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Abstract

A continuous-state polynomial branching process is constructed as the pathwise unique
solution of a stochastic integral equation with absorbing boundary condition. The process can
also be obtained from a spectrally positive Lévy process through Lamperti type transformations.
The extinction and explosion probabilities and the mean extinction and explosion times are
computed explicitly. Some of those are also new for the classical linear branching process. We
present necessary and sufficient conditions for the process to extinguish or explode in finite
times. In the critical or subcritical case, we give a construction of the process coming down
from infinity. Finally, it is shown that the continuous-state polynomial branching process arises
naturally as the rescaled limit of a sequence of discrete-state processes.
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1 Introduction

Branching processes are models for the evolution of populations of particles. Those processes
constitute an important subclass of Markov processes. Standard references on those processes
with discrete-state space \( \mathbb{N} := \{0, 1, 2, \ldots \} \) are Harris (1963) and Athreya and Ney (1972).
As the quantity of particles can sometimes be expressed by other means than by counting, it is
reasonable to consider branching models with continuous-state space \( \mathbb{R}_+ := [0, \infty) \). A diffusion
process of that type was first studied by Feller (1951), which is now referred to as the Feller
branching diffusion. A general class of continuous-state branching processes were characterised
in Lamperti (1967a) as the weak limits of rescaled discrete-state branching processes. The
continuous-state branching models involve rich and deep mathematical structures and have
attracted the attention of many researchers in the past decades. In particular, the connec-
tion of those processes with Lévy processes through random time changes was pointed out by
Lamperti (1967b). Multitype continuous-state branching processes were studied in Rhyzhov
and Skorokhod (1970) and Watanabe (1969). A remarkable theory of flows of such processes
with applications to flows of Bessel bridges and coalescents with multiple collisions has been developed by Bertoin and Le Gall (2000, 2003, 2005, 2006); see also Dawson and Li (2006, 2012). The reader may refer to Kyprianou (2006), Li (2011) and Pardoux (2016) for reviews of the literature in this subject.

It is well-known that the transition function \((P_t)_{t \geq 0}\) of a classical continuous-time branching process with state space \(E = \mathbb{N}\) or \(\mathbb{R}_+\) satisfies the following so-called branching property:

\[
P_t(x, \cdot) * P_t(y, \cdot) = P_t(x + y, \cdot), \quad x, y \in E,
\]

where “\(*\)” denotes the convolution operation. The property means that different individuals in the population act independently of each other. In most realistic situations, however, this property is unlikely to be appropriate. In particular, when the number of particles becomes large or the particles move with high speed, the particles may interact and, as a result, the birth and death rates can either increase or decrease. Those considerations have motivated the study of generalised branching processes, which may not satisfy (1.1).

### 1.1 Polynomial branching processes

Let \(\alpha\) and \(b_i, i = 0, 1, \ldots\) be positive constants satisfying \(b_1 = 0\) and \(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} b_i \leq 1\). A discrete-state polynomial branching process is a Markov chain on \(\mathbb{N}\) with \(Q\)-matrix \((q_{ij})\) defined by

\[
q_{ij} = \begin{cases} 
\alpha^i b_{j-i+1}, & j \geq i + 1, i \geq 1, \\
-\alpha^i, & j = i \geq 1, \\
\alpha^i b_0, & j = i - 1, i \geq 1, \\
0, & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]

Observe that \(q_{ij} = i^\theta \rho_{ij}\), where \((\rho_{ij})\) is the \(Q\)-matrix of a random walk on the space of integers with jumps larger than \(-1\). The transition rate of the discrete-state polynomial branching process is given by the power function \(i \mapsto i^\theta\) and its transition distribution is given by the sequence \(\{b_i : i \geq 0\}\). The \(Q\)-matrix (1.2) is essentially a particular form of the model introduced by Chen (1997), who considered more general branching structures. Those processes have attracted the research interest of many other authors; see, e.g. Chen (2002), Chen et al. (2008) and Pakes (2007). When \(\theta = 1\), the model reduces to a classical discrete-state branching process, which satisfies property (1.1). We refer to Chen (2004) for the general theory of continuous-time Markov chains.

In this paper, we introduce and study a continuous-state version of the process defined by (1.2). Let \(C_0^2[0, \infty)\) be the space of twice continuously differentiable functions on \([0, \infty)\) which together with their derivatives up to the second order vanish at \(\infty\). By convention, we extend each \(f\) on \([0, \infty)\) to \([0, \infty]\) by setting \(f(\infty) = 0\). Fix a constant \(\theta > 0\) and let

\[
\mathcal{D}(L) = \left\{ f \in C_0^2[0, \infty) : \lim_{x \to \infty} x^\theta |f^{(n)}(x)| = 0, n = 0, 1, 2 \right\},
\]

where \(f^{(n)}\) denotes the \(n\)-th derivative of \(f\). Let \(b \in \mathbb{R}\) and \(c \geq 0\) be constants and \(m(du)\) a \(\sigma\)-finite measure on \((0, \infty]\) satisfying

\[
\int_{(0, \infty)} (1 \wedge u^2)m(du) < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad m(\{\infty\}) = a \geq 0.
\]
For \( x \in [0, \infty) \) and \( f \in \mathcal{D}(L) \) we define

\[
Lf(x) = x^\theta \left[ -af(x) - bf'(x) + cf''(x) + \int_{(0,\infty)} D_zf(x)m(dz) \right],
\]

(1.3)

where

\[
D_zf(x) = f(x + z) - f(x) - zf'(x)1_{\{z \leq 1\}}.
\]

By Taylor’s expansion one can see \( Lf(\infty) := \lim_{x \to \infty} Lf(x) = 0 \). In this work, a stochastically continuous Markov process \((X_t : t \geq 0)\) with state space \([0, \infty]\) is called a continuous-state polynomial branching process if it has traps 0 and \( \infty \) and its transition semigroup \((P_t)_{t \geq 0}\) satisfies the forward Kolmogorov equation

\[
\frac{dP_t f}{dt}(x) = P_t Lf(x), \quad x \in [0, \infty], f \in \mathcal{D}(L).
\]

(1.4)

We call \( \theta > 0 \) the rate power of the continuous-state polynomial branching process. The ordinary continuous-state branching process corresponds to the special case \( \theta = 1 \), which we refer to as the classical branching case; see, e.g., Lamperti (1967a, 1967b). That is the only situation where the branching property (1.1) is satisfied. Let \( \psi \) be the function on \([0, \infty)\) defined by

\[
\psi(\lambda) = -a + b\lambda + c\lambda^2 + \int_{(0,\infty)} (e^{-\lambda z} - 1 + \lambda z 1_{\{z \leq 1\}}) m(dz), \quad \lambda \geq 0.
\]

(1.5)

We call \( \psi \) the reproduction mechanism of the process. It can be easily checked that \( \psi(0) = -a \leq 0 \) and \( \psi \) is a convex function. By (1.5), dominated convergence and monotone convergence we see

\[
\beta := \psi'(0) = b - \int_{(1,\infty)} zm(dz).
\]

(1.6)

Note that \(-\psi\) is the Laplace exponent of a spectrally positive Lévy process. In this paper, we always assume that there exists \( \lambda \in (0, \infty) \) such that \( \psi(\lambda) > 0 \), i.e., \(-\psi\) does not corresponds to a subordinator.

### 1.2 Construction of the process

We here present a construction of the continuous-state polynomial branching process in terms of a stochastic equation with jumps. Suppose that \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbf{P})\) is a filtered probability space satisfying the usual hypotheses. Let \((B_t : t \geq 0)\) be an \((\mathcal{F}_t)\)-Brownian motion. Let \(M(ds, dz, du)\) be an \((\mathcal{F}_t)\)-Poisson random measure on \((0, \infty) \times (0, \infty) \times (0, \infty)\) with intensity \(ds m(dz)du\) and \(\tilde{M}(ds, dz, du)\) the compensated measure. Let \(X_0\) be a positive \(\mathcal{F}_0\)-measurable random variable. We consider positive solutions of the stochastic integral equation

\[
X_t = X_0 + \sqrt{2c} \int_0^t X_s^{\theta/2} dB_s + \int_0^t \int_{(0,1]} \int_0^{X_s} z \tilde{M}(ds, dz, du).
\]
Theorem 1.3

The mapping of the continuous-state polynomial branching process is the absorbing time. For $x$ in the distribution on $D$, let \( \Lambda \) be the set of increasing homeomorphisms of \([0,\infty)\) homeomorphic to \([0,1)\]. We have \( \rho \) defined the uniform distance \( \rho \) on \([0,\infty)\) making it homeomorphic to \([0,1]\). It is easy to see that \( \rho(x,y) \leq 1 \wedge |x-y| \) for all \( x,y \in [0,\infty) \). Then we define the uniform distance \( \rho_\infty \) on \( D \) by

\[
\rho_\infty(v,w) = \sup_{s \in [0,\infty)} \rho(v(s),w(s)), \quad v,w \in D.
\] (1.8)

Let \( \Lambda \) be the set of increasing homeomorphisms of \([0,\infty)\) into itself and define the metric \( d_\infty \) on \( D \) by

\[
d_\infty(v,w) := \inf_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \rho_\infty(v,w \circ \lambda) \vee \|\lambda - I\|, \quad v,w \in D,
\] (1.9)

where \( I \) is the identity and \( \| \cdot \| \) is the supremum norm. For \( x \in [0,\infty) \) let \( P^x \) denote the distribution on \( D \) of the process \( X^x \times t \geq 0 \) defined by (1.7) with initial value \( X_0 = x \).

Theorem 1.2

The mapping \([0,\infty) \ni x \mapsto P^x \) is continuous in the weak convergence topology.

For any \( y \in [0,\infty) \) let \( \tau_y = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t = y\} \). We call \( \tau_0 \) the extinction time and \( \tau_\infty \) the explosion time of the continuous-state polynomial branching process \( X \). Note that \( \tau_0 \wedge \tau_\infty = \tau \) is the absorbing time. For \( x \in [0,\infty) \) write \( P_x = P(\cdot|X_0 = x) \). Since \( X \) has no negative jump, we have \( P_x(X_{\tau_y} = y) = 1 \) for \( x \geq y \in [0,\infty) \). Let \( q = \inf\{\lambda > 0 : \psi'(\lambda) > 0\} \) be the largest root of \( \psi(\lambda) = 0 \).

Theorem 1.3

(1) For any \( y \leq x \in (0,\infty) \) we have

\[
P_x(\tau_y < \infty) = e^{-q(x-y)}. \tag{1.10}
\]
(2) For any \( x \in [0, \infty) \) we have
\[
P_x(X_\infty = 0) = e^{-qx}, \quad P_x(X_\infty = \infty) = 1 - e^{-qx},
\] (1.11)
where \( X_\infty = \lim_{t \to \infty} X_t \).

By applying Theorem 7.8 in Either and Kurtz (1986, p. 131) and Theorem 1.2 we see the process is a Feller process. From the transition semigroup \((P_t)_{t \geq 0}\) of the process we define its resolvent \((U^\eta)_{\eta > 0}\) by
\[
U^\eta(x, dy) = \int_0^\infty e^{-\eta t} P_t(x, dy) dt, \quad x, y \in [0, \infty].
\] (1.12)
The next theorem gives a characterization of the resolvent and plays the key role in the study of the hitting times of \( X \). Let \( e_\lambda(x) = e^{-\lambda x} \) for \( \lambda \in (0, \infty) \) and \( x \in [0, \infty] \).

**Theorem 1.4** For any \( \eta, \lambda > 0 \) and \( x \in [0, \infty) \) we have
\[
\eta U^\eta e_\lambda(x) - e^{-\lambda x} = \psi(\lambda) \int_{[0,\infty)} y^\theta e^{-\lambda y} U^\eta(x, dy)
\] (1.13)
and
\[
\int_\lambda^\infty l_x(\eta, z)(z - \lambda)^{\theta-1} dz = \Gamma(\theta) \int_0^\infty e^{-\eta t} dt \int_{(0,\infty)} e^{-\lambda y} P_t(x, dy),
\] (1.14)
where \( \Gamma \) denotes the Gamma function and, for \( \eta, z > 0 \),
\[
l_x(\eta, z) = \int_{[0,\infty)} y^\theta e^{-zy} U^\eta(x, dy) = \psi(z)^{-1} [\eta U^\eta e_z(x) - e^{-zx}].
\] (1.15)

We remark that, in the case \( q > 0 \), the second expression in (1.15) should be understood by continuity at \( z = q \).

