

SOME HARMONIC FUNCTIONS FOR KILLED MARKOV BRANCHING PROCESSES WITH IMMIGRATION AND CULLING

MATIJA VIDMAR

ABSTRACT. For a continuous-time Bienaymé-Galton-Watson process, X , with immigration and culling, 0 as an absorbing state, call X^q the process that results from killing X at rate $q \in (0, \infty)$, followed by stopping it on extinction or explosion. Then an explicit identification of the relevant harmonic functions of X^q allows to determine the Laplace transforms (at argument q) of the first passage times downwards and of the explosion time for X . Strictly speaking, this is accomplished only when the killing rate q is sufficiently large (but always when the branching mechanism is not supercritical or if there is no culling). In particular, taking the limit $q \downarrow 0$ (whenever possible) yields the passage downwards and explosion probabilities for X . A number of other consequences of these results are presented. As an application, an optimal control problem is explicitly solved.

1. INTRODUCTION

Branching processes are ubiquitous in the modeling of many real-world phenomena that are subject to the laws of chance, “avalanches, networks, earthquakes, family names, populations of bacteria and cells, nuclear reactions, cultural evolution and neuronal avalanches” [13, first paragraph]. They represent a fundamental family of (types of) stochastic processes in discrete or continuous time or space, that has received considerable attention in the mathematical literature [2, 15, 1, 18, 20]. Many fine results are available, especially concerning their asymptotic behavior, while much less is known about the laws of the quantities attached to the exits of branching processes from (even semi-infinite) intervals.

1.1. Specification of the class of processes under consideration. Let $X = (X_t)_{t \in [0, \infty)}$ be a continuous-time Bienaymé-Galton-Watson process (ctBGWp) [2, Chapter 3] [15, Chapter V] [1, Chapter IV] [18, Section 1.2] under the probabilities $\mathbb{P} = (\mathbb{P}_x)_{x \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, defined on a base measurable space (Ω, \mathcal{G}) .

Recall that, informally, for $x \in \mathbb{N}_0$, under \mathbb{P}_x , X measures the size of a population in which all individuals die, and give birth to offspring at the times of their death, all at some common rate, $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$, and with a common number-of-offspring distribution, $p = (p_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, independently of each other, x being the initial number of individuals. Put differently: starting with a population of size x , each individual, independently of the others, stays alive for an exponentially of rate λ distributed amount of time; upon its death, for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, p_k is the probability of it giving birth to precisely k offspring. In particular, p_0 is the probability of dying without producing progeny.

CtBGWp, being continuous-time Markov chains (ctMc) [21, 7], are arguably the simplest branching processes in continuous time. They are also the closest continuous-time analogues of the basic (discrete-time) Bienaymé-Galton-Watson processes (BGWp) [2, Chapter I]. Though, the continuous-discrete time correspondence is not without limitation: the ctBGWp are skip-free downwards (i.e. a.s. do not skip any level as they attain new

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 60J80. Secondary: 60J85; 60J50.

Key words and phrases. Branching processes; immigration; culling; harmonic functions; first passage downwards; explosion; Laplace transforms; factorization at the minimum; conditioning; stochastic optimal control.

Financial support from the Slovenian Research Agency is acknowledged (programme No. P1-0402).

minima), while the BGWp are not. Accordingly a ctBGWp is not simply a subordination of a BGWp, and only some BGWp are embeddable in a ctBGWp [2, Section III.12]. Still, every discrete-time skeleton of a ctBGWp is a BGWp [2, Section III.6]. Scaling limits of (ct)BGWp lead to continuous-state branching processes (csbp) [20, Chapter 3].

In this paper we will be interested in the *continuous-time, discrete-space* process X only. That being so, we add to the “branching constellation” described above immigration, *as well as* – culling. More precisely, independently of the branching, at some rate $\mu \in [0, \infty)$, *until the process dies out or explodes*, we either immigrate a certain number of individuals, or *cull*, but at any given point in time at most one individual, according to the distribution function $r = (r_k)_{k \in \{-1\} \cup \mathbb{N}}$, culling of one individual occurring with probability r_{-1} , immigration of $k \in \mathbb{N}$ individuals occurring with probability r_k .

The addition of culling and immigration preserves the downwards skip-free property. We have of course the special cases: (i) $\mu = 0$ — no immigration/culling, i.e. pure branching; (ii) $r_{-1} = 0$ — no culling, i.e. branching with immigration (stopped on extinction). Besides, if, *ceteris paribus*, we were to allow $\lambda = 0$ (but insist that $\mu r_{-1} > 0$), then X would simply be a, stopped on hitting 0, homogeneous-Poisson-process-subordinated, integer-valued left-continuous random walk. For the latter we refer to [26] and retain the standing assumption $\lambda > 0$ (except where otherwise indicated). To avoid some complications/trivial considerations we will also assume throughout that $p_0 > 0$ and that X does not have a.s. nonincreasing paths.

1.2. Overview of results. Let now T_0^- be the first hitting time of 0 by the process X and let $q \in (0, \infty)$. Set: $\varphi := \mathbb{P}_1(T_0^- < \infty) \in (0, 1]$, wherein we take $\mu = 0$; $\phi_q := \mathbb{P}_1[e^{-qT_0^-}; T_0^- < \infty] \in [0, 1)$, wherein we take, *ceteris paribus*, $\lambda = 0$ (so $\phi_q = 0$, if there is no culling).¹ The quantities φ and ϕ_q can be specified explicitly in terms of the p.g.f. of p and r , respectively (see below).

Then, under the condition $\phi_q \leq \varphi$ (resp. $\phi_q < \varphi$ and X can explode) this paper will provide an explicit expression for a non-zero, bounded, vanishing at infinity (resp. *and* an explicit expression for a non-zero, bounded, *not* vanishing at infinity), harmonic function of the process X that is killed at rate q and stopped on becoming extinct or exploding. The expressions will be “explicit” in the sense that they will be expressed directly in terms of q, λ, μ and the p.g.f. of p and r . See Theorem 3.6.

As a consequence of the preceding we will obtain the Laplace transforms of the first passage times downwards of X (resp. *and* of the explosion time of X) at all arguments q for which $\phi_q \geq \varphi$ (resp. $\phi_q > \varphi$), Theorem 4.2, together with some immediate related corollaries to do with the following, among others: the computation of the means of first passage and explosion times (Corollaries 5.2 and 5.3); the conditioning of X on extinction before an independent exponential time has elapsed (Corollary 5.4); the factorization of X at the minimum up to an independent exponential random time (Corollary 5.7). In particular, taking the limit $q \downarrow 0$ will yield expressions for the passage downwards (hence extinction) and explosion (before passage downwards) probabilities of X , provided $\lim_{q \downarrow 0} \phi_q \leq \varphi$. A change of measure allows to include the cumulative-lifetime-to-date process $\int_0^\cdot X_t dt$ at first passage, Corollary 4.12.

By way of “concrete” application, we shall consider in detail, and solve — Proposition 6.6 — a simple optimal control problem pertaining to keeping a ctBGWp from extinction, or more generally from it going below a predetermined level. The control is “exogeneous” immigration, a fixed cost is attributed to the immigration of each individual, the costs are discounted over time, and one seeks to minimize their expected value.

¹We write expectations in Markov theory parlance: $\mathbb{P}_x[F; A] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_x}[F\mathbb{1}_A]$, whenever it is defined.

Besides the generality (immigration, culling, explosions), the main appeal of the present work is the level of explicitness that one can attach to the harmonic functions. The fact that we also obtain the harmonic function corresponding to explosions is a further distinguishing element of our analysis.

1.3. Connections to existing literature; indication of some related problems that are left open. Our deliberations contribute mainly to the literature on first passage times, which is a venerable topic of the theory of real stochastic processes, with considerable practical relevance [23].

Specifically as it concerns first passage theory of branching processes, our results complement the following two papers. On the one hand, [3], that considered the first passage downwards problem of ctBGWp, but did not include immigration/culling, and provided an expression for the relevant excessive function in terms of the transition semigroup only (except in special cases), cf. Remark 4.8. On the other hand, [10], which considered the analogous first passage problem for csbp with immigration (cbi), providing in fact for this class an explicit formula [10, Eq. (11)] that even includes the cumulative-lifetime-to-date (a.k.a. total progeny, avalanche size) process at first passage besides the first passage time itself. This formula, expressed in terms of the Laplace exponents of the underlying branching/immigration mechanisms, is very much akin to ours (4.6), cf. Remark 4.14. This is not surprising since cbi are scaling limits of ctBGWp with immigration. By a similar token, culling, just like immigration, should also allow for an analogue in the continuous state-space setting, cf. Remark 2.1. This, together with the treatment of the time of explosion for csbp with immigration and culling, is left to be pursued in future work. Further connections with [3, 10] are provided in the main body of the exposition, as appropriate.

We may draw a parallel with the theory of scale functions of upwards or downwards skip-free Markov processes. Indeed, for processes with stationary independent increments (psii) this skip-free property contributes to a significant simplification of their fluctuation theory, with the fundamental exit problems being then parsimoniously expressible in terms of a collection of so-called scale functions [16, 19, 4, 26]. Outside of the psii class the situation becomes more complex [17, 25], except for special cases, e.g. diffusions that have continuous sample paths [24, Section V.46]. The harmonic function Φ_q defined below is nothing but the simplest scale function attributable to ctBGWp on account of their downwards skip-free property, solving the first-passage downwards problem. Characterizing efficiently the whole suite of scale functions of ctBGWp or csbp with immigration and/or culling, which would solve the two-sided exit problem for these classes of processes, remains an open task.

This paper relates in general to the literature on ctBGWp. Of the more recent results we may mention [13], that contains an interesting exploration of the asymptotically universal behaviour of ctBGWp near criticality, in particular with regard to the extinction time and total progeny (avalanche duration and size, respectively, in the terminology of [13]).

From another point of view, our results fall under the study of excessive functions of Markov processes, and their connections to Martin boundaries, viz. the ways in which a Markov process exits its state-space, see e.g. [27, Chapter 7], [11, passim], and [6] for upwards/downwards skip-free Markov chains in particular.

1.4. Article structure. We give the precise results concerning harmonic functions in Section 3, after establishing some preliminaries in Section 2. Then Section 4 delivers the promised Laplace transforms, while Section 5 is devoted to further consequences. Finally, Section 6 concerns an application to the above-mentioned optimal control problem.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Without loss of generality we may, and do assume $p_1 = 0$ (the general case requires only changing the rate at which the individuals are dying/reproducing to $\lambda(1 - p_1)$ and conditioning the offspring distribution on $\mathbb{N}_0 \setminus \{1\}$). On the other hand, we put $r_0 := 0$. We refer to p as the branching, and to r as the immigration/culling mechanism.

Formally, the system (X, P) is a minimal (lifetime: ζ ; cemetery: ∞) càdlàg ctMc with state space \mathbb{N}_0 . Its conservative generator matrix Q on \mathbb{N}_0 satisfies $Q_{00} = 0$, while for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $-Q_{nn} = \lambda n + \mu$ and $Q_{n(n+m)} = p_{m+1}\lambda + r_m\mu$ for further $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1\}$. The generator Q is irreducible on restriction to \mathbb{N} and all the states in \mathbb{N} are transient.

