CONTINUOUS-STATE BRANCHING PROCESSES WITH SPECTRALLY POSITIVE MIGRATION
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Abstract. Continuous-state branching processes (CSBPs) with immigration (CBIs), stopped on hitting zero, are generalized by allowing the process governing immigration to be any Lévy process without negative jumps. Unlike the CBIs, these newly introduced processes do not appear to satisfy any natural affine property on the level of the Laplace transforms of the semigroups. Basic properties are noted. Explicit formulae (on neighborhoods of infinity) for the Laplace transforms of the first passage times downwards and of the explosion time are derived.

1. Introduction

CSBPs (resp. CBIs) are the continuous analogues and scaling limits of the basic, but fundamental Bienaymé-Galton-Watson branching processes (resp. with independent constant-rate immigration). In [14] there was added to the latter (so in discrete space) the phenomenon of “culling”, which is to say emmigration (killing) of individuals at constant rate, but never more than one at any given point in time. One speaks of continuous-time Bienaymé-Galton-Watson processes with immigration and culling. In [14, Remark 2.1] it was noted that these in turn should also allow for a continuous-space version. In this short note we construct said continuous-space analogues, christen them continuous-state branching processes with spectrally positive migration (CBMs) [because unlike in the discrete-space case it is no longer possible (in general) to, as it were, separate out immigration and culling, so it is no longer appropriate to speak of the latter separately], derive their basic properties, finally we study their first-passage times downwards and explosion times (on the level of the Laplace transforms).

2. Construction of CBMs and first properties

We are given two Laplace exponents of Lévy processes having no negative jumps:

$$\Psi_b(x) := \frac{\sigma_b^2}{2} x^2 - \gamma_b x + \int \left( e^{-xh} - 1 + xh \mathbb{1}_{(0,1)}(h) \right) \pi_b(dh), \quad x \in [0, \infty),$$

where $\pi_b$ is a measure on $(0, \infty)$ satisfying $\int (1 \wedge h^2) \pi_b(dh) < \infty$, $\sigma_b \in [0, \infty)$, $\gamma_b \in \mathbb{R}$;

$$\Psi_m(x) := \frac{\sigma_m^2}{2} x^2 - \gamma_m x + \int \left( e^{-xh} - 1 + xh \mathbb{1}_{(0,1)}(h) \right) \pi_m(dh), \quad x \in [0, \infty),$$
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1
CONTINUOUS-STATE BRANCHING PROCESSES WITH MIGRATION

...with the analogous qualifications on \((\pi_m, \sigma_m, \gamma_m)\). The subscripts \(b\) and \(m\) stand for branching and migration, respectively. The corresponding generators are given by

\[
\mathcal{L}^b f(z) := \frac{\sigma_b^2}{2} f''(z) + \gamma_b f'(z) + \int_0^\infty \left( f(z + h) - f(z) - h f'(z) \mathbb{1}_{[0,1]}(h) \right) \pi_b(\mathrm{d}h)
\]

\[
\mathcal{L}^m f(z) := \frac{\sigma_m^2}{2} f''(z) + \gamma_m f'(z) + \int_0^\infty \left( f(z + h) - f(z) - h f'(z) \mathbb{1}_{[0,1]}(h) \right) \pi_m(\mathrm{d}h)
\]

for \(f \in C^2_b(\mathbb{R})\), \(z \in \mathbb{R}\) (more generally \(\mathcal{L}^b f, \mathcal{L}^m f\) are defined by the right-hand sides of the above display whenever the expressions appearing in them are defined). Let also \(\mu\) be a probability on the Borel sets of \([0, \infty)\), to be thought of as the initial distribution of the CBM.

On a filtered probability space \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, \infty)}, \mathbb{P})\) satisfying the usual assumptions we prepare the following independent processes: an \(\mathcal{F}\)-Poisson random measure \(\mathcal{M}_b(\mathrm{d}s, \mathrm{d}v, \mathrm{d}h)\) on \([0, \infty)^3\) with intensity \(\mathrm{d}s \mathrm{d}v \pi_b(\mathrm{d}h)\) (for Poisson random measures time will always be the first coordinate — the measure is canonically identified with the associated point process), two independent standard \(\mathcal{F}\)-Brownian motions \(W\) and \(B\), an \(\mathcal{F}\)-Poisson random measure \(\mathcal{N}_m(\mathrm{d}s, \mathrm{d}h)\) on \([0, \infty)^2\) with intensity \(\mathrm{d}s \pi_m(\mathrm{d}h)\). \(\mathcal{N}_m\) and \(\mathcal{M}_b\) denote the compensated versions of \(\mathcal{N}_m\) and \(\mathcal{M}_b\), respectively. There is also an \(\mathcal{F}_0\)-measurable random variable \(X_0\) satisfying \(X_0, \mathbb{P} = \mu\).

