, t \geq 0$*;* ($\boldsymbol{\phi}$) *conditions* $\mathbf{E}_\gamma$, $\mathbf{F}_{a,\gamma}$ *are necessary and sufficient for relation* (70) *to hold;* ($\boldsymbol{\chi}$) *the limiting cumulant in relation* (70) *takes, in this case, the form* $\varsigma(s) = as^\gamma$*, where* $0 < \gamma \leq 1$ *and* $a > 0$.

*Proof.* The statements ($\boldsymbol{\tau}$) and ($\boldsymbol{\upsilon}$) are well-known and, in fact, they are explained above, in (99) and (100).

Let $0 < \gamma \leq 1$, $a > 0$, and $L(t)$ is a slowly varying function. Let us introduce conditions:

$\mathbf{G}_\gamma$:: $1 - \varphi(s) \sim s^\gamma L(1/s)$ as $0 < s \to 0$;
$\mathbf{H}_{a,\gamma}$:: $\frac{L(u_\varepsilon)}{p_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon^\gamma} \to a$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

We shall use that ($\mathbf{t}$) conditions $\mathbf{G}_\gamma$ and $\mathbf{H}_{a,\gamma}$ are necessary and sufficient for relation (70) to hold. It should be noted that this proposition is known and we give its proof just to keep the text self-readable.

If these conditions holds, then for every $s > 0$,

$$\frac{1 - \varphi(s/u_\varepsilon)}{p_\varepsilon} \sim \frac{L(u_\varepsilon)}{p_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon^\gamma} \cdot s^\gamma \cdot \frac{L(u_\varepsilon/s)}{L(u_\varepsilon)} \to as^\gamma \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0. \tag{101}$$

On the other hand, let us assume that (70) hold. Define the auxiliary function $\widetilde{\varphi}(s) = 1 - \varphi(1/s)$. Function $\widetilde{\varphi}(s)$ is monotonically decreasing. Due to $\mathbf{D}$, there exists $\varepsilon_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ such that $p_{\varepsilon_n}/p_{\varepsilon_{n+1}} \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$. Relation (70) implies that, $p_{\varepsilon_n}^{-1}\widetilde{\varphi}(u_{\varepsilon_n}s) \to \varsigma(1/s) > 0$ as $n \to \infty$, for $s > 0$. Thus, by known criterium (see, for example, Feller (1966)), function $\widetilde{\varphi}(s)$

regularly varies, i.e. $\widetilde{\varphi}(s) = s^\rho L(s)$, where $L(s)$ is a slowly varying function, and $\varsigma(1/s) = as^\rho$, where $-\infty < \rho < +\infty$ and $a$ is a positive constant. The representations can be re-written in the following equivalent form,

$$1 - \varphi(s) = s^\gamma L(1/s), \ \varsigma(s) = as^\gamma, s > 0, \tag{102}$$

where $-\infty < \gamma = \rho^{-1} < \infty$ and $a > 0$. Since function $e^{-\varsigma(s)} = e^{-as^\gamma}$ should be a Laplace transform of some non-negative and non-zero random variable, the only values $0 < \gamma \leq 1$ are admissible. In this case $e^{-as^\gamma}$ is the Laplace transform of the non-negative stable law with parameter $\gamma$. The cases $\gamma \leq 0$ should be obviously excluded. The case $\gamma > 1$ should be also excluded since for any non-negative and non-zero random variable $\xi$ the corresponding Laplace transform $\mathsf{E}e^{-s\xi} \geq e^{-s\delta}\mathsf{P}\{\xi \leq \delta\}$. Therefore, $\mathsf{E}e^{-s\xi}$ can not decline in $s$ with the super-exponential rate $e^{-as^\gamma}$.

The condition $\mathbf{G}_\gamma$ follows from (102). To verify condition $\mathbf{H}_{a,\gamma}$, we should just repeat the calculations given in (101), based on the assumed relation (70) and proved representation (102). Relation (101) coincides with condition $\mathbf{H}_{a,\gamma}$ if $s = 1$.

