Combinatorics, Probability and Computing (2013) 22, 161–183. © Cambridge University Press 2013
doi:10.1017/S0963548312000594

The Compensation Approach for Walks With Small Steps in the Quarter Plane

IVO J. B. F. ADAN,[1] JOHAN S. H. van LEEUWAARDEN[1]
and KILIAN RASCHEL[2]

[1]Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Eindhoven University of Technology,
PO Box 513, 5600 MB Eindhoven, The Netherlands
(e-mail: i.j.b.f.adan@tue.nl, j.s.h.v.leeuwaarden@tue.nl)
[2]CNRS and Université de Tours, Faculté des Sciences et Techniques,
Parc de Grandmont, 37200 Tours, France
(e-mail: kilian.raschel@lmpt.univ-tours.fr)

Received 3 January 2011; revised 27 November 2012; first published online 11 January 2013

This paper is the first application of the compensation approach (a well-established theory in probability theory) to counting problems. We discuss how this method can be applied to a general class of walks in the quarter plane $\mathbb{Z}_+^2$ with a step set that is a subset of

$$\{(-1,1),(-1,0),(-1,-1),(0,-1),(1,-1)\}$$

in the interior of $\mathbb{Z}_+^2$. We derive an explicit expression for the generating function which turns out to be non-holonomic, and which can be used to obtain exact and asymptotic expressions for the counting numbers.

AMS 2010 *Mathematics subject classification*: Primary 05A15
Secondary 05A16

1. Introduction

In the field of enumerative combinatorics, counting walks on a lattice is among the most classical topics. While counting problems have been largely resolved for unrestricted walks on $\mathbb{Z}^2$, walks that are confined to the quarter plane $\mathbb{Z}_+^2$ still pose considerable challenges. In recent years, much progress has been made, in particular for walks in the quarter plane with small steps, which means that the step set $\mathcal{S}$ is a subset of $\{(i,j) : |i|,|j| \leqslant 1\} \setminus \{(0,0)\}$. Bousquet-Mélou and Mishna [7] constructed a thorough classification of these models. By definition, there are 2^8 such models, but after eliminating trivial cases and exploiting equivalences, it is shown in [7] that there are 79 inherently different problems that need to be studied. Let $q_{i,j,k}$ denote the number of paths in $\mathbb{Z}_+^2$ having length k, starting from

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548312000594 Published online by Cambridge University Press

$(0,0)$ and ending in (i,j), and define the generating function (GF) as

$$Q(x,y;z) = \sum_{i,j,k=0}^{\infty} q_{i,j,k} x^i y^j z^k. \tag{1.1}$$

There are then two key challenges:

(i) Finding an explicit expression for $Q(x,y;z)$.

(ii) Determining the nature of $Q(x,y;z)$: Is it holonomic, *i.e.*, is the vector space over $\mathbb{C}(x,y,z)$ – the field of rational functions in the three variables x,y,z – spanned by the set of all derivatives of $Q(x,y;z)$ finite-dimensional (see [11, Appendix B.4])? And in that event, is it algebraic, or even rational?

The common approach to addressing these challenges is to start from a functional equation for the GF, which for the walks with small steps takes the form (see [7, Section 4])

$$K(x,y;z)Q(x,y;z) = A(x)Q(x,0;z) + B(y)Q(0,y;z) - \delta Q(0,0;z) - xy/z, \tag{1.2}$$

where K, A and B are polynomials of degree two in x and/or y, and δ is a constant. For $z = 1/|\mathcal{S}|$, (1.2) belongs to the generic class of functional equations (arising in the probabilistic context of *random* walks) studied and solved in the book by Fayolle, Iasnogorodski and Malyshev [8]. For general values of z, the analysis of (1.2) for the 79 above-mentioned models has been carried out by Raschel and Kurkova [13, 18], who have settled challenge (i).

In order to describe the results regarding challenge (ii), it is worth to define the *group of the walk*, a notion introduced by Malyshev [15]. This is the group of birational transformations $W = \langle \xi, \eta \rangle$, with

$$\xi(x,y) = \left(x, \frac{1}{y} \frac{\sum_{(i,-1)\in\mathcal{S}} x^i}{\sum_{(i,+1)\in\mathcal{S}} x^i} \right), \quad \eta(x,y) = \left(\frac{1}{x} \frac{\sum_{(-1,j)\in\mathcal{S}} y^j}{\sum_{(+1,j)\in\mathcal{S}} y^j}, y \right), \tag{1.3}$$

which leaves invariant the function $\sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{S}} x^i y^j$. Clearly, $\xi \circ \xi = \eta \circ \eta = \mathrm{id}$, and W is a dihedral group of even order larger than or equal to four.

Challenge (ii) is now resolved for all 79 problems. It was first solved for the 23 models that have a finite group. The nature of the GF (as a function of the three variables x,y,z) was determined in [7] for 22 of these 23 models: 19 models turn out to have a GF that is holonomic but non-algebraic, while 3 models have a GF that is algebraic. For the 23rd model, defined by $\mathcal{S} = \{(-1,0),(-1,-1),(1,0),(1,1)\}$ and known as *Gessel's walk*, it was proved in [6] that $Q(x,y;z)$ is algebraic. Alternative proofs for the nature of the GF for these 23 problems have been given in [9]. For the remaining 56 models, which all have an infinite group, it was first shown that 5 of them (called singular) have a non-holonomic GF: see [16, 17]. Bousquet-Mélou and Mishna [7] have conjectured that the 51 other models also have a non-holonomic GF. Partial evidence was provided in [5, 18], and the proof was recently given in [14].

In this paper we consider walks on $\mathbb{Z}_+^2$ with small steps that do not fall into the class considered in [7]. The classification in [7] builds on the assumption that the steps on the boundaries are the same steps (if possible) as those in the interior. However, when the behaviour on the boundaries is allowed to be different, we have many more models to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548312000594 Published online by Cambridge University Press



Figure 1. The jumps of the walk.



Figure 2. Walk considered in [17].

consider. There are several motivations to permit arbitrary jumps on the boundary. First, this allows us to extend the existing results, and thus to have a better understanding of the combinatorics of the walks confined to a quarter plane. Second, some studies in probability theory (see, *e.g.*, [12]) suggest that the behaviour of the walk on the boundary has a deep and interesting influence on the quantities of interest. In this paper we first consider the walk in Figure 1, with steps taken from $\mathcal{S} = \{(-1,1),(-1,-1),(1,-1)\}$ in the interior, $\mathcal{S}_H = \{(-1,1),(-1,0),(1,0)\}$ on the horizontal boundary, $\mathcal{S}_V = \{(0,1),(0,-1),(1,-1)\}$ on the vertical boundary, and $\mathcal{S}_0 = \{(0,1),(1,0)\}$ in state $(0,0)$.

Notice that the step set $\mathcal{S} = \{(-1,1),(-1,-1),(1,-1)\}$ in the framework of [7] would render a trivial walk, since the walk could never depart from state $(0,0)$. However, by choosing the steps on the boundaries as in $\mathcal{S}_H$, $\mathcal{S}_V$ and $\mathcal{S}_0$, it becomes possible to start walking from state $(0,0)$, and we have a rather intricate counting problem on our hands.

It turns out that our walk has an infinite group. To see this, observe that the interior step set in Figure 1 and the one represented in Figure 2 have isomorphic groups ([7, Lemma 2] says that two step sets differing by one of the eight symmetries of the square have isomorphic groups), and notice that the group associated with the step set in Figure 2 is infinite ([7, Section 3.1]).

Since our walk has an infinite group, the approach in [7] cannot be applied. The methods developed in [17] also fail to work. Indeed, the main tool used there is an expression of $Q(x,0;z)$ and $Q(0,y;z)$ as series involving the iterates of the roots of the kernel. While these series are convergent when the transitions $(-1,0),(-1,-1),(0,-1)$ are absent, they become strongly divergent in our case: see [8, Chapter 6]. The approach via boundary value problems of [8] seems to apply, but this is more cumbersome than in [13, 18]. Indeed, contrary to the 79 models studied there, for which in (1.2), A and B depend on one variable, and δ is constant, these quantities are now polynomials in two variables, since the functional equation (1.2) for our walk becomes (for a proof, see

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548312000594 Published online by Cambridge University Press

equations (2.5)–(2.10) below)

$$K(x,y;z)Q(x,y;z) = [1+x^2-x^2y-y]Q(x,0;z) + [1+y^2-xy^2-x]Q(0,y;z) + [x+y-1]Q(0,0;z) - xy/z \tag{1.4}$$

with the kernel

$$K(x,y;z) = 1+x^2+y^2-xy/z. \tag{1.5}$$

We shall derive an explicit expression for $Q(x,y;z)$, which turns out to be a meromorphic function of x,y with infinitely many poles in x and in y. This implies that $Q(x,y;z)$ is non-holonomic as a function of x, and as a function of y. We note that for one variable, a function is holonomic if and only if it satisfies a linear differential equation with polynomial coefficients (see [11, Appendix B.4]), so that a holonomic function must have finitely many poles, since the latter are found among the zeros of the polynomial coefficients of the underlying differential equation. Accordingly, the trivariate function $Q(x,y;z)$ is non-holonomic as well, since the holonomy is stable by specialization of a variable (see [11]). As in [14, 18], this paper therefore illustrates the intimate relation between the infinite group case and non-holonomy.