A couple of the particulars agreed on thus far, that are not entirely innocuous, are a little hidden from sight; let us stress them for the reader's benefit once more. To wit: 0 is an absorbing state, even though under immigration without culling it might not have been rendered as such; $\lambda p_0 > 0$, even though also the case $p_0 = 0$ is of interest when $r_{-1} > 0$ (while we have already commented on what happens for $\lambda = 0$); we preclude a.s. nonincreasing paths, i.e. we assume that

$$\mu r_k > 0 \text{ for some } k \in \mathbb{N} \text{ or } p_0 < 1.$$

Remark 2.1. In the spirit of [5] we may note as follows. Let us take the following independent random elements: two independent downwards skip-free random walks on \mathbb{Z} , W^1 and W^2 , with jump probabilities $(p_{k+1})_{k \in \{-1\} \cup \mathbb{N}}$ and r , respectively; two independent homogeneous Poisson processes, N^1 and N^2 , of intensities λ and μ , respectively. Let $(Q_x)_{x \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be the probabilities for W^1 (only nonnegative starting values of W^1 are of interest); $W_0^2 = N_0^1 = N_0^2 = 0$ a.s.- Q_x for all $x \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Set $Y^i := W_{N^i}^i$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Then a.s. there is a unique \mathbb{N}_0 -valued càdlàg path $Z = (Z_t)_{t \in [0, \infty)}$ with lifetime ξ , cemetery ∞ , 0 as an absorbing state, such that, with τ_0 the hitting time of 0 by Z ,

$$Z_t = Y_{\int_0^t Z_s ds}^1 + Y_{t \wedge \tau_0}^2 \text{ for } t \in [0, \xi) \text{ and } \lim_{\xi^-} Z = \infty \text{ if } \xi < \infty.$$

The process Z with lifetime ξ under the probabilities $(Q_x)_{x \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is seen to be a realization of (X, P) as described above. Thus a ctBGWp with immigration and culling comes from a path transformation of two downwards skip-free random walks. Replacing Y^1 and Y^2 with independent spectrally positive Lévy processes is then likely to represent one possible avenue into defining a csbp with immigration and culling, but we will not pursue this here.

We set next, for $z \in (0, 1]$,

$$\tilde{p}(z) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_k z^k \text{ and } \tilde{r}(z) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} r_k z^k,$$

the p.g.f. of p and r , respectively. Then φ will denote the smallest root of $\tilde{p}(z) = z$ in $z \in (0, 1]$, there being at most one more in addition to 1. The case $\tilde{p}'(\varphi-) = 1$ occurs iff $\tilde{p}'(1-) = 1$, in which case also $\varphi = 1$, and this corresponds to the critical branching mechanism. On the other hand, when $\tilde{p}'(1-) < 1$, and so $\varphi = 1$ (resp. is > 1 , and so $\varphi < 1$) the branching mechanism is called subcritical (resp. supercritical). We recall further that the condition

$$\int_v^1 \frac{dz}{z - \tilde{p}(z)} < \infty \text{ for some } v \in (\varphi, 1)$$

is equivalent to

$$P_x(\zeta < \infty) > 0 \text{ for some (equivalently, all) } x \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{E}$$

i.e. to the explosivity of the chain X [15, Theorem V.9.1] (the presence of the immigration and culling is without effect on the (non-)explosiveness of X , because immigration/culling occur at a constant rate). By a result of Doney

[9, Corollary 2] condition (E) is also equivalent to

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(n \sum_{k=0}^n \sum_{l=k+1}^{\infty} p_l \right)^{-1} < \infty.$$

In particular the chain is always explosive if $\sum_{l=k}^{\infty} p_l \sim k^{-\alpha} L(k)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ for a slowly varying L and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ [14]; the situation corresponding to (E) is thus non-vacuous.

In terms of first passage quantities — that will be of fundamental importance — for $a \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we denote by $T_a^- := \inf\{t \in [0, \zeta) : X_t \leq a\}$ [$\inf \emptyset = \infty$], the first passage time below the level a . Because all the states in \mathbb{N} are transient, a.s. Ω is equal to the disjoint union of $\{T_0^- < \infty\}$, $\{\zeta = \infty, \lim_{\infty} X = \infty\}$ and $\{\zeta < \infty, \lim_{\zeta-} X = \infty\}$. If $\mu = 0$, then for all $x \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\varphi^x = P_x(T_0^- < \infty)$ is the extinction probability of X under P_x .

When the qualifiers a.s., independent, martingale etc. shall appear below without specification of a probability measure, they are asserted under P_x for all $x \in \mathbb{N}_0$. We grant ourselves access to a random exponential time of rate 1, e_1 , independent of X ; then we set $e_q := e_1/q$ for $q \in [0, \infty) \setminus \{1\}$. We will be adding killing to X at the times e_q , $q \in (0, \infty)$. The cemetery for this killing will be $-\infty$. For any function f not defined at $-\infty$ we understand $f(-\infty) := 0$ (but leave f with its domain such as it is).

3. HARMONIC FUNCTIONS FOR THE KILLED PROCESS

Throughout this section let $q \in (0, \infty)$ and define the process

$$X^q := X \mathbb{1}_{\{\cdot \wedge T_0^- \wedge \zeta < e_q\}} + (-\infty) \mathbb{1}_{\{\cdot \wedge T_0^- \wedge \zeta \geq e_q\}},$$

which is X , *first* killed and sent to the cemetery $-\infty$ at the time e_q , and *then* stopped on hitting $\{0, \infty\}$. We stress: to go from X to X^q one adds killing (at rate q) in the non-absorbing states *only*.

The following proposition characterizes the bounded harmonic functions of X^q (with a well-defined limit at infinity).

Proposition 3.1. *Let $f : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be bounded and assume that*

$$\text{the limit } f(\infty) := \lim_{\infty} f \text{ exists whenever (E) prevails.} \tag{3.1}$$

Define $W_f^q := (e^{-q(t \wedge T_0^- \wedge \zeta)} f(X_t))_{t \in [0, \infty)}$. *The following statements are equivalent.*

- (i) f is harmonic for X^q , i.e. rendering $f(X^q)$ a martingale.
- (ii) $f(X^q)$ is a martingale in the smallest filtration that makes X adapted and e_q a stopping time.
- (iii) The process W_f^q is a martingale.
- (iv) The process W_f^q is a martingale in the natural filtration of X .
- (v) For all $x \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(q + \lambda x + \mu)f(x) = \lambda x \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_k f(x+k-1) + \mu \sum_{k=-1}^{\infty} r_k f(x+k). \tag{3.2}$$

Such statements can certainly be considered valid “as part of folklore”. Nevertheless we provide a proof, since we allow for explosions, and in principle subtleties could have been overlooked.

Proof. As a preliminary observation note that the natural filtration of X^q (resp. of W_f^q) is included in the smallest filtration that makes X adapted and e_q a stopping time (resp. in the natural filtration of X).

Notation-wise, let $(J_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence of jump times of X (if there are only finitely many, then the remaining ones are set equal to ∞). Set $J_0 := 0$, and define $H_n := X_{J_n}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ (here $X_\infty := 0$, of course). The process $H = (H_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is the jump chain of X . We denote by τ_0^- the first time H enters $\{0\}$.

Suppose first that (i) or (iii) holds; we show (v). Indeed, by optional sampling, $\mathbb{P}_x[f(X_{J_1}^q)] = f(x)$ or $\mathbb{P}_x[W_f^q(J_1)] = f(x)$, and (3.2) follows from the structural characterization of ctMc.

Now assume (v) holds. We show (iv), which in turn trivially implies (iii). This could be achieved using results from general Markov process theory [12, Proposition 4.1.7], but in this context it is probably easier to follow a direct approach. To wit, using (3.2) one establishes by induction that the discrete-time process $(f(H_n) \prod_{k=1}^{n \wedge \tau_0^-} \frac{\mu + \lambda H_{J_{k-1}}}{q + \mu + \lambda H_{J_{k-1}}})_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is a martingale in the natural filtration of the jump chain of X . Consequently, from the structural characterization of ctMc, by “integrating out” the normalized holding periods, one sees that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the process W_f^q , stopped at J_n , viz. the process $(e^{-q(t \wedge T_0^- \wedge J_n)} f(X_{t \wedge J_n}))_{t \in [0, \infty)}$, is a martingale in the natural filtration of X . Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the preceding yields the martingale property of W_f^q .

(ii), which in turn trivially implies (i), is a mere rewriting of (iv), using the independence of X and e_q (and the Markov property of X coupled with the memoryless property of e_q). \square

Definition 3.2. We denote by \mathcal{I}^q the space of bounded $f : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that satisfy (3.1) and the equivalent conditions of the preceding proposition. We put $\mathcal{I}_0^q := \{f \in \mathcal{I}^q : \lim_{\infty} f = 0\}$ and $\mathcal{I}_\infty^q = \{f \in \mathcal{I}^q : f(0) = 0\}$.

Let us provide a “landscape view” of \mathcal{I}^q .

Proposition 3.3. \mathcal{I}^q is a vector space of dimension one (resp. two) when (E) fails (resp. prevails). \mathcal{I}_0^q is a vector subspace of \mathcal{I}^q of dimension one. If (E) prevails, then \mathcal{I}_∞^q is also a vector subspace of \mathcal{I}^q of dimension one. Let $f \in \mathcal{I}_0^q \setminus \{0\}$. Then $f \neq 0$ everywhere on \mathbb{N}_0 , f is strictly decreasing, and for $\{x, a\} \subset \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_x[e^{-qT_a^-}; T_a^- < \infty] = \frac{f(x)}{f(a)}, \quad a \leq x.$$

If further $g \in \mathcal{I}^q \setminus \mathcal{I}_0^q$, then (E) prevails and for $\{x, a\} \subset \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_x[e^{-q\zeta}; \zeta < T_a^-] = \frac{g(x)}{g(\infty)} - \frac{g(a)}{g(\infty)} \frac{f(x)}{f(a)}, \quad a \leq x.$$

If even $g \in \mathcal{I}_\infty^q \setminus \{0\}$, then $g \neq 0$ on \mathbb{N} , g is strictly increasing, and for $x \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_x[e^{-q\zeta}; \zeta < \infty] = \frac{g(x)}{g(\infty)}.$$

Informally speaking, the preceding statement is connected to the fact that X^q can exit \mathbb{N} in one or two ways, according as explosions cannot or can happen (it can always exit \mathbb{N} by hitting 0). As alluded to in the Introduction, this is part of a much grander story of Martin boundaries, however in the present case the proof is elementary.

Proof. Let $h \in \mathcal{I}^q$. Applying optional sampling to the martingale W_h^q from Proposition 3.1 we find that for all $x \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$h(x) = h(0)\mathbb{P}_x[e^{-qT_0^-}; T_0^- < \infty] + h(\infty)\mathbb{P}_x[e^{-q\zeta}; \zeta < \infty],$$

and more generally, for further $a \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$h(x) = h(a)\mathbb{P}_x[e^{-qT_a^-}; T_a^- < \infty] + h(\infty)\mathbb{P}_x[e^{-q\zeta}; \zeta < T_a^-], \quad a \leq x.$$

All the claims follow. \square

In order to identify \mathcal{I}^q (to the extent indicated in the Introduction) we will also need the following technical result.