Let us now show that ($\mathbf{u}$) conditions $\mathbf{G}_\gamma$ and $\mathbf{H}_{a,\gamma}$ are equivalent to conditions $\mathbf{E}_\gamma$ and $\mathbf{F}_{a,\gamma}$.

We first consider the case $\gamma = 1$. To simplify notations let us write

$$\xi_{n\varepsilon} = \xi_n/u_\varepsilon.$$

The case $\gamma = 1$ corresponds to situation when limiting process

$$\xi(t) = at, \qquad t \geq 0,$$

is a non-random linear function. According to the central criterium of convergence for the sums of i.i.d. random variables (see, for example, Loève 1955), the necessary and sufficient conditions for weak convergence of such sums (which automatically are equivalent to $\mathbf{G}_1$ and $\mathbf{H}_{a,1}$) have the following form,

**I:** : $p_\varepsilon^{-1}\mathsf{P}\{\xi_{1\varepsilon} > u\} \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, $u > 0$;
**J:** : $p_\varepsilon^{-1}\mathsf{E}\xi_{1\varepsilon}\chi(\xi_{1\varepsilon} \leq v) \to a$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, for some $v > 0$.

Note that under condition **I**, condition **J** either holds or not simultaneously for all $v > 0$. Indeed, **I** implies that $p_\varepsilon^{-1}\mathsf{E}\xi_{1\varepsilon}\chi(v' < \xi_{1\varepsilon} \leq v'') \leq v'p_\varepsilon^{-1}\mathsf{P}\{\xi_{1\varepsilon} > v'\} \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, for any $0 < v' < v'' < \infty$. Taking into account this remark we can transform conditions **I** and **J** in the following equivalent form,

**I′**:: $\mathsf{P}\{\xi_{1\varepsilon} > u\}/\mathsf{E}\xi_{1\varepsilon}\chi(\xi_{1\varepsilon} \leq u) \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0, \ u > 0$;
**J′**:: $p_\varepsilon^{-1}\mathsf{E}\xi_{1\varepsilon}\chi(\xi_{1\varepsilon} \leq 1) \to a$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

It is easy to check that $\mathsf{P}\{\xi_{1\varepsilon} > u\} = 1 - G(uu_\varepsilon)$ and $\mathsf{E}\xi_{1\varepsilon}\chi(\xi_{1\varepsilon} \leq u) = \int_0^{uu_\varepsilon} sG(ds)/u_\varepsilon$. Thus, conditions **I′** and **J″** can be rewritten as,

**I′**: : $u_\varepsilon(1 - G(uu_\varepsilon))/\int_0^{uu_\varepsilon} sdG(s) \to 0$, as $\varepsilon \to 0, \ u > 0$;
**J′**: : $\int_0^{u_\varepsilon} sG(ds)/(p_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon) \to a$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

Condition $\mathbf{J}'$ is identical to $\mathbf{F}_{a,1}$. Condition $\mathbf{E}_1$ implies $\mathbf{I}'$ that easily seen by setting $y = uu_\varepsilon$ in $\mathbf{E}_1$. It remains to show that $\mathbf{I}'$ implies $\mathbf{E}_1$.

Since $u_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{W}$, there exists sequence $0 < \varepsilon_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ such that $u_{\varepsilon_{n+1}}/u_{\varepsilon_n} \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$. For any $t, u > 0$ we define $n(t) = \max(n : uu_{\varepsilon_n} \leq t)$. By the definition, $(\mathbf{w}_1)$ $uu_{\varepsilon_{n(t)}} \leq t < uu_{\varepsilon_{n(t)+1}}$ for $t > 0$, and $(\mathbf{w}_2)$ $n(t) \to \infty$ as $t \to \infty$. Thus, $(\mathbf{w}_3)$ $u_{\varepsilon_{n(t)+1}}/u_{\varepsilon_{n(t)}} \to 1$ as $t \to \infty$. Using $\mathbf{I}'$ and $(\mathbf{w}_1)$ - $(\mathbf{w}_3)$ we get,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{t(1 - G(t))}{\int_0^t sG(ds)} &\leq \frac{uu_{\varepsilon_{n(t)+1}}(1 - G(uu_{\varepsilon_{n(t)}}))}{\int_0^{uu_{\varepsilon_{n(t)}}} sG(ds)} \\
&= \frac{u_{\varepsilon_{n(t)+1}}}{u_{\varepsilon_{n(t)}}} \cdot \frac{uu_{\varepsilon_{n(t)}}(1 - G(uu_{\varepsilon_{n(t)}}))}{\int_0^{uu_{\varepsilon_{n(t)}}} sG(ds)} \\
&\to 0 \text{ as } t \to \infty. \qquad (103)
\end{aligned}
$$