### 1.3 Mean extinction and explosion times

In this subsection, we give some expressions for the mean hitting times of the continuous-state polynomial branching process \( X = (X_t : t \geq 0) \). Let \( E_x \) denote the expectation with respect to the conditional law \( P_x = P(\cdot | X_0 = x) \). Recall that \( q = \inf\{\lambda > 0 : \psi(\lambda) > 0\} \) is the largest root of \( \psi(\lambda) = 0 \). Let
\[
h_x(\lambda) = \frac{e^{-qx} - e^{-\lambda x}}{\psi(\lambda)}, \quad \lambda > 0, x > 0
\] (1.16)
with \( h_x(q) = xe^{-qx}/\psi'(q) \) by continuity if \( q > 0 \).
**Theorem 1.5** For any $x \in (0, \infty)$ we have the moment formulas:

$$E_x(\tau_0 : X_\infty = 0) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\theta)} \int_0^\infty h_x(\lambda + q) \lambda^{\theta-1} d\lambda,$$

(1.17)

$$E_x(\tau_\infty : X_\infty = \infty) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\theta)} \int_0^\infty [h_x(\lambda) - h_x(\lambda + q)] \lambda^{\theta-1} d\lambda.$$

(1.18)

and

$$E_x(\tau) = E_x(\tau_\infty \wedge \tau_0) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\theta)} \int_0^\infty h_x(\lambda) \lambda^{\theta-1} d\lambda.$$

(1.19)

**Theorem 1.6** For any $y \leq x \in (0, \infty)$ we have

$$E_x(\tau_\infty \wedge \tau_y) = e^{-qx} \frac{e^{-(\lambda-y)\psi(\lambda)} - e^{-(\lambda-q)\psi(\lambda)}}{\psi(\lambda)} \lambda^{\theta-1} d\lambda.$$

(1.20)

**Corollary 1.7** Suppose that $a = -\psi(0) = 0$ and $\psi'(0) \geq 0$. Then for $y \leq x \in (0, \infty)$ we have

$$E_x(\tau_y) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\theta)} \int_0^\infty \frac{e^{-\lambda y} - e^{-\lambda x}}{\psi(\lambda)} \lambda^{\theta-1} d\lambda.$$

(1.21)

The discrete-state versions of (1.17) and (1.18) were proved in Chen (2002) and Pakes (2007), respectively. As far as we know, the discrete-state form of (1.20) has not been established in the literature. One may compare (1.21) with Corollary 9 in Duhalde et al. (2014). It seems other moment formulas are new also for classical continuous-state branching processes.

### 1.4 Extinction and explosion probabilities

The two theorems presented in this subsection are about the extinction and explosion probabilities of the process. They generalize the results in Grey (1974) and Kawazu and Watanabe (1971), where the classical branching case $\theta = 1$ was studied.

**Theorem 1.8** (1) In the case $\theta \geq 2$, for any $x \in (0, \infty)$ we have $P_x(\tau_0 < \infty) = 0$. (2) In the case $0 < \theta < 2$, for any $x \in (0, \infty)$ we have $P_x(\tau_0 < \infty) > 0$ if and only if

$$\int_\varepsilon^\infty \frac{\lambda^{\theta-1}}{\psi(\lambda)} d\lambda < \infty$$

(1.22)

for some and hence all $\varepsilon \in (q, \infty)$. (3) If $P_x(\tau_0 < \infty) > 0$, then $P_x(\tau_0 < \infty) = P_x(X_\infty = 0) = e^{-qx}.$

**Corollary 1.9** If $0 < \theta < 2$ and $c > 0$, for any $x \in (0, \infty)$ we have $P_x(\tau_0 < \infty) > 0$. 

6
Theorem 1.10 (1) In the case $\theta > 1$, for any $x \in (0, \infty)$ we have $P_x(\tau_\infty < \infty) = 0$ if and only if $a = -\psi(0) = 0$ and $\psi'(0) \geq 0$. (2) In the case $0 < \theta \leq 1$, for any $x \in (0, \infty)$ we have $P_x(\tau_\infty < \infty) = 0$ if and only if $a = -\psi(0) = 0$ and one of the following two conditions is satisfied: (i) $\psi'(0) > -\infty$; (ii) $\psi'(0) = -\infty$ and
\[\int_0^\varepsilon \frac{\lambda^{\theta-1}}{-\psi(\lambda)} d\lambda = \infty.\] (1.23)
for some and hence all $\varepsilon \in (0, q)$.

1.5 The process coming down from infinity

Let $X^x = (X^x_t : t \geq 0)$ be defined as in Theorem 1.1. Since the process has no negative jump, for any $x \geq y \in [0, \infty)$ we can define $\tau^x_y = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X^x_t = y\}$. By Theorem 1.1 (2), we see the mapping $x \mapsto \tau^x_y$ is increasing in $x \in [y, \infty)$, thus the limit $\tau^\infty_y := \lim_{x \to \infty} \tau^x_y$ exists. It is easy to see that $y \mapsto \tau^\infty_y$ is decreasing in $y \in [0, \infty)$. By Corollary 1.7 for any $y \in (0, \infty)$ we have
\[E(\tau^\infty_y) = \lim_{x \to \infty} E(\tau^x_y) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\theta)} \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda y} \lambda^{\theta-1} d\lambda.\] (1.24)

Theorem 1.11 Suppose that $a = -\psi(0) = 0$ and $\psi'(0) \geq 0$. Then the following four statements are equivalent:

(i) $P(\tau^\infty_y < \infty) > 0$ for each $y \in (0, \infty)$;
(ii) $P(0 < \tau^\infty_y < \infty) = 1$ for each $y \in (0, \infty)$;
(iii) $E(\tau^\infty_y) < \infty$ for each $y \in (0, \infty)$;
(iv) for each $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ we have
\[\int_0^\varepsilon \frac{\lambda^{\theta-1}}{-\psi(\lambda)} d\lambda < \infty.\] (1.25)

Corollary 1.12 Suppose that $a = -\psi(0) = 0$, $\psi'(0) \geq 0$ and (1.24) holds. Then we have a.s.
\[\lim_{y \to \infty} \tau^\infty_y = 0\]

By saying a process $(X_t)_{t>0}$ is a solution to (1.7) with initial state $\infty$, we mean $\lim_{t \downarrow 0} X_t = \infty$ and, for $t > r > 0,$
\[X_t = X_r + \sqrt{2c} \int_r^t \sqrt{X^0_s} dB_s + \int_r^t \int_{(0,1]} \int_0^{X^0_s} \zeta M(ds,dz,du)\]
\[-b \int_r^t X^0_s ds + \int_r^t \int_{[1,\infty]} \int_0^{X^0_s} \zeta M(ds,dz,du).\] (1.26)
Theorem 1.13 Suppose that $a = -\psi(0) = 0$, $\psi'(0) \geq 0$ and $(1.25)$ holds. Then: (i) there is a pathwise unique solution $(X^\infty_t)_{t \geq 0}$ to $(1.7)$ with initial state $\infty$; (ii) $\tau_\infty^\infty = \inf\{t > 0 : X^\infty_t = y\}$ for $y \in (0, \infty)$; (iii) if we set $X^\infty_0 = \infty$, then $(X^x_t)_{t \geq 0}$ converges a.s. to $(X^\infty_t)_{t \geq 0}$ in $(D, \rho_\infty)$ as $x \to \infty$.

The above theorem shows that a solution of $(1.7)$ may come down from $\infty$. This property is not possessed by classical branching processes. In fact, to guarantee the integrability $(1.25)$ we should at least have $\theta > 1$. We refer to Bansaye et al. (2015) for a study of the speed of coming down from infinity of birth and death process. For coalescent processes and branching models with interaction, similar phenomena have been observed and studied by a number of authors; see, e.g., Berestycki et al. (2010, 2014), Lambert (2005) and Pardoux (2016) and the references therein.

1.6 Convergence of discrete-state processes

The following theorem shows that the continuous-state polynomial branching process $X = (X_t : t \geq 0)$ defined by $(1.7)$ can be obtained as the limit of a sequence of rescaled discrete-state branching processes.

Theorem 1.14 There exists a sequence of discrete-state polynomial branching processes $\xi_n = (\xi_n(t) : t \geq 0)$ and a sequence of positive number $\gamma_n$, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$ such that $(n^{-1}\xi_n(\gamma_n t) : t \geq 0)$ converges to $(X_t : t \geq 0)$ weakly in $(D, d_\infty)$.

To conclude the introduction, we give the following two examples of the continuous-state polynomial branching process.

Example 1.1 Let $0 < \theta < 1$ and consider the equation

$$X_t = \int_0^t X_s^{\theta} ds, \quad z(0) = 0.$$  (1.27)

Obviously $X_t = (1 - \theta)^{1/(1-\theta)} t^{1/1-\theta}$ is a solution to $(1.27)$. It is trivial to see that $x_0(t) \equiv 0$ is another solution to the above equation. Then the requirement of $0$ being a trap is necessary to guarantee the pathwise uniqueness of the solution to $(1.7)$.

Example 1.2 A continuous-state polynomial branching process with reproduction mechanism $\psi(\lambda) = c\lambda^2 + b\lambda$ ($c > 0$, $b > 0$) is defined by

$$X_t = X_0 + \sqrt{2c} \int_0^t X_s^{\theta/2} dB_s - b \int_0^t X_s^{\theta} ds.$$  (1.28)

For this process we have a.s. $\tau_\infty = \infty$ and the formulas given above take simple forms. From $(1.24)$ we have, for $y \in (0, \infty)$,

$$E(\tau_\infty^\infty) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\theta)} \int_0^\infty \frac{e^{-\lambda y} \lambda^{\theta-1}}{c\lambda^2 + b\lambda} d\lambda.$$
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which is finite if and only if \( \theta > 1 \). By letting \( y \to 0 \) in the above equality we get

\[
E(\tau_0^\infty) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\theta)} \int_0^\infty \frac{\lambda^{\theta-1}}{c\lambda^2 + b\lambda} d\lambda,
\]

which is finite if and only if \( 1 < \theta < 2 \). The above formula gives explicitly the expected time for the process \( X \) to cross the state space from \( \infty \) to \( 0 \). The process defined by (2.12) reduces to a classical Feller branching diffusion when \( \theta = 1 \). A closely related model has been studied recently by Berestycki et al. (2015). The polynomial branching structure has also appeared in the so-called generalized Cox-Ingersoll-Ross model; see, for example, Borkovec and Klüppelberg (1998) and Fasen et al. (2006).

We present the proofs of the results in the following sections. Section 2 is devoted to the construction of the process. The mean extinction and explosion times are computed in Section 3. In Section 4, the extinction and explosion probabilities are explored. In Section 5, we prove the construction of the process coming down from \( \infty \). The convergence of discrete-state processes is discussed in Section 6.

## 2 Construction of the process

In this section, we construct the continuous-state polynomial branching process \( X \) in terms of stochastic equations and random time changes.

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.* (1) We prove the result by an approximation argument. For each \( n \geq 1 \) define

\[
r_n(x) = \begin{cases} 
n^\theta, & n < |x| < \infty, \\
|x|^\theta, & 1/n < |x| \leq n, \\
n^{2-\theta}|x|^2, & 0 \leq |x| \leq 1/n.
\end{cases}
\]

(2.1)

By Theorem 9.1 in Ikeda and Watanabe (1989, p.245) there is a pathwise unique solution \( \{\xi_n(t) : t \geq 0\} \) to the stochastic equation

\[
\xi_n(t) = x + \int_0^t \sqrt{2c r_n(\xi_n(s))} dB(s) + \int_0^t \int_{[0,1]} \int_0^{r_n(\xi_n(z)^{-1})} z\tilde{M}(ds, dz, du) \\
- \int_0^t br_n(\xi_n(s)) ds + \int_0^t \int_{[1,\infty]} \int_0^{r_n(\xi_n(z)^{-1})} (z \land n) M(ds, dz, du). \tag{2.2}
\]

Let \( \zeta_n = \inf\{t \geq 0 : \xi_n(t) \geq n \text{ or } \xi_n(t) \leq 1/n\} \). Clearly, the sequence of stopping times \( \{\zeta_n\} \) is increasing and \( \xi_n(t) = \xi_m(t) \) for \( t \in [0,\zeta_m/n) \). Let \( \tau = \lim_{n \to \infty} \zeta_n \). We define the process \( (X_t : t \geq 0) \) by \( X_t = \xi_n(t) \) for \( t \in [0, \zeta_n) \) and \( X_t = \lim_{n \to \infty} \xi_n(\zeta_n) \) for \( t \in [\tau, \infty) \). Then \( \zeta_n = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t \geq n \text{ or } X_t \leq 1/n\} \) and \( (X_t : t \geq 0) \) is a solution of (2.2). The pathwise uniqueness of the solution follows from that for (2.2) in the time interval \([0, \zeta_n]\) for each \( n \geq 1 \).