The technique we are using is the so-called *compensation approach*. This technique has been developed in a series of papers [1, 3, 4] in the probabilistic context of *random* walks: see [2] for an overview. It does not aim directly at obtaining a solution for the GF, but rather tries to find a solution for its coefficients

$$q_{i,j}(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} q_{i,j,k} z^k. \tag{1.6}$$

These coefficients satisfy certain recursion relations, which differ depending on whether the state (i,j) lies on the boundary. The idea is then to express $q_{i,j}(z)$ as a linear combination of products $\alpha^i\beta^j$, for pairs (α,β) such that

$$K(1/\alpha, 1/\beta; z) = 0. \tag{1.7}$$

By choosing only pairs (α,β) for which (1.7) is satisfied, the recursion relations for $q_{i,j}(z)$ in the interior of the quarter plane are satisfied by any linear combination of products $\alpha^i\beta^j$, by virtue of the linearity of the recursion relations. The products have to be chosen such that the recursion relations on the boundaries are satisfied as well. As it turns out, this can be done by alternately compensating for the errors on the two boundaries, which eventually leads to an infinite series of products.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we obtain an explicit expression for the generating function $Q(x,y;z)$ by applying the compensation approach. In Section 3 we derive an asymptotic expression for the coefficients $q_{i,j,k}$ for large values of k, using the technique of singularity analysis. Because this paper is the first application of the compensation approach to counting problems, we also discuss briefly in Section 4 the classes of walks for which this compensation approach might work.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548312000594 Published online by Cambridge University Press

2. The compensation approach

We start from the following recursion relations:

$$q_{i,j,k+1} = q_{i-1,j+1,k} + q_{i+1,j-1,k} + q_{i+1,j+1,k}, \qquad i,j \geqslant 1, k \geqslant 0, \tag{2.1}$$

$$q_{i,0,k+1} = q_{i-1,1,k} + q_{i+1,1,k} + q_{i-1,0,k} + q_{i+1,0,k}, \qquad i \geqslant 1, k \geqslant 0, \tag{2.2}$$

$$q_{0,j,k+1} = q_{1,j-1,k} + q_{1,j+1,k} + q_{0,j-1,k} + q_{0,j+1,k}, \qquad j \geqslant 1, k \geqslant 0, \tag{2.3}$$

$$q_{0,0,k+1} = q_{0,1,k} + q_{1,1,k} + q_{1,0,k}, \qquad k \geqslant 0. \tag{2.4}$$

Since $q_{i,j,0} = 0$ if $i + j > 0$ and $q_{0,0,0} = 1$, these relations uniquely determine all the counting numbers $q_{i,j,k}$. Multiplying the relations (2.1)–(2.4) by z^k and summing with respect to $k \geqslant 0$ leads to (with the generating functions $q_{i,j} = q_{i,j}(z)$ defined in (1.6))

$$q_{i,j}/z = q_{i-1,j+1} + q_{i+1,j-1} + q_{i+1,j+1}, \qquad i,j \geqslant 1, \tag{2.5}$$

$$q_{i,0}/z = q_{i-1,1} + q_{i+1,1} + q_{i-1,0} + q_{i+1,0}, \qquad i \geqslant 2, \tag{2.6}$$

$$q_{0,j}/z = q_{1,j-1} + q_{1,j+1} + q_{0,j-1} + q_{0,j+1}, \qquad j \geqslant 2, \tag{2.7}$$

and

$$q_{1,0}/z = q_{0,1} + q_{2,1} + q_{0,0} + q_{2,0}, \tag{2.8}$$

$$q_{0,1}/z = q_{1,0} + q_{1,2} + q_{0,0} + q_{0,2}, \tag{2.9}$$

$$q_{0,0}/z = 1/z + q_{0,1} + q_{1,1} + q_{1,0}. \tag{2.10}$$

For reasons that will become clear below, we want to discuss separately the equations involving $q_{0,0}$, and we therefore do not merge (2.8) (resp. (2.9)) and (2.6) (resp. (2.7).

Lemma 2.1. *Equations* (2.5)–(2.10) *have a unique solution in the form of formal power series.*

Proof. Substituting the power series $q_{i,j}$ into equations (2.5)–(2.10), and equating coefficients of z^k, yields equations (2.1)–(2.4). The latter obviously have a unique solution for the coefficients $q_{i,j,k}$, because these counting numbers can be determined recursively using $q_{0,0,0} = 1$. □

In order to find the unique solution for $q_{i,j}$, we shall employ the compensation approach, which consists of three steps.

- Characterize all products $\alpha^i \beta^j$ for which the inner equations (2.5) are satisfied, and construct linear combinations of these products, which in addition to being formal solutions to (2.5), also satisfy (2.6) and (2.7).
- Prove that these solutions are formal power series.
- Determine the complete unique solution $q_{i,j}$ by taking into account the boundary conditions (2.8)–(2.10).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548312000594 Published online by Cambridge University Press



Figure 3. The curve (2.11) in $\mathbb{R}_+^2$ for $z = 1/4$.

2.1. Linear combinations of products

Substituting the product $\alpha^i\beta^j$ into the inner equations (2.5), and dividing by common powers, yields

$$\alpha\beta/z = \beta^2 + \alpha^2 + \alpha^2\beta^2. \tag{2.11}$$

Incidentally, note that (2.11) is simply (1.7) (see (1.5)). Hence, a product $\alpha^i\beta^j$ is a solution of (2.5) if and only if (2.11) is satisfied, and any linear combination of such products will satisfy (2.5). Figure 3 depicts the curve (2.11) in $\mathbb{R}_+^2$ for $z = 1/4$.

Now we construct a linear combination of the products introduced above, which will give a formal solution to the equations (2.5)–(2.7). The first term of this combination, say $\alpha_0^i\beta_0^j$, is required to satisfy both (2.5) and (2.6). In other words, the pair (α_0, β_0) has to satisfy (2.11) as well as

$$\alpha\beta/z = \beta^2 + \alpha^2\beta^2 + \beta + \alpha^2\beta. \tag{2.12}$$

The motivation to start with a term satisfying both (2.11) and (2.12) will be explained at the end of this subsection: see Remark 2.5.

Lemma 2.2. *There exists a unique pair* (α_0, β_0), *namely*

$$\alpha_0 = \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 8z^2}}{4z}, \quad \beta_0 = \frac{\alpha_0^2}{1 + \alpha_0^2}, \tag{2.13}$$

of formal power series in z *such that the product* $\alpha_0^i\beta_0^j$ *satisfies both* (2.5) *and* (2.6).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548312000594 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Proof. Equation (2.12) yields

$$\alpha/z = \beta + \alpha^2\beta + 1 + \alpha^2 = (1+\beta)(1+\alpha^2). \tag{2.14}$$

Subtracting (2.12) from (2.11) gives $\beta(1+\alpha^2) = \alpha^2$, so that $(1+\beta)(1+\alpha^2) = 1 + 2\alpha^2$, and together with (2.14) this gives $\alpha/z = 1 + 2\alpha^2$. The last equation has the two solutions $(1 \pm \sqrt{1-8z^2})/(4z)$, and only the solution with the $-$ sign is a formal power series in z. □

The function $\alpha_0^i\beta_0^j$ thus satisfies (2.5) and (2.6), but it fails to satisfy (2.7). Indeed, if $\alpha^i\beta^j$ is a solution to (2.7), then (α, β) should satisfy

$$\alpha\beta/z = \alpha^2 + \alpha^2\beta^2 + \alpha + \alpha\beta^2, \tag{2.15}$$

and (α_0, β_0) is certainly not a solution to (2.15).