Lemma 3.4. *Assume $\mu r_{-1} > 0$. The equation $q = \mu(\tilde{r}(z) - 1)$ in z has a unique root $\phi_q \in (0, 1)$. The equation $0 = \mu(\tilde{r}(z) - 1)$ in z has at most two roots in $z \in (0, 1]$, one of which is 1; the smaller of the two is denoted ϕ . The map $q \mapsto \phi_q$ is a continuous and strictly decreasing bijection from $(0, \infty)$ onto $(0, \phi)$; $\phi = \uparrow\text{-lim}_{q \downarrow 0} \phi_q$. We have that $q + \mu(1 - \tilde{r})$ is > 0 (resp. < 0) on $(\phi_q, 1)$ (resp. $(0, \phi_q)$). Besides, $\phi_q = P_1(T_0^- < e_q)$ if, ceteris paribus, we set $\lambda = 0$.*

Proof. These are well-known facts from the theory of (homogeneous-Poisson-process-subordinated) left-continuous random walks, see e.g. [4, 26]. \square

Definition 3.5. When $\mu r_{-1} = 0$, we set $\phi_q := \phi := 0$. Otherwise ϕ_q and ϕ are given by the preceding lemma. It will sometimes be convenient to write $\phi_0 := \phi$.

We turn now to the identification of \mathcal{I}^q (when $\phi_q < \varphi$). Before stating, and proving the result, let us provide some motivational computations, which also represent the gist of the eventual proof.

Take any $x \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Recall that when $\mu = 0$, then $P_x(T_0^- < \infty) = \varphi^x$, while if, ceteris paribus, $\lambda = 0$, then $P_x(T_0^- < e_q) = \phi_q^x$. Given also the structure of (3.2), it seems therefore natural, in order to find a harmonic function f for X^q , to take the ansatz

$$f(x) = \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} w(v)v^x dv$$

for suitable delimiters $0 \leq \alpha < \beta \leq 1$ and a sufficiently nice $w : (\alpha, \beta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Plugging this in (3.2) one obtains (we omit technical reservations)

$$\int_{\alpha}^{\beta} v^x (q + \mu)w(x) + xv^{x-1}\lambda vw(v)dv = \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} xv^{x-1}\lambda\tilde{p}(v)w(v) + v^x\mu\tilde{r}(v)dv.$$

After an integration by parts and some rearranging it becomes

$$\int_{\alpha}^{\beta} v^x (q + \mu(1 - \tilde{r}(v)))w(x)dv = \lambda(\tilde{p}(v) - v)w(v)v^x|_{v=\alpha}^{\beta} - \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} v^x \frac{d}{dv}[\lambda(\tilde{p}(v) - v)w(v)]dv.$$

So ignoring the boundary terms (hoping they vanish, or can otherwise be “remedied” by adding a simple function to f , like a constant or some power function), one should like to have

$$(q + \mu(1 - \tilde{r}(v)))w(v) = -\frac{d}{dv}[\lambda(\tilde{p}(v) - v)w(v)], \quad v \in (\alpha, \beta).$$

Basically this o.d.e. can be solved for w and then the α, β can be conjured to provide the candidate solutions (modulo adding a constant to f). Backtracking one checks that they are indeed correct. However (apparently), it works only if $\phi_q < \varphi$.

Here is then our main result: the promised identification of \mathcal{I}^q when $\phi_q < \varphi$.

Theorem 3.6. *Put*

$$\rho(v) := \lambda|\tilde{p}(v) - v| \text{ and } \gamma_q(v) := \frac{q + \mu(1 - \tilde{r}(v))}{\rho(v)}, \quad v \in (0, 1) \setminus \{\varphi\},$$

noting that $\tilde{p}(z) - z$ is > 0 (resp. < 0) for $z \in (0, \varphi)$ (resp. $z \in (\varphi, 1)$), and that $\gamma_q(z)$ is < 0 (resp. > 0) for $z \in (0, \phi_q) \setminus \{\varphi\}$ (resp. for $z \in (\phi_q, 1) \setminus \{\varphi\}$).

(i) Let $\phi_q < \varphi$. Then $\Phi_q : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, given by

$$\Phi_q(x) := q \int_0^\varphi \frac{\exp\{-\int_{\phi_q}^v \gamma_q\}}{\rho(v)} v^x dv, \quad x \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

is from $\mathcal{I}_0^q \setminus \{0\}$. Assume further (E). Then $\Psi_q : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, given by

$$\Psi_q(x) := 1 - q \int_\varphi^1 \frac{\exp\{-\int_v^1 \gamma_q\}}{\rho(v)} v^x dv, \quad x \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

is an element of $\mathcal{I}^q \setminus \mathcal{I}_0^q$.

(ii) When $\phi_q = \varphi$, then $\Phi_q : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, given by

$$\Phi_q(x) := \varphi^x, \quad x \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

is from $\mathcal{I}_0^q \setminus \{0\}$.

Definition 3.7. In what follows the functions Φ_q and Ψ_q are as introduced in Theorem 3.6.

When applied to Φ_q in lieu of f , Proposition 3.1 is a refinement of [3, Lemma that includes Eq. (2.7)]. We provide some remarks and an example before turning to the proof.

Remark 3.8. The condition $\phi_q < \varphi$ is vacuous when $\mu r_{-1} = 0$ or $\varphi = 1$, and more generally whenever $\phi \leq \varphi$. If $\varphi < \phi$ (which necessitates supercritical branching and the presence of culling), then $\phi_q < \varphi$ is equivalent to $q > \mu(\tilde{r}(\varphi) - 1)$.

Remark 3.9. Assume $\phi_q < \varphi$. Then $\int_{\phi_q}^\varphi \gamma_q = \infty$, and $\int_0^{\phi_q} \gamma_q = -\infty$ unless $\mu r_{-1} = 0$, in which case $\int_0^v \gamma_q < \infty$ for all $v \in (0, \varphi)$. If further (E) prevails, then $\int_\varphi^1 \gamma_q = \infty$ (but $\int_v^1 \gamma_q < \infty$ for all $v \in (\varphi, 1)$).

Remark 3.10. Assume $\phi_q \in (0, \varphi)$. As, ceteris paribus, $\lambda \downarrow 0$, then Φ_q is becoming “more and more concentrated” at $\mathbb{N}_0 \ni x \mapsto \phi_q^x$, which is what one expects given the known results for the process X for which, again ceteris paribus, $\lambda = 0$.

Remark 3.11. Assume $\mu = 0$. Then an integration by parts simplifies the expressions for Φ_q and Ψ_q : for $x \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_q(x) &= \delta_{x0} + x \int_0^\varphi v^{x-1} \exp\left\{-\int_0^v \gamma_q\right\} dv, \quad \text{while, assuming (E),} \\ \Psi_q(x) &= x \int_\varphi^1 v^{x-1} \exp\left\{-\int_v^1 \gamma_q\right\} dv. \end{aligned}$$

We see that in this case Ψ_q belongs even to $\mathcal{I}_\infty^q \setminus \{0\}$ (under (E)).

Example 3.12. Let $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $\delta \in [0, \infty)$, $\gamma + \delta \geq 0$, $\{\alpha, \beta\} \subset (0, \infty)$, and assume $\lambda(\tilde{p}(z) - z) = \alpha(1 - z) + \beta(1 - z)^2$, while $\mu(\tilde{r}(z) - 1)z = \gamma(1 - z) + \delta(1 - z)^2$ for $z \in (0, 1]$. It corresponds to non-trivial subcritical binary branching and to immigration/culling of at most one individual at a time. In this case X is skip-free upwards as well as downwards. We obtain (the proportionality constant depends only on q and $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$, not on $x \in \mathbb{N}_0$)

$$\Phi_q(x) \propto \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\gamma+\delta}{\alpha+\beta} + x + 1\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\gamma+\delta}{\alpha+\beta} + \frac{q}{\alpha} + x + 1\right)} {}_2F_1\left(\frac{\beta\gamma - \alpha\delta}{\beta(\alpha + \beta)} + \frac{q}{\alpha} + 1, \frac{\gamma + \delta}{\alpha + \beta} + x + 1; \frac{\gamma + \delta}{\alpha + \beta} + \frac{q}{\alpha} + x + 1; \frac{\beta}{\alpha + \beta}\right),$$

where ${}_2F_1$ is Gauss’ hypergeometric function. Taking $\gamma = \delta = 0$ one has consistency with [3, Section 3.1] (via Euler’s transformation for ${}_2F_1$).

Proof of Theorem 3.6. (ii) is clear from Proposition 3.1(v). Assume then $\phi_q < \varphi$. Set $\omega := \exp\{-\int_{\phi_q}^{\cdot} \gamma_q\}$. Then $\omega : (0, \varphi) \rightarrow (0, 1]$ is C^1 , it satisfies $\lim_{\varphi^-} \omega = 0$ and $\lim_{0^+} \omega \in [0, \infty)$, and it solves the o.d.e. $-\gamma_q \omega = \omega'$. Besides, we see that Φ_q is well-defined, bounded, non-zero, and vanishing at infinity. Using Proposition 3.1(v) one concludes via an integration by parts (to get rid of the “ λx ”s; see the computation immediately preceding the statement of Theorem 3.6) that $\Phi_q \in \mathcal{I}_0^q$. In a similar way one sees that $\Psi_q \in \mathcal{I}^q \setminus \mathcal{I}_0^q$. \square

An immediate consequence of Theorem 3.6 and Proposition 3.1 is the following martingale change of measure. We will have more to say on this in Proposition 4.11.