(2) Let \( \{\xi_n^x(t) : t \geq 0\} \) denote the solution of (2.2) to indicate its dependence on the initial state. For any \( y \geq x \geq 0 \), we can use Theorem 5.5 in Fu and Li (2010) to see \( P(\xi_n^y(t) \geq \xi_n^x(t) \text{ for every } t \geq 0) = 1 \), and so \( P(X_t^y \geq X_t^x \text{ for every } t \geq 0) = 1 \).
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(3) For any \( t \geq 0 \) let \( P_t(x, \cdot) \) be the distribution of \( X_t \) on \([0, \infty)\) with \( X_0 = x \in [0, \infty] \). By Theorem II.1 for any \( y \in [0, \infty] \), the mapping \( x \mapsto P_t(x, [0,y]) \) is decreasing, so it is Borel measurable. A monotone class argument shows \( x \mapsto P_t(x, A) \) is Borel measurable for each Borel set \( A \subset [0, \infty] \). Then \( P_t(x, dy) \) is a Borel kernel on \([0, \infty]\). For any finite \((\mathcal{F}_t)\)-stopping time \( \sigma \), from the equation (1.7) we have

\[
X_{\sigma+t} = X_\sigma + \sqrt{2c} \int_0^t X_\sigma^{\sigma+s} dB_{\sigma+s} + \int_0^t \int_{(0,1]} \int_0^{X_\sigma^{\sigma+s}} z \tilde{M}(\sigma + ds, dz, du) \\
- b \int_0^t X_\sigma^{\sigma+s} ds + \int_0^t \int_{(1,\infty]} \int_0^{X_\sigma^{\sigma+s}} z M(\sigma + ds, dz, du).
\]

Here \((B_{\sigma+s} - B_\sigma : s \geq 0)\) is a Brownian motion and \( M(\sigma + ds, dz, du) \) is a Poisson random measure on \((0, \infty)^3\) with intensity \( ds \, dz \, du \). Those are true under the original probability \( P(\cdot) \) and also under the conditional probability \( P(\cdot | \mathcal{F}_\sigma) \) because of the independent increment property. In particular, under \( P(\cdot | \mathcal{F}_\sigma) \), the process \((X_{\sigma+t} : t \geq 0)\) satisfies a stochastic equation of the same form as (1.7) with initial state \( X_\sigma \). From the uniqueness of solution of (1.7), it follows that \( P(X_{\sigma+t} \in \cdot | \mathcal{F}_\sigma) = P_t(X_\sigma, \cdot) \). That gives the strong Markov property of the process \((X_t : t \geq 0)\). For \( f \in \mathcal{D}(L) \), we can use (2.2) and Itô's formula to see

\[
f(\xi_n(t \wedge \zeta_n)) = f(x) + b \int_0^{t \wedge \zeta_n} f'(\xi_n(s)) \nu_n(\xi_n(s)) ds + c \int_0^{t \wedge \zeta_n} f''(\xi_n(s)) \nu_n(\xi_n(s)) ds \\
+ \int_0^{t \wedge \zeta_n} \nu_n(\xi_n(s)) ds \int_{(0,\infty]} \left[ f(\xi_n(s) + z) - f(\xi_n(s)) \\
- f'(\xi_n(s)) \mathbf{1}_{\{z \leq 1\}} \right] m(dz) + M_n(t)
\]

where

\[
M_n(t) = \int_0^{t \wedge \zeta_n} f'(\xi_n(s)) \sqrt{2cr_n(\xi_n(s))} dB(s) \\
+ \int_0^{t \wedge \zeta_n} \nu_n(\xi_n(s)) \int_{(0,\infty]} \left[ f(\xi_n(s) + z) - f(\xi_n(s)) \right] \tilde{M}(ds, dz, du).
\]

Notice that \((M_n(t) : t \geq 0)\) is a martingale bounded on each bounded time interval. Then letting \( n \to \infty \) in the above equality and using bounded convergence theorem we get

\[
f(X_{t \wedge \tau}) = f(x) + \int_0^{t \wedge \tau} Lf(X_s) ds + \text{martingale}.
\]

Since \( 0 \) and \( \infty \) are traps for \((X_t : t \geq 0)\) and \( Lf(0) = Lf(\infty) = 0 \), it follows that

\[
f(X_t) = f(x) + \int_0^t Lf(X_s) ds + \text{martingale}. \quad (2.3)
\]

Then we take the expectation on both sides and obtain

\[
P_tf(x) = f(x) + \int_0^t P_s Lf(x) ds.
\]
That gives the Kolmogorov forward equation (1.4).

We next give some results connecting the process $X$ and a spectrally positive Lévy process through Lamperti type transformations. This connection plays an important role in the study of properties of the process. Let $Z = (Z_t : t \geq 0)$ be a spectrally positive Lévy process with Laplace exponent $-\psi$ and initial state $Z_0 = x \geq 0$. Note that $Z$ is absorbed by $\infty$ after an exponential time $T_\infty$ with parameter $a = -\psi(0) \geq 0$. Let $T_y = \inf\{t \geq 0 : Z_t = y\}$ for $y \in [0, \infty]$. Let $T = T_0 \wedge T_\infty$ be the absorbing time of $Z$. Let $Y_t = Z_{t \wedge T}$ for $t \geq 0$. We call $Y := (Y_t : t \geq 0)$ an absorbed spectrally positive Lévy process. By Proposition 37.10 in Sato (1999, p.255), the limit $Y_\infty := \lim_{t \to \infty} Y_t$ exists a.s. in $[0, \infty]$. 

**Proposition 2.1** Let $\alpha(t) = \int_0^t Y_s^{-\theta} ds$ and $\eta(t) = \inf\{s \geq 0 : \alpha(s) > t\}$ for $t \geq 0$. Then $J_\theta(Y) := (Y_{\eta(t)} : t \geq 0)$ solves (1.7) on an extension of the original probability space.

**Proof.** Let $W(t)$ be a Brownian motion and let $N_0(ds,dz)$ be a Poisson random measure on $(0, \infty) \times (0, \infty]$ with intensity $dsm(dz)$. Then a realization of the Lévy process $Z := (Z_t : t \geq 0)$ is defined by

$$Z_t = x - bt + \sqrt{2c}W(t) + \int_0^t \int_{(0,1]} z\tilde{N}_0(ds,dz) + \int_0^t \int_{(1,\infty]} zN_0(ds,dz), \quad (2.4)$$

where $\tilde{N}_0(ds,dz) = N_0(ds,dz) - dsm(dz)$. Let $\{(s_i, z_i) : i = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ be an enumeration of the atoms of $N_0(ds,dz)$. On an extension of the original probability space, we can construct a sequence of $(0, 1]$-valued i.i.d. uniform random variables $\{u_i\}$ independently of $W(t)$ and $N_0(ds,dz)$. Then

$$M_0(ds,dz,du) := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{(s_i, z_i, u_i)}(ds,dz,du)$$

defines a Poisson random measure on $(0, \infty) \times (0, \infty] \times (0, 1]$ with intensity $dsm(dz)du$. Let $\tilde{M}_0(ds,dz,du) = M_0(ds,dz,du) - dsm(dz)du$. Then we have

$$Z_t = x - bt + \sqrt{2c}W(t) + \int_0^t \int_{(0,1]} \int_0^1 z\tilde{M}_0(ds,dz,du)$$
$$+ \int_0^t \int_{(1,\infty]} \int_0^1 zM_0(ds,dz,du).$$

Let $Y = (Y_t : t \geq 0)$ be the absorbed process associated with $Z$ and let $X_t = Y_{\eta(t)}$ for $t \geq 0$. Let $\zeta_n = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t \geq n \text{ or } X_t \leq 1/n\}$ and $\zeta = \lim_{n \to \infty} \zeta_n$. Then we have

$$X_{t \wedge \zeta_n} = x + \sqrt{2cW(\eta(t \wedge \zeta_n)) + \int_0^{\eta(t \wedge \zeta_n)} \int_{(0,1]} \int_0^1 z\tilde{M}_0(ds,dz,du) - b\eta(t \wedge \zeta_n)$$
$$+ \int_0^{\eta(t \wedge \zeta_n)} \int_{(1,\infty]} \int_0^1 zM_0(ds,dz,du)$$
$$= x + \sqrt{2cW(\eta(t \wedge \zeta_n)) + \int_0^t \int_{(0,1]} \int_0^1 z\tilde{M}_0(ds,dz,du)$$
$$- b\eta(t \wedge \zeta_n) + \int_0^t \int_{(1,\infty]} \int_0^1 zM_0(ds,dz,du)$$
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\[-b\eta(t \wedge \zeta_n) + \int_0^t \int_{\{1, \infty\}} \int_0^1 z M_0(d\eta(s \wedge \zeta_n), dz, du). \quad (2.5)\]

By the definition of \(\alpha(t)\) we have \(d\alpha(t) = Y_{t-}^\theta dt\) for \(0 \leq t < T\) and \(d\eta(t) = Y_{\eta(t)-}^\theta dt = X_{t-}^\theta dt\) for \(0 \leq t < \tau\), where \(\tau\) is defined after (1.7). It follows that

\[\eta(t \wedge \zeta_n) = \int_0^{t \wedge \zeta_n} X_s^\theta 1_{\{s < \tau\}} ds = \int_0^{t \wedge \zeta_n} X_s^\theta ds. \quad (2.6)\]

By representation of time-changed Brownian motions, there is a Brownian motion \(\{B(t)\}\) on an extension of the original probability space so that

\[W(\eta(t \wedge \zeta_n)) = \int_0^{t \wedge \zeta_n} X_s^\theta \beta_2 dB(s);\]

see e.g. Theorem 4.3 in Ikeda and Watanabe (1989, p.198). On the extended probability space, we can take another independent Poisson random measure \(\{M_1(ds, dz, du)\}\) on \((0, \infty) \times (0, \infty) \times (0, \infty)\) with intensity \(dsm(dz)du\) and define the random measure

\[M(ds, dz, du) = 1_{\{s < \tau, u < X_s^\theta\}} M_0(d\eta(s), dz, X_{s-}^\theta du) + 1_{\{u > X_s^\theta\}} M_1(ds, dz, du).\]

Using (2.6) one can see \(\{M(ds, dz, du)\}\) has the deterministic compensator \(dsm(dz)du\), so it is a Poisson random measure. Then (1.7) follows by substituting \(W(t)\) and \(M_0(ds, dz, du)\) in (2.5) and taking \(n \to \infty\). \(\square\)

**Proposition 2.2** Let \(\gamma(t) = \int_0^t X_s^\theta ds\) and \(\beta(t) = \inf\{s \geq 0 : \gamma(s) > t\}\) for \(t \geq 0\). Then \(L_\theta(X) := (X_{\beta(t)} : t \geq 0)\) is an absorbed spectrally positive Lévy process.