Now we start adding compensation terms. We consider $c_0\alpha_0^i\beta_0^j + d_1\alpha^i\beta^j$, where (α, β) satisfies (2.11) and is such that $c_0\alpha_0^i\beta_0^j + d_1\alpha^i\beta^j$ satisfies (2.7). The identity (2.7), which has to be true for any $j \geqslant 2$, forces us to take $\beta = \beta_0$. Then, thanks to (2.11), we see that α is the conjugate root of α_0 in (2.11). Denote this new root by α_1. Hence, α_0 and α_1 are the two roots of equation (2.11), where β is replaced by β_0. In other words, α_0 and α_1 satisfy

$$(1+\beta_0^2)\alpha^2 - (\beta_0/z)\alpha + \beta_0^2 = 0. \tag{2.16}$$

Due to the root-coefficient relationships, we obtain

$$\frac{\beta_0/z}{1+\beta_0^2} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1. \tag{2.17}$$

We now determine d_1 in terms of c_0. Note that $c_0\alpha_0^i\beta_0^j + d_1\alpha_1^i\beta_0^j$ is a solution to (2.7) if and only if

$$(\beta_0/z)(c_0 + d_1) = (\alpha_0 c_0 + \alpha_1 d_1)(1+\beta_0^2) + (c_0 + d_1)(1+\beta_0^2). \tag{2.18}$$

The latter identity can be rewritten as

$$\frac{\beta_0/z}{1+\beta_0^2}(c_0 + d_1) = (\alpha_0 c_0 + \alpha_1 d_1) + (c_0 + d_1), \tag{2.19}$$

and thus, using (2.17),

$$d_1 = -\frac{1-\alpha_1}{1-\alpha_0}c_0. \tag{2.20}$$

The series $c_0\alpha_0^i\beta_0^j + d_1\alpha_1^i\beta_0^j$ after one compensation step satisfies (2.5) and (2.7) for the interior and the vertical boundary. However, the compensation term $d_1\alpha_1^i\beta_0^j$ has generated a new error at the horizontal boundary. To compensate for this, we must add another compensation term, and so on. In this way, the compensation approach can be continued, which eventually leads to

$$x_{i,j} = \underbrace{\overbrace{c_0\alpha_0^i\beta_0^j}^{\mathrm{H}} + \overbrace{d_1\alpha_1^i\beta_0^j}^{\mathrm{H}}}_{\mathrm{V}} + \underbrace{\overbrace{c_1\alpha_1^i\beta_1^j}^{\mathrm{H}} + \overbrace{d_2\alpha_2^i\beta_1^j}^{\mathrm{H}}}_{\mathrm{V}} + c_2\alpha_2^i\beta_2^j + \cdots \tag{2.21}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548312000594 Published online by Cambridge University Press



Figure 4. The curve (2.11) near 0 for $z = 1/4$, and the construction of the products: the α_k and β_k are given by the intersections of the curve (2.11) with the broken line.

where, by construction and (2.11), for all $k \geqslant 0$ we have

$$\beta_k = f(\alpha_k), \quad \alpha_{k+1} = f(\beta_k), \quad f(t) = \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 4z^2(1+t^2)}}{2z(1+t^2)} t, \tag{2.22}$$

and the function $f(t)$ follows from (2.11). We shall prove in Section 2.2 the convergence of the series (2.21) as a formal power series in z. The construction is such that each term in (2.21) satisfies the equations in the interior of the state space, the sum of two terms with the same α satisfies the horizontal boundary conditions (H) and the sum of two terms with the same β satisfies the vertical boundary conditions (V). Hence $x_{i,j}$ satisfies all equations (2.5)–(2.7). See also Figure 4. Furthermore,

$$d_{k+1} = -\frac{1-\alpha_{k+1}}{1-\alpha_k} c_k, \quad c_{k+1} = -\frac{1-\beta_{k+1}}{1-\beta_k} d_{k+1}, \quad k \geqslant 0. \tag{2.23}$$

An easy calculation starting from (2.23) yields

$$d_{k+1} = -\frac{(1-\alpha_{k+1})(1-\beta_k)}{(1-\alpha_0)(1-\beta_0)} c_0, \quad c_{k+1} = \frac{(1-\beta_{k+1})(1-\alpha_{k+1})}{(1-\alpha_0)(1-\beta_0)} c_0, \quad k \geqslant 0, \tag{2.24}$$

so that choosing (arbitrarily) $c_0 = (1-\alpha_0)(1-\beta_0)$ finally gives

$$x_{i,j} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (1-\beta_k)\beta_k^j [(1-\alpha_k)\alpha_k^i - (1-\alpha_{k+1})\alpha_{k+1}^i]. \tag{2.25}$$

By symmetry, we also obtain that $x_{j,i}$ is a formal solution to (2.5)–(2.7). This leaves us to consider the solution for the states $(0,1)$, $(0,0)$ and $(1,0)$, *i.e.*, the boundary conditions (2.8)–(2.10).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548312000594 Published online by Cambridge University Press

2.2. Formal power series

Proposition 2.3. *The sequences* $\{\alpha_k\}_{k\geqslant 0}$ *and* $\{\beta_k\}_{k\geqslant 0}$ *appearing in* (2.21)–(2.22) *satisfy the following property: for all* $k \geqslant 0$, $\alpha_k = z^{2k+1}\widehat{\alpha}_k(z)$ *and* $\beta_k = z^{2k+2}\widehat{\beta}_k(z)$, *where* $\widehat{\alpha}_k$ *and* $\widehat{\beta}_k$ *are formal power series such that* $\widehat{\alpha}_k(0) = \widehat{\beta}_k(0) = 1$.

Proof. For f defined in (2.22), all $p \geqslant 0$, and all real numbers $s_1, s_2, \ldots,$

$$f(z^p[1 + s_1 z + s_2 z^2 + \cdots]) = z^{p+1}[1 + s_1 z + (1 + s_2)z^2 + \cdots]. \tag{2.26}$$

Because (2.13) yields $\alpha_0 = z + 2z^3 + \cdots$, the proof is completed via (2.22). □

The following result is an immediate consequence of Proposition 2.3.

Corollary 2.4. *For* $i, j \geqslant 0$, $x_{i,j}$ *and* $x_{j,i}$ *defined in* (2.25) *are formal power series in* z.

Remark 2.5. The approach outlined in Section 2.1 is initialized with a term satisfying both (2.11) and (2.12). Alternatively, we could start with an arbitrarily chosen term with power series α_0 and β_0 satisfying (2.11) only. This term would violate (2.12) as well as (2.15), and therefore generate two sequences of terms, one starting with compensation of (2.12) and the other with (2.15). It is readily seen that in one of the two sequences, some of the parameters α or β will not be power series. Indeed, the two sequences of terms would be generated as in (2.22), with instead of f the function

$$f_{\pm}(t) = \frac{1 \pm \sqrt{1 - 4z^2(1 + t^2)}}{2z(1 + t^2)}t. \tag{2.27}$$

In Section 2.1 we described the construction of the sequence with the choice $f_- = f$. For $f = f_+$, notice that for all $p \geqslant 0$, and all real numbers $s_1, \ldots,$ we have

$$f_+(z^p[1 + s_1 z + \cdots]) = z^{p-1}[1 + s_1 z + \cdots]. \tag{2.28}$$

Hence, the resulting solution constructed as in (2.22) would fail to be a formal power series: see equation (2.25) and Section 2.3.

2.3. Determining the unique solution

We now determine the generating functions $q_{i,j}$. Define

$$\widehat{x}_{i,j} = x_{i,j} + x_{j,i}, \tag{2.29}$$

so that in particular

$$\widehat{x}_{0,0} = 2\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(1 - \beta_k)(\alpha_{k+1} - \alpha_k). \tag{2.30}$$

Proposition 2.6. *The expressions*

$$q_{0,0} = \frac{1 + \widehat{x}_{0,0}}{1 - 2z + z\widehat{x}_{0,0}} \tag{2.31}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548312000594 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and

$$q_{i,j} = c\widehat{x}_{i,j}, \quad i+j>0, \tag{2.32}$$

with

$$c = \frac{1}{1-2z+z\widehat{x}_{0,0}}, \tag{2.33}$$

are the unique solutions to equations (2.5)–(2.10) *in the form of formal power series.*

Proof. We shall look for a solution satisfying, for $i+j>0$,

$$q_{i,j} = cx_{i,j} + \widetilde{c}x_{j,i}. \tag{2.34}$$

By symmetry we must have $c=\widetilde{c}$. Such combinations have been shown to satisfy (2.5)–(2.7), which do not involve $q_{0,0}$. We still need to determine the solution for which the boundary conditions (2.8) (or by symmetry (2.9)) and (2.10) are also satisfied. This can be achieved by choosing c and $q_{0,0}$ appropriately.