Corollary 3.13. *Suppose $\phi > \varphi$, i.e. $\tilde{r}(\varphi) > 1$. Set $q = \mu(\tilde{r}(\varphi) - 1)$. Define the probabilities*

$$\mathbb{Q}_x := \varphi^{-x} e^{-qT_0^-} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_0^- < \infty\}} \cdot \mathbb{P}_x, \quad x \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Let \mathcal{F} be the natural filtration of X . Then: for any \mathcal{F} -stopping time S and any $F \in (\mathcal{F}_S/\mathcal{B}_{[0, \infty)}) \cup (b\mathcal{F}_S)$,

$$\mathbb{Q}_x[F] = \mathbb{P}_x[F \varphi^{X_S - x} e^{-q(S \wedge T_0^-)}], \quad x \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

where we set (a.s.) $X_S := \lim_{\infty} X$ on $\{S = \infty\}$; furthermore, X remains a minimal ctMc under the probabilities $\mathbb{Q} = (\mathbb{Q}_x)_{x \in \mathbb{N}_0}$. In fact, the system (X, \mathbb{Q}) is again a ctBGWp with subcritical branching mechanism ($\mathbb{N}_0 \ni k \mapsto p_k \varphi^{k-1}$), the same reproduction rate λ , immigration/culling mechanism ($\mathbb{N} \cup \{-1\} \ni k \mapsto r_k \varphi^k / \tilde{r}(\varphi)$), and immigration/culling rate $q + \mu = \mu \tilde{r}(\varphi)$. Finally, $\mathbb{Q}_x(T_0^- < \infty) = 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Proof. We see that $\phi_q = \varphi$. By Proposition 3.1 and Theorem 3.6(ii), the process $W_{\Phi_q}^q$ of Proposition 3.1 is a bounded martingale with terminal value $e^{-qT_0^-} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_0^- < \infty\}}$ and initial value φ^x , \mathbb{P}_x -a.s. for all $x \in \mathbb{N}_0$. The first claim is then the content of a standard change of measure of the Markov process X by the uniformly integrable martingale W^q . The second claim follows by direct computation: for $x \in \mathbb{N}$ and $y \in x + (\mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{-1\})$, $\mathbb{Q}_x(X_t = y) = \varphi^{-x} \mathbb{P}_x[e^{-q(t \wedge T_0^- \wedge \zeta)} \varphi^{X_t}; X_t = y] = \varphi^{y-x} \mathbb{P}_x(X_t^q = y)$. The final claim follows directly from the definition of \mathbb{Q}_x . \square

4. LAPLACE TRANSFORMS OF FIRST PASSAGE DOWNWARDS AND EXPLOSION TIMES

The main harvest of Theorem 3.6 are the Laplace transforms of the extinction and explosion time of X . For their succinct formulation we complement Definition 3.7 with

Definition 4.1. When $\phi \leq \varphi$, set for $x \in \mathbb{N}_0$:

$$\Phi_0(x) := \mu \int_0^\varphi \frac{\exp\left\{-\int_\phi^v \frac{\mu(1-\tilde{r}(w))}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(w)-w)} dw\right\}}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(v)-v)} v^x dv$$

if $\mu(1 - \tilde{r}(\varphi)) > 0$ [i.e. $\mu > 0$ and $\phi < \varphi < 1$] or if $\mu > 0$, $\phi < 1 = \varphi$ and $\int_0^1 \frac{\exp\left\{-\int_\phi^v \frac{\mu(1-\tilde{r}(w))}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(w)-w)} dw\right\}}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(v)-v)} dv < \infty$;
 $\Phi_0(x) := \varphi^x$ otherwise [i.e. if $\mu = 0$, or else $\phi = \varphi$, or else $\varphi = 1$ and $\int_0^1 \frac{\exp\left\{-\int_\phi^v \frac{\mu(1-\tilde{r}(w))}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(w)-w)} dw\right\}}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(v)-v)} dv = \infty$].

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\{a, x\} \subset \mathbb{N}_0$, $a \leq x$, $q \in [0, \infty)$. Then for $q \geq \mu(\tilde{r}(\varphi) - 1)$, i.e. for $\phi_q \leq \varphi$,*

$$\mathbb{P}_x[e^{-qT_a^-}; T_a^- < \infty] = \frac{\Phi_q(x)}{\Phi_q(a)}. \quad (4.1)$$

In particular if $\phi \leq \varphi$, then

$$\mathbb{P}_x(T_a^- < \infty) = \frac{\Phi_0(x)}{\Phi_0(a)}, \quad (4.2)$$

and $\mathbf{P}_x(T_0^- < \infty) = 1$ for some (equivalently, all) $x \in \mathbb{N}$ iff

$$\varphi = 1 \text{ and } \left(\mu = 0 \text{ or else } \phi = 1 \text{ or else } \int_0^1 \frac{\exp\left\{-\int_\phi^v \frac{\mu(1-\tilde{r}(w))}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(w)-w)} dw\right\}}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(v)-v)} dv = \infty \right). \quad (4.3)$$

If (E) prevails and $q \in (0, \infty)$, then for $q > \mu(\tilde{r}(\varphi) - 1)$, i.e. for $\phi_q < \varphi$,

$$\mathbf{P}_x[e^{-q\zeta}; \zeta < T_a^-] = \Psi_q(x) - \Psi_q(a) \frac{\Phi_q(x)}{\Phi_q(a)}. \quad (4.4)$$

Finally, if $\phi \leq \varphi$ and (E) holds true, then

$$\mathbf{P}_x(\zeta < T_a^-) + \mathbf{P}_x(T_a^- < \infty) = 1. \quad (4.5)$$

The condition of (4.3) is similar to the recurrence-transience criterion in the setting of cbi [10, Theorem 3]. Before turning to the proof, let us make a number of remarks, and provide some examples.

Remark 4.3. The theorem is conclusive in case $\phi \leq \varphi$. Suppose, however, $\varphi < \phi$. Then in principle for $q \in (0, \mu(\tilde{r}(\varphi) - 1))$, (4.1) may be got by analytic continuation, since the l.h.s. is analytic in $\Re(q) > 0$. Once (4.1) is known for $q > 0$, then the value at $q = 0$ follows by taking the limit $q \downarrow 0$, since the l.h.s. is continuous in $q \in [0, \infty)$. By a coupling argument (cf. the proof of this theorem for the idea), we also see from (4.2) that $\mathbf{P}_x(T_a^- < \infty) \in [\varphi^{x-a}, \phi^{x-a}]$ for $a \leq x$ from \mathbb{N}_0 . An entirely analogous remark pertains to (4.4).

Example 4.4. As an illustration of Remark 4.3, consider the binary branching mechanism with $p_0 = 1 - p_2 = \frac{1}{3}$, $\lambda = 3$, and the culling mechanism with $r_{-1} = 1$ and $\mu = 1$. This is a case of a supercritical branching mechanism with culling for which $1 = \phi > \varphi = \frac{1}{2}$. Then one computes using (4.1) that $\mathbf{P}_1[e^{-qT_0^-}; T_0^- < \infty] = \frac{1}{4} \left(3 - q + 2^q(q-1)q \int_0^{1/2} \frac{v^q}{1-v} dv \right)$ for $q \in [1, \infty)$. The formula persists for $q \in (0, 1)$ by analytic continuation, and then also at $q = 0$ by continuity. In particular $\mathbf{P}_1(T_0^- < \infty) = \frac{3}{4}$.

Example 4.5. Let $\tilde{p}(z) - z = (1-z)^2/2$, $z \in (0, 1]$ (critical binary branching) and $1 - \tilde{r}(z) = \sqrt{1-z}$, $z \in (0, 1]$ (immigration of infinite mean, no culling). We have $\phi = 0 < 1 = \varphi$ and $\int_0^1 \frac{\exp\left\{-\int_\phi^v \frac{\mu(1-\tilde{r}(w))}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(w)-w)} dw\right\}}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(v)-v)} dv < \infty$, viz. (4.3) fails.

Remark 4.6. We will see in Corollary 5.1 that there are examples of critical branching mechanisms with finite-in-the-mean immigration for which extinction is not almost certain. Assume on the other hand that $\tilde{p}'(1-) < 1$ and $0 < \mu\tilde{r}'(1-) < \infty$ (i.e. subcritical branching, net /of culling/ — but finite-in-the-mean — immigration). Then $\phi < 1 = \varphi$ and $\int_0^1 \frac{\exp\left\{-\int_\phi^v \frac{\mu(1-\tilde{r}(w))}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(w)-w)} dw\right\}}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(v)-v)} dv = \infty$, hence extinction is almost certain. Whether or not already merely subcritical branching is sufficient to ensure (4.3) is not so obvious.

Remark 4.7. A priori one cannot preclude the failure of (4.5): it could happen that with a positive probability X explodes and with a positive probability it drifts to ∞ without exploding (it is easy to think of (even irreducible!) ctMc on \mathbb{N} which display such behavior). What (4.5) is saying is that for ctBGWp with immigration and culling this cannot happen for $\phi \leq \varphi$.

Remark 4.8. Assume $\mu = 0$ and $q > 0$. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}_0$. One has that

$$\mathbf{P}_d(T_0^- \leq \mathbf{e}_q) = q \int_0^\infty e^{-qr} \mathbf{P}_d(X_t = 0) dr = q \int_0^\infty e^{-qr} \mathbf{P}_1(X_t = 0)^d dr, \quad d \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

as noted in [3, Eq. (1.10)]. Similarly,

$$\mathbf{P}_d(\zeta > e_q) = q \int_0^\infty e^{-qr} \mathbf{P}_d(X_r < \infty) dr = q \int_0^\infty e^{-qr} (1 - \mathbf{P}_1(X_r = \infty))^d dr.$$

In principle one can compute these provided the fixed-time extinction/explosion probabilities of X are known (but this is rarely the case). Alternatively, taking $d = 1$, one can view Φ_q and Ψ_q as furnishing, via the above identifications, the Laplace transforms of, respectively, $([0, \infty) \ni t \mapsto \mathbf{P}_1(X_t = 0))$ and $([0, \infty) \ni t \mapsto \mathbf{P}_1(X_t = \infty))$. The law of the extinction time may also implicitly be characterized as follows:

$$\int_0^{\mathbf{P}_1(T_0^- < t)} \frac{ds}{\rho(s)} = t, \quad t \in [0, \infty),$$

see e.g. [18, Theorem 1.2.3.2].

Proof of Theorem 4.2. (4.4), and (4.1) for $q > 0$ are immediate from Theorem 3.6 and Proposition 3.3.

As concerns (4.1) when $q = 0$, i.e. (4.2), we have as follows. The case $\mu = 0$ is well-known; we assume $\mu > 0$.

(•) For $\phi = \varphi < 1$, one appeals directly to the obvious analogues of Propositions 3.1 and 3.3 for $q = 0$: the map $(\mathbb{N}_0 \ni x \mapsto \varphi^x)$ is bounded, positive, harmonic for X and vanishes at infinity. Thus (4.2) follows in this case.

(•) For $\phi = \varphi = 1$ one can use a limiting coupling argument. Adjust indeed, ceteris paribus, the probabilities p to p' by decreasing p_0 to p'_0 , rescaling the remaining ps , and r to r' by decreasing r_{-1} and rescaling the remaining rs , in such a way that (in the obvious notation) $\phi' = \varphi' \uparrow 1$ as the adjustment is becoming lesser and lesser. Then $\mathbf{P}_x(T_a^- < \infty) \geq \mathbf{P}'_x(T_a^- < \infty) = (\varphi')^{x-a} \uparrow 1$, again as the adjustment is becoming lesser and lesser, and again (4.2) is proved.

(•) In case $\phi < \varphi < 1$, hence $\mu(1 - \tilde{r}(\varphi)) > 0$, (4.2) follows from (4.1) with $q > 0$ by dominated convergence upon taking the limit $q \downarrow 0$.