Remark that the sort of constellations described just now for sure exist for any given triplet \((\mu, \pi_b, \pi_m)\). Note also that automatically \((\mathcal{M}_b, W, B, \mathcal{N}_m)\) has in fact \(\mathcal{F}\)-independent increments (jointly, not just each component separately) [5, Theorem II.6.3, Eq. (II.6.12)].

We combine \(X_0, \mathcal{N}_m, B\) according to Lévy-Itô into the Lévy process \(X\) having no negative jumps,

\[
X_t = X_0 + \sigma_b B_t + \gamma_m t + \int_{[0,t]} h \mathcal{M}_b(\mathrm{d}s, \mathrm{d}v, \mathrm{d}h) + \int_{[0,t] \times (1, \infty)} h \mathcal{N}_m(\mathrm{d}s, \mathrm{d}h), \quad t \in [0, \infty), \text{ a.s.-}\mathbb{P},
\]

in the filtration \(\mathcal{F}\), with Laplace exponent \(\Psi_b\), starting law \(\mu\). For \(f\) and \(z\) for which the right-hand side is defined we also set

\[
\mathcal{A}f(z) := \mathcal{L}^m f(z) + z \mathcal{L}^b f(z).
\]

**Theorem 2.1** (SDE construction of CBMs). There exists a \(\mathbb{P}\)-a.s. unique càdlàg, nonnegative real, \(\mathcal{F}\)-adapted process with lifetime, denoted \(Y = (Y_t)_{t \in [0, \zeta]}\), having 0 as an absorbing state, no negative jumps, and such that with \(\tau_0\) the first entrance time into \(\{0\}\) by \(Y\), a.s.-\(\mathbb{P}\),

\[
Y_t = X_{t \wedge \tau_0} + \int_{[0,t] \times [0, Y_{t-}]} \mathcal{M}_b(\mathrm{d}s, \mathrm{d}v, \mathrm{d}h) + \int_{[0,t] \times [0, Y_{t-} \times (1, \infty)]} \mathcal{N}_m(\mathrm{d}s, \mathrm{d}h) + \sigma_b \int_0^t \sqrt{Y_s} \mathrm{d}W_s + \gamma_b \int_0^t Y_s \mathrm{d}s
\]

for \(t \in [0, \zeta]\), also \(\sup_{[0, \zeta]} Y = \infty\) a.s.-\(\mathbb{P}\) on \(\{\zeta < \infty\}\) (implicitly, necessarily \(\zeta > 0\) a.s.-\(\mathbb{P}\)). The process \(Y\) then further enjoys the following properties:

(i) it is adapted to the \(\mathbb{P}\)-augmented natural filtration generated by \(X_0, B, W, \mathcal{N}_m, \mathcal{M}_b\) (we mean of course \(X_0\) as a constant process here); \(Y\) is viewed as a process on \([0, \infty)\) by transferring it to the cemetery (natural: \(\infty\)) after \(\zeta\) and its \(\mathbb{P}\)-law, \(\mathbb{P}_Y := Y_* \mathbb{P}\), is uniquely determined by the triplet \((\mu, \Psi_b, \Psi_m)\);

(ii) it is quasi left-continuous on \([0, \zeta]\) in the filtration \(\mathcal{F}\), in the sense that for any sequence \((S_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) of \(\mathcal{F}\)-stopping times that is \(\uparrow\) a.s.-\(\mathbb{P}\) to some limit \(S\) one has \(\lim_{n \to \infty} Y(S_n) = Y(S)\) a.s.-\(\mathbb{P}\) on \(\{S < \zeta\}\);

(iii) it is strong Markov on \([0, \zeta]\) in the filtration \(\mathcal{F}\) in the sense that for any \(\mathcal{F}\)-stopping time \(S, \mathcal{F}_S\) is \(\mathbb{P}\)-independent of \(Y_{S+}\); given \(Y_S\) on \(\{S < \zeta\}\), furthermore, for any nonnegative measurable map \(G_\nu\) \(\mathbb{P}\)-law of \(Y_S\) conditionally on \(\{S < \zeta\}\) (assuming of course \(\mathbb{P}(S < \zeta) > 0\));

(iv) \(\lim_{\zeta^-} Y = \infty\) a.s.-\(\mathbb{P}\) on \(\{\zeta < \infty\}\);
exists a pathwise unique strong (global, no lifetimes) solution (as happens for CBIs).

where \( Y \) stopped on hitting zero cess here a further dynamics in that we allow \( X \) in general or negative drift of the latter represent the possibility of culling, so that immigration is counterbalanced by killing/emmigrating an individual independently of the population size at constant rate in time. We stress that visible if one considers the special case when \( \gamma = b \).