Let us now consider the case $0 < \gamma < 1$. Due to the corresponding Tauberian theorem (see, for example, Feller (1966)), condition $\mathbf{G}_\gamma$ is equivalent to the condition,

$\mathbf{K}_\gamma$**::** $1 - G(t) \sim \frac{t^{-\gamma}L(t)}{\Gamma(1-\gamma)}$ as $t \to \infty$.

Due to the corresponding theorem about regularly varying functions (see, for example, Feller (1966)) condition $\mathbf{K}$ is equivalent to the following condition,

$\mathbf{K}'_\gamma$**::** $t[1 - G(t)]/\int\limits_0^t [1 - G(s)]ds \to 1 - \gamma$ as $t \to \infty$.

Since $\int\limits_0^t [1 - G(s)]ds = t[1 - G(t)] + \int\limits_0^t sG(ds), t \geq 0$, condition $\mathbf{K}'_\gamma$ can be re-written in the following equivalent form,

$\mathbf{K}''_\gamma$**::** $t[1 - G(t)]/\int\limits_0^t sG(s)ds \to \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma}$ as $t \to \infty$.

Condition $\mathbf{K}''_\gamma$ is identical to condition $\mathbf{E}_\gamma$. Let us show that under condition $\mathbf{E}_\gamma$, conditions $\mathbf{F}_{a,\gamma}$ and $\mathbf{H}_{a,\gamma}$ are equivalent. Indeed, $\mathbf{K}_\gamma$ and $\mathbf{K}''_\gamma$ (equivalent to $\mathbf{E}_\gamma$) imply the following asymptotic relation,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\int\limits_0^{u_\varepsilon} sG(ds)}{p_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon} &\sim \frac{u_\varepsilon(1 - G(u_\varepsilon))}{u_\varepsilon p_\varepsilon} \cdot \frac{\gamma}{1 - \gamma} \\
&\sim \frac{L(u_\varepsilon)}{p_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon^\gamma \Gamma(1 - \gamma)} \cdot \frac{\gamma}{1 - \gamma} \\
&= \frac{L(u_\varepsilon)}{p_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon^\gamma} \cdot \frac{\gamma}{\Gamma(2 - \gamma)} \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0. \qquad (104)
\end{aligned}
$$

This completes the proof. □

**Remark 6.** The proof of Lemma 6 can be applied in the same way to the asymptotic relation (48). Thus, under condition **D**, conditions $\mathbf{E}_\gamma$ and $\mathbf{F}_{a,\gamma}$ (with replacement of function $p_\varepsilon$ by $q_{i\varepsilon}$ in these conditions), imposed on distribution of the random variable $\beta_i$, are necessary and sufficient for relation (48) to hold.

**Remark 7.** As follows from the proof presented above, the assumption $(\mathbf{x}_1)$ $u_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{W}$ can be omitted in the statements of necessity in Lemma 6; the assumption $(\mathbf{x}_2)$ $p_\varepsilon^{-1} \in \mathbb{W}$ in the statement of sufficiency in Lemma 6, for the case $\gamma = 1$; and the assumption $(\mathbf{x}_3)$ $u_\varepsilon, p_\varepsilon^{-1} \in \mathbb{W}$, i.e. condition **D**, in the statement of sufficiency in Lemma 6, for the case $0 < \gamma < 1$. In sequel, these assumptions can be omitted in the corresponding statements in and in Lemmas 4-5 and Theorem 1.