(•) When $\phi < 1 = \varphi$, taking the limit $q \downarrow 0$ in (4.1) is more delicate. On the one hand, splitting the integral for $\Phi_q(x)/q$ from Theorem 3.6 into \int_0^ϕ and \int_ϕ^1 , one can take the limit $q \downarrow 0$ in the first, resp. second of these, using bounded, resp. monotone convergence, to find that, as $q \downarrow 0$,

$$\Phi_q(x)/q \rightarrow \int_0^1 \frac{\exp\left\{-\int_\phi^v \frac{\mu(1-\tilde{r}(w))}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(w)-w)} dw\right\}}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(v)-v)} v^x dv.$$

Thus if $\int_0^1 \frac{\exp\left\{-\int_\phi^v \frac{\mu(1-\tilde{r}(w))}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(w)-w)} dw\right\}}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(v)-v)} dv < \infty$, (4.2) follows. On the other hand, assume now $\int_0^1 \frac{\exp\left\{-\int_\phi^v \frac{\mu(1-\tilde{r}(w))}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(w)-w)} dw\right\}}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(v)-v)} dv = \infty$ and let $\epsilon \in (0, 1 - \phi)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_x[e^{-qT_a^-}; T_a^- < \infty] &= \frac{\int_0^1 \frac{\exp\left\{-\int_{\phi_q}^v \frac{q+\mu(1-\tilde{r}(w))}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(w)-w)} dw\right\}}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(v)-v)} v^x dv}{\int_0^1 \frac{\exp\left\{-\int_{\phi_q}^v \frac{q+\mu(1-\tilde{r}(w))}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(w)-w)} dw\right\}}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(v)-v)} v^a dv} \\ &\geq \frac{(1-\epsilon)^x}{1 + \int_0^{1-\epsilon} \frac{\exp\left\{-\int_{\phi_q}^v \frac{q+\mu(1-\tilde{r}(w))}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(w)-w)} dw\right\}}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(v)-v)} v^a dv / \int_{1-\epsilon}^1 \frac{\exp\left\{-\int_{\phi_q}^v \frac{q+\mu(1-\tilde{r}(w))}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(w)-w)} dw\right\}}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(v)-v)} dv} \\ &\rightarrow (1-\epsilon)^x \text{ as } q \downarrow 0 \\ &\quad \text{(by bounded/monotone convergence for the numerator/denominator)} \\ &\uparrow 1 \text{ as } \epsilon \downarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof (4.2) for all cases that can occur (all the time assuming $\phi \leq \varphi$ and $\mu > 0$, of course).

Finally, let us prove (4.5).

(•) When $\phi < \varphi$ it follows at once by taking the limit $q \downarrow 0$ in (4.4) (using monotone convergence for the integral in the expression for Ψ_q of Theorem 3.6).

(•) When $\phi = \varphi$ the taking of the limit $q \downarrow 0$ in (4.4) is again a little more delicate. On the one hand, still, $\frac{\Phi_q(x)}{\Phi_q(a)} = \mathbb{P}_x(T_a^- < e_q) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_x(T_a^- < \infty) = \varphi^{x-a}$ as $q \downarrow 0$. On the other hand, set $I(v) := \int_v^1 \frac{dw}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(w)-w)}$ for $v \in (\varphi, 1)$; then $I : (\varphi, 1) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is a strictly decreasing C^1 bijection and by a change of variables

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \Psi_q(x) &= \int_\varphi^1 \frac{q}{\lambda(v - \tilde{p}(v))} \exp \left\{ - \int_v^1 \frac{q + \mu(1 - \tilde{r}(w))}{\lambda(w - \tilde{p}(w))} dw \right\} v^x dv \\ &= \int_0^\infty dz q e^{-qz} \exp \left\{ - \int_{I^{-1}(z)}^1 \frac{\mu(1 - \tilde{r}(w))}{\lambda(w - \tilde{p}(w))} dw \right\} I^{-1}(z)^x \\ &= \mathbb{P}_0 \left[\exp \left\{ - \int_{I^{-1}(e_q)}^1 \frac{\mu(1 - \tilde{r}(w))}{\lambda(w - \tilde{p}(w))} dw \right\} I^{-1}(e_q)^x \right] \\ &\rightarrow \exp \left\{ - \int_\varphi^1 \frac{\mu(1 - \tilde{r}(w))}{\lambda(w - \tilde{p}(w))} dw \right\} \varphi^x \text{ as } q \downarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

by bounded convergence. Consequently again we find that (4.5) holds true. \square

Various consequences of Theorem 4.2 will be explored in the next section. Here we would like to note a strengthening of Corollary 3.13 that allows immediately to extend (4.1) to include also the cumulative-lifetime-to-date (avalanche size) process $\int_0^\cdot X_t dt$, Corollary 4.12. A preliminary lemma is required to this end; it is Lemma 3.4 rewritten for $p_{-1}|_{\{-1\} \cup \mathbb{N}}$ in lieu of of r .

Lemma 4.9. *Let $\bar{q} \in (0, \infty)$. The equation $\frac{\lambda + \bar{q}}{\lambda} = \tilde{p}(z)/z$ in z has a unique root $\varphi_{\bar{q}} \in (0, 1)$. The map $\bar{q} \mapsto \varphi_{\bar{q}}$ is a continuous and strictly decreasing bijection from $(0, \infty)$ onto $(0, \varphi)$; $\varphi = \uparrow \text{-lim}_{\bar{q} \downarrow 0} \varphi_{\bar{q}}$.* \square

Definition 4.10. In what follows $\varphi_{\bar{q}}$ is as given by the preceding lemma. It will sometimes be convenient to write $\varphi_0 := \varphi$.

Proposition 4.11. *Let $\bar{q} \in [0, \infty)$ and set $q := \mu(\tilde{r}(\varphi_{\bar{q}}) - 1) \in [-\mu, \infty)$. Then the process $(\varphi_{\bar{q}}^{X_t} e^{-q(t \wedge T_0^-) - \bar{q} \int_0^t X_s ds})_{t \in [0, \infty)}$ is a martingale in the natural filtration $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, \infty)}$ of X . Assuming the filtered space (Ω, \mathcal{F}) is rich enough for Kolmogorov's extension theorem to apply [22, Section V.4]², for each $x \in \mathbb{N}_0$, there exists a unique probability measure \mathbb{Q}_x on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\infty)$ such that*

$$\mathbb{Q}_x|_{\mathcal{F}_t} = \varphi_{\bar{q}}^{X_t - x} e^{-q(t \wedge T_0^-) - \bar{q} \int_0^t X_s ds} \cdot \mathbb{P}_x, \quad t \in [0, \infty).$$

Under the measures $\mathbb{Q} = (\mathbb{Q}_x)_{x \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ the process X remains a minimal ctMc. In fact, the system (X, \mathbb{Q}) is again a ctBGWp with not-supercritical branching mechanism $(\mathbb{N}_0 \ni k \mapsto p_k \varphi_{\bar{q}}^k / \tilde{p}(\varphi_{\bar{q}}))$, reproduction rate $\lambda + \bar{q}$, immigration/culling mechanism $(\mathbb{N} \cup \{-1\} \ni k \mapsto r_k \varphi_{\bar{q}}^k / \tilde{r}(\varphi_{\bar{q}}))$, and immigration/culling rate $q + \mu = \mu \tilde{r}(\varphi_{\bar{q}})$.

Proof. One checks that $(x(\lambda + \bar{q}) + \mu + q)\varphi_{\bar{q}}^x = \mu \sum_{k=-1}^\infty r_k \varphi_{\bar{q}}^{x+k} + \lambda x \sum_{k=0}^\infty p_k \varphi_{\bar{q}}^{x+k-1}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{N}$. The martingale property is then got as in Proposition 3.1. All the claims follow. \square

Corollary 4.12. *Let $\{a, x\} \subset \mathbb{N}_0$, $a \leq x$, $\{q, \bar{q}\} \subset [0, \infty)$. If $q > \mu(\tilde{r}(\varphi_{\bar{q}}) - 1)$, i.e. if $\phi_q < \varphi_{\bar{q}}$, then*

$$\mathbb{P}_x[e^{-qT_a^- - \bar{q} \int_0^{T_a^-} X_s ds}; T_a^- < \infty] = \frac{\Phi_{q, \bar{q}}(x)}{\Phi_{q, \bar{q}}(a)}, \quad (4.6)$$

²If one takes for Ω a suitable canonical space, then for sure the conditions of the extension theorem are met. This one can do without affecting any distributional results.

where

$$\Phi_{q,\bar{q}}(z) := q \int_0^{\varphi_{\bar{q}}} \frac{\exp\left\{-\int_{\phi_q}^v \frac{q+\mu(1-\tilde{r}(w))}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(w)-w)-\bar{q}w} dw\right\}}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(v)-v)-\bar{q}v} v^z dv, \quad z \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Consequently, if $r_{-1} = 0$, $\mu > 0$ and $\bar{q} > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_x[e^{-\bar{q}\int_0^{T_a^-} X_s ds}; T_a^- < \infty] = \frac{\int_0^{\varphi_{\bar{q}}} \frac{\exp\left\{-\int_0^v \frac{\mu(1-\tilde{r}(w))}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(w)-w)-\bar{q}w} dw\right\}}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(v)-v)-\bar{q}v} v^x dv}{\int_0^{\varphi_{\bar{q}}} \frac{\exp\left\{-\int_0^v \frac{\mu(1-\tilde{r}(w))}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(w)-w)-\bar{q}w} dw\right\}}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(v)-v)-\bar{q}v} v^a dv},$$

while if $\mu = 0$, then, with no further restriction on \bar{q} ,

$$\mathbb{P}_x[e^{-\bar{q}\int_0^{T_a^-} X_s ds}; T_a^- < \infty] = \varphi_{\bar{q}}^{x-a}.$$

Remark 4.13. The expression for $\mathbb{P}_x[e^{-\bar{q}\int_0^{T_a^-} X_s ds}; T_a^- < \infty]$ in case $\mu = 0$ is also immediate from the Lamperti transform, cf. Remark 2.1.

Remark 4.14. We have already mentioned in the Introduction that (4.6) dovetails nicely with [10, Eq. (11)] from the setting of cbi. In order to see this in a little more detail fix $\{h, \gamma\} \subset (0, \infty)$ and define $\hat{X} := hX_{\gamma\cdot}$. On an heuristic level, for “small” h and “large” γ , \hat{X} may be thought of as an approximation of a csbp with immigration and culling. Next, set, for $z \in [0, \infty)$, $\psi(z) := \frac{\gamma\lambda}{h}(\tilde{p}(e^{-zh})/e^{-zh} - 1)$ and $\Phi(z) := \mu\gamma(1 - \tilde{r}(e^{-zh}))$, cf. [20, Eqs. (3.60-3.61)]. Further, let $\{\alpha, \bar{\alpha}\} \subset [0, \infty)$ and put $\mathbf{q}(\bar{\alpha}) := -\log(\varphi_{\bar{\alpha}h/\gamma})/h$, $\boldsymbol{\theta}(\alpha) := -\log(\phi_{\alpha/\gamma})/h$. [$\log 0 := -\infty$]. Then, in the obvious notation, provided $\mathbf{q}(\bar{\alpha}) < \boldsymbol{\theta}(\alpha)$, for $\{a, x\} \subset h\mathbb{N}_0$ with $a \leq x$, $\hat{\mathbb{P}}_x[e^{-\alpha\hat{T}_a^- - \bar{\alpha}\int_0^{\hat{T}_a^-} \hat{X}_t dt}; \hat{T}_a^- < \infty] = \mathbb{P}_{x/h}[e^{-\frac{\alpha}{\gamma}T_{a/h}^- - \frac{\bar{\alpha}h}{\gamma}\int_0^{T_{a/h}^-} X_t dt}; T_{a/h}^- < \infty] = \frac{\hat{\Phi}_{\alpha,\bar{\alpha}}(x)}{\hat{\Phi}_{\alpha,\bar{\alpha}}(a)}$, where

$$\hat{\Phi}_{\alpha,\bar{\alpha}}(y) := \int_{\mathbf{q}(\bar{\alpha})}^{\infty} \frac{\exp\left\{\int_{\boldsymbol{\theta}(\alpha)}^z \frac{\Phi(u)+\alpha}{\psi(u)-\mu} du\right\}}{\psi(z)-\bar{\alpha}} e^{-yz} dz, \quad y \in h\mathbb{N}_0.$$

Proof of Corollary 4.12. By optional sampling, using Proposition 4.11 (with the same \bar{q}),

$$\mathbb{P}_x \left[e^{-q(T_a^- \wedge t) - \bar{q}\int_0^{T_a^- \wedge t} X_s ds} \varphi_{\bar{q}}^{X_{T_a^- \wedge t} - x} \right] = \mathbb{Q}_x [e^{-(q-\mu(\tilde{r}(\varphi_{\bar{q}})-1))(T_a^- \wedge t)}], \quad t \in [0, \infty).$$

Then let $t \rightarrow \infty$ and use (4.1) to get (4.6). The second claim follows by monotone convergence, taking the limit $q \downarrow 0$ (for the case $\mu = 0$ one first effects a change of variables of the kind that we have seen in the proof of Theorem 4.2; we leave the details to the reader). \square

5. FURTHER CONSEQUENCES

As a first offspring of Theorem 4.2 we have the following identification of a situation in which the overall infimum of X before an independent exponential time is uniformly distributed.