When the process \( \sigma \) (I) for any \( \{\alpha, \vec{\alpha}\} \subset [0, \infty) \) and any \( f \in C^2([0, \infty)) \) (i.e. \( f \) compactly supported and admitting a \( C^2 \) extension to a neighborhood of \([0, \infty)\)) satisfying \( \mathcal{L}^\Psi f(0) = 0 \), the process \( M \) given by

\[
M_t := f(Y_t) e^{-\alpha t - \vec{\alpha} \int_0^t Y_s ds} 1_{\{t < \zeta\}} - f(Y_0)
\]

\[ - \int_0^{t \wedge \zeta} e^{-\alpha s - \vec{\alpha} \int_0^s Y_u du} (A f(Y_s) - \alpha f(Y_s) - \vec{\alpha} Y_s f(Y_s)) \, ds, \quad t \in [0, \infty), \]

is an \( \mathcal{F} \)-martingale under \( \mathbb{P} \), vanishing at zero, that is bounded up to every deterministic time, so that in particular \( A \) is the generator of \( Y \) on \( \{g \in C^2([0, \infty)) : \mathcal{L}^\Psi g(0) = 0\} \);

(II) if merely \( f \in C^2([0, \infty)) \) is bounded and \( \mathcal{L}^\Psi f(0) = 0 \), then the same process \( M \) (restricted to \([0, \zeta)\)) is a local martingale on \([0, \zeta)\) in \( \mathcal{F} \) under \( \mathbb{P} \), in the sense that there exists a sequence \( (S_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) of \( \mathcal{F} \)-stopping times that is \( \uparrow \zeta \), each member of which is \( < \zeta \) a.s.-\( \mathbb{P} \) on \( \{\zeta < \infty\} \), and such that \( M^{S_n} = M_{S_n \wedge} \) is an \( \langle \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P} \rangle \)-martingale for each \( n \in \mathbb{N} \).

When the process \( X \) is a subordinator, we recognize in (2.2) the stochastic equation solved by a CBI process stopped on hitting zero with branching mechanism \( \Psi_b \) and immigration mechanism \( -\Psi_m \). We add then here a further dynamics in that we allow \( X \) to be any Lévy process without negative jumps. Oscillations or negative drift of the latter represent the possibility of culling, so that immigration is counterbalanced by killing/emmigrating an individual independently of the population size at constant rate in time. We stress that because of the presence of culling it is only natural, in general, to stop the process \( Y \) on hitting zero (unlike when \( X \) is a (non-zero) subordinator), at least as long as we insist on the state space being \([0, \infty)\) (it is clearly visible if one considers the special case when \( \gamma_b, \gamma_m \) are both \( < 0 \), \( \pi_e \) and \( \pi_b \) are non-zero and carried by \((1, \infty) \), \( \sigma_b = \sigma_m = 0 \)). This is however not to a priori preclude the possibility that for other, but necessarily non-generic, constellations of input data the \( Y \) of (2.2) could not be naturally prolonged after \( \tau_0 \) as a nonnegative process (as happens for CBIs).

\textbf{Proof.} Existence. Fix, for the time being, \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). We claim that thanks to [11] Theorems 3.2 and 5.1 there exists a pathwise unique strong (global, no lifetimes) solution \( Y^n \) to the stochastic integral equation

\[
Y^n_t = Y^n_0 + \int_0^t (\gamma_m + \gamma_b((Y^n_{s-} \lor 0) \land n)) \, ds + \int_0^t \sigma_b \sqrt{(Y^n_{s-} \lor 0) \wedge n} \, dW_s + \int_0^t \sigma_m \, dB_s
\]

\[ + \int_{[0,t] \times U_0} g_0(Y^n_{s-}, u_0) N_0(ds, du_0) + \int_{[0,t] \times U_1} g_1(Y^n_{s-}, u_1) N_1(ds, du_1), \quad t \in [0, \infty), \]

\[ Y^n_0 = X_0, \]

where

\[ U_0 := ([0, n] \times [0, 1]) \cup [0, 1], \]

\[ U_1 := ([0, n] \times (1, \infty)) \cup (1, \infty), \]

\[ N_0(ds, dh) := N_{m}(ds, dh) \text{ for } h \in [0, 1], \]

\[ N_0(ds, du_0) := M_{b}(ds, du_0) \text{ for } u_0 = (v, h) \in [0, n] \times [0, 1], \]

\[ \mathbb{N}_0 = \text{ the compensated measure of } N_0, \]

\[ N_1(ds, dh) := N_{m}(ds, dh) \text{ for } h \in (1, \infty), \]

\[ N_1(ds, du_1) := M_{b}(ds, du_1) \text{ for } u_1 = (v, h) \in [0, n] \times (1, \infty), \]

\[ g_0(x, h) := h \text{ for } (x, h) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, 1], \]

\[ g_0(x, u_0) := 1_{[v, \infty)}(x)h \text{ for } (x, u_0) = (x, (v, h)) \in \mathbb{R} \times ([0, n] \times [0, 1]). \]
Indeed (2.3) is really just (2.2) except that one allows the process $Y^n$ to evolve after it hits negative values (without branching, just following $X$) and that the branching is also “truncated” at level $n$ (to preclude explosion), viz. the process $Y$. In fact, we may write more succinctly

$$Y_t = X_t + \int_{[0,t] \times [0,1]} h_b(ds, dv, dh) + \int_{[0,t] \times [0,1]} h_{M_b}(ds, dv, dh)$$