By using (2.10) and (2.8) (or (2.10) and (2.9)), we obtain that

$$q_{0,0} = 1 + zc[\widehat{x}_{0,1} + \widehat{x}_{1,1} + \widehat{x}_{1,0}] \tag{2.35}$$

and

$$c = \frac{z}{\widehat{x}_{1,0} - z[\widehat{x}_{0,1} + \widehat{x}_{2,1} + \widehat{x}_{2,0}] - z^2[\widehat{x}_{1,0} + \widehat{x}_{0,1} + \widehat{x}_{1,1}]}. \tag{2.36}$$

In addition, tedious calculations starting from (2.25) give

$$\widehat{x}_{1,0}/z - [\widehat{x}_{0,1} + \widehat{x}_{2,1} + \widehat{x}_{2,0} + \widehat{x}_{0,0}] = 1, \quad (1/z-1)\widehat{x}_{0,0} + 2 - [\widehat{x}_{1,0} + \widehat{x}_{0,1} + \widehat{x}_{1,1}] = 0. \tag{2.37}$$

Thanks to the equations in (2.37), the denominator of (2.36) can be written as $z[1-2z+z\widehat{x}_{0,0}]$. The functions defined in (2.31) and (2.32) are the solutions to equations (2.5)–(2.10) by construction. Finally, the uniqueness follows from Lemma 2.1. □

Proposition 2.7. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} Q(x,y;z) &= \sum_{i,j=0}^{\infty} q_{i,j}x^i y^j \\ &= c + c\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\left(\frac{1-\beta_k}{1-\beta_k y}\left[\frac{1-\alpha_k}{1-\alpha_k x} - \frac{1-\alpha_{k+1}}{1-\alpha_{k+1}x}\right] + \frac{1-\beta_k}{1-\beta_k x}\left[\frac{1-\alpha_k}{1-\alpha_k y} - \frac{1-\alpha_{k+1}}{1-\alpha_{k+1}y}\right]\right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.38}$$

with $q_{i,j}$ as in Proposition 2.6, c as in (2.33), *and α_k and β_k as in* (2.13) *and* (2.22), *respectively. Furthermore,*

$$Q(0,0;z) = c(1+\widehat{x}_{0,0}), \quad Q(1,0;z) = Q(0,1;z) = c(1-\alpha_0(z)), \quad Q(1,1;z) = c. \tag{2.39}$$

Proof. This is immediate from (2.25), (2.30)–(2.33). □

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548312000594 Published online by Cambridge University Press

2.4. Retrieving coefficients

Now that we have an explicit expression for $q_{i,j}$, we briefly present an efficient procedure for calculating its coefficients $q_{i,j,k}$.

To compute $q_{i,j}$ we need to calculate in principle an infinite series, or to solve the recurrence relations. However, we shall prove that if we are only interested in a finite number of coefficients $q_{i,j,k}$, then it is enough to take into account a finite number of α_k and β_k. For $k \geqslant 0$, denote by $k \vee 1$ the maximum of k and 1. Define

$$N_p^{i,j} = 1 + \lfloor \tfrac{1}{4} \max\{p - (i \vee 1 + 2(j \vee 1)), p - (2(i \vee 1) + j \vee 1)\} \rfloor. \tag{2.40}$$

Proposition 2.8. *For any $i, j \geqslant 0$, the first p coefficients of $q_{i,j}$ only require the series expansions of order p of $\alpha_0, \beta_0, \ldots, \alpha_{N_p^{i,j}}, \beta_{N_p^{i,j}}$.*

Proof. In order to obtain the series expansion of $q_{0,0}$ of order p, it is enough to know the series expansion of $\widehat{x}_{0,0}$ of order p: see (2.31). From (2.25) we obtain

$$\widehat{x}_{0,0} = 2\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(1-\beta_k)(\alpha_{k+1}-\alpha_k) = -2\alpha_0 + 2\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\beta_k(\alpha_k - \alpha_{k+1}). \tag{2.41}$$

With Proposition 2.3, $\beta_k\alpha_k = O(z^{4k+3})$ and $\beta_k\alpha_{k+1} = O(z^{4k+5})$, so that in order to obtain the series expansion of $\widehat{x}_{0,0}$ of order p, it is enough to consider in (2.41) the values of k such that $4k+3 \leqslant p$. In other words, we have to deal with $\alpha_0, \beta_0, \ldots, \alpha_k, \beta_k, \alpha_{k+1}$ for $4k+3 \leqslant p$. Since $N_p^{0,0} = 1 + \lfloor (p-3)/4 \rfloor$ (see (2.40)), Proposition 2.8 is shown for $i = j = 0$. The proof for other values of i and j is similar and therefore omitted. □

As an application of Proposition 2.8, let us find the numbers $q_{0,0,k}$ for $k \in \{0, \ldots, 10\}$. Taking $i = j = 0$, we have $N_{10}^{0,0} = 2$; we then calculate the series expansions of order 10 of $\alpha_0, \beta_0, \alpha_1, \beta_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2$. After using (2.31) and (2.41), we obtain the numbers

$$1, 0, 2, 2, 10, 16, 64, 126, 454, 1004, 3404. \tag{2.42}$$

3. Asymptotic analysis

In this section we derive an asymptotic expression for the coefficients $q_{i,j,k}$ for large values of k, using the technique of *singularity analysis* (see Flajolet and Sedgewick [11] for an elaborate exposition). This requires the investigation of the function $q_{i,j} = q_{i,j}(z)$ near its dominant singularity (closest to the origin) in the z-plane. First, notice that

$$\sum_{i,j=0}^{\infty} q_{i,j,k} \leqslant 3^k, \tag{3.1}$$

because there are at most 3^k paths of length k. This clearly implies that $q_{i,j,k} \leqslant 3^k$, so that $q_{i,j}$ is analytic at least for $|z| < 1/3$, and the singularities z of $q_{i,j}$ must satisfy $|z| \geqslant 1/3$.

In fact, the singularities of $q_{i,j}$ will be found among the singularities of $\widehat{x}_{i,j}$ and the zeros of the denominator of c in (2.33): see (2.31) and (2.32). In what follows, we first show in

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548312000594 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Section 3.1 that $\widehat{x}_{i,j}$ converges in the domain $|z| \leqslant 1/\sqrt{8}$. We then find in Section 3.2 the first singularity of $q_{i,j}$. Finally, we state and prove our asymptotic results in Section 3.3.

3.1. Convergence of the solutions

Proposition 3.1. *The sequences $\{\alpha_k\}_{k\geqslant 0}$ and $\{\beta_k\}_{k\geqslant 0}$ appearing in* (2.21)–(2.22) *satisfy the following properties.*

(i) *For any $k \geqslant 0$, α_k and β_k are analytic in the disc with centre at* 0 *and radius $1/\sqrt{8}$.*
(ii) *For all $|z| \leqslant 1/\sqrt{8}$, we have $1/\sqrt{2} \geqslant |\alpha_0| > |\beta_0| > |\alpha_1| > |\beta_1| > \cdots$.*
(iii) *For all $|z| \leqslant 1/\sqrt{8}$ and all $k \geqslant 0$, we have $|\alpha_k| \leqslant 1/\sqrt{2}^{2k+1}$ and $|\beta_k| \leqslant 1/\sqrt{2}^{2k+2}$.*

Proof. We first prove (ii) and (iii). To that purpose, it is sufficient, thanks to (2.22) and since $\alpha_0 = f(1)$, to prove that for all $|t| \leqslant 1$ and $|z| \leqslant 1/\sqrt{8}$,

$$|f(t)| \leqslant \frac{|t|}{\sqrt{2}}. \tag{3.2}$$

For this, we notice that as soon as $4|z|^2|1+t^2| \leqslant 1$ (in particular for $|t| \leqslant 1$ and $|z| \leqslant 1/\sqrt{8}$), we have

$$\frac{f(t)}{t} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} C_n z^{2n+1}(1+t^2)^n, \tag{3.3}$$

where $C_n = \binom{2n}{n}/(n+1)$ is the nth Catalan number, and thus

$$\left|\frac{f(t)}{t}\right| \leqslant \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} C_n |z|^{2n+1}(1+|t|^2)^n \leqslant \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} C_n |z|^{2n+1} 2^n = \frac{1-\sqrt{1-8|z|^2}}{4|z|}. \tag{3.4}$$

For $|z| \leqslant 1/\sqrt{8}$, the last quantity is less than $1/\sqrt{2}$, and (3.2) is proved.