Corollary 5.1. *Let $q \in [0, \infty)$. Suppose $\mu > 0$, $\frac{\mu}{q+\mu} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} kp_k$, $\lambda = q + \mu$, $r_{-1} = 0$ and $r_k = \frac{q+\mu}{\mu}(k+1)p_{k+1}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then for all $x \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\inf_{t \in [0, e_q)} X_t$ is uniformly distributed on $\{0, \dots, x\}$ under \mathbb{P}_x and*

$$\mathbb{P}_x[e^{-\bar{q}\int_0^{T_a^-} (1+X_s) ds}; T_a^- < e_q] = \frac{a+1}{x+1} \varphi_{\bar{q}}^{x-a}, \quad \bar{q} \in [0, \infty).$$

The analogue of the preceding for the case $q = 0$ in the setting of cbi can be found in [10, Corollaries 11 and 13].

Proof. One checks readily that $\varphi = 1$, $\phi = 0$, and $q + \mu(1 - \tilde{r}) = -\lambda(\tilde{p} - \text{id}_{(0,1)})'$ on $(0, 1)$. Consequently $\Phi_q(x)/\Phi_q(0) = \frac{1}{x+1}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{N}_0$, whence the first claim follows from Theorem 4.2. The second claim is got similarly from Corollary 4.12. \square

Differentiating the Laplace transform (4.1) we can obtain the means of the first passage times downwards (when they are finite a.s.). To ease the computations we make a simplifying assumption.

Corollary 5.2. *Assume the extinction time is a.s. finite and $\phi < 1$. Let $\{x, a\} \subset \mathbb{N}_0$, $a < x$. Then*

$$P_x[T_a^-] = \int_0^1 (v^a - v^x) \frac{\exp \left\{ \int_v^1 \frac{\mu(1-\tilde{r}(w))}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(w)-w)} dw \right\}}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(v)-v)} dv.$$

For the cbi version, see [10, Corollary 9].

Proof. Necessarily $\varphi = 1$. By monotone convergence $P_x[T_a^-] = \lim_{q \downarrow 0} \frac{1 - P_x[e^{-qT_a^-}]}{q} = \lim_{q \downarrow 0} \frac{\Phi_q(a) - \Phi_q(x)}{\Phi_q(a)q}$. Now, setting $I(v) := \int_0^v \frac{dw}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(w)-w)}$ for $v \in (0, 1)$, so that $I : (0, 1) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is a strictly increasing bijection,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_q(a) &= q \int_0^1 \frac{\exp \left\{ - \int_{\phi_q}^v \frac{q + \mu(1-\tilde{r}(w))}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(w)-w)} dw \right\}}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(v)-v)} v^a dv \\ &= \int_0^\infty dz q e^{-q(z-I(\phi_q))} \exp \left\{ - \int_{\phi_q}^{I^{-1}(z)} \frac{\mu(1-\tilde{r}(w))}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(w)-w)} dw \right\} I^{-1}(z)^a \\ &= e^{qI(\phi_q)} P_a \left[\exp \left\{ - \int_{\phi_q}^{I^{-1}(e_q)} \frac{\mu(1-\tilde{r}(w))}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(w)-w)} dw \right\} I^{-1}(e_q)^a \right] \\ &\rightarrow \exp \left\{ - \int_\phi^1 \frac{\mu(1-\tilde{r}(w))}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(w)-w)} dw \right\} \text{ as } q \downarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

by bounded convergence and since $qI(\phi_q) \rightarrow 0I(\phi) = 0$ as $q \downarrow 0$ thanks to $\phi < 1$. Besides,

$$\begin{aligned} (\Phi_q(a) - \Phi_q(x))/q &= \int_0^1 (v^a - v^x) \frac{\exp \left\{ - \int_{\phi_q}^v \frac{q + \mu(1-\tilde{r}(w))}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(w)-w)} dw \right\}}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(v)-v)} dv \\ &\rightarrow \int_0^1 (v^a - v^x) \frac{\exp \left\{ - \int_\phi^v \frac{\mu(1-\tilde{r}(w))}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(w)-w)} dw \right\}}{\lambda(\tilde{p}(v)-v)} dv \text{ as } q \downarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

by monotone convergence on $(\phi, 1)$ and bounded convergence on $(0, \phi)$. \square

More generally, at least whenever $\phi \leq \varphi$, similar computations could be effected to obtain the means of the explosion time and of the first passage times downwards, *conditional on them being finite*. We look here only at the explosion time, and assume for simplicity that X is a pure branching process: no immigration, no culling.

Corollary 5.3. *Assume $\mu = 0$ and (E) holds. Then*

$$P_x[\zeta; \zeta < \infty] = x \int_\varphi^1 v^{x-1} \int_v^1 \frac{dw}{\lambda(w-\tilde{p}(w))} dv < \infty, \quad x \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Proof. By monotone convergence $P_x[\zeta; \zeta < \infty] = \lim_{q \downarrow 0} \frac{P_x(\zeta < \infty) - P_x[e^{-q\zeta}; \zeta < \infty]}{q}$. Then by Theorem 4.2 and Remark 3.11 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P_x[\zeta; \zeta < \infty] &= \lim_{q \downarrow 0} \frac{1 - \varphi^x - x \int_\varphi^1 v^{x-1} e^{-q \int_v^1 \frac{dw}{\lambda(w-\tilde{p}(w))}} dv}{q} \\ &= \lim_{q \downarrow 0} \frac{x \int_\varphi^1 v^{x-1} \left(1 - e^{-q \int_v^1 \frac{dw}{\lambda(w-\tilde{p}(w))}} \right) dv}{q} \\ &= x \int_\varphi^1 v^{x-1} \int_v^1 \frac{dw}{\lambda(w-\tilde{p}(w))} dv, \text{ by monotone convergence.} \end{aligned}$$

The finiteness of the integral comes from the integrability of the log at $0+$. \square

We can also specify the probabilities of X “conditioned to become extinct before an independent exponential random clock has rung”.

Corollary 5.4. *Let $q \in [\mu(\tilde{r}(\varphi) - 1) \vee 0, \infty)$. Let $(\Theta, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{B}_t)_{t \in [0, \infty)})$ be the canonical filtered probability space of \mathbb{N} -valued paths with lifetime, cemetery 0. The canonical process on this space is denoted $Z = (Z_t)_{t \in [0, \infty)}$ and the lifetime ξ . Then there exists a unique family of probability measures $(\mathbb{P}_x^\downarrow)_{x \in \mathbb{N}}$ on (Θ, \mathcal{A}) such that for all $x \in \mathbb{N}$, $t \in [0, \infty)$, and then $F \in \mathcal{B}_t/\mathcal{B}_{[0, \infty)}$,*

$$\mathbb{P}_x^\downarrow[F; t < \xi] := \frac{e^{-qt}}{\Phi_q(x)} \mathbb{P}_x[F(X)\Phi_q(X_t); t < T_0^-] = \mathbb{P}_x[F(X)\mathbb{1}_{\{t < T_0^-\}} | T_0^- < e_q].$$

Under this family of measures, Z is a (non-conservative) ctMc in the filtration \mathcal{B} , lifetime ξ , cemetery 0, state space \mathbb{N} , whose transition law is specified as follows: for $x \in \mathbb{N}$, the rate at which Z leaves state x is $q + \mu + \lambda x$; on leaving state x , the probability that it jumps to $x - 1$ is $\frac{(p_0 \lambda x + r_{-1} \mu) \Phi_q(x-1)}{(q + \mu + \lambda x) \Phi_q(x)} \mathbb{1}_{[2, \infty)}(x)$, while for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the probability that it jumps to $x + k$ is $\frac{(p_{k+1} \lambda x + \mu r_k) \Phi_q(x+k)}{(q + \mu + \lambda x) \Phi_q(x)}$, no other jumps (except to the cemetery) being possible with a positive probability; in particular Z is sent to the cemetery only when in state 1, and then at rate $(p_0 \lambda + r_{-1} \mu) \frac{\Phi_q(0)}{\Phi_q(1)}$. \square

Proof. This is a standard Doob transform by an excessive function, e.g. [8, Chapter 11]. The description of the stochastic dynamics of Z follows by looking at $\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1 - \mathbb{P}_x^\downarrow(Z_t = x)}{t}$ and $\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{P}_x^\downarrow(Z_t = y)}{t}$ for the relevant x and y . \square

Finally we fix a $q \in [0, \infty)$ and an $x \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and consider the temporal factorization at the minimum for X on $[0, e_q)$, when issued from x . The following observation represents the basis of the argument:

Under \mathbb{P}_x , the sequence of the consecutive excursions from strict new minima,

$$\epsilon^k := (X_{T_k^- + t})_{t \in [T_k^-, T_{k-1}^-)}, \quad k \in \{x, \dots, 0\},$$

where we take $T_{-1}^- := \infty$, has the law of a finite sequence $S = (S_l)_{l=x}^0$ of independent (but not identically distributed, unless $x = 0$) path segments with lifetime, *absorbed* into \emptyset after first entering a path segment of infinite length, and with the distribution of S_l being $((X_t)_{t \in [0, T_{l-1}^-)}) \star \mathbb{P}_l$ for $l \in \{0, \dots, x\}$.

For $t \in [0, \infty]$ set indeed

$$G_t := \sup\{u \in [0, t) : X \text{ attains a strict new minimum at time } u\}$$

(we consider 0 as being a time at which a strict new minimum occurs) and note that $G_{e_q} < \infty$ a.s. even for $q = 0$. We then have

Proposition 5.5. *The following two objects are independent under \mathbb{P}_x , conditionally on $X_{G_{e_q}}$, the value of the last strict new minimum before e_q : (i) $(X_t)_{t \in [0, G_{e_q}]}$, the path of X seen until it makes its last strict new minimum before e_q ; and (ii) $(\epsilon^{X_{G_{e_q}}}, e_q - G_{e_q})$, the excursion from strict new minima straddling e_q , together with the time that has elapsed from the last strict new minimum to e_q .*

Proof. The trick to show this, well-known, is that instead of simply waiting for e_q to ring, we may mark each excursion with an independent exponential clock of rate q , and wait for the first one to ring before the excursion ends. We include a precise argument for the sake of completeness.