(2.4)

$$+ \sigma_b \int_0^t \sqrt{(Y^n_s \vee 0)} \wedge ndW_s + \gamma_b \int_0^t (Y^n_s \vee 0) \wedge nds.$$

However it is the form (2.3) given above, not (2.4), that relates most easily to [11] Eq. (2.1).

Now, strictly speaking the stochastic equation for $Y^n$ does not fall under [11] because of the following minor point: in [11] Eq. (2.1) the Brownian motion is one-dimensional – in the preceding, two-variate. However, the generalization of the results of [11] to a setting allowing a multidimensional Brownian motion is straightforward, especially if one of the two Brownian motions is just integrated against a constant (which is the present case).

Furthermore, as far as the question of the existence of a strong pathwise unique solution is concerned, the integral $\int_{[0,t] \times [t_1]}$ may be ignored [11] Proposition 2.1]. Once this has been noted it is easy to check that all the conditions of [11] required to establish the strong pathwise unique solution $Y^n$ of the above stochastic equation (trivially adjusted to allow a two-variate Brownian motion) are in fact met.

Let next $\zeta^n$ be the first time the stopped process $(Y^n)_{\tau_0^n}$ exits the interval $[0, n]$; here $\tau_0^n$ is the first entrance time into $\{0\}$ by the process $Y^n$. Then $\tau_0^{n+1} \geq \zeta^n$ and $Y^{n+1} = Y^n_{\tau_0^n} \in [0, n]$ a.s.-P. Set $\zeta := \lim_{n \to \infty} \zeta^n$ and $Y := \lim_{n \to \infty} Y^n_{\tau_0^n} \in [0, \zeta]$ a.s.-P. We get all the properties stipulated for $Y$ in the “unique existence” part of the proposition. Thus existence is proved.

Uniqueness. Let $Y^I = (Y^I_t)_{t \in [0, \zeta^I]}$ and $Y^{II} = (Y^{II}_t)_{t \in [0, \zeta^{II}]}$ both have the properties listed for $Y$ in the “unique existence” part of the proposition. Let $\tau^I_n$ (resp. $\tau^0_n$) be the first exit time from $[0, n]$ (resp. first entrance time into $\{0\}$) of $Y^I$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $i \in \{I, II\}$. Then, for each $i \in \{I, II\}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the stopped process $(Y^i)_{\tau^I_n \wedge \tau^0_n}$ satisfies, on the interval $[0, \tau^I_n \wedge \tau^0_n] \cap [0, \zeta^i)$, the stochastic equation given above for the process $Y^n$.

By the pathwise uniqueness of these solutions we obtain $Y^I = Y^{II}$ a.s.-P on $[0, \tau^I_n \wedge \tau^0_n \wedge \tau^I_0 \wedge \tau^{II}_0] \cap [0, \zeta^I \wedge \zeta^{II}]$. Since $\sup_{[0, \zeta^I]} Y^I = \infty$ a.s.-P on $\{\zeta^I < \infty\}$ and since $Y^I$ is càdlàg, therefore locally bounded, on $[0, \zeta^I)$, we have that $\tau^I_n \uparrow \zeta^I$ a.s.-P as $n \to \infty$, $i \in \{I, II\}$. Therefore, passing to the limit $n \to \infty$, $Y^I = Y^{II}$ a.s.-P on $[0, \tau^I_0 \wedge \tau^{II}_0] \cap [0, \zeta^I \wedge \zeta^{II}]$. Because 0 is absorbing for $Y^i$, $i \in \{I, II\}$, it follows further that $Y^I = Y^{II}$ a.s.-P on $[0, \zeta^I \wedge \zeta^{II}]$. Next, write $I' := II$ and $II' := I$; because again $\sup_{[0, \zeta^I]} Y^I = \infty$ a.s.-P on $\{\zeta^I < \infty\}$ and because $Y^{II'}$ admits left limits on $[0, \zeta^I)$ we get $\zeta^{I'} \geq \zeta^{I''}$ a.s.-P for each $i \in \{I, II\}$. In conclusion, $\zeta^I = \zeta^{II}$ a.s.-P and finally $Y^I = Y^2$ a.s.-P. Therefore there is a.s.-P unique existence.

As for the further properties of $Y$ we have as follows.

Adaptedness to the augmented natural filtration is by construction, for each $Y^n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is a strong solution in its own right.