We now show (i). To that end we note the following. Let γ be a power series in z. If

(a) the radius of convergence of γ is larger than or equal to $1/\sqrt{8}$,
(b) $\max_{|z|\leqslant 1/\sqrt{8}} |\gamma| \leqslant 1$,

then with f as in (2.22), $f(\gamma)$ is a power series satisfying (a) and (b). (This lemma is an obvious consequence of the expression (2.22) of function f.)

The function α_0 defined in (2.13) clearly satisfies (a) and (b). Further, the functions $\alpha_0, \beta_0, \alpha_1, \beta_1, \ldots$ follow from the iterative scheme (2.22), so that with (ii) (or with (iii)), we obtain that (a) and (b) hold. We then conclude (i). □

Corollary 3.2. *For $i, j \geqslant 0$, $x_{i,j}$ and $x_{j,i}$ defined in* (2.25) *are convergent for $|z| \leqslant 1/\sqrt{8}$. Further, for each $|z| \leqslant 1/\sqrt{8}$,*

$$\sum_{i,j=0}^{\infty} |x_{i,j}(z)| < \infty. \tag{3.5}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548312000594 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Proof. The first statement in Corollary 3.2 immediately follows from Proposition 3.1 and from the expression for $x_{i,j}$. Next, use (2.25) to get that for $i+j>0$,

$$|x_{i,j}| \leqslant \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |1-\beta_k||\beta_k|^j \left[|1-\alpha_k||\alpha_k|^i + |1-\alpha_{k+1}||\alpha_{k+1}|^i\right]. \tag{3.6}$$

Using then that $|1-\beta_k|$, $|1-\alpha_k|$ and $|1-\alpha_{k+1}|$ are bounded (see Proposition 3.1(ii)) and applying Proposition 3.1(iii) gives that there is some constant constant $C>0$ such that for all $i+j>0$,

$$|x_{i,j}| \leqslant C \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 1/\sqrt{2}^{(2k+1)i+(2k+2)j}. \tag{3.7}$$

Likewise, we can prove that for some constant $C>0$,

$$|x_{0,0}| \leqslant C \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 1/\sqrt{2}^{(2k+1)}. \tag{3.8}$$

The second claim in Corollary 3.2 immediately follows. □

We conclude this section with the following statement.

Proposition 3.3. *For all* $0<|z|<1/\sqrt{8}$, *the functions* $\sum_{i,j=0}^{\infty} q_{i,j}x^iy^j$, $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q_{i,0}x^i$ *and* $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} q_{0,j}y^j$ *have infinitely many poles.*

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Propositions 2.3, 2.7 and 3.1, and of Corollary 3.2. □

It follows immediately from Proposition 3.3 that both $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q_{i,0}x^i$ and $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} q_{0,j}y^j$ are non-holonomic. Since the holonomy is maintained after specialization to a variable (see [11]), we reach the conclusion that the trivariate generating function $Q(x,y;z)$ is non-holonomic as well.

3.2. Dominant singularity of $q_{i,j}$

A consequence of the results in Section 3.1 is that $q_{i,j}$ is analytic for $|z|<1/\sqrt{8}$, except possibly at points z such that the denominator of c in (2.33) equals 0. Denote this denominator by

$$h(z) = 1-2z+z\widehat{x}_{0,0}. \tag{3.9}$$

Lemma 3.4. *The series* $h(z)$ *has a unique root* ρ *in the interval* $(1/3, 1/\sqrt{8})$, *which is the dominant singularity of* c.

The proof of Lemma 3.4 is presented in the Appendix. Furthermore, in Corollary A.3 we shall prove that $\rho \in [0.34499975, 0.34499976]$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548312000594 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Remark 3.5. It seems hard to find a closed-form expression for ρ or to decide whether ρ is algebraic. From this point of view, the situation is quite different from that for the 74 (non-singular) models of walks discussed in Section 1. Indeed, for all these 74 models, the analogue of ρ (which will eventually be the first positive singularity of $Q(0,0;z)$, $Q(1,0;z)$, $Q(0,1;z)$ and $Q(1,1;z)$: see below) is always algebraic (of some degree between 1 and 7): see [10].

Remark 3.6. In fact, it will be proved in Section 3.3 that the series $q_{i,j}$, $Q(0,0;z)$, $Q(1,0;z)$, $Q(0,1;z)$ and $Q(1,1;z)$ are analytic within the domain

$$\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < (1+\epsilon)\rho\} \setminus [\rho, (1+\epsilon)\rho), \tag{3.10}$$

for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, with a unique pole at ρ.

3.3. Asymptotic results

Here are our main results on the asymptotic behaviour of large counting numbers.

Proposition 3.7. *The asymptotics of the numbers of walks $q_{i,j,k}$ as $k \to \infty$ is*

$$q_{i,j,k} \sim C_{i,j}\rho^{-k}, \tag{3.11}$$

with ρ as defined in Lemma 3.4,

$$C_{0,0} = \frac{3\rho - 1}{-\rho^2 h'(\rho)}, \tag{3.12}$$

and

$$C_{i,j} = \frac{\widehat{x}_{i,j}(\rho)}{-\rho h'(\rho)}, \quad i + j \geqslant 1. \tag{3.13}$$

Proof. Consider first the case $i = j = 0$. Thanks to (2.31), (3.9) and Lemma 3.4, we obtain that $q_{0,0}$ has a pole at ρ, and is analytic within the domain (3.10) for any $\epsilon > 0$ small enough. Moreover, the pole of $q_{0,0}$ at ρ is of order one, as we now show. For this it is sufficient to prove that $1 + \widehat{x}_{0,0}(\rho) \neq 0$ and that $h'(\rho) \neq 0$; see again (2.31) and (3.9). In this respect, note that with (3.9) and Lemma 3.4 we have $h(\rho) = 1 - 2\rho + \rho\widehat{x}_{0,0}(\rho) = 0$, so that $1 + \widehat{x}_{0,0}(\rho) = (3\rho - 1)/\rho$, which is positive by Lemma 3.4. On the other hand, it is a consequence of Lemma A.5 that $h'(\rho) \neq 0$. In particular, the behaviour of $q_{0,0}$ near ρ is given by

$$q_{0,0} = \frac{1 + \widehat{x}_{0,0}(\rho)}{h'(\rho)(z-\rho)[1 + O(z-\rho)]} = \frac{3\rho - 1}{-\rho^2 h'(\rho)(1 - z/\rho)}[1 + O(z-\rho)]. \tag{3.14}$$

The analyticity of $q_{0,0}$ within the domain (3.10) and the behaviour (3.14) of $q_{0,0}$ near ρ immediately give the asymptotics (3.11) for $i = j = 0$ (see, *e.g.*, [11, Chapter 6]). The proof for other values of i and j is similar and therefore omitted. □

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548312000594 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A result similar to Proposition 3.7 also holds for the total number of walks of length k (not necessarily ending in state $(0,0)$). Indeed, from formula (2.39), we obtain that

$$Q(1,0;z) = \frac{1-\alpha_0(z)}{h(z)}, \quad Q(1,1;z) = \frac{1}{h(z)}, \tag{3.15}$$

with $h(z)$ as in (3.9). Accordingly, the exponential growth rate of these generating functions is the same as that of $Q(0,0;z)$, namely ρ (defined in Lemma 3.4). An identical reasoning as in the proof of Proposition 3.7 then gives the following result.