**Proof.** Without loss of generality, we assume \(X_0 = x \in [0, \infty)\) is deterministic. Let \(Y_t = X_{\beta(t)} = X_{\beta(t) \wedge \tau}\) for \(t \geq 0\) and let \(T = \inf\{t \geq 0 : Y_t = 0\text{ or }Y_t = \infty\}\). We have

\[Y_t = x + \sqrt{2}c \int_0^{\beta(t) \wedge \tau} X_s^\theta dB(s) + \int_0^{\beta(t) \wedge \tau} \int_{[0,1]} \int_0^{X_s^\theta} z \tilde{M}(ds, dz, du)
\]

\[-b \int_0^{\beta(t) \wedge \tau} X_s^\theta ds + \int_0^{\beta(t) \wedge \tau} \int_{[1, \infty]} \int_0^{X_s^\theta} z M(ds, dz, du)\]

\[= x + \sqrt{2}c \int_0^t X_{\beta(s)-}^\theta 1_{\{\beta(s) \leq \tau\}} dB(\beta(s)) + \int_0^t \int_{[0,1]} \int_0^{X_{\beta(s)-}^\theta} z 1_{\{\beta(s) \leq \tau\}} M(d\beta(s), dz, du)
\]

\[-b \int_0^t X_{\beta(s)-}^\theta 1_{\{\beta(s) \leq \tau\}} d\beta(s) + \int_0^t \int_{[1, \infty]} \int_0^{X_{\beta(s)-}^\theta} z 1_{\{\beta(s) \leq \tau\}} M(d\beta(s), dz, du)\]

\[= x + \sqrt{2}c \int_0^t Y_{s-}^\theta 1_{\{\beta(s) \leq \tau\}} dB(\beta(s)) + \int_0^t \int_{[0,1]} \int_0^{Y_{s-}^\theta} z 1_{\{\beta(s) \leq \tau\}} \tilde{M}(d\beta(s), dz, du)
\]

\[-b \int_0^t Y_{s-}^\theta 1_{\{\beta(s) \leq \tau\}} d\beta(s) + \int_0^t \int_{[1, \infty]} \int_0^{Y_{s-}^\theta} z 1_{\{\beta(s) \leq \tau\}} M(d\beta(s), dz, du). \quad (2.7)\]
By the definition of $\gamma(t)$ and $\beta(t)$ we have $d\gamma(t) = X_{t-}^\theta dt$ for $0 \leq t < \tau$ and $d\beta(t) = X_{\beta(t)-}^\theta dt = Y_{t-}^\theta dt$ for $0 \leq t < T$. Thus

$$\int_0^t Y_{s-}^\theta 1_{\{\beta(s)<\tau\}} d\beta(s) = \int_0^t 1_{\{s<T\}} ds = t \wedge T.$$ 

It follows that

$$W_0(t) := \int_0^t Y_{s-}^\theta 1_{\{\beta(s)<\tau\}} dB(\beta(s))$$

defines a continuous local martingale with $\langle W_0 \rangle(t) = t \wedge T$. Then we can extend $\{W_0(t)\}$ to a Brownian motion $\{W(t)\}$. Now define the random measure $\{N_0(ds,dz)\}$ on $(0,\infty) \times (0,\infty)$ by

$$N_0((0,t] \times (a_1,a_2]) = \int_0^t \int_{a_1}^{a_2} \int_0^t Y_{s-}^\theta 1_{\{\beta(s)<\tau\}} M(d\beta(s),dz,du),$$

where $t \geq 0$ and $a_1, a_2 \in (0,\infty]$. It is easy to check that $\{N_0(ds,dz)\}$ has predictable compensator $Y_{s-}^\theta 1_{\{\beta(s)<\tau\}} d\beta(s)m(dz) = 1_{\{s<T\}} dsm(dz)$. Then we can extend $\{N_0(ds,dz)\}$ to a Poisson random measure $\{N(ds,dz)\}$ on $(0,\infty)^2$ with intensity $dsm(dz)$; see, e.g., Ikeda and Watanabe (1989, p.93). From (2.7) it follows that

$$Y_t = x + \sqrt{2cW(t \wedge T) + \int_0^{t \wedge T} \int_{[0,1]} z\bar{N}(ds,dz) - b(t \wedge T) + \int_0^{t \wedge T} \int_{[1,\infty]} zN(ds,dz).$$

Then $\{Y_t\}$ is an absorbed spectrally positive Lévy process. \hfill \Box

We call $L_\theta$ a generalized Lamperti transformation and $J_\theta$ the inverse generalized Lamperti transformation. In the particular case $\theta = 1$, they reduce to the classical transformations introduced by Lamperti (1967a, 1967b).

**Proof of Theorem 1.2** Let $Z = (Z_t : t \geq 0)$ be the Lévy process starting at 0 with Laplace exponent $-\psi$. Let $Z_x^x = x + Z_x$ for $x \in [0,\infty)$. Let $T_0^x = \inf\{t \geq 0 : Z_t^x = 0\}$ and $T_\infty^x = \inf\{t \geq 0 : Z_t^x = \infty\}$. Then $x \mapsto T_0^x$ is a.s. increasing. By Corollary 3.13 in Kyprianou (2006, p.82), for any $\lambda > 0$ we have

$$E(e^{-\lambda T_0^x}) = E(e^{-\lambda T_0^y} 1_{\{T_0^x < T_\infty^y\}}) = \exp\{-\psi^{-1}(\lambda)x\},$$

where $\psi^{-1}(\lambda) = \inf\{z \geq 0 : \psi(z) > \lambda\}$. Then $\lim_{y \rightarrow x} T_0^y = T_0^x$ first in distribution and then almost surely. Let $Y^x = (Z_{t \wedge T_0^x}^x : t \geq 0)$. For $x < y \in [0,\infty)$ we have

$$\rho(Z_{t \wedge T_0^x}^x, Z_{t \wedge T_0^y}^y) \leq \rho(Z_{t \wedge T_0^x}, Z_{t \wedge T_0^y}) + \rho(Z_{t \wedge T_0^x}, Z_{t \wedge T_0^y}) \leq |Z_{t \wedge T_0^x}^x - Z_{t \wedge T_0^y}^y| + \sup_{s \in [T_0^x, T_0^y]} \rho(0, Z_s^y) \leq |x - y| + \sup_{s \in [T_0^x, T_0^y]} Z_s^y.$$ 

By the right-continuity of the Lévy process we have a.s. $\lim_{t \uparrow T_0^x} Z_t^y = Z_{T_0^y}^y = y - x$. Since the Lévy process has no negative jump, we have a.s. $\lim_{t \uparrow T_0^y} Z_t^y = 0$. Then a.s.

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow x} d_\infty(Y^y, Y^x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow y} d_\infty(Y^y, Y^x) = 0.$$
By Proposition 2.1 the process $X^x := J_\theta(Y^x)$ is a solution to (1.7). A modification of the proof of Proposition 5 in Caballero et al. (2009) shows that the transformation $J_\theta$ is continuous on $(D, d_\infty)$. Then we have a.s.

$$
\lim_{y \to x} d_\infty(X^y, X^x) = \lim_{x \to y} d_\infty(X^y, X^x) = 0.
$$

That proves the desired result. □

**Proof of Theorem 1.4.** Let $X = J_\theta(Y)$ be constructed as in Proposition 2.1. Let $T_y = \inf\{t \geq 0 : Y_t = y\}$. By Corollary 3.13 in Kyprianou (2006, p.81) we have $P(T_y < \infty | Y_0 = x) = e^{-q(x-y)}$ for $0 \leq y \leq x$. Since $Y = (Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ has no negative jumps, we have $Y_t > y$ for $0 \leq t < T_y$. By Proposition 2.1 for $0 < y \leq x$ we have $\tau_y = \alpha(T_y) < \infty$ if and only if $T_y < \infty$. Then (1.10) holds. By Proposition 3.10 in Sato (1999, p.255), on the event $\{T_0 = \infty\}$ we have a.s. $\lim_{t \to \infty} Y_t = \infty$ and hence a.s. $\lim_{t \to \infty} X_t = \infty$. Then (1.11) holds. □

### 3 Mean extinction and explosion times

In this section we prove the results on the hitting times of the continuous-state polynomial branching process. We shall see that the relations established in Theorem 1.4 play important roles in the proofs. Recall that $e_{\lambda}(x) = e^{-\lambda x}$ for $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$ and $x \in [0, \infty]$.

**Proposition 3.1** (1) $t \mapsto P_t e_{\lambda}(x)$ is decreasing if $0 < \lambda \leq q$; (2) $t \mapsto P_t e_{\lambda}(x)$ is increasing if $q \leq \lambda < \infty$; (3) $\lim_{t \to \infty} P_t e_{\lambda}(x) = e_q(x)$ for all $0 < \lambda < \infty$; (4) $e_q$ is an invariant function of $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$.

**Proof.** It is easy to see that $e_{\lambda} \in \mathcal{D}(L)$ and $Le_{\lambda}(x) = x^\theta \psi(\lambda) e_{\lambda}(x)$. By (1.4) we have

$$
\frac{d}{dt} P_t e_{\lambda}(x) = \psi(\lambda) \int_{[0,\infty)} y^\theta e^{-\lambda y} P_t(x, dy). \tag{3.1}
$$

By convexity of $\psi$ we see (1) and (2) hold. By Theorem 1.3 (2) we get (3), from which (4) follows. □

**Proof of Theorem 1.4.** Taking the Laplace transform in both sides of (3.1) and using integration by parts we get

$$
\psi(\lambda) \int_{[0,\infty)} y^\theta e^{-\lambda y} U^n(x, dy) = \int_0^\infty e^{-\eta t} \frac{d}{dt} P_t e_{\lambda}(x) dt = e^{-\eta t} P_t e_{\lambda}(x)_{t=0} + \eta \int_0^\infty e^{-\eta t} P_t e_{\lambda}(x) dt = -e^{-\lambda x} + \eta \int_0^\infty e^{-\eta t} P_t e_{\lambda}(x) dt.
$$
Then we get (1.13). By (1.15), we see that
\[ l_x(y, z) = \int_{[0, \infty)} y^\theta e^{-zy} U^y(x, dy) = \int_0^\infty e^{-\eta t} dt \int_{[0, \infty)} y^\theta e^{-zy} P_t(x, dy). \] (3.2)

Multiplying (3.2) by \((z - \lambda)^{\theta-1}\) and integrating both sides, we have
\[
\int_\lambda^\infty l_x(\eta, z)(z - \lambda)^{\theta-1} d\lambda = \int_\lambda^\infty (z - \lambda)^{\theta-1} d\lambda \int_0^\infty e^{-\eta t} dt \int_{[0, \infty)} y^\theta e^{-(\lambda+\eta) y} P_t(x, dy)
= \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty e^{-\eta t} dt \int_0^\infty \int_{[0, \infty)} y^\theta e^{-(\lambda+\eta) y} P_t(x, dy)
= \int_0^\infty e^{-\eta t} dt \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda y} P_t(x, dy) \int_0^\infty y^\theta z^{\theta-1} e^{-yz} dz
= \Gamma(\theta) \int_0^\infty e^{-\eta t} dt \int_{[0, \infty)} e^{-\lambda y} P_t(x, dy).
\]

That gives (1.14). \(\square\)

**Lemma 3.2** For any \(\lambda \geq 0\) and \(x \in [0, \infty)\) we have
\[ e^{-q x} - e^{-\lambda x} = \psi(\lambda) \int_0^\infty dt \int_{[0, \infty)} y^\theta e^{-\lambda y} P_t(x, dy) \] (3.3)
and
\[ \int_\lambda^\infty h_x(z)(z - \lambda)^{\theta-1} d\lambda = \Gamma(\theta) \int_0^\infty dt \int_{[0, \infty)} e^{-\lambda y} P_t(x, dy). \] (3.4)

**Proof.** By Proposition 1.10 and Proposition 3.1 as \(t \uparrow \infty\) we have \(e^{-\lambda x} \leq P_t e_\lambda(x) \uparrow e^{-q x}\) for \(0 < \lambda < \infty\) and \(e^{-\lambda x} \geq P_t e_\lambda(x) \downarrow e^{-q x}\) for \(0 < \lambda < q\). Since
\[ \eta U^n e_\lambda(x) = \int_0^\infty \eta e^{-\eta t} P_t e_\lambda(x) dt = \int_0^\infty e^{-t} P_t/\eta e_\lambda(x) dt, \]
we see that \(e^{-\lambda x} \leq \eta U^n e_\lambda(x) \uparrow e^{-q x}\) for \(0 < \lambda < \infty\) and \(e^{-\lambda x} \geq \eta U^n e_\lambda(x) \downarrow e^{-q x}\) for \(0 < \lambda < q\) as \(\eta \downarrow 0\). Then we use monotone convergence to get (3.3) and (3.4) by letting \(\eta \to 0\) in (1.13) and (1.14), respectively. \(\square\)

**Proof of Theorem 1.5** Observe that, for any \(\eta \geq 0\),
\[
\int_{(0, \infty)} e^{-\eta z} P_t(x, dz) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\theta)} \int_{(0, \infty)} e^{-\eta z} P_t(x, dz) \int_0^\infty y^{\theta-1} e^{-y} dy
= \frac{1}{\Gamma(\theta)} \int_{(0, \infty)} z^{\theta} e^{-\eta z} P_t(x, dz) \int_0^\infty \lambda^{\theta-1} e^{-\lambda z} d\lambda.
\]
we have the stopped process $X$.