That $\mathbb{R}_\mu$ is uniquely determined by the triplet $(\mu, \Psi_b, \Psi_m)$ is because pathwise uniqueness implies uniqueness in law by a well-known general argument (the method is the same as in the proof of IX. Theorem IX.1.7).

Quasi-left continuity is immediate from (2.2), while the strong Markov property one infers from the “pathwise unique strong” existence.

If it is not the case that $\lim_{\zeta \to -\infty} Y = \infty$ a.s. on $\{\zeta < \infty\}$, then for some $c \in (0, \infty)$, with positive probability, $Y$ hits the level $c$ after having first gone above the level $c + 1$, and does so consecutively infinitely many times.
over in finite time, which is in contradiction with the strong Markov property coupled with the downwards skip-free property/ and the strong law of large numbers.

The first martingale claim is a consequence of the second by bounded convergence. For the second martingale claim appeal to Itô’s formula for the stopped \((\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})\)-semimartingale
\[
\left( Y^n_t, t, \int_0^t Y^n_s \, ds \right)_{t \in [0, \infty)}.
\]

You get that \(M_{\infty}^{n} \) is an \((\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})\)-local martingale for each \(n \in \mathbb{N}\), so \(M\) is “locally a local martingale on \([0, \zeta])\).

By the usual trick (basically that of [3] Lemma 1.35], mutatis mutandis to handle the lifetime \(\zeta\) it follows that \(M\) is a local martingale on \([0, \zeta]\) in the sense stipulated.

We call the (law of the) process \(Y\) as rendered in the preceding theorem a continuous-state branching process with spectrally positive migration (CBM), branching mechanism \(\Psi_b\), migration one \(\Psi_m\), initial law \(\mu\). If needed, to emphasize \(\mu\), we write \(Y^\mu\) and/or \(\mathbb{P}^\mu\) in lieu of \(Y\) and/or \(\mathbb{P}\), respectively. For \(a \in [0, \infty)\) let \(\tau_a\) be the first entrance time of \(Y\) into \([0, a]\).

Remark 2.2. By a standard general argument (cf. [3] Theorem IV.1.1]) one shows that the map \((0, \infty) \ni x \mapsto \mathbb{R}_x(A)\) is universally measurable for each measurable \(A\) and \(\mathbb{P}^{\mu}(G(Y_{S^+}) | F_S) = \mathbb{R}_{X_s}[G]\) holds a.s.-\(\mathbb{P}\) on \(\{S < \zeta\}\) in Theorem 2.1(iii) also \(\mathbb{R}_\mu = \int \mathbb{R}_z \mathbb{P}(dz)\). Here we have written (and will continue to write) \(\mathbb{R}_x := \mathbb{R}_{d_x}, x \in [0, \infty)\), for short.

Remark 2.3. In Theorem 2.1(v) if for some \(a \in [0, \infty)\) the initial law \(\mu\) is carried by \([a, \infty)\) and if, ceteris paribus, the process \(M\) is stopped at \(\tau_a\), then, ceteris paribus, one can drop the assumption \(\mathcal{L}^{\Psi}f(0) = 0\) and it is enough for the \(C^2\) and boundedness property to prevail on \([a, \infty)\), and still the same martingale claims hold true.

In complete analogy with the discrete-space case [13] Remark 2.1], the process \(Y\) verifies a random time-change integral equation involving two spectrally positive Lévy processes (one of which is \(X\)).

**Proposition 2.4** (Lamperti transform for CBMs). On an extension of the underlying probability space there exists a spectrally positive Lévy process \(L\), vanishing at zero a.s., with Laplace exponent \(\Psi_b\), and such that
\[
Y_t = X_{t \wedge \tau_0} + L_{\int_0^t Y_s \, ds}, \quad t \in [0, \zeta], \text{ a.s.,}
\]
also [in what follows \(\gamma^{-1}\) means the left inverse]

(a) \(L\) has independent increments relative to the augmented natural filtration of the pair of processes \((L, (\int_0^{t \wedge \zeta} Y_s \, ds)^{-1})\) initially enlarged by \(\sigma(X)\), in particular \(L\) is independent of \(X\), while

(b) \(X\) has independent increments relative to the augmented join of the natural filtration of \((L, (\int_0^{t \wedge \zeta} Y_s \, ds)^{-1})\) time-changed by \(\int_0^{t \wedge \zeta} Y_s \, ds\) and of the natural filtration of \(X\).

**Proof.** We may and do assume \(\mathcal{F}\) is the augmented natural filtration of \((X_0, W, \mathcal{M}_b, B, \mathcal{N}_m)\). By first extending (if necessary) the probability space by an independent factor supporting a standard Brownian motion \(H\) and a Poisson random measure \(N(du, dh)\) on \([0, \infty)^2\) with intensity \(dax \pi_b(dh)\), we may and do also assume the latter were there to begin with.