**Remark 8.** The simplest variant for normalization functions is when

$$u_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-1}.$$

In this case, due to condition $\mathbf{H}_{a,\gamma}$, function

$$p_\varepsilon^{-1} = \frac{a\varepsilon^{-\gamma}}{L(\varepsilon^{-1})}.$$

Both functions belong to the class $\mathbb{W}$. In this case, condition **D** can me omitted in Lemmas 4-6 and Theorem 1.

**Remark 9.** As follows from the proof of Lemma 6, conditions $\mathbf{E}_\gamma$, and $\mathbf{F}_{a,\gamma}$ can be replaced in Lemmas 4-6 and Theorem 1 by the equivalent conditions $\mathbf{G}_\gamma$, and $\mathbf{H}_{a,\gamma}$.

**Remark 10.** In the case $0 < \gamma < 1$, condition $\mathbf{E}_\gamma$ is equivalent to the condition $\mathbf{K}_\gamma$ which means that the distribution $G(t)$ belongs to the domain of attraction of the stable law with the parameter $\gamma$. In the case $\gamma = 1$, the condition $\mathbf{E}_1$ is necessary and sufficient condition for the distribution $G(t)$ to belong to the domain of attraction of the degenerated law, as it was given, for example, in Feller (1966). In both cases, Lemma 6 just unifies these conditions for both cases and gives a convenient form for the additional balancing condition that should connect the normalization function $u_\varepsilon$ and the function $p_\varepsilon^{-1}$ determining the number of summands in the sum $\xi_\varepsilon(t)$.

**Remark 11.** The specific Markov property (1) possessed by the Markov renewal process $(\eta_n, \varkappa_n, \zeta_n)$ implies in an obvious way that

$$(\mathbf{y}) \qquad \mathsf{P}_i\{\varkappa_{\nu_\varepsilon} > t\} = \sum_{j \in X} \mathsf{P}_i\{\eta_{\nu_\varepsilon - 1} = j\}\mathsf{P}_j\{\varkappa_1 > t/\zeta_1 \in D_\varepsilon\}.$$

It follows from $(\mathbf{y})$ that, under condition **A** for any normalization $u_\varepsilon$,

$$(\mathbf{z}) \qquad \text{the random variables} \quad \varkappa_{\nu_\varepsilon}/u_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{\mathsf{P}} 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0.$$

This relation implies that the first-rare-event times $\xi_\varepsilon = \sum_{n=1}^{\nu_\varepsilon} \varkappa_n$ can be replaced in Theorem 1 by the modified first-rare-event times $\xi'_\varepsilon = \sum_{n=1}^{\nu_\varepsilon - 1} \varkappa_n$ and, moreover, by any random variable $\xi''_\varepsilon$ such that $\xi'_\varepsilon \le \xi''_\varepsilon \le \xi_\varepsilon$.