Proposition 3.8. *The asymptotics of the total number of walks* $\sum_{i,j=0}^{\infty} q_{i,j,k}$ *as* $k \to \infty$ *is*

$$\sum_{i,j=0}^{\infty} q_{i,j,k} \sim \frac{1}{-\rho h'(\rho)} \rho^{-k}. \tag{3.16}$$

The asymptotics of the total number of walks ending on the horizontal axis (*or, equivalently, on the vertical axis*) $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q_{i,0,k}$ *as* $k \to \infty$ *is*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q_{i,0,k} \sim \frac{1-\alpha_0(\rho)}{-\rho h'(\rho)} \rho^{-k}. \tag{3.17}$$

Remark 3.9. *A priori*, the fact that

$$Q(0,0;z), \quad Q(1,0;z), \quad Q(0,1;z), \quad Q(1,1;z) \tag{3.18}$$

have the same first positive singularity (namely, ρ) is far from obvious. This appears to be related to the fact that the two coordinates of the drift vector of our $\mathcal{S}$ are negative (they both equal -2). Here, for any step set $\mathcal{S}$, the drift vector is given by $(\sum_{-1\leqslant i\leqslant 1} \delta^{\mathcal{S}}_{i,j}, \sum_{-1\leqslant j\leqslant 1} \delta^{\mathcal{S}}_{i,j})$, where $\delta^{\mathcal{S}}_{i,j} = 1$ if $(i,j) \in \mathcal{S}$, and 0 otherwise. Indeed, the following phenomenon has been observed in [10] for the 79 models of walks mentioned in Section 1: if the two coordinates of the drift vector are negative, then the four functions (3.18) do have the same first positive singularity.

Let us illustrate Proposition 3.7 with Table 1, obtained by approximating ρ by 0.34499975 and $C_{0,0}$ by 0.0531; see Corollary A.3 and Lemma A.5 below.

4. Discussion

4.1. A wider range of applicability

The compensation approach for our counting problem leads to an exact expression for the generating function $Q(x,y;z)$. A detailed exposition of the compensation approach can be found in [1, 3, 4], in which it has been shown to work for two-dimensional random walks on the lattice of the first quadrant that obey the following conditions.

- Step size: only transitions to neighboring states.
- Forbidden steps: no transitions from interior states to the North, North-East, and East.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548312000594 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1.

Value of k	Exact value of $q_{0,0,k}$ (see Section 2.4)	Approximation of $q_{0,0,k}$ (see Proposition 3.7)	Ratio
10	3.404×10^{3}	2.222×10^{3}	0.653
20	1.106×10^{8}	9.305×10^{7}	0.840
30	4.254×10^{12}	3.895×10^{12}	0.915
40	1.714×10^{17}	1.630×10^{17}	0.951
50	7.037×10^{21}	6.825×10^{21}	0.969
60	2.913×10^{26}	2.857×10^{26}	0.980
70	1.211×10^{31}	1.196×10^{31}	0.987
80	5.051×10^{35}	5.007×10^{35}	0.991
90	2.109×10^{40}	2.096×10^{40}	0.993
100	8.814×10^{44}	8.774×10^{44}	0.995

- Homogeneity: the same transitions occur for all interior points, and similarly for all points on the horizontal boundary, and for all points on the vertical boundary.

Although the theory has been developed for the *bivariate* transform of stationary distributions of recurrent two-dimensional random walks, this paper shows that it can also be applied to obtain a series expression for the *trivariate* function $Q(x, y; z)$. The fact that $Q(x, y; z)$ has one additional variable does not seem to matter much. We therefore expect that the compensation approach will work for walks in the quarter plane that obey the three conditions mentioned above. This will be a topic for future research. Another topic is to see whether the above conditions can be relaxed, and in fact in the next section we present an example of a walk not satisfying these properties, yet amenable to the compensation approach.

4.2. Another example

We consider the walk with $\mathcal{S} = \{(-1,0),(-1,-1),(0,-1),(1,-1),(1,0)\}$ in the interior, $\mathcal{S}_H = \{(-1,0),(1,0)\}$ on the horizontal boundary, $\mathcal{S}_V = \{(0,1),(0,-1),(1,-1),(1,0)\}$ on the vertical boundary, and $\mathcal{S}_0 = \{(0,1),(1,0)\}$: see Figure 5(a). This walk has a rather special behaviour, as it can only move upwards on the vertical boundary. By simple enumeration, we get the following recursion relations:

$$q_{i,j}/z = q_{i-1,j} + q_{i-1,j+1} + q_{i,j+1} + q_{i+1,j} + q_{i+1,j+1}, \qquad i, j > 0, \tag{4.1}$$

$$q_{i,0}/z = q_{i-1,0} + q_{i-1,1} + q_{i,1} + q_{i+1,0} + q_{i+1,1}, \qquad i > 0, \tag{4.2}$$

$$q_{0,j}/z = q_{0,j-1} + q_{0,j+1} + q_{1,j} + q_{1,j+1}, \qquad j > 0, \tag{4.3}$$

$$q_{0,0}/z = 1/z + q_{0,1} + q_{1,1} + q_{1,0}. \tag{4.4}$$

Notice that equations (4.1) and (4.1) could be merged into a single equation, valid for $i > 0$ and $j \geqslant 0$, and that this simplification is, in part, responsible for the simplicity of the solution that follows.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548312000594 Published online by Cambridge University Press



(a) (b)

Figure 5. Two walks with different boundary behaviour.

Proposition 4.1. *The unique solution to equations* (4.1)–(4.4) *is given by* $q_{i,j} = c_0\alpha_0^i\beta_0^j$, *with* β_0 *defined as the unique formal power series in* z *and solving*

$$\beta/z = 1 + \beta^2 + \beta^2(1+\beta)^2, \tag{4.5}$$

$\alpha_0 = \beta_0(1+\beta_0)$ *and* $c_0 = \beta_0/z$. *Therefore, the GF is algebraic* (*and even rational in* x, y) *and given by*

$$Q(x,y;z) = \sum_{i,j,k=0}^{\infty} q_{i,j,k}x^iy^jz^k = \frac{c_0}{(1-\alpha_0 x)(1-\beta_0 y)}. \tag{4.6}$$

Proof. Let us first construct all pairs (α,β) such that $c\alpha^i\beta^j$ solves (4.1), (4.2) and (4.3). We obtain that α and β must satisfy

$$\alpha\beta/z = \beta + \beta^2 + \alpha\beta^2 + \alpha^2\beta + \alpha^2\beta^2, \tag{4.7}$$

$$\alpha\beta/z = \alpha + \alpha\beta^2 + \alpha^2\beta + \alpha^2\beta^2. \tag{4.8}$$

(Note that the reason why we obtain two and not three equations is that equations (4.2) and (4.1) can be merged into a single equation.) Further, all pairs (α,β) that satisfy both (4.7) and (4.8) are such that $\beta(1+\beta) = \alpha$. Substituting the latter into (4.7) gives (4.5). Denote by β_k, $k \in \{0,\dots,3\}$, the four roots of (4.5). Among the β_k, only one, say β_0, is a unique formal power series in z: see [20, Proposition 6.1.8]. Letting

$$\alpha_0 = \beta_0(1+\beta_0), \tag{4.9}$$

we conclude that for any c_0, $c_0\alpha_0^i\beta_0^j$ is a solution to (4.1), (4.2) and (4.3). With the particular choice $c_0 = 1/[1 - z(\alpha_0 + \alpha_0\beta_0 + \beta_0)]$, $c_0\alpha_0^i\beta_0^j$ is also solution to (4.4). By uniqueness of the solution to the recursion relations (see Lemma 2.1), we conclude that $q_{i,j} = c_0\alpha_0^i\beta_0^j$. Finally, by (4.5) and (4.9), we can simplify c_0 into β_0/z. □

We now modify the boundary behaviour of this walk and we show that this has severe consequences for the GF. Consider again the walk with

$$\mathcal{S} = \{(-1,0),(-1,-1),(0,-1),(1,-1),(1,0)\}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548312000594 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in the interior, but this time with $\mathcal{S}_V = \{(0,-1),(1,-1),(1,0)\}$ on the vertical boundary, $\mathcal{S}_0 = \{(1,0)\}$, and the following rather special step set on the horizontal boundary. If the walk is in state $(i,0)$ with $i > 0$, the possible steps are $\{(-1,0),(1,0)\}$ and a *big* step to $(0,i)$: see Figure 5(b). We should note that a *random* walk, with similar unusual boundary behaviour, has already been considered in [19]. The equations for $q_{i,j}$ are then given by (4.1), (4.2), (4.4) and

$$q_{0,j}/z = q_{j,0} + q_{0,j+1} + q_{1,j} + q_{1,j+1}, \quad j > 0. \tag{4.10}$$

Proposition 4.2. *Let*

$$g(t) = \frac{1 - tz - \sqrt{(1-tz)^2 - 4z^2(1+t)^2}}{2z(1+t)}, \tag{4.11}$$

and define the sequences α_k, β_k *and* c_k *by*

$$\alpha_k = g(\beta_k), \quad \beta_{k+1} = \alpha_k, \quad c_{k+1} = c_k \frac{\alpha_{k+1}}{1+\beta_{k+1}}, \quad k \geqslant 0, \tag{4.12}$$

starting with $\beta_0 = 0$ *and*

$$1/c_0 = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\beta_2 \cdots \beta_{k+1}}{(1+\beta_1)\cdots(1+\beta_k)} [1 - z(\beta_k + \beta_{k+1} + \beta_k\beta_{k+1})]. \tag{4.13}$$