Put \(\gamma_t := \int_0^t Y_s \, ds\) for \(t \in [0, \infty)\); then \(\gamma|_{[0, \zeta \wedge \tau_0]}\) is \(\uparrow \uparrow\), vanishing at zero and continuous. Let \(\gamma^{-1}\) be its inverse, defined, \(\uparrow \uparrow\), vanishing at zero and continuous on \([0, \rho]\), where \(\rho := \int_0^\rho Y_s \, ds\). Additionally put \(\rho^{-1} := \zeta \wedge \tau_0 = \lim_{\rho \to -} \gamma^{-1} \) on \([\rho, \infty)\). Thus \(\gamma^{-1}\) is just the left-continuous inverse of \(\gamma\) and \((\gamma^{-1}(u))_{u \in [0, \infty)}\) is a continuous \(\uparrow\) family of \(\mathcal{F}\)-stopping times, a time-change. Define the filtration \(\mathcal{G}\) as the augmented join of
the time-changed filtration $\mathcal{F}_{\gamma^{-1}}$, of the natural filtration of the pair of processes $(H, N)$, and of $\sigma(B, N_m, X_0)$ (initial enlargement). Since $\{\rho \leq u\} = \{\gamma^{-1}(u) = \infty\}$ for all $u \in [0, \infty)$, we have that $\rho$ is a $G$-stopping time. For $u \in [0, \rho)$ set $\tilde{W}_u := \int_0^{\gamma^{-1}(u)} \sqrt{\gamma_s} \, dW_s$ and $\tilde{N}_b([0, u] \times A) := \int_0^{\gamma^{-1}(u)} \int_A \mathcal{M}_b(ds, dv, dh), \; A \in \mathcal{B}_{[0, \infty)}$ (it is easy to check that the latter specifies uniquely a random measure on $[0, \rho) \times [0, \infty)$).

By time-change (optional sampling) and independent enlargement we see that the process $W' = \int_0^{\gamma^{-1}(\cdot)} \sqrt{\gamma_s} \, dW_s$, which agrees with $\tilde{W}$ on $[0, \rho)$, is a $G$-continuous local martingale vanishing at zero that is stopped at $\rho$ with terminal value $\tilde{W}_\rho := \int_0^\rho \sqrt{\gamma_s} \, dW_s$ a.s. on $\{\rho < \infty\}$. Its quadratic variation process is given by $\langle W' \rangle_u = \int_0^{\gamma^{-1}(u)} Y_s \, dW_s = u \wedge \rho$ a.s. for $u \in [0, \infty)$. Now define $\tilde{W}_u := \tilde{W}_\rho + H(u) - H(\rho)$ for $u \in [\rho, \infty)$. Then we have that $\tilde{W} = W' + 1_{[\rho, \infty)}(H - H(\rho))$ is a $G$-continuous local martingale vanishing at zero with increasing process given by $\langle \tilde{W} \rangle_u = u$ a.s. for $u \in [0, \infty)$. By Lévy’s martingale characterization \cite{L} Theorem II.6.1] of Brownian motion it follows that $\tilde{W}$ is a $G$-Brownian motion.

Similarly, again by time-change (optional sampling) and independent enlargement, we see that for each Borel set $A$ of $[0, \infty)$ of finite $\pi_b$-measure the process $\int_0^{\gamma^{-1}(\cdot)} \int_A \mathcal{M}_b(ds, dv, dh) - \pi_b(A)\rho$ is a $G$-martingale that is stopped at $\rho$ with terminal value $\int_0^\rho \int_A \mathcal{M}_b(ds, dv, dh) - \pi_b(A)\rho =: \tilde{N}_b([0, \rho] \times A) - \pi_b(A)\rho$ a.s. on $\{\rho < \infty\}$. Then define the random measure $\tilde{N}_b$ on $[0, \infty)^2$ unambiguously by specifying further that $\tilde{N}_b([0, u] \times A) = \tilde{N}_b([0, \rho] \times A) + N((\rho, u] \times A)$ for $u \in [\rho, \infty)$ and $A \in \mathcal{B}_{[0, \infty)}$. We see that for each Borel set $A$ of $[0, \infty)$ of finite $\pi_b$-measure the process $\tilde{N}_b([0, \cdot] \times A) - \pi_b(A)$ is a $G$-martingale. It follows from the martingale characterization \cite{L} Theorem II.6.2] of Poisson point processes that $\tilde{N}_b(dw, dh)$ is a $G$-Poisson random measure with intensity $\pi_b(dh)dw$.