**Proposition 3.3** For any expressions we get (1.19).

By Theorem 1.3 (2) and Proposition 3.1 (4), the function $x \mapsto e^{-qx} = P_x(X_\infty = 0) = P_x(\tau_\infty > t, X_\infty = 0)$ is invariant for the transition semigroup of $X$. By (3.5),

$$P_x(\tau_0 > t, X_\infty = 0) = P_x(X_\infty = 0) - P_x(\tau_0 \leq t, X_\infty = 0) = e^{-qx} - P_t(x, \{0\}) = \int_{(0,\infty)} e^{-qz} P_t(x, dz)$$

and

$$P_x(\tau_\infty > t, X_\infty = \infty) = P_x(\tau_\infty > t) - P_x(\tau_\infty > t, X_\infty = 0) = P_t(x, [0, \infty)) - e^{-qx} = \int_{(0,\infty)} (1 - e^{-qz}) P_t(x, dz)$$

By Lemma 3.2 we have

$$E_x(\tau_0 : X_\infty = 0) = \int_0^\infty P_x(\tau_0 > t, X_\infty = 0) dt = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\theta)} \int_0^\infty \lambda^{\theta-1} d\lambda \int_0^\infty dt \int_{(0,\infty)} z^\theta e^{-(\lambda+q)z} P_t(x, dz)$$

and

$$E_x(\tau_\infty : X_\infty = \infty) = \int_0^\infty P_x(\tau_\infty > t, X_\infty = \infty) dt = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\theta)} \int_0^\infty \lambda^{\theta-1} d\lambda \int_0^\infty dt \int_{(0,\infty)} z^\theta e^{-\lambda z} (1 - e^{-qz}) P_t(x, dz)$$

where $h_x$ is defined by (1.16). Then (1.17) and (1.18) are proved. By summing up those two expressions we get (1.19). 

**Proposition 3.3** For any $y \in [0, \infty)$, let $(P_t^{(y)} t \geq 0$ denote the transition semigroup on $[y, \infty]$ of the stopped process $X^{(y)} = (X_t \wedge y : t \geq 0)$ with $X_0 \geq y$. For any $\eta > 0$, $\lambda \geq 0$ and $x \in [y, \infty)$ we have

$$\eta \int_0^\infty e^{-\eta t} P_t^{(y)} E_x(x) dt = e^{-\lambda x} + \psi(\lambda) \int_0^\infty e^{-\eta t} dt \int_{(y,\infty)} z^\theta e^{-\lambda z} P_t^{(y)}(x, dz).$$

(3.6)
Proof. For any \( x \geq y \in [0, \infty) \) we have \( P_x(\tau_y < \tau_0, X_{\tau_y} = y) = 1 \). Then (2.3) implies
\[
e^{-\lambda X_{t \wedge \tau_y}} = e^{-\lambda x} + \psi(\lambda) \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_y} X_s e^{-\lambda x} ds + \text{martingale}
\]
\[
= e^{-\lambda x} + \psi(\lambda) \int_0^t X_s e^{-\lambda x} 1_{(y, \infty)}(X_{s \wedge \tau_y}) ds + \text{martingale.}
\]
Taking the expectation in both sides yields
\[
P_t^{(y)} e_{\lambda}(x) = e^{-\lambda x} + \psi(\lambda) \int_0^t ds \int_{(y, \infty)} z^\theta e^{-\lambda z} P_s^{(y)}(x, dz).
\]
Thus we have
\[
\eta \int_0^\infty e^{-\eta t} P_t^{(y)} e_{\lambda}(x) dt = e^{-\lambda x} \eta \psi(\lambda) \int_0^\infty e^{-\eta t} dt \int_0^t ds \int_{(y, \infty)} z^\theta e^{-\lambda z} P_s^{(y)}(x, dz)
\]
\[
= e^{-\lambda x} \eta \psi(\lambda) \int_0^\infty ds \int_0^\infty e^{-\eta t} dt \int_{(y, \infty)} z^\theta e^{-\lambda z} P_s^{(y)}(x, dz)
\]
\[
= e^{-\lambda x} \eta \psi(\lambda) \int_0^\infty e^{-\eta t} dt \int_0^\infty ds \int_{(y, \infty)} e^{-\eta t} dt \int_{(y, \infty)} z^\theta e^{-\lambda z} P_s^{(y)}(x, dz)
\]
\[
= e^{-\lambda x} \eta \psi(\lambda) \int_0^\infty e^{-\eta t} dt \int_{(y, \infty)} z^\theta e^{-\lambda z} P_t^{(y)}(x, dz).
\]
That proves (3.6). \[\square\]

Proof of Theorem 1.6 By Theorem 1.3(2) we have \( P_x(\{X_\infty = 0\} \cup \{X_\infty = \infty\}) = 1 \). Observe that
\[
\eta \int_0^\infty e^{-\eta t} P_t^{(y)} e_{\lambda}(x) dt = \int_0^\infty e^{-t} dt \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda z} P_t^{(y)}(x, dz)
\]
\[
= \int_0^\infty e^{-t} \mathbf{E}_x \left[ \exp \left\{ -\lambda X_{(t/\eta) \wedge \tau_y} \right\} 1_{\{\tau_y < t/\eta\}} \right] dt + \int_0^\infty e^{-t} \mathbf{E}_x \left[ \exp \left\{ -\lambda X_{(t/\eta) \wedge \tau_y} \right\} 1_{\{\tau_y \geq t/\eta\}} \right] dt.
\]
The first term on the right-hand side converges to \( e^{-\lambda y} P_x(\tau_y < \infty) \) as \( \eta \to 0 \). Since the process \( X \) started from \( x (> y) \) can come to \( 0 \) only by crossing \( y \), we have a.s. \( X_\infty = \infty \) on the event \( \{\tau_y = \infty\} \), so the second term vanishes as \( \eta \to 0 \). Then by Theorem 1.3(1), as \( \eta \to 0 \) we have
\[
\eta \int_0^\infty e^{-\eta t} P_t^{(y)} e_{\lambda}(x) dt \to e^{-\lambda y - q(x - y)}.
\]
By taking \( \eta \to 0 \) in (3.6) we obtain
\[
e^{-qx} (e^{-(\lambda - q)y} - e^{-(\lambda - q)x}) = \psi(\lambda) \int_0^\infty dt \int_{(y, \infty)} z^\theta e^{-\lambda z} P_t^{(y)}(x, dz).
\]
Thus we have
\[
e^{-qx} \int_0^\infty \frac{e^{-(\lambda - q)y} - e^{-(\lambda - q)x}}{\psi(\lambda)} \lambda^{\theta - 1} d\lambda = \int_0^\infty \lambda^{\theta - 1} d\lambda \int_0^\infty dt \int_{(y, \infty)} z^\theta e^{-\lambda z} P_t^{(y)}(x, dz)
\]
For \( \theta > 1 \), the continuous-state polynomial branching process.

That implies (1.20) by a formula for the expectation.

**Proof of Corollary 1.7** By Theorem 1.3(1) we see \( P_x(\tau_y < \infty) = 1 \) and hence \( P_x(\tau_y < \tau_\infty) = 1 \). Then (1.21) follows from (1.20).

### 4 Extinction and explosion probabilities

In this section we give the proofs of the results on the extinction and explosion probabilities of the continuous-state polynomial branching process.

**Lemma 4.1** Let \( \varepsilon > q \). Then for any \( x \in (0, \infty) \), we have \( P_x(\tau_0 < \infty) > 0 \) if and only if (1.22) holds.

**Proof.** (1) Suppose that \( P_x(\tau_0 < \infty) > 0 \) for some \( x \in (0, \infty) \). Then for sufficiently large \( t \geq 0 \) we have \( P_t(x, \{0\}) = P_x(\tau_0 \leq t) > 0 \). It follows that

\[
\rho_x(\eta) := \lim_{\lambda \to \infty} U^\eta e_\lambda(x) = \int_0^\infty e^{-\eta t} P_t(x, \{0\}) dt > 0, \quad \eta > 0.
\]

Then there exists \( \varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(x, \eta) > q \) such that \( e^{-\varepsilon_0 x} \leq \eta \rho_x(\eta)/2 \), and so

\[
\eta U^\eta e_\lambda(x) - e^{-\lambda x} \geq \eta U^\eta e_\lambda(x) - \frac{1}{2} \eta \rho_x(\eta) \geq \frac{1}{2} \eta \rho_x(\eta), \quad \lambda > \varepsilon_0.
\]

For \( \lambda \geq \varepsilon_0 + 1 \) we have \( \lambda^{\theta-1} \leq (\lambda - \varepsilon_0)^{\theta-1} \) if \( 0 < \theta \leq 1 \), and \( \lambda^{\theta-1} \leq (\varepsilon_0 + 1)^{\theta-1}(\lambda - \varepsilon_0)^{\theta-1} \) if \( \theta > 1 \). Therefore we can find a constant \( C = C(\varepsilon_0, \theta) > 0 \) such that

\[
\int_{\varepsilon_0+1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^{\theta-1}}{\psi(\lambda)} d\lambda \leq \frac{C}{2} \int_{\varepsilon_0}^{\infty} \frac{(\lambda - \varepsilon_0)^{\theta-1}}{\psi(\lambda)} d\lambda \leq \frac{C}{\eta \rho_x(\eta)} \int_{\varepsilon_0}^{\infty} \frac{\eta U^\eta e_\lambda(x) - e^{-\lambda x}}{\psi(\lambda)} (\lambda - \varepsilon_0)^{\theta-1} d\lambda.
\]

By (1.14) we see the right hand side is finite, and hence (1.22) holds for any \( \varepsilon > q \).

(2) Suppose that \( P_x(\tau_0 < \infty) = 0 \) for some \( x \in (0, \infty) \). Then \( P_t(x, \{0\}) = 0 \) for every \( t \geq 0 \). By Theorem 1.3(2), for \( \varepsilon > q \) we have

\[
\lim_{t \to \infty} \int_{(0, \infty)} e^{-\varepsilon z} P_t(x, dz) = \lim_{t \to \infty} \int_{(0, \infty)} e^{-\varepsilon z} P_t(x, dz) = e^{-q x} > 0.
\]

By (3.4) it follows that

\[
\int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^{\theta-1}}{\psi(\lambda)} d\lambda \geq \int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty} h_x(\lambda) (\lambda - \varepsilon)^{\theta-1} d\lambda = \Gamma(\theta) \int_{0}^{\infty} dt \int_{(0, \infty)} e^{-\varepsilon \lambda} P_t(x, dz) = \infty.
\]

\( \square \)
Lemma 4.2 Suppose that $P_x(\tau_0 < \infty) > 0$ for some $x \in (0, \infty)$. Then we have $P_x(\tau_0 < \infty) = P_x(X_\infty = 0) = e^{-qx}$.

Proof. Suppose that $P_x(\tau_0 < \infty) > 0$ for some $x \in (0, \infty)$. By Theorem 1.3 (2) we only need to prove $P_x(\tau_0 = \infty, X_\infty = 0) = 0$. In this case, we have $P_x(\tau_0 < \infty) > 1$, and hence $\alpha := P_x(\tau_0 > v) = P_x(X_v > 0) < 1$ for some $v > 0$. By Theorem 1.1 we have $P_y(X_v > 0) < \alpha$ for $y \leq x$. Let $\sigma_0 = 0$ and $\sigma_n = \inf\{t > \sigma_{n-1} + v : X_t \leq x\}$ for $n \geq 1$. It is easy to see that $X_{\sigma_n} \leq x$. By the strong Markov property, for any $n \geq 1$ we have

$$P_x(\tau_0 = \infty, X_\infty = 0) \leq P_x\left(\bigcap_{k=1}^n \{\sigma_k < \infty, X_{\sigma_k+v} > 0\}\right) \leq \alpha P_x\left(\bigcap_{k=1}^n \{\sigma_k < \infty, X_{\sigma_k+v} > 0\}\right) \leq \alpha^2 P_x\left(\bigcap_{k=1}^n \{\sigma_k < \infty, X_{\sigma_k+v} > 0\}\right) \leq \cdots \leq \alpha^n.$$

Then the left-hand side vanishes. □

Proof of Theorem 1.8 From Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2 we only need to check that (1.22) does not hold in the case $\theta \geq 2$. By the Taylor expansion, we see $e^{-\lambda u} - 1 + \lambda u \leq \lambda^2 u^2 / 2$. In view of (1.6) we have

$$\psi(\lambda) \leq |b|\lambda + c\lambda^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \int_{(0,1]} u^2 m(du) - \lambda \int_{(1,\infty]} (1 - e^{-\lambda u}) m(du).$$

Then there is a constant $C > 0$ so that $\psi(\lambda) \leq C\lambda^2$ for $\lambda \geq \varepsilon$. If $\theta \geq 2$, then

$$\int_\varepsilon^\infty \lambda^{\theta-1} d\lambda \geq \frac{1}{C} \int_\varepsilon^\infty \lambda^{\theta-3} d\lambda = \infty,$$

so (1.22) does not hold. □

Proof of Corollary 1.9 If $c > 0$, we can take $\varepsilon > 0$ so that $\psi(\lambda) \geq c\lambda^2 / 2$ for $\lambda \geq \varepsilon$. When $0 < \theta < 2$, we have

$$\int_\varepsilon^\infty \frac{\lambda^{\theta-1}}{\psi(\lambda)} d\lambda \leq \frac{2}{c} \int_\varepsilon^\infty \lambda^{\theta-3} d\lambda < \infty,$$

so the process hits 0 by Lemma 4.1. □
Proposition 4.3 Let $\varepsilon > q$. For any $x \in (0, \infty)$ we have $P_x(\tau_\infty < \infty) = 0$ if and only if $a = -\psi(0) = 0$ and one of the following two conditions is satisfied: (i) $\psi'(0) \geq 0$; (ii) $\psi'(0) < 0$ and (1.23) holds.