Formally let us take then, in addition to the sequence $(S_l)_{l=x}^0$ that we have already introduced (recall, this one is “non-absorbed”, consisting of independent path segments), also an independent sequence $(e_l)_{l=x}^0$ of i.i.-exponentially with rate q -d. random variables. Let K be the first index l from $x, \dots, 0$ (in the indicated order)

for which the lifetime of S_l is $\geq e_l$. Because the lifetime of S_0 is a.s. infinite, such an index exists (a.s.). Then, by the memoryless property of the exponential distribution, as far as the joint law is concerned, we may see (i) and (ii), as being, respectively, (i') the obvious ‘‘concatenation’’ of S_x, \dots, S_{K-1} , and (ii') (S_K, e_K) .

The desired conclusion now follows from an elementary claim concerning first entries into measurable sets of sequences with independent values, to feature presently (Lemma 5.6). \square

Lemma 5.6. *Let $Z = (Z_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be a sequence of independent random elements valued in some measurable space (E, \mathcal{E}) . Denote by \mathcal{L}_k the law of Z_k , $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Let also $A \in \mathcal{E}$ and $K := \inf\{k \in \mathbb{N}_0 : Z_k \in A\}$. Then, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $\mathbb{P}(K = k) > 0$, conditionally on $\{K = k\}$, Z_0, \dots, Z_{k-1}, Z_k are independent with respective laws $\mathcal{L}_0(\cdot|E \setminus A), \dots, \mathcal{L}_{k-1}(\cdot|E \setminus A), \mathcal{L}_k(\cdot|A)$. \square*

As a consequence of the preceding we can provide an explicit description of the temporal quantities at the minimum.

Corollary 5.7. *Under \mathbb{P}_x , G_{e_q} and $e_q - G_{e_q}$ are conditionally independent given $X_{G_{e_q}}$. Assume now $q \geq \mu(\tilde{r}(\varphi) - 1)$ and let $k \in \{0, \dots, x\}$. Then*

$$\mathbb{P}_x(X_{G_{e_q}} = k) = \frac{\Phi_q(x)}{\Phi_q(k)} - \frac{\Phi_q(x)}{\Phi_q(k-1)} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{N}}(k).$$

Moreover, provided $\mathbb{P}(X_{G_{e_q}} = k) > 0$, for further $\alpha \in [0, \infty)$:

$$\mathbb{P}_x[e^{-\alpha G_{e_q}} | X_{G_{e_q}} = k] = \frac{\Phi_{q+\alpha}(x)}{\Phi_q(x)} \frac{\Phi_q(k)}{\Phi_{q+\alpha}(k)};$$

hence, when $q > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_x[e^{-\alpha(e_q - G_{e_q})} | X_{G_{e_q}} = k] = \frac{q}{q + \alpha} \frac{1 - \frac{\Phi_{q+\alpha}(k)}{\Phi_{q+\alpha}(k-1)} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{N}}(k)}{1 - \frac{\Phi_q(k)}{\Phi_q(k-1)} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{N}}(k)}.$$

Proof. The first statement is immediate from Proposition 5.5. The other statements then follow by routine calculation from Theorem 4.2. \square

When $\phi \leq \varphi$, then taking $q = 0$ in the preceding corollary provides us with the joint law-Laplace transform of (X_{G_∞}, G_∞) , viz. of the overall infimum of X and the time when this overall infimum is reached. Plainly it is most interesting when the extinction time of X is not a.s. finite (for, when it is, then $G_\infty = T_0^-$ and $X_{G_\infty} = 0$ a.s.).

6. AN OPTIMAL CONTROL PROBLEM

Assume $\mu = 0$: no (‘‘endogenous’’) immigration, no culling. Fix also an $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and a $q \in [0, \infty)$. By ‘‘exogenously’’ immigrating individuals, we control the population of the ctBGWp X from going below, or hitting the level \mathbf{a} . Associated to the immigration of each individual there is a fixed cost. We discount the costs over time by the discount factor q , take the expectation, and seek to immigrate optimally.

Let us now make this precise. A slightly more elaborate structure than the one we have considered thus far is required; we ask the reader to bear with us in this arduous, but necessary delineation.

Begin by taking a sequence $L = (L_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of independent exponentially with rate λ distributed random variables with values in $(0, \infty)$ and an independent sequence $N = (N_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of independent \mathbb{N}_0 -valued random variables with p.m.f. p . The interpretation is that we have a denumerable supply of individuals indexed by \mathbb{N} ; for $i \in \mathbb{N}$, the

individual with index i has lifetime L_i and gives birth to N_i offspring upon its death. Discarding a negligible set we may and shall assume that

$$\text{the sums of finite subcollections of } L \text{ are all pairwise different.} \quad (6.1)$$

Then, for each measurable nondecreasing $\mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{\infty\}$ -valued right-continuous “control” process $c = (c_t)_{t \in [0, \infty)}$, to be thought of as the cumulative number of immigrated individuals by a given time, we define the “controlled” processes $X^c = (X_t^c)_{t \in [0, \infty)}$ and $\Gamma^c = (\Gamma_t^c)_{t \in [0, \infty)}$, with common lifetime ζ^c , locally constant to the right, and valued in \mathbb{N}_0 and $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ respectively, as follows.

For $t \in [0, \zeta^c)$, $\Gamma_t^c \subset \mathbb{N}$ is a finite set and $X_t^c = |\Gamma_t^c|$ is the size of Γ_t^c : we think of our controlled population at time t as consisting precisely of the individuals with indices from Γ_t^c ; X_t^c is the number of individuals alive in our population at time t . At time 0 we immigrate $c_0 + X_0$ individuals, $\Gamma_0^c = \{1, \dots, c_0 + X_0\}$. Then, whenever c jumps³ (resp. whenever an individual with index $i \in \mathbb{N}$ lifetime clock rings), the first size-of-the-jump-of- c -many (resp. the first N_i -many) indices that have not yet featured in the population are added to Γ^c (resp. and the index of the individual that has died is removed from Γ^c). Of course c may jump at the same time as one or several individuals die; in this case we effect the preceding in some (definite) order, but it is without ambiguity to the definition of Γ^c (hence X^c) what the precise order of this is. This may define Γ^c (and hence X^c) only up to a finite explosion time ζ^c , which is a right-accumulation point of the death times or of the jump times of c ; we relegate the two processes to some cemetery thereafter. Of course X^0 , which obtains by never immigrating any individuals, has the law of the ctBGWp X .

We define next the class of “admissible” controls c as follows. First, for simplicity, in order that c be admissible, it is necessary that

$$(A.1) \text{ it jump only at time 0 or when an individual in the controlled population has died.}$$

There is then a definite strictly increasing $(0, \infty]$ -valued sequence $(D_i^c)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ consisting of the consecutive times of death that are recorder in the population: if only finitely many individuals ever die (equivalently, are ever present in the population), then the remaining times of deaths are set to ∞ . For $i \in \mathbb{N}$, on $\{D_i^c < \infty\}$, there is further an unambiguous number of offspring N_i^c attached to the, because of (6.1) unique individual deceased at the i -th death time. In addition, we put $D_0^c := 0$ and $N_0^c := X_0$. We then set $\mathcal{F}^c = (\mathcal{F}_t^c)_{t \in [0, \infty)}$ to be the smallest filtration w.r.t. which the death times are stopping times, and w.r.t. which the processes $(N_i^c \mathbb{1}_{\{D_i^c \leq t\}})_{t \in [0, \infty)}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, are adapted. With this notation in hand we further stipulate that for c to be admissible, it is necessary that

$$(A.2) \text{ it is } \mathcal{F}^c\text{-adapted, and that}$$

$$(A.3) \text{ it render } X^c > \mathbf{a} \text{ on } [0, \zeta^c).$$

Conversely, any control process c that meets the requirements (A.1)-(A.2)-(A.3) above is deemed admissible. We denote by \mathcal{C}_a the set of admissible controls.

Finally, with the admissible class \mathcal{C}_a having been specified, we may formulate our (family of) optimal control problem(s) as follows:

$$\text{for } x \in \mathbb{N}_0 \text{ find } \inf_{c \in \mathcal{C}_a} \mathbf{P}^x \left[\int_{[0, \zeta^c)} e^{-qt} dc_t \right] \text{ and a corresponding minimizer, if it exists.} \quad (6.2)$$

We make some remarks concerning \mathcal{C}_a .

Remark 6.1. For all $c \in \mathcal{C}_a$, the process X^c (but, in general, not Γ^c) is \mathcal{F}^c -adapted.

³For $j \in [0, \infty)$, j is a jump time of c iff $c_{j-} < c_j$ ($c_{0-} := 0$).

Remark 6.2. The collection of admissible controls, \mathcal{C}_a , formalizes (among other things) the intuitive idea that we observe the ctBGWp X , allowing immigration whenever it changes (and at time 0).

Remark 6.3. It appears that the requirement that we immigrate only at a time of death (or at time 0) is not really a restriction. In fact, because of the memoryless property of the exponential distribution, and because of the exponential discounting, it is intuitively clear that it would not make a difference (to the (existence of an) optimal strategy and the optimal value), if, “ceteris paribus”, we were to allow controls to possibly increase in-between the death times. However, we wish not to dwell on the technical details that making such an allowance would convey, preferring to focus on the “true substance” of the problem.

In order to solve (6.2), it is natural to consider the class of “barrier” strategies.

Definition 6.4. Let $a \in \mathbb{N}_0$. A barrier strategy π^a with barrier a consists of the process $c = (c_t)_{t \in [0, \infty)}$ that immigrates individuals only when their number is just about to fall below, or hit a , immigrating at that moment the exact number of individuals required to (momentarily) bring the number of individuals to level $a + 1$. So, $c_0 = (a + 1 - N_0)^+$, while after time 0, c simply immigrates one individual whenever X^c is just about to hit a .

Clearly $\{\pi^a : a \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq a}\} \subset \mathcal{C}_a$. To ensure that $V(x) < \infty$ for some (all) $x \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we make

Assumption 6.5. *Either $q > 0$, or else the branching mechanism p is supercritical (i.e. $\varphi < 1$).*

Then, for $a \in \mathbb{N}_0$, plainly

$$W_a(x) := \mathbb{P}_x \left[\int_{[0, \zeta^{\pi^a})} e^{-qt} d\pi_t^a \right] = \begin{cases} \frac{\Phi_q(x)}{\Phi_q(a)} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\Phi_q(a+1)}{\Phi_q(a)} \right)^k = \frac{\frac{\Phi_q(x)}{\Phi_q(a)}}{1 - \frac{\Phi_q(a+1)}{\Phi_q(a)}} = \frac{\Phi_q(x)}{\Phi_q(a) - \Phi_q(a+1)}, & x > a \\ a + 1 - x + W_a(a + 1) = a + 1 - x + \frac{\Phi_q(a+1)}{\Phi_q(a) - \Phi_q(a+1)}, & x \leq a \end{cases}, \quad x \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Let us first optimize this over $a \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq a}$.