Further, it is well-known that in a common filtration a Poisson point process and a Brownian motion are automatically independent \cite{L} Theorem II.6.3], not only that, they have jointly independent increments in said filtration, which is in fact what is proved in the quoted theorem, cf. \cite{L} Eq. (II.6.12)]. Therefore, setting (as usual a bar indicates the compensated measure)

$$L_u := \sigma_0 \tilde{W}_u + \gamma_b u + \int_{[0, u] \times [0, 1]} \tilde{N}_b(dw, dh) + \int_{[0, u] \times (1, \infty]} \tilde{N}_b(dw, dh), \; u \in [0, \infty), \; a.s.,$$

we get a $G$-spectrally positive Lévy process $L$ with Laplace exponent $\Psi_b$. Moreover, from (2.2) we obtain exactly (2.5). The fact that $L$ is a Lévy process in the filtration $G$ gives (a) just because $G$ contains the augmented natural filtration of the pair of processes $(L, \gamma^{-1})$ initially enlarged by $\sigma(X)$. On the other hand, $X$ has independent increments relative to $\mathcal{F}$ initially enlarged by $\sigma(H, N)$ (and augmented), which contains the natural filtration of $X$ but also that of $(L, \gamma^{-1})$ time-changed by $\gamma$, since the latter is contained in $(\mathcal{F}_{\gamma^{-1}} \lor \sigma(H, N))_\gamma = (\mathcal{F}_{\gamma^{-1}})_\gamma \lor \sigma(H, N) = \mathcal{F}_\sigma \wedge \mathcal{F}_{\gamma^{-1}} \subset \mathcal{F} \lor \sigma(H, N)$ (for the last equality see \cite{L} Exercise 1.12], the first follows easily because $\sigma(H, N)$ is independent of $\mathcal{F}_\infty$).

Some historical comments on the preceding. When, ceteris paribus, $X = 0$, the time-change delineated above is originally due to Lamperti \cite{Lamperti}, which explains the name “Lamperti transform”; see also \cite{Lamperti}. In fact, the Lamperti transform for CSBP works also in the other direction, constructing $Y$ from $L$. \cite{Lamperti} generalizes the transform to CBIs (without stopping on hitting zero), albeit only in the latter direction, starting from the pair $(X, L)$ to obtain $Y$. \cite{Lamperti} handles the Lamperti transform of CSBP with competition (both ways) in the SDE setting; many of the ideas of the proofs of Propositions (2.4) and (2.6) are from this source.

It appears that obtaining the converse to Proposition (2.4) is more involved for CBMs, viz. CBIs or CSBPs with competition, and this is left as an open problem. The main difficulty lies in establishing that (2.6) has a unique solution for $Y$ given $(X, L)$, in the appropriate precise sense (if indeed it can be made precise in any reasonable way). Note that, on the one hand, the approach of \cite{Lamperti} p. 1603, proof of Theorem 1, uniqueness, esp.
last display] for CBIs relies heavily on the monotonicity of \( X \), which is absent in the setting of CBMs. On the other hand, the line of attack of [12] proof of Theorem 2.2] (to relate uniqueness of \( (2.5) \) to the uniqueness of \( (2.2) \)) is hindered by the fact that, roughly speaking, one has to work simultaneously with the filtrations of \( X \) and \( L \) which “run on different time-scales” (it is not enough to just shift between time-changed filtrations, cf. Items [a] and [b] of Proposition 2.4].

**Corollary 2.5.** Assume the CSBP with branching mechanism \( \Psi_b \) is non-explosive. Then \( \mathbb{P}(\zeta < \infty) = 0 \), i.e. we have non-explosivity of the CBM as well.

This result will be refined to an equivalence in Corollary 3.7.

**Proof.** Coupling argument. Suppose per absurdum that \( \mathbb{P}(\zeta < \infty) > 0 \). We may and do assume that \( \mu = \delta_z \) for some \( z \in (0, \infty) \). By continuity from below \( \mathbb{P}(\zeta < \infty, X_\zeta < m) > 0 \) for some \( m \in (z, \infty) \). Let \( \tilde{Y} \) be the solution to \( (2.5) \) with, ceteris paribus, \( X \equiv m \) (for a constant \( X \) we know that \( (2.5) \) has an a.s. unique solution). So \( \tilde{Y} \) is a CSBP with starting point \( m \) and branching mechanism \( \Psi_b \). All its corresponding quantities get a “. We claim that \( \tilde{\zeta} \leq \zeta \) a.s. on \( \{ \zeta < \infty, X_\zeta < m \} \) (which implies that \( \tilde{\zeta} < \infty \) with positive probability, contradicting the non-explosivity of \( \tilde{Y} \) and completing the proof). Suppose \( \zeta < \tilde{\zeta} \) with positive probability on \( \{ \zeta < \infty, X_\zeta < m \} \). Then we cannot have \( \int_0^1 Y_sds \leq \int_0^1 \tilde{Y}_sds \) for all \( t \in [0, \zeta) \) a.s. on \( \{ \zeta < \tilde{\zeta}, X_\zeta < m \} \), since if it is true, letting \( t \uparrow \zeta \) yields (by the Lamperti transform for \( Y \)) \( \infty = \int_0^\zeta \tilde{Y}_sds \) a.s. on the event \( \{ \zeta < \tilde{\zeta}, X_\zeta < m \} \) of positive probability, contradicting the local boundedness of \( \tilde{Y} \) on \( [0, \tilde{\zeta}] \). So with positive probability on \( \{ \zeta < \tilde{\zeta}, X_\zeta < m \}, \int_0^1 Y_sds > \int_0^1 \tilde{Y}_sds \) for some \( t \in [0, \zeta) \). Let \( \delta := \inf \{ t \in [0, \zeta \wedge \tilde{\zeta}] : \int_0^t Y_sds > \int_0^t \tilde{Y}_sds \} \). a.s. on \( \{ \delta < \zeta < \tilde{\zeta}, X_\zeta < m \} \), an event of positive probability, we have by the Lamperti transform