Proof. (1) In the case $a = -\psi(0) > 0$, we can let $\lambda \to 0$ in (1.13) to see

$$
\eta \int_0^\infty e^{-\eta t} P_t(x, [0, \infty)) dt = \eta U^n(x_0, [0, \infty)) = 1 + \psi(0) \int_{[0, \infty)} z^\theta U^n(x, dz) < 1.
$$

Then for some $t > 0$ we have $P_t(x, [0, \infty)) < 1$ and so $P_x(\tau_\infty \leq t) = P_t(x, \{\infty\}) > 0$.

(2) Suppose that $a = -\psi(0) = 0$ and $\psi'(0) \geq 0$. By the convexity of $\psi$ we have $\psi(\lambda) > 0$ for each $\lambda > 0$. Then (1.13) implies

$$
\eta \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda z} U^n(x, dz) = \eta \int_0^\infty e^{-\eta t} dt \int_{[0, \infty)} e^{-\lambda z} P_t(x, dz) > e^{-\lambda x}.
$$

By letting $\lambda \to 0$ on the both sides we see $\eta U^n(x, [0, \infty)) = 1$. Then $P_x(\tau_\infty > t) = P_t(x, [0, \infty)) = 1$ for every $t > 0$. That implies $P_x(\tau_\infty = \infty) = 1$.

(3) Consider the case with $a = -\psi(0) = 0$ and $\psi'(0) < 0$. (a) Suppose that (1.23) holds but $P_x(\tau_\infty < \infty) > 0$. Then $P_t(x, [0, \infty)) = P_x(\tau_\infty > t) < 1$ for sufficiently large $t \geq 0$. For any $\eta > 0$ we have

$$
\kappa(x) := 1 - \eta \int_0^\infty e^{-\eta t} P_t(x, [0, \infty)) dt > 0. \quad (4.1)
$$

By continuity there exists an $\varepsilon \in (0, q)$ such that $\psi(\lambda) < 0$ and

$$
e^{-\lambda x} - \eta U^n e_\lambda(x) \geq \frac{1}{2} \kappa(x) > 0, \quad 0 < \lambda \leq \varepsilon.
$$

By (1.23) we have

$$
\int_0^\varepsilon l_\varepsilon(\eta, \lambda) \lambda^{\theta-1} d\lambda = \int_0^\varepsilon \eta U^n e_\lambda(x) - e^{-\lambda x} \frac{\lambda^{\theta-1} d\lambda}{\psi(\lambda)} \geq \frac{\kappa(x)}{2} \int_0^\varepsilon \frac{\lambda^{\theta-1}}{-\psi(\lambda)} d\lambda = \infty.
$$

Then (1.14) implies

$$
\int_0^\infty e^{-\eta t} P_t(x, (0, \infty)) dt = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\theta)} \int_0^\infty l_\varepsilon(\eta, \lambda) \lambda^{\theta-1} d\lambda = \infty,
$$

which is in contradiction to (4.1). (b) Conversely, suppose that (1.23) does not hold. Then we have

$$
\int_0^\varepsilon \frac{\lambda^{\theta-1}}{-\psi(\lambda)} d\lambda < \infty.
$$

Using the convexity of $\psi$ we know $\psi'(q) > 0$, and so

$$
\lim_{\lambda \to q} e^{-(\lambda-q)u} - e^{-(\lambda-q)x} \psi(\lambda) = \frac{(x-y)}{\psi'(q)}.
$$
Since \( \lim_{\lambda \to \infty} \psi(\lambda) = \infty \), by Theorem \ref{thm:6} we see

\[
E_x(\tau_x = \infty) \leq E_x(\tau_x \wedge \tau_y) = \frac{e^{-qx}}{\Gamma(\theta)} \int_0^{\infty} \frac{e^{-(\lambda-q)y} - e^{-(\lambda-q)x}}{\psi(\lambda)} \lambda^{\theta-1} d\lambda < \infty.
\]

It follows that \( P_x(\tau_x < \infty) \geq P_x(\tau_y = \infty) = 1 - e^{-q(x-y)} > 0 \). \( \square \)

**Lemma 4.4** Suppose that \( P_x(\tau_x < \infty) > 0 \) for some \( x \in (0, \infty) \). Then we have \( P_x(\tau_x < \infty) = P_x(X_\infty = \infty) = 1 - e^{-q x} \).

**Proof.** We only need to prove \( P_x(\tau_x = \infty, X_\infty = \infty) = 0 \) for each \( x \in (0, \infty) \). Fix \( x \in (0, \infty) \) and choose sufficiently large \( v > 0 \) so that \( \alpha := P_x(\tau_x > v) = P_x(X_v < \infty) < 1 \). By Theorem \ref{thm:11} we have \( P_y(X_v < \infty) \leq \alpha \) for \( y \geq x \in [0, \infty) \). Let \( \sigma_1 = 0 \) and \( \sigma_n = \inf\{t > \sigma_{n-1} + v : X_t \geq x\} \) for \( n \geq 1 \). As in the proof of Theorem \ref{thm:8} one sees

\[
P_x(\tau_x = \infty, X_\infty = \infty) \leq P_x\left( \bigcap_{k=1}^{n} \{\sigma_k < \infty, X_{\sigma_k+v} < \infty\} \right) \leq \alpha^n.
\]

for every \( n \geq 1 \). Then we must have \( P_x(\tau_x = \infty, X_\infty = \infty) = 0 \). \( \square \)

**Proof of Theorem \ref{thm:10}.** (1) Suppose that \( \theta > 1 \). By Proposition \ref{prop:3} we have \( P_x(\tau_x < \infty) > 0 \) if \( a = -\psi(0) > 0 \), and \( P_x(\tau_x < \infty) = 0 \) if \( \psi(0) = 0 \) and \( \psi'(0) \geq 0 \). Since \( \theta > 1 \), when \( a = -\psi(0) = 0 \) and \( \psi'(0) < 0 \), we have

\[
\int_0^\varepsilon \frac{\lambda^{\theta-1}}{-\psi(\lambda)} d\lambda < \infty.
\]

Then \( P_x(\tau_x < \infty) > 0 \) by Proposition \ref{prop:3}.

(2) Suppose that \( 0 < \theta \leq 1 \). It suffices to consider the case with \( a = -\psi(0) = 0 \) and \( \psi'(0) > -\infty \). In this case, since \( 0 < \theta \leq 1 \) and \( \psi(\lambda) = \psi'(0)\lambda + o(\lambda) \) as \( \lambda \to 0 \), we have

\[
\int_0^\varepsilon \frac{\lambda^{\theta-1}}{-\psi(\lambda)} d\lambda = \infty.
\]

Then \( P_x(\tau_x < \infty) = 0 \) by Proposition \ref{prop:3}. Finally, by using Lemma \ref{lem:4.4} we complete the proof. \( \square \)

## 5 The process coming down from infinity

In this section, we give a construction of the continuous-state polynomial branching process coming down from \( \infty \).

**Proof of Theorem \ref{thm:11}.** By the right continuity of \( (X_t^x)_{t \geq 0} \) we have a.s. \( \tau_x^x > 0 \) for \( x > y \in [0, \infty) \), yielding a.s. \( \tau_y^x > 0 \) for \( y \in [0, \infty) \). Then (iii) \( \Rightarrow \) (ii) \( \Rightarrow \) (i). By \ref{thm:12.1} we see (iii) \( \Leftrightarrow \) (iv).
To show that (i) $\Rightarrow$ (iii), suppose that $P(\tau_0^y < \infty) > 0$ for some $y > 0$. Then there exists $t > 0$ such that $\alpha := P(\tau_0^y > t) < 1$. By Theorem 1.1 we see for each $x \geq y \in [0, \infty)$ we have $P(\tau_0^x > t) \leq \alpha < 1$. By the Markov property, for $n \geq 1,$

\[
P(\tau_0^\infty > nt) = \lim_{x \to \infty} P(\tau_0^x > nt) \\
= \lim_{x \to \infty} \mathbb{E}(1_{\{\tau_0^x > nt\}}1_{\{\tau_0^x > (n-1)t\}}) \\
= \lim_{x \to \infty} \mathbb{E}[1_{\{\tau_0^x > t\}} \mathbb{E}(1_{\{\tau_0^x > (n-1)t\}}|\mathcal{F}_t)] \\
= \lim_{x \to \infty} \mathbb{E}[1_{\{\tau_0^x > t\}} \mathbb{E}(1_{\{\tau_0^x > (n-1)t\}}|z=x_t)] \\
\leq \mathbb{E}[1_{\{\tau_0^\infty > t\}}\mathbb{E}(1_{\{\tau_0^\infty > (n-1)t\}})] \\
= \alpha P(\tau_0^\infty > (n-1)t)].
\]

Then $P(\tau_0^\infty > nt) \leq \alpha^n$ by induction. That implies (iii). \hfill \Box

**Lemma 5.1** For any $0 < x < \infty$ we have a.s. $\lim_{y \uparrow x} \tau_0^y = \tau_0^x$.

**Proof.** By Theorem 1.1 the mapping $y \mapsto \tau_0^y$ is increasing. Then for $x > y > 0$ and $\lambda > 0$ we have

\[
\mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda \tau_0^y}] \geq \mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda \tau_0^x}].
\]

By Fubini theorem, for $\lambda, y > 0$,

\[
\mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda \tau_0^y}] = \mathbb{E}\left[1 - \lambda \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}1_{\{\tau_0^y > t\}}dt\right] = 1 - \lambda \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t}P(X_t^y > 0)dt.
\]

By Theorem 1.2 we infer $X_t^y \to X_t^x$ in distribution as $y \to x$. Then, by the above equality and Theorem 3.1 (e) in Ethier and Kurtz (1986, page 108),

\[
\lim_{y \uparrow x} \mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda \tau_0^y}] \leq \mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda \tau_0^x}].
\]

From the above two inequalities it follows that $\tau_0^y \to \tau_0^x$ in distribution as $y \uparrow x$. By the monotonicity of $y \mapsto \tau_0^y$ we see a.s. $\lim_{y \uparrow x} \tau_0^y = \tau_0^x$. \hfill \Box

**Proposition 5.2** Suppose that $a = -\psi(0) = 0$ and $\psi'(0) \geq 0$. Then for each $x \in (0, \infty)$ we have a.s. $\lim_{y \uparrow x} \sup_{t \geq 0} |X_t^y - X_t^x| = 0$.