Put $B(a) := \Phi_q(a) - \Phi_q(a + 1)$ for $a \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq a}$. If $q = 0$, then $\varphi < 1$, $\Phi_q(a) = \varphi^a$ for $a \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and hence $B : \mathbb{N}_{\geq a} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ has a unique maximum at \mathbf{a} . Similarly one finds from the explicit form of Φ_q given in Theorem 3.6(i), that this is the case also for $q > 0$. Furthermore, for $x \in \mathbb{N}_{> a}$,

$$a + 1 - x + \frac{\Phi_q(a + 1)}{\Phi_q(a) - \Phi_q(a + 1)} > \frac{\Phi_q(x)}{\Phi_q(\mathbf{a}) - \Phi_q(\mathbf{a} + 1)}, \quad a \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq x},$$

while for $x \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $x \leq \mathbf{a}$,

$$a + 1 - x + \frac{\Phi_q(a + 1)}{\Phi_q(a) - \Phi_q(a + 1)} > \mathbf{a} + 1 - x + \frac{\Phi_q(\mathbf{a} + 1)}{\Phi_q(\mathbf{a}) - \Phi_q(\mathbf{a} + 1)}, \quad a \in \mathbb{N}_{> \mathbf{a}}.$$

Indeed, the latter two inequalities are easily seen to be true by noting that the map

$$\left(\mathbb{N} \ni y \mapsto \frac{\Phi_q(y)}{\Phi_q(y - 1) - \Phi_q(y)} = \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}_y[e^{-qT_{y-1}^-}; T_{y-1}^- < \infty]^{-1} - 1} \right)$$

is nondecreasing (while Φ_q is (thanks to Assumption 6.5 even strictly) decreasing).

From the preceding discussion we conclude that the optimal admissible *barrier* policy is $\pi^{\mathbf{a}}$. It is reasonable to conjecture that $\pi^{\mathbf{a}}$ is in fact optimal for the entire class \mathcal{C}_a . We turn now to establishing this fact.

Put $W := W_{\mathbf{a}}$ for short. In order to check our conjecture, for $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $c \in \mathcal{C}_a$, let us define

$$V_i^c := \int_{[0, D_i^c)} e^{-qt} dc_t + e^{-qD_i^c} W(X_{D_i^c}^c + N_i - 1) \mathbb{1}_{\{D_i^c < \infty\}}.$$

Additionally we put $V_0^c := W(X_0)$ for all $c \in \mathcal{C}$. Intuitively, for $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, V_i^c , the so-called Bellman process evaluated at time D_i^c , gives the optimal value if we follow c up to strictly before D_i^c and then follow the would-be optimal control thereafter.

Now, as $i \rightarrow \infty$, by monotone and bounded convergence,

$$\mathbb{P}_x[V_i^c] \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_x \left[\int_{[0, \zeta^c)} e^{-qt} dc_t \right],$$

since, when $q > 0$, on the event $\{\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} D_n^c < \infty\}$, a.s. $X_{D_n^c}^c \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, while $\Phi_q \in \mathcal{I}_0^q$, and because, when $q = 0$, thanks to Assumption 6.5, a.s. $X_{D_n^c}^c \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, while again $\Phi_q \in \mathcal{I}_0^q$. Therefore, in order to check that π^a is optimal in the class \mathcal{C}_a , it suffices to establish that $V^c = (V_i^c)_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is nondecreasing in the mean for each $c \in \mathcal{C}_a$.

Fix then a $c \in \mathcal{C}_a$. We see that for all x and i from \mathbb{N}_0 , $\mathbb{P}_x[V_{i+1}^c] - \mathbb{P}_x[V_i^c]$ is

$$\begin{aligned} &= \mathbb{P}_x[e^{-qD_i^c}(\Delta c_{D_i^c} - W(X_{D_i^c}^c + N_i - 1)\mathbb{1}_{\{D_i^c < \infty\}}) + e^{-qD_{i+1}^c}W(X_{D_{i+1}^c}^c + N_{i+1} - 1)\mathbb{1}_{\{D_{i+1}^c < \infty\}}] \\ &= \mathbb{P}_x \left[e^{-qD_i^c} \left(\Delta c_{D_i^c} - W(X_{D_i^c}^c + N_i - 1) \right); D_i^c < \infty \right] + \\ &\quad \mathbb{P}_x \left[e^{-qD_i^c} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_k W(X_{D_i^c}^c + \Delta c_{D_i^c} + N_i - 1 + k - 1) \frac{\lambda(X_{D_i^c}^c + \Delta c_{D_i^c} + N_i - 1)}{q + \lambda(X_{D_i^c}^c + \Delta c_{D_i^c} + N_i - 1)} \right); D_i^c < \infty \right], \end{aligned}$$

unless $i = 0$, in which case it is simply

$$= \mathbb{P}_x \left[c_0 - W(X_0) + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_k W(X_0 + c_0 + k - 1) \frac{\lambda(X_0 + c_0)}{q + \lambda(X_0 + c_0)} \right].$$

So, exploiting the recursive relation for Φ_q of Proposition 3.1(v), we see that it will suffice to check that:

(i) if $x \leq a$, for all $f \in \mathbb{N}_{>a+1-x}$, one has

$$f + \frac{\Phi_q(x+f)}{\Phi_q(a) - \Phi_q(a+1)} \geq a + 1 - x + \frac{\Phi_q(a+1)}{\Phi_q(a) - \Phi_q(a+1)};$$

(ii) if $x > a$, for all $f \in \mathbb{N}$, one has

$$f + \frac{\Phi_q(x+f)}{\Phi_q(a) - \Phi_q(a+1)} \geq \frac{\Phi_q(x)}{\Phi_q(a) - \Phi_q(a+1)}.$$

With regard to (ii), from the explicit form of Φ_q , we gather that we need only verify

$$(1 - v^f)v^x \leq f(1 - v)v^a, \quad v \in (0, \varphi].$$

In fact $(1 - v^f)v \leq f(1 - v)$ for all $v \in (0, 1]$. Similarly (i) is proved.

In conclusion, we have established

Proposition 6.6. *The strategy π^a belongs to \mathcal{C}_a and, under Assumption 6.5,*

$$\inf_{c \in \mathcal{C}_a} \mathbb{P}^x \left[\int_{[0, \zeta^c)} e^{-qt} dc_t \right] = \mathbb{P}_x \left[\int_{[0, \zeta^{\pi^a})} e^{-qt} d\pi_t^a \right] = \begin{cases} \frac{\Phi_q(x)}{\Phi_q(a) - \Phi_q(a+1)}, & x > a \\ a + 1 - x + \frac{\Phi_q(a+1)}{\Phi_q(a) - \Phi_q(a+1)}, & x \leq a \end{cases}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{N}_0$. □

Remark 6.7. Of course X^{π^a} , under the probabilities $(\mathbb{P}_x)_{x \in \mathbb{N}_{>a}}$, is a temporally homogeneous Markov process; it is X with “reflecting boundary” at a . The generator matrix of X^{π^a} is that of X on restriction to $\mathbb{N}_{>a}$, except that its $(a+1, a+1)$ -th entry is $-\lambda(a+1)(1 - p_0)$, not $-\lambda(a+1)$.

REFERENCES

1. S. Asmussen and H. Hering. *Branching processes*. Progress in probability and statistics. Birkhäuser, 1983.
2. K. B. Athreya and P. E. Ney. *Branching Processes*. Dover Books on Mathematics. Dover Publications, 2004.
3. F. Avram, P. Patie, and J. Wang. Purely excessive functions and hitting times of continuous-time branching processes. *Methodology and Computing in Applied Probability*, 21(2):391–399, 2019.
4. F. Avram and M. Vidmar. First passage problems for upwards skip-free random walks via the scale functions paradigm. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 51(2):472–495, 2019.
5. M. E. Caballero, J. L. Prez Garmendia, and G. Uribe Bravo. A Lamperti-type representation of continuous-state branching processes with immigration. *The Annals of Probability*, 41(3A):1585–1627, 2013.
6. M. C. H. Choi and P. Patie. Skip-free Markov chains. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 371(10):7301–7342, 2019.
7. K. L. Chung. *Markov chains with stationary transition probabilities*. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften. Springer, 1967.
8. K. L. Chung and J. B. Walsh. *Markov Processes, Brownian Motion, and Time Symmetry*. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften. Springer New York, 2006.
9. R. A. Doney. A note on some results of Schuh. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 21(1):192–196, 1984.
10. X. Duhalde, C. Foucart, and M. Ma. On the hitting times of continuous-state branching processes with immigration. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 124(12):4182 – 4201, 2014.
11. E. B. Dynkin. *Markov Processes and Related Problems of Analysis*. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, 1982.
12. S. N. Ethier and T. G. Kurtz. *Markov Processes: Characterization and Convergence*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. Wiley, 2009.
13. R. Garcia-Millan, J. Pausch, B. Walter, and G. Pruessner. Field-theoretic approach to the universality of branching processes. *Physical Review E*, 98:062107, 2018.
14. D. R. Grey. A note on explosiveness of Markov branching processes. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 21(1):226–228, 1989.
15. T. E. Harris. *The Theory of Branching Processes*. Dover phoenix editions. Dover Publications, 2002.
16. A. Kuznetsov, A. E. Kyprianou, and V. Rivero. The theory of scale functions for spectrally negative Lévy processes. In *Lévy Matters II: Recent Progress in Theory and Applications: Fractional Lévy Fields, and Scale Functions*, pages 97–186. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013.
17. A. E. Kyprianou and Z. Palmowski. Fluctuations of spectrally negative markov additive processes. In C. Donati-Martin, M. Émery, A. Rouault, and C. Stricker, editors, *Séminaire de Probabilités XLI*, pages 121–135. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008.
18. A. Lambert. Population dynamics and random genealogies. *Stochastic Models*, 24(sup1):45–163, 2008.
19. B. Li and Z. Palmowski. Fluctuations of Omega-killed spectrally negative Lévy processes. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 128(10):3273 – 3299, 2018.
20. Z. Li. *Measure-Valued Branching Markov Processes*. Probability and Its Applications. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2010.
21. J. R. Norris. *Markov Chains*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
22. K. R. Parthasarathy. *Probability Measures on Metric Spaces*. AMS Chelsea Publishing Series. Acad. Press, 1972.
23. S. Redner. *A Guide to First-Passage Processes*. A Guide to First-passage Processes. Cambridge University Press, 2001.
24. L. C. G. Rogers and D. Williams. *Diffusions, Markov Processes and Martingales: Volume 2, Itô Calculus*. Cambridge Mathematical Library. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
25. M. Vidmar. Exit problems for positive self-similar Markov processes with one-sided jumps. *arXiv:1807.00486*, 2018.
26. M. Vidmar. Fluctuation theory for upwards skip-free Lévy chains. *Risks*, 6(3):no. 102, 2018.
27. W. Woess. *Denumerable Markov Chains: Generating Functions, Boundary Theory, Random Walks on Trees*. EMS textbooks in mathematics. European Mathematical Society, 2009.