## References


1. Aldous, D.J. (1982) Markov chains with almost exponential hitting times. Stoch. Proces. Appl., **13**, 305–310
2. Alimov, D., Shurenkov, V.M. (1990a) Markov renewal theorems in triangular array model. Ukr. Mat. Zh., **42**, 1443–1448 (English translation in Ukr. Math. J., **42**, 1283–1288)
3. Alimov, D., Shurenkov, V.M. (1990b) Asymptotic behavior of terminating Markov processes that are close to ergodic. Ukr. Mat. Zh., **42**, 1701–1703 (English translation in Ukr. Math. J., **42** 1535–1538)
4. Anisimov, V.V. (1971a) Limit theorems for sums of random variables on a Markov chain, connected with the exit from a set that forms a single class in the limit. Teor. Veroyatn. Mat. Stat., **4**, 3–17 (English translation in Theory Probab. Math. Statist., **4**, 1–13)
5. Anisimov, V.V. (1971b) Limit theorems for sums of random variables in array of sequences defined on a subset of states of a Markov chain up to the exit time. Teor. Veroyatn. Mat. Stat., **4**, 18–26 (English translation in Theory Probab. Math. Statist., **4**, 15–22)
6. Anisimov, V.V. (1988) Random Processes with Discrete Components. Vys- shaya Shkola and Izdatel'stvo Kievskogo Universiteta, Kiev
7. Anisimov, V.V., Zakusilo, O.K. and Donchenko, V.S. (1987) Elements of Queueing and Asymptotical Analysis of Systems. Lybid', Kiev
8. Brown, M., Shao, Y. (1987) Identifying coefficients in spectral representation for first passage-time distributions. Prob. Eng. Inf. Sci. **1** 69–74
9. Chung, Kai Lai (1960) Markov Chains with Stationary Transition Probabilities. Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences, **104**, Springer, Berlin
10. Darroch, J., Seneta, E. (1965) On quasi-stationary distributions in absorbing discrete-time finite Markov chains. J. Appl. Probab., **2**, 88–100
11. Darroch, J., Seneta, E. (1967) On quasi-stationary distributions in absorbing continuous-time finite Markov chains. J. Appl. Probab., **4**, 192–196
12. Eleĭko, Ya.I., Shurenkov, V.M. (1995) Transient phenomena in a class of matrix-valued stochastic evolutions. Teor. Ĭmorvirn. Mat. Stat., **52**, 72–76 (English translation in Theory Probab. Math. Statist., **52**, 75–79)
13. Feller, W. (1966, 1971) An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications, Vol. II. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics, Wiley, New York
14. Gusak, D.V., Korolyuk, V.S. (1971) Asymptotic behaviour of semi-Markov processes with a decomposable set of states. Teor. Veroyatn. Mat. Stat., **5**, 43–50 (English translation in Theory Probab. Math. Statist., **5**, 43–51)
15. Gut, A., Holst, L. (1984) On the waiting time in a generalized roulette game. Statist. Probab. Lett., **2**, No. 4, 229–239
16. Gyllenberg, M., Silvestrov, D.S. (1999) Quasi-stationary phenomena for semi-Markov processes. In: Janssen, J., Limnios, N. (eds) Semi-Markov Models and Applications. Kluwer, Dordrecht, 33–60
17. Gyllenberg, M., Silvestrov, D.S. (2000a) Nonlinearly perturbed regenerative processes and pseudo-stationary phenomena for stochastic systems. Stoch. Proces. Appl., **86**, 1–27
18. Gyllenberg, M., Silvestrov, D.S. (2000b) Cramér–Lundberg approximation for nonlinearly perturbed risk processes. Insurance: Math. Econom., **26**, 75–90
19. Hassin, R., Haviv, M. (1992) Mean passage times and nearly uncoupled Markov chains. SIAM J. Disc Math., **5**, 386–397
20. Iglehart, D.L. (1969). Diffusion approximation in collective risk theory. J. Appl. Probab., **6**, 285–292