**Proof.** Let $\beta$ be defined as in (1.6). Under the assumptions, we have $\beta > -\infty$ and $a = m(\{\infty\}) = 0$, so we can rewritten (1.7) as

\[
X_t = X_0 - \beta \int_0^t X_s^0 ds + \sqrt{2c} \int_0^t X_s^{\theta/2} dB_s + \int_0^t \int_{(0,\infty)} \int_0^{X_s^\theta} z^M(ds,dz,du).
\]

For each $n \geq 1$ define the function $r_n$ as in (2.1). For each $x > 0$ let $\{\xi_n(t) : t \geq 0\}$ be the unique solution to the following equation

\[
\xi_n(t) = x + \int_0^t \sqrt{2cr_n(\xi_n(s-))} dB(s) - \int_0^t \beta r_n(\xi_n(s-))ds
\]
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drift term in above we have

\[ + \int_0^t \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty (z \land n) \tilde{M}(ds, dz, du). \]

For \(0 < y < x\) define \(\xi_{n}^{x,y} = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t^x \geq n\} \text{ or } X_t^y \leq 1/n\}. Since \(1/n \leq X_t^y = \xi_{n}^{x,y} \leq X_t^x = \xi_{n}^{x}(t) \leq n\) for \(0 \leq t < \xi_{n}^{x,y}\), the trajectory \(t \mapsto \xi_{n}^{x}(t)\) and \(t \mapsto \xi_{n}^{y}(t)\) have no jumps larger than \(n\) on the time interval \([0, \xi_{n}^{x,y}]\). Then we have

\[
\xi_{n}^{x}(t \land \xi_{n}^{x,y}) - \xi_{n}^{y}(t \land \xi_{n}^{x,y}) = x - y - \beta \int_0^{t \land \xi_{n}^{x,y}} [\xi_{n}^{x}(s-)^\theta - \xi_{n}^{y}(s-)^\theta] ds \\
+ \sqrt{2c} \int_0^{t \land \xi_{n}^{x,y}} [\xi_{n}^{x}(s-)^{\theta/2} - \xi_{n}^{y}(s-)^{\theta/2}] dB_s \\
+ \int_0^t \int_0^{\infty} \int_0^{\infty} \xi_{n}^{x}(s-) [z \land n] \tilde{M}(ds, dz, du).
\]

By applying Doob’s inequality to the martingale terms and applying Hölder’s inequality to the drift term in above we have

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t \land \xi_{n}^{x,y}} |\xi_{n}^{x}(s-) - \xi_{n}^{y}(s-)|^2 \right] \\
\leq 4|x - y|^2 + 4\beta^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \int_0^t |\xi_{n}^{x}(s-)^\theta - \xi_{n}^{y}(s-)^\theta| ds \right)^2 \right] \\
+ 32c \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^t |\xi_{n}^{x}(s-)^{\theta/2} - \xi_{n}^{y}(s-)^{\theta/2}|^2 ds \right] \\
+ 16 \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^t |\xi_{n}^{x}(s-)^\theta - \xi_{n}^{y}(s-)^\theta|^2 ds \int_{(0, \infty)} z^2 \land n^{-2} m(dz) \right] \\
\leq 4|x - y|^2 + 4\beta^2 t \int_0^t \mathbb{E} [|\xi_{n}^{x}(s-)^\theta - \xi_{n}^{y}(s-)^\theta|^2] ds \\
+ 32c t \int_0^t \mathbb{E} [|\xi_{n}^{x}(s-)^{\theta/2} - \xi_{n}^{y}(s-)^{\theta/2}|^2] ds \\
+ 16 t \int_0^t \mathbb{E} [|\xi_{n}^{x}(s-)^\theta - \xi_{n}^{y}(s-)^\theta|^2] ds \int_{(0, \infty)} z^2 \land n^{-2} m(dz).
\]

Obviously \(x \mapsto x^\theta\) and \(x \mapsto x^{\theta/2}\) are Lipschitz functions on \([1/n, n]\). Then for \(t < k\) there exists a constant \(C_{n,k}\) such that

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq u \leq \xi_{n}^{x,y}} |\xi_{n}^{x}(s) - \xi_{n}^{y}(s)|^2 \right] \leq 4|x - y|^2 + C_{n,k} \int_0^t \mathbb{E} (|\xi_{n}^{x}(s) - \xi_{n}^{y}(s)|^2) ds \\
\leq 4|x - y|^2 + C_{n,k} \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq u \leq \xi_{n}^{x,y}} |\xi_{n}^{x}(s) - \xi_{n}^{y}(s)|^2 \right] ds.
\]

Then by Gronwall’s inequality for \(t \leq k\) we see

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{0 \leq s \leq \xi_{n}^{x,y}} |\xi_{n}^{x}(s) - \xi_{n}^{y}(s)|^2 \right] \leq 4|x - y|^2 \exp[C_{n,k}t].
\]
It follows that
\[ \lim_{y \to \infty} E \left[ \sup_{0 \leq s \leq k \land \zeta_{n}^{x,y}} |\xi_{n}^{x}(s) - \xi_{n}^{y}(s)|^2 \right] = 0, \]
which yields
\[ \lim_{y \to \infty} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq k \land \zeta_{n}^{x,y}} |\xi_{n}^{x}(s) - \xi_{n}^{y}(s)| = 0 \quad \text{a.s.} \]

Since \( X^x \) has no negative jump, for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \) there exists a \( 0 < T < \tau_0^x \) such that \( X^x_t < \varepsilon \) for \( t > T \). As \( a = -\psi(0) = 0 \) and \( \psi'(0) \geq 0 \), by Proposition 3.1 we see \( \lim_{t \to \infty} X_t = 0 \). By Lemma 5.1 we have \( \lim_{y \to \infty} \tau_0^y = \tau_0^x \). It follows that \( \lim_{y \to \infty} \lim_{n \to \infty} \zeta_{n}^{x,y} = \tau_0^x \). Then for sufficiently large \( k,n \) and \( y < x \) we have \( k \land \zeta_{n}^{x,y} > T \), and thus
\[ \sup_{t \geq 0} |X^x_t - X^y_t| \leq \sup_{0 \leq s \leq k \land \zeta_{n}^{x,y}} |X^x_s - X^y_s| + \varepsilon \]
\[ = \sup_{0 \leq s \leq k \land \zeta_{n}^{x,y}} |\xi_{n}^{x}(s) - \xi_{n}^{y}(s)| + \varepsilon. \]

Since \( \varepsilon > 0 \) can be arbitrarily small, we have a.s. \( \lim_{y \to \infty} \sup_{t \geq 0} |X^x_t - X^y_t| = 0. \)

**Proof of Corollary 1.12.** It follows from (1.24), (1.25) and dominated convergence that \( \lim_{y \to \infty} E(\tau^x_y) = 0 \). Then we have a.s. \( \lim_{y \to \infty} \tau^x_y = 0. \)

In the sequel of this section, we assume \( a = -\psi(0) = 0 \), \( \psi'(0) \geq 0 \) and (1.25) holds. By Theorem 1.11 and Corollary 1.12 we have a.s. \( \tau^\infty_y \in (0, \infty) \) for \( y \in (0, \infty) \) and \( \lim_{y \to \infty} \tau^\infty_y = 0. \)

Now fix \( y \in (0, \infty) \). For any positive random variable \( \xi \) measurable with respect to \( \mathcal{F}_\infty \), consider the stochastic integral equation
\[ X_t = \xi + \sqrt{2c} \int_0^t X_s^{\theta/2} dB^{\tau^\infty_y}_s + \int_0^t \int_{0}^{1} \int_{0}^{1} z M(\tau^\infty_y + ds, dz, du) \]
\[ - b \int_0^t X_s^{\theta} ds + \int_0^t \int_{1}^{\infty} \int_{1}^{\infty} z M(\tau^\infty_y + ds, dz, du). \]

**Lemma 5.3** As \( k \to \infty \), in the supremum norm \( (X^{k}_{\tau^\infty_y+t})_{t \geq 0} \) converges a.s. to a process \( (X^{y}_{\tau^\infty_y+t})_{t \geq 0} \), which is the pathwise unique solution to (5.1) with \( \xi = y \).

**Proof.** Recall that \((X^k_t)_{t \geq 0}\) is the solution to (1.7) with \( X_0^k = k \). It follows that \((Y_t)_{t \geq 0} := (X^k_{\tau^\infty_y+t})_{t \geq 0}\) solves (5.1) with \( Y_0 = X_0^\infty \). By Theorem 1.1 there is a pathwise unique solution \((X^y_t)_{t \geq 0}\) to (5.1) with \( \xi = y \). Using the strong Markov property we see \((X^k_{\tau^\infty_y+t})_{t \geq 0} = (X^y_t)_{t \geq 0}\) in distribution, where \((X^y_t)_{t \geq 0}\) is the solution to (1.7) with \( X_0^y = y \). For any \( \varepsilon > 0 \) we can choose \( \delta > 0 \) so that \( \text{P}(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq \delta} |X^y_t - y| > \varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon/2 \). Since \( \tau^\infty_y \uparrow \tau^\infty_y \) as \( k \uparrow \infty \), there is \( k_0 \geq 1 \) so that \( \text{P}(\tau^\infty_y > \tau^k_y + \delta) \leq \varepsilon/2 \) for \( k \geq k_0 \). For \( k \geq k_0 \) we have
\[ \text{P}(|X^k_{\tau^\infty_y+t} - y| > \varepsilon) \leq \text{P}(|X^\infty_{\tau^\infty_y} - y| > \varepsilon, \tau^k_y \leq \tau^\infty_y \leq \tau^k_y + \delta) + \varepsilon/2 \]
\[ \leq \text{P} \left( \sup_{0 \leq t \leq \delta} |X^k_{\tau^\infty_y+t} - n| > \varepsilon \right) + \varepsilon/2 \]
\[ \leq P \left( \sup_{0 \leq t \leq \delta} |X^y_t - y| > \varepsilon \right) + \varepsilon/2 \leq \varepsilon. \]

It follows that \( \lim_{k \to \infty} X^k_{\tau^y_n} = y \) in probability. But \( k \mapsto X^k_{\tau^y_n} \) is increasing by Theorem 1.1 so we also have a.s. \( \lim_{k \to \infty} X^k_{\tau^y_n} = y \). Then the desired result follows from Proposition 5.2. \( \square \)

For \( y \in [0, \infty) \) let \( (X^{(y)}_t)_{t \geq 0} \) be given by Lemma 5.3. By the pathwise uniqueness, for any \( y \leq x \in (0, \infty) \) and \( t \geq \tau^y_n \) we have a.s. \( X^y_{t-\tau^y_n} = X^{(y)}_{t-\tau^y_n} \). Then we can construct a positive càdlàg process \( X^\infty = (X^\infty_t)_{t \geq 0} \) such that \( X^\infty_t = X^{(n)}_{t-\tau^\infty_n} \) a.s. for each \( t \geq \tau^\infty_n \) and \( n \geq 1 \).

**Proposition 5.4** The process \( X^\infty = (X^\infty_t)_{t \geq 0} \) defined above is a solution to (1.7) with initial state \( \infty \). Moreover, we have a.s. \( X^\infty_t \geq X^x_t \) for \( t > 0 \) and \( x \in (0, \infty) \) and \( \tau^\infty_n = \inf\{ t > 0 : X^\infty_t = y \} \) for \( y \in (0, \infty) \).

**Proof.** From the construction of \( X^\infty \) it is clear that \( X^\infty_{\tau^y_n} = X^0 = y \) and \( X^\infty \) satisfies (1.20) for \( t > r > 0 \). For any \( t > 0 \) we can choose \( n \geq 1 \) so that \( 0 < \tau^\infty_n \leq t \). By Lemma 5.3 we see \( X^\infty_t = X^{(n)}_{t-\tau^\infty_n} \geq X^k_t \) for any \( k \geq 1 \). Then \( X^\infty_t \geq X^x_t \) for any \( t > 0 \) and \( x \in (0, \infty) \). In particular, we get \( X^\infty_t \geq X^x_t > y \) for \( 0 < t < \tau^x_n \) if \( y \leq x \in (0, \infty) \). Since \( \tau^x_n \uparrow \tau^\infty_n \) as \( x \uparrow \infty \), we see \( X^\infty_t > y \) for \( 0 < t < \tau^\infty_n \), implying \( \lim_{t \to 0} X^\infty_t = \infty \) and \( \tau^\infty_n = \inf\{ t > 0 : X^\infty_t = y \} \). Then \( X^\infty \) is a solution to (1.7) with initial state \( \infty \). \( \square \)

**Proof of Theorem 1.13** The existence of the solution \( X^\infty = (X^\infty_t)_{t \geq 0} \) to (1.7) with initial state \( \infty \) follows by Proposition 5.4. Fix \( n \geq 1 \). Since \( \lim_{k \to \infty} \tau^k_n = \tau^\infty_n > \tau^\infty_n \), we can choose sufficiently large \( k \geq 1 \) so that \( \tau^k_n > \tau^\infty_n \). Then for any \( x \geq k \) we have \( \tau^x_n > \tau^\infty_n \), and so

\[ \rho^\infty(X^x, X^\infty) \leq \sup_{0 \leq t < \tau^\infty_n}(e^{-X^x_t} - e^{-X^\infty_t}) \vee \sup_{t \geq \tau^\infty_n}(X^\infty_t - X^x_t). \]

From the construction of \( X^\infty \) we see

\[ \sup_{t \geq \tau^\infty_n}(X^\infty_t - X^x_t) \sup_{t \geq 0}(X^\infty_{\tau^x_n + t} - X^x_{\tau^x_n + t}) = \sup_{t \geq 0}(X^\infty_t - X^x_{\tau^x_n + t}). \]