The unique solution to equations (4.1), (4.2), (4.4) *and* (4.10) *is given by*

$$q_{i,j} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k \alpha_k^i \beta_k^j. \tag{4.14}$$

Therefore, the GF is given by

$$Q(x,y;z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{c_k}{(1-\alpha_k x)(1-\beta_k y)}, \tag{4.15}$$

which has infinitely many poles in x *and* y, *and is therefore non-holonomic as a trivariate function.*

Proof. We start searching for a solution of the form (4.14) with $\alpha_k = g(\beta_k)$. Since equation (4.1) for the interior and equation (4.2) for the horizontal boundary are then fulfilled, we only have to consider equation (4.10) for the vertical boundary, which reads

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k \alpha_k^j &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k \beta_k^j (1/z - \beta_k - \alpha_k - \alpha_k\beta_k) \\ &= c_0\beta_0^j(1/z - \beta_0 - \alpha_0 - \alpha_0\beta_0) + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_{k+1}\beta_{k+1}^j(1/z - \beta_{k+1} - \alpha_{k+1} - \alpha_{k+1}\beta_{k+1}).\end{aligned}$$

Then an obvious (formal) solution is given by (4.12).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548312000594 Published online by Cambridge University Press

We now determine c_0 to satisfy the remaining equation (4.4). With (4.12), proved above, we obtain

$$\frac{c_k}{c_0} = \frac{\beta_2 \cdots \beta_{k+1}}{(1+\beta_1)\cdots(1+\beta_k)}, \quad k \geqslant 0. \tag{4.16}$$

Further, from (4.4) we have

$$\frac{c_0}{z}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{c_k}{c_0} = \frac{1}{z} + c_0\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{c_k}{c_0}(\alpha_k + \beta_k + \alpha_k\beta_k). \tag{4.17}$$

Together with (4.16) we obtain (4.13). The α_k and β_k converge to the unique formal power series β_* solution to $g(\beta_*) = \beta_*$. Using (4.11), we obtain that

$$\beta_*^3 + 2\beta_*^2 + \beta_*(1 - 1/z) + 1 = 0. \tag{4.18}$$

The series β_* is such that $\beta_*(0) = 0$. It remains to show that $q_{i,j}$ defined in (4.14) is a (well-defined) formal power series. Here we find an interesting phenomenon: for the general compensation approach of Section 2, $q_{i,j}$ was a formal power series because $\alpha_k = z^{2k+1}\widehat{\alpha}_k$ and $\beta_k = z^{2k+2}\widehat{\beta}_k$, where $\widehat{\alpha}_k$ and $\widehat{\beta}_k$ are formal power series (see Proposition 2.3). But here we have $\alpha_k = z\widehat{\alpha}_k$ and $\beta_k = z\widehat{\beta}_k$, where $\widehat{\alpha}_k$ and $\widehat{\beta}_k$ are formal power series not vanishing at 0 (this follows from (4.11) and (4.12)). On the other hand, we have $c_k = z^k\widehat{c}_k$, where $\widehat{c}_k$ is a formal power series. Therefore, in the particular case of Proposition 4.2, $q_{i,j}$ is a formal power series thanks to the constants c_k (see (4.12) and (4.14)). The non-holonomy of the trivariate function $Q(x, y; z)$ follows by the same arguments as were given below Proposition 3.3. □

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to an anonymous referee for numerous valuable and constructive comments. The work of IA and JvL was supported by an ERC Starting Grant and a Free Competition grant from the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research. The work of KR was partially supported by CRC 701, Spectral Structures and Topological Methods in Mathematics at the University of Bielefeld.

Appendix: Remaining proofs

Let us start by expressing h, defined in (3.9), as an alternating sum. The reason why we wish to formulate h differently is twofold. First, this will enable us to show that

$$\rho \in [0.34499975, 0.34499976]$$

(see Corollary A.3), and in fact, in a similar way, we can approximate ρ up to any level of precision. Also, this is actually a key lemma for proving Lemma 3.4.

Lemma A.1.

$$h(z) = 1 + 2z\left(-1 - \alpha_0 + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(-1)^k T_k\right), \quad T_k = \begin{cases} \beta_{k/2}\alpha_{k/2} & \text{if } k \text{ is even,} \\ \beta_{(k-1)/2}\alpha_{(k+1)/2} & \text{if } k \text{ is odd.} \end{cases} \tag{A.1}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548312000594 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Proof. Equation (A.1) follows immediately from (2.41) and (3.9). □

As a preliminary result, we also need the following refinement of Proposition 3.1:

Lemma A.2. *Assume that $z \in (0, 1/\sqrt{8})$. Then both sequences $\{\alpha_k\}_{k\geqslant 0}$ and $\{\beta_k\}_{k\geqslant 0}$ are positive and decreasing. Moreover, for all $k \geqslant 0$,*

$$0 \leqslant \alpha_k \leqslant 1/\sqrt{2}^{2k+1}, \quad 0 \leqslant \beta_k \leqslant 1/\sqrt{2}^{2k+2}. \tag{A.2}$$

Proof. It is enough to prove that for all $|t| \leqslant 1$ and $z \in (0, 1/\sqrt{8})$,

$$0 \leqslant f(t) \leqslant \frac{t}{\sqrt{2}}. \tag{A.3}$$

The proof of this inequality is similar to that of (3.2) and therefore omitted. □

Corollary A.3. *The series $h(z)$ defined in* (3.9) *or* (A.1) *has a radius of convergence at least $1/\sqrt{8}$. Its first positive zero ρ lies in* $[0.34499975, 0.34499976]$.

Proof. For $z \in (0, 1/\sqrt{8})$, the sequence $\{T_k\}_{k\geqslant 0}$ defined in Lemma A.1 is positive and decreasing; see Lemma A.2. In particular, denoting

$$\Lambda^p = \sum_{k=0}^{p} (-1)^k T_k \tag{A.4}$$

and using (A.1), for all $p \geqslant 0$ and all $z \in (0, 1/\sqrt{8})$ we have

$$1 + 2z(-1 - \alpha_0 + \Lambda^{2p+1}) < h(z) < 1 + 2z(-1 - \alpha_0 + \Lambda^{2p}). \tag{A.5}$$

Applying the last inequalities to $p = 4$ and noting that the right-hand side (resp. left-hand side) evaluated at 0.34499976 (resp. 0.34499975) is negative (resp. positive) concludes the proof. □

Before proving Lemma 3.4, let us recall Rouché's theorem (see, *e.g.*, [11, Chapter 4]).

Theorem A.4 (Rouché's theorem). *Let the functions F and G be analytic in a simply connected domain of $\mathbb{C}$ containing in its interior the closed simple curve γ. Assume that F and G satisfy $|F(r) - G(r)| < |G(r)|$ for r on the curve γ. Then F and G have the same number of zeros inside the interior domain delimited by γ.*

Proof of Lemma 3.4. First, using the explicit expression of α_k and β_k, and employing calculus software, we obtain that the algebraic function $1 + 2z(-1 - \alpha_0 + \Lambda^5)$ has only one zero within the circle of radius $1/\sqrt{8}$, and that

$$\inf_{|z|=1/\sqrt{8}} |1 + 2z(-1 - \alpha_0 + \Lambda^5)| > 10^{-2}. \tag{A.6}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548312000594 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Note that the lower bound 10^{-2} in (A.6) is almost optimal; it is rather small because, like ρ, the unique zero of $1 + 2z(-1 - \alpha_0 + \Lambda^5)$ within the disc of radius $1/\sqrt{8}$ is very close to $1/\sqrt{8}$.