21. Kaplan, E.I. (1979) Limit theorems for exit times of random sequences with mixing. Teor. Veroyatn. Mat. Stat., **21**, 53–59 (English translation in Theory Probab. Math. Statist., **21**, 59–65)
22. Kartashov, N.V. (1987) Estimates for the geometric asymptotics of Markov times on homogeneous chains. Teor. Veroyatn. Mat. Stat., **37**, 66–77 (English translation in Theory Probab. Math. Statist., **37**, 75–88)
23. Kartashov, N.V. (1991) Inequalities in Renyi's theorem. Theory Probab. Math. Statist., **45**, 23–28
24. Kartashov, N.V. (1995) Strong Stable Markov Chains, VSP, Utrecht and TBiMC, Kiev
25. Keilson, J. (1966) A limit theorem for passage times in ergodic regenerative processes. Ann. Math. Statist., **37**, 866–870
26. Keilson, J. (1978) Markov Chain Models – Rarity and Exponentiality. Applied Mathematical Sciences, **28**, Springer, New York
27. Kijima, M. (1997) Markov Processes for Stochastic Modelling. Stochastic Modeling Series. Chapman & Hall, London
28. Kingman, J.F. (1963) The exponential decay of Markovian transition probabilities. Proc. London Math. Soc., **13**, 337–358
29. Korolyuk, D.V., Silvestrov D.S. (1983) Entry times into asymptotically receding domains for ergodic Markov chains. Teor. Veroyatn. Primen., **28**, 410–420 (English translation in Theory Probab. Appl., **28**, 432–442)
30. Korolyuk, D.V., Silvestrov D.S. (1984) Entry times into asymptotically receding regions for processes with semi-Markov switchings. Teor. Veroyatn. Primen., **29**, 539–544 (English translation in Theory Probab. Appl., **29**, 558–563)
31. Korolyuk, V.S. (1969) On asymptotical estimate for time of a semi-Markov process being in the set of states. Ukr. Mat. Zh., **21**, 842–845
32. Korolyuk, V.S., Korolyuk, V.V. (1999) Stochastic Models of Systems. Mathematics and its Applications, **469**, Kluwer, Dordrecht
33. Korolyuk, V.S., Turbin, A.F. (1970) On the asymptotic behaviour of the occupation time of a semi-Markov process in a reducible subset of states. Teor. Veroyatn. Mat. Stat., **2**, 133–143 (English translation in Theory Probab. Math. Statist., **2**, 133–143)
34. Korolyuk, V.S., Turbin, A.F. (1976) Semi-Markov Processes and its Applications. Naukova Dumka, Kiev
35. Korolyuk, V.S., Turbin, A.F. (1978) Mathematical Foundations of the State Lumping of Large Systems. Naukova Dumka, Kiev (English edition: Mathematics and its Applications, **264**, Kluwer, Dordrecht (1993))
36. Korolyuk, V.S., Turbin, A.F. (1982) Markov Renewal Processes in Problems of System Reliability. Naukova Dumka, Kiev
37. Kovalenko, I.N. (1973) An algorithm of asymptotic analysis of a sojourn time of Markov chain in a set of states. Dokl. Acad. Nauk Ukr. SSR, Ser. A, No. 6, 422–426
38. Latouch, G., Louchard, G. (1978) Return times in nearly decomposible stochastic processes. J. Appl. Probab., **15**, 251–267
39. Loève, M. (1955, 1963) Probability Theory. Van Nostrand, Toronto and Princeton
40. Masol, V.I., Silvestrov, D.S. (1972) Record values of the occupation time of a semi-Markov process. Visnik Kiev. Univ., Ser. Mat. Meh., **14**, 81–89
41. Motsa, A.I., Silvestrov, D.S. (1996) Asymptotics of extremal statistics and functionals of additive type for Markov chains. In: Klesov, O., Korolyuk,

V., Kulldorff, G., Silvestrov, D. (eds) Proceedings of the First Ukrainian–Scandinavian Conference on Stochastic Dynamical Systems, Uzhgorod, 1995. Theory Stoch. Proces., **2(18)**, No. 1-2, 217–224