By Lemma 5.3 the right-hand side vanishes as \( x \to \infty \). Using Proposition 5.4 we can see \( X^\infty_t \geq X^x_t > n \) for \( 0 < t < \tau^x_n \), and hence \( \sup_{0 \leq t < \tau^\infty_n}(e^{-X^x_t} - e^{-X^\infty_t}) \leq e^{-n} \). It follows that \( \limsup_{x \to \infty} \rho^\infty(X^x, X^\infty) \leq e^{-n} \). Since \( n \geq 1 \) can be arbitrary, we conclude \( \lim_{x \to \infty} \rho^\infty(X^x, X^\infty) = 0 \). Now suppose that \( Y = (Y_t)_{t \geq 0} \) is another solution to (1.7) with initial state \( \infty \). By right-continuity and comparison property we see a.s. \( X^\infty_t = \lim_{x \to \infty} X^x_t \leq Y_t \) for any \( t > 0 \). For \( n \geq 1 \) let \( (X^x_{n,t})_{t \geq 1/n} \) be the pathwise unique solution to

\[ X^x_t = \frac{x + \sqrt{2c}}{t} \int_{1/n}^{t} \int_{1/n}^{1} X^\theta_s/2dB_s + \int_{1/n}^{t} \int_{0}^{1/n} X^\theta_s ds + \int_{1/n}^{t} \int_{0}^{1/n} \int_{0}^{1/n} zM(ds, dz, du), \]

\[ -b \int_{1/n}^{t} X^\theta_s ds + \int_{1/n}^{t} \int_{1/n}^{1} \int_{0}^{1/n} zM(ds, dz, du). \]

Let \( X^{n,t}_t = \lim_{x \to \infty} X^x_{n,t} \) for \( t \geq 1/n \). By the comparison property we see a.s. \( Y_t \leq X^x_{n,t} \) for \( t \geq 1/n \). Notice that \( X^{n,t}_t = X^{1/n}_t \) in distribution for each \( t \geq 1/n \). Then \( X^\infty_t \to X^\infty \) in distribution as \( n \to \infty \). From the a.s. relation \( X^\infty_t \leq Y_t \leq X^\infty_t \), it follows that \( Y_t = X^\infty_t \) in distribution for \( t > 0 \). Then we must have \( Y_t = X^\infty_t \) a.s. for each \( t > 0 \). That gives the pathwise uniqueness for (1.7) with initial state \( \infty \). \( \square \)
6 Convergence of discrete-state processes

In this section, we study the convergence of rescaled discrete-state polynomial branching processes to continuous-state ones. Let us consider a sequence of generating functions $g_n, n = 1, 2, \ldots$ given by

$$g_n(s) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} b_i^{(n)} s^i, \quad s \in [0, 1],$$

where $\{b_i^{(n)} : i = 0, 1, \ldots, \infty\}$ is a discrete probability distribution. Let $\{\gamma_n : n = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ be a sequence of positive numbers. We define the two sequences of functions $\{\phi_n\}$ and $\{\psi_n\}$ by

$$\phi_n(\lambda) = \gamma_n [g_n(e^{-\lambda/n}) - e^{-\lambda/n}], \quad \lambda \geq 0$$

and

$$\psi_n(\lambda) = \gamma_n [g_n(1 - \lambda/n) - (1 - \lambda/n)], \quad 0 \leq \lambda \leq n.$$ (6.2)

Proposition 6.1 The sequence $\{\phi_n\}$ defined by (6.2) is Lipschitz uniformly on each bounded interval $[\alpha, \beta] \subset (0, \infty)$ if and only if so is the sequence $\{\psi_n\}$ defined by (6.3). In this case, we have $\lim_{n \to \infty} |\psi_n(\lambda) - \phi_n(\lambda)| = 0$ uniformly on each bounded interval $[\alpha, \beta] \subset (0, \infty)$.

Proof. Clearly, the sequences $\{\phi_n\}$ or $\{\psi_n\}$ are Lipschitz uniformly on some interval $[\alpha, \beta] \subset (0, \infty)$ if and only if the sequences of derivatives $\{\phi'_n\}$ or $\{\psi'_n\}$ are bounded uniformly on the interval. From (6.2) and (6.3) we have

$$\phi'_n(\lambda) = n^{-1} \gamma_n e^{-\lambda/n}[1 - g'_n(e^{-\lambda/n})], \quad \lambda \geq 0$$

and

$$\psi'_n(\lambda) = n^{-1} \gamma_n [1 - g'_n(1 - \lambda/n)], \quad 0 \leq \lambda \leq n.$$ (6.3)

Then $\{\phi'_n\}$ is uniformly bounded on each bounded interval $[\alpha, \beta] \subset (0, \infty)$ if and only if so is $\{\psi'_n\}$. That proves the first assertion. We next assume $\{\phi_n\}$ is Lipschitz uniformly on each bounded interval $[\alpha, \beta] \subset (0, \infty)$. Observe that

$$\phi_n(\lambda) - \psi_n(\lambda) = \gamma_n [g_n(e^{-\lambda/n}) - e^{-\lambda/n} - g_n(1 - \lambda/n) + (1 - \lambda/n)].$$

By the mean-value theorem, for $n \geq \beta$ and $\alpha \leq \lambda \leq \beta$ we have

$$\phi_n(\lambda) - \psi_n(\lambda) = \gamma_n [g'_n(\eta_n) - 1](e^{-\lambda/n} - 1 + \lambda/n),$$

where $1 - \lambda/n \leq \eta_n := \eta_n(\lambda) \leq e^{-\lambda/n}$. Choose sufficiently large $n_0 \geq \beta$ so that $e^{-2\beta/n_0} \leq 1 - \beta/n_0$. For $n \geq n_0$ we have $e^{-2\beta/n} \leq 1 - \beta/n \leq 1 - \lambda/n$. It follows that $e^{-2\beta/n} \leq \eta_n \leq e^{-\alpha/n}$ for $\alpha \leq \lambda \leq \beta$. By the monotonicity of $z \mapsto g'(z)$,

$$n^{-1} \gamma_n |g'_n(\eta_n) - 1| \leq \sup_{\alpha \leq \lambda \leq 2\beta} n^{-1} \gamma_n |g'_n(e^{-\lambda/n}) - 1| = \sup_{\alpha \leq \lambda \leq 2\beta} e^{\lambda/n} |\phi'_n(\lambda)|.$$ (6.4)

Then $\{n^{-1} \gamma_n |g'_n(\eta_n) - 1| : n \geq n_0\}$ is a bounded sequence. Since $\lim_{n \to \infty} n(e^{-\lambda/n} - 1 + \lambda/n) = 0$ uniformly on $[\alpha, \beta]$, the desired result follows by (6.4). \qed
Proposition 6.2 For any function $\psi$ on $[0, \infty)$ with representation \((6.5)\) there is a sequence \(\{\phi_n\}\) in form \((6.2)\) so that \(\lim_{n \to \infty} \phi_n(\lambda) = \psi(\lambda)\) for \(\lambda \geq 0\).

Proof. By Proposition 6.1 it is sufficient to construct a sequence \(\{\psi_n\}\) in form \((6.3)\) that is Lipschitz uniformly on \([\alpha, \beta]\) and \(\lim_{n \to \infty} \psi_n(\lambda) = \psi(\lambda)\) uniformly on \([0, \beta]\) for any \(\beta > \alpha > 0\). In view of \((1.14)\), we can write

\[
\psi(\lambda) = -a + b_n \lambda + c \lambda^2 + \int_{(0, \infty)} (e^{-\lambda u} - 1 + \lambda u 1_{\{u \leq \sqrt{n}\}}) m(du),
\]

where

\[
b_n = b - \int_{(1, \sqrt{n})} u m(du).
\]

Observe that \(|b_n| \leq |b| + m(1, \infty) \sqrt{n}\). Let \(\gamma_{1,n} = n\) and \(g_{1,n}(z) = (1 - n^{-2}a)z\). Let \(\psi_{1,n}(\lambda)\) be defined by \((6.3)\) with \((\gamma_n, g_n)\) replaced by \((\gamma_{1,n}, g_{1,n})\). Then we have \(\psi_{1,n}(\lambda) = -a (1 - \lambda/n)\).

Following the proof of Proposition 4.4 in Li (2011, p.93) one can find a sequence of positive numbers \(\{\alpha_{2,n}\}\) and a sequence of probability generating functions \(\{g_{2,n}\}\) so that the function \(\psi_{2,n}(\lambda)\) defined by \((6.3)\) from \((\alpha_{2,n}, g_{2,n})\) is given by

\[
\psi_{2,n}(\lambda) = b_n \lambda + \frac{1}{2n} (|b_n| - b_n) \lambda^2 + c \lambda^2 + \int_{(0, \sqrt{n})} (e^{-\lambda u} - 1 + \lambda u) m(du).
\]

Let \(\gamma_n = \gamma_{1,n} + \gamma_{2,n}\) and \(g_n(z) = \gamma_n^{-1} [\gamma_{1,n} g_{1,n}(z) + \gamma_{2,n} g_{2,n}(z)]\). Then the sequence \(\{\psi_n(\lambda)\}\) defined by \((6.3)\) is equal to \(\{\psi_{1,n}(\lambda) + \psi_{2,n}(\lambda)\}\), which clearly possesses the required properties. \(\Box\)

Proof of Theorem 1.14 By Proposition 2.2, the generalized Lamperti transform \(Y = L_{\theta}(X)\) is a Lévy process with Laplace exponent \(-\psi\) stopped at 0. By Proposition 6.2, there is a sequence \(\{\phi_n\}\) in form \((6.2)\) so that \(\lim_{n \to \infty} \phi_n(\lambda) = \psi(\lambda)\) for \(\lambda \geq 0\). By adjusting the parameters, we may assume the probability distribution \(\{b_i^{(n)} : i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, \infty\}\) satisfies \(b_0^{(n)} = 0\). Let \(Z_n = (Z_n(t) : t \geq 0)\) be a compound Poisson process on the state space \(\{0, \pm1, \pm2, \ldots, \infty\}\) with \(Q\)-matrix defined by

\[
\rho_n(i, j) = \begin{cases} 
b_{i+1, j}^{(n)}, & i + 1 \leq j < \infty, \\
-1, & i = j < \infty, \\
b_{0, i}^{(n)}, & i - 1 = j < \infty, \\
0, & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]

Then \(Z_n\) has Laplace exponent \(e^\lambda [e^{-\lambda} - g_n(e^{-\lambda})]\). Let \(T_n = \inf\{t \geq 0 : Z_n(t) = 0\}\) and let \(Y_n = (Z_n(t \wedge T_n) : t \geq 0)\) be the stopped process. Set \(Z_n(t) = n^{-1} Z_n(\gamma_n t)\). The rescaled compound Poisson process \(Z_n(t) = (Z_n(t) : t \geq 0)\) has Laplace exponent

\[
e^{\lambda/n} \phi_n(\lambda) = n \gamma_n e^{\lambda/n} [e^{-\lambda/n} - g_n(e^{-\lambda/n})].
\]

Let \(T_n = \inf\{t \geq 0 : Z_n(t) = 0\}\) and let \(Y_n = (Z_n(t \wedge T_n) : t \geq 0)\) be the stopped process. The inverse generalized Lamperti transforms \(X_n := J_\theta(Y_n)\) and \(X_n := J_\theta(Y_n)\) can
be defined similarly as in the introduction. By a simple extension of Theorem 2.1 in Chen et al. (2008), one can see $X_n$ is a discrete-state polynomial branching process with $Q$-matrix given by

$$q_n(i,j) = \begin{cases} 
\theta b^{(n)}_{i-1}, & i + 1 \leq j < \infty, \ i \geq 1, \\
-i\theta, & 1 \leq i = j < \infty, \\
\theta b^{(n)}_0, & 0 \leq i - 1 = j < \infty, \\
0, & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}$$

Then $X^{(n)}$ is a rescaled discrete-state polynomial branching process. Since

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} e^{\lambda/n} \phi_n(\lambda) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \phi_n(\lambda) = \psi(\lambda), \quad \lambda \geq 0,$$

by Proposition 6 in Caballero et al. (2009) we see $Y^{(n)} \to Y$ weakly in $(D,d_\infty)$. By a slight generalization of Proposition 5 in Caballero et al. (2009), one can see the transformation $J_\theta$ is continuous on $(D,d_\infty)$. Then $X^{(n)} \to X = J_\theta(Y)$ in $(D,d_\infty)$.
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