By Rouché's theorem (see Theorem A.4), applied to the circle with radius $1/\sqrt{8}$, it is now enough to prove that

$$\sup_{|z|=1/\sqrt{8}} |[1 + 2z(-1 - \alpha_0 + \Lambda^5)] - [1 + 2z(-1 - \alpha_0 + \Lambda^\infty)]| < 10^{-2}. \tag{A.7}$$

For this we write

$$|\Lambda^\infty - \Lambda^p| = \left| \sum_{k=p+1}^{\infty} (-1)^k T_k \right| \leqslant \sum_{k=p+1}^{\infty} |T_k| \leqslant \frac{1/\sqrt{2}^{2p+5}}{1 - (1/\sqrt{2})^2} < 1/\sqrt{2}^{2p+3}, \tag{A.8}$$

where the second upper bound is obtained from the inequality $|T_k| \leqslant 1/\sqrt{2}^{2k+3}$: see (A.1) and Lemma A.2. By (A.8) we then obtain

$$|[1 + 2z(-1 - \alpha_0 + \Lambda^p)] - [1 + 2z(-1 - \alpha_0 + \Lambda^\infty)]| \leqslant 2|z| \frac{1}{2^{p+3/2}}. \tag{A.9}$$

If $|z| < 1/\sqrt{8}$, the last quantity is bounded from above by $1/2^{p+2}$. For $p = 5$, we obviously get $1/2^{p+2} < 10^{-2}$, and (A.7) is proved. □

Lemma A.5.

$$C_{0,0} = 0.0531 \cdot [1 + O(10^{-3})]. \tag{A.10}$$

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 3.7, we can write

$$C_{0,0} = \frac{3\rho - 1}{\rho[1 - \rho^2 \widehat{x}'_{0,0}(\rho)]}, \tag{A.11}$$

so the main difficulty lies in approximating $\widehat{x}'_{0,0}(\rho)$. For this, we use (2.41) and (A.1) to write

$$\widehat{x}'_{0,0}(z) = -2\alpha'_0(z) + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k T'_k(z). \tag{A.12}$$

While it is easy to control the series $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k T_k(z)$, because $\alpha_k(z)$ and $\beta_k(z)$, and hence $T_k(z)$, decrease exponentially fast to 0 as $k \to \infty$ (see Proposition 2.3 and Lemma A.2), it is not obvious how we should deal with $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k T'_k(z)$, where terms like $\alpha'_k(z)$ and $\beta'_k(z)$ appear. We next show that $\alpha'_k(z)$ and $\beta'_k(z)$ actually also decrease exponentially fast to 0 as $k \to \infty$, at least for $z \in [1/4, 0.35]$. Note that this assumption on z is not restrictive, since ρ belongs to the interval $[1/4, 0.35]$ by Corollary A.3.

Consider the sequence $\{\gamma_k(z)\}_{k \geqslant 0}$ defined by $\gamma_0(z) = \alpha_0(z)$ and, for $k \geqslant 0$, by $\gamma_{k+1}(z) = f(\gamma_k(z))$, with $\alpha_0(z)$ and f as defined in (2.13) and (2.22), respectively. Note that (2.22) gives $\gamma_{2k}(z) = \alpha_k(z)$ and $\gamma_{2k+1}(z) = \beta_k(z)$. The sequence $\{\gamma'_k(z)\}_{k \geqslant 0}$ satisfies the recurrence relation

$$\gamma'_{k+1}(z) = \gamma'_k(z) \partial_t f(\gamma_k(z)) + \partial_z f(\gamma_k(z)). \tag{A.13}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548312000594 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Below we study the coefficients $\partial_t f(\gamma_k(z))$ and $\partial_z f(\gamma_k(z))$ of (A.13). By using expression (2.22) of f, we easily obtain that for all $z \in [0, 1/\sqrt{8}]$ and all $t \in [0, a_0(z)]$

$$|\partial_t f(\gamma_k(z))| \leqslant 4\sqrt{2}/9. \tag{A.14}$$

In addition, $\partial_z f(t) = f(t)/[z\sqrt{1-4z^2(1+t^2)}]$, in such a way that $|\partial_z f(t)| \leqslant |2/z| \cdot |f(t)|$ for all $z \in [0, 1/\sqrt{8}]$ and all $t \in [0, a_0(z)]$. Then, using Lemma A.2 we obtain

$$|\partial_z f(\gamma_k(z))| \leqslant |2/z| \cdot |f(\gamma_k(z))| = |2/z| \cdot |\gamma_{k+1}(z)| \leqslant |2/z| \cdot 1/\sqrt{2}^{k+1} \leqslant 8/\sqrt{2}^{k+1}, \tag{A.15}$$

where the last inequality follows from the assumption $z \in [1/4, 0.35]$. From (A.13)–(A.15) we get

$$|\gamma'_{k+1}(z)| \leqslant \eta \cdot |\gamma'_{k+1}(z)| + \xi_k, \quad \eta = 4\sqrt{2}/9, \quad \xi_k = 8/\sqrt{2}^{k+1}. \tag{A.16}$$

We deduce that

$$|\gamma'_{k+1}(z)| \leqslant \eta^{k+1} \cdot |\gamma'_0(z)| + \sum_{p=0}^{k} \eta^p \xi_{k-p} \leqslant \eta^{k+1} \cdot |\gamma'_0(z)| + 72/\sqrt{2}^{k+1} \leqslant 100/\sqrt{2}^{k+1}, \tag{A.17}$$

where the last inequality follows from $\sup_{z\in[0.25,0.35]} |\gamma'_0(z)| \leqslant 13$ and $\eta \leqslant 1/\sqrt{2}$. With Lemma A.2 and (A.17), we obtain

$$|T'_k(z)| \leqslant 200/\sqrt{2}^{k+2}, \tag{A.18}$$

and thanks to (A.12) we can obtain approximations of $\widehat{x}'_{0,0}(\rho)$ up to any level of precision. Lemma A.5 follows. □

References

[1] Adan, I. J. B. F. (1991) A compensation approach for queueing problems. PhD dissertation, Technische Universiteit Eindhoven.

[2] Adan, I. J. B. F., Boxma, O. J. and Resing, J. (2001) Queueing models with multiple waiting lines. *Queueing Syst.* **37** 65–98.

[3] Adan, I. J. B. F., Wessels, J. and Zijm, W. H. M. (1990) Analysis of the symmetric shortest queue problem. *Comm. Statist. Stochastic Models* **6** 691–713.

[4] Adan, I. J. B. F., Wessels, J. and Zijm, W. H. M. (1993) A compensation approach for two-dimensional Markov processes. *Adv. Appl. Probab.* **25** 783–817.

[5] Bostan, A. and Kauers, M. (2009) Automatic classification of restricted lattice walks. In *Proc. 21st International Conference on Formal Power Series and Algebraic Combinatorics*, pp. 203–217.

[6] Bostan, A. and Kauers, M. (2010) The complete generating function for Gessel's walk is algebraic. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **432** 3063–3078.

[7] Bousquet-Mélou, M. and Mishna, M. (2010) Walks with small steps in the quarter plane. *Contemp. Math.* **520** 1–40.

[8] Fayolle, G., Iasnogorodski, R. and Malyshev, V. (1999) *Random Walks in the Quarter-Plane*, Springer.

[9] Fayolle, G. and Raschel, K. (2010) On the holonomy or algebraicity of generating functions counting lattice walks in the quarter-plane. *Markov Process. Rel. Fields* **16** 485–496.

[10] Fayolle, G. and Raschel, K. (2012) Some exact asymptotics in the counting of walks in the quarter plane. In *DMTCS Proc. AofA'12*, pp. 109–124.

[11] Flajolet, P. and Sedgewick, R. (2009) *Analytic Combinatorics*. Cambridge University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548312000594 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[12] Kurkova, I. and Malyshev, V. (1998) Martin boundary and elliptic curves. *Markov Process. Rel. Fields* **4** 203–272.
[13] Kurkova, I. and Raschel, K. (2011) Explicit expression for the generating function counting Gessel's walk. *Adv. Appl. Math.* **47** 414–433.
[14] Kurkova, I. and Raschel, K. (2012) On the functions counting walks with small steps in the quarter plane. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.* **116** 69–114.
[15] Malyshev, V. (1971) Positive random walks and Galois theory. *Uspehi Mat. Nauk* **26** 227–228.
[16] Melczer, S. and Mishna, M. (2012) Singularity analysis via the iterated kernel method. In preparation.
[17] Mishna, M. and Rechnitzer, A. (2009) Two non-holonomic lattice walks in the quarter plane. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **410** 3616–3630.
[18] Raschel, K. (2012) Counting walks in a quadrant: a unified approach via boundary value problems. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* **14** 749–777.
[19] Resing, J. and Rietman, R. (2004) The $M/M/1$ queue with gated random order of service. *Statist. Neerlandica* **58** 97–110.
[20] Stanley, R. (1999) *Enumerative Combinatorics*, Vol. 2, Cambridge University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548312000594 Published online by Cambridge University Press