42. Pyke, R. (1999) The solidarity of Markov renewal processes. In: Janssen, J., Limnios, N. (eds) Semi-Markov Models and Applications. Kluwer, Dordrecht, 3–21
43. Pyke, R., Schanflie, R. (1964) Limit theorems for Markov renewal processes. Ann. Math. Statist., **35**, 1746–1764
44. Shurenkov, V.M. (1980a) Transition phenomena of the renewal theory in asymptotical problems of theory of random processes 1. Mat. Sbornik, **112**, 115–132 (English translation in Math. USSR: Sbornik, **40**, No. 1, 107–123 (1981))
45. Shurenkov, V.M. (1980b) Transition phenomena of the renewal theory in asymptotical problems of theory of random processes 2. Mat. Sbornik, **112**, 226–241 (English translation in Math. USSR: Sbornik, **40**, No. 2, 211–225 (1981))
46. Silvestrov, D.S. (1970) Limit theorems for semi-Markov processes and their applications. 1, 2. Teor. Veroyatn. Mat. Stat., **3**, 155–172, 173–194 (English translation in Theory Probab. Math. Statist., **3**, 159–176, 177–198)
47. Silvestrov, D.S. (1971) Limit theorems for semi-Markov summation schemes. 1. Teor. Veroyatn. Mat. Stat., **4**, 153–170 (English translation in Theory Probab. Math. Statist., **4**, 141–157)
48. Silvestrov, D.S. (1974) Limit Theorems for Composite Random Functions. Vysshaya Shkola and Izdatel'stvo Kievskogo Universiteta, Kiev
49. Silvestrov, D.S. (1980) Semi-Markov Processes with a Discrete State Space. Library for an Engineer in Reliability, Sovetskoe Radio, Moscow
50. Silvestrov, D.S. (1981) Theorems of large deviations type for entry times of a sequence with mixing. Teor. Veroyatn. Mat. Stat., **24**, 129–135 (English translation in Theory Probab. Math. Statist., **24**, 145–151)
51. Silvestrov, D.S. (1995) Exponential asymptotic for perturbed renewal equations. Teor. Ǐmovirn. Mat. Stat., **52**, 143–153 (English translation in Theory Probab. Math. Statist., **52**, 153–162)
52. Silvestrov, D.S. (2000a) Nonlinearly perturbed Markov chains and large deviations for lifetime functionals. In: Limnios, N., Nikulin, M. (eds) Recent Advances in Reliability Theory: Methodology, Practice and Inference. Birkhäuser, Boston, 135–144
53. Silvestrov, D.S. (2000b) Perturbed renewal equation and diffusion type approximation for risk processes. Teor. Ǐmovirn. Mat. Stat., **62**, 134–144 (English translation in Theory Probab. Math. Statist., **62**, 145–156)
54. Silvestrov D.S. (2004) Limit Theorems for Randomly Stopped Stochastic Processes, Springer, London
55. Silvestrov, D.S., Abadov, Z.A. (1991) Uniform asymptotic expansions for exponential moments of sums of random variables defined on a Markov chain and distributions of entry times. 1. Teor. Veroyatn. Mat. Stat., **45**, 108–127 (English translation in Theory Probab. Math. Statist., **45**, 105–120)
56. Silvestrov, D.S., Abadov, Z.A. (1993) Uniform representations of exponential moments of sums of random variables defined on a Markov chain, and of distributions of passage times. 2. Teor. Veroyatn. Mat. Stat., **48**, 175–183 (English translation in Theory Probab. Math. Statist., **48**, 125–130)
57. Silvestrov, D.S., Poleščuk V.S. (1974) Cyclic conditions for the convergence of sums of random variables defined on a recurrent Markov chain. Dokl. Acad. Nauk Ukr. SSR, Ser. A, No. 9, 790–792

58. Silvestrov, D.S., Velikii, Yu.A. (1988) Necessary and sufficient conditions for convergence of attainment times. In: Zolotarev, V.M., Kalashnikov, V.V. (eds) Stability Problems for Stochastic Models. Trudy Seminara, VNIISI, Moscow, 129–137 (English translation in J. Soviet. Math., **57**, 3317–3324 (1991))
59. Simon, H.A., Ando, A. (1961) Aggregation of variables in dynamic systems. Econometrica, **29**, 111–138
60. Turbin, A.F. (1971) On asymptotic behavior of time of a semi-Markov process being in a reducible set of states. Linear case. Teor. Verotatn. Mat. Stat., **4**, 179–194 (English translation in Theory Probab. Math. Statist., **4**, 167–182)
61. Zakusilo, O.K. (1972a) Thinning semi-Markov processes. Teor. Veroyatn. Mat. Stat., **6**, 54–59 (English translation in Theory Probab. Math. Statist., **6**, 53–58)
62. Zakusilo, O.K. (1972b) Necessary conditions for convergence of semi-Markov processes that thin. Teor. Veroyatn. Mat. Stat., **7**, 65–69 (English translation in Theory Probab. Math. Statist., **7**, 63–66)

Department of Mathematics and Physics, Mälardalen University, Box 883, SE-721 23 Västerås, Sweden
*E-mail address*: dmitrii.silvestrov@mdh.se

*E-mail address*: myroslav.drozdenko@mdh.se