\[
Y_\delta = X_\delta + L_{\int_0^\delta Y_sds} < m + L_{\int_0^\delta \tilde{Y}_sds} = \tilde{Y}_\delta
\]

contradicting the fact that \( \int_0^\delta Y_sds > \int_0^\delta \tilde{Y}_sds \) immediately after \( \delta \).

Let us conclude this section by emphasizing, at least on an informal level, the fundamental difference between CBI and CBM processes. The former are such that for independent \( X_1, X_2, L_1, L_2, L \), with \( L_1 \) and \( L_2 \) having the same law as \( L \), the process associated (via the Lamperti transform) to the pair \( (X_1 + X_2, L) \) has the same law as the sum of the processes associated to \( (X_1, L_1) \) and \( (X_2, L_2) \). Put more succinctly, CBIs can be superposed. This property fails for CBMs. Analytically it is a manifestation of the “affine” property of the Laplace transform of a CBI process [3 Eq. (1.1)], which cannot hold for the CBM class [3 Theorem 1.1]. In this connection, one should emphasize that the exponential functions \( e_\alpha := e^{-\alpha z}, \alpha \in (0, \infty) \), do not actually fall under Theorem 2.4[v] (not even the local martingale part, just because \( L^\Psi = e_\alpha(0) \) need not be 0), at least not generically, so even though as a matter of analytical fact \( A_\zeta e_\alpha(z) = \Psi_m(\alpha)e_\alpha(z) + z\Psi_b(\alpha)e_\alpha(z) = (\Psi_m(\alpha) - \Psi_b(\alpha)b_\alpha)e_\alpha(z) = B_\alpha e_\alpha(z) \), and even if \( \Psi_m \geq 0 \) (so that \( \Psi_m \) may be interpreted as the instantaneous rate of killing in the operator \( B \)), one is not able to simply “integrate” this duality on the level of (sic) the generators to a Laplace duality on the level of the semigroups [2 Proposition 1.2] (as is the case for CBI). Nevertheless:

**Proposition 2.6.** Suppose two CBMs \( Y^1 \) and \( Y^2 \) have been prepared according to \( (2.2) \) using independent Brownian and Poisson drivers in the common filtration \( F \) under a common probability \( \mathbb{P} \). All the quantities pertaining to \( Y^i \) get a superscript \( i \), \( i \in \{ 1, 2 \} \). Suppose \( \Psi_1^b = \Psi_2^b =: \Psi_b \). Then there exists (still on the same probability space, in the same filtration) a CBM process \( Y = (Y_t)_{t \in [0, \zeta]} \) with initial distribution \( \mu := \mu^1 \ast \mu^2 \), branching mechanism \( \Psi_b \), migration mechanism \( \Psi_m := \Psi_m^1 + \Psi_m^2 \), such that, a.s.-\( \mathbb{P} \), \( \zeta \wedge \tau_0^1 \wedge \tau_0^2 = \zeta_1 \wedge \zeta_2 \wedge \tau_0^1 \wedge \tau_0^2 \) and \( Y = Y^1 + Y^2 \) on \( [0, \tau_0^1 \wedge \tau_0^2 \wedge \zeta] \). If \( \Psi_2^m = 0 \) then we may further insist that, on the event \( \{ \tau_0^2 < \tau_0^1 \wedge \zeta \} \), a.s.-\( \mathbb{P} \), \( \zeta = \zeta_1 \) and \( Y = Y^1 \) on \( [\tau_0^2, \zeta] \).
Proof. Define the random measure $\mathcal{M}_b(A) := \int_A \mathbb{1}_{[0,Y^b_\cdot]}(v) M_b^1(ds, dv, dh) + \int_A \mathbb{1}_{[Y^b_\cdot,\infty)}(v) M_b^2(ds, dv, dh)$, $A \in \mathcal{B}_{[0,\infty)^3}$, where we understand $Y^1 = \infty$ on $[\zeta, \infty)$. Then [3, Theorem II.6.2] $\mathcal{M}_b(ds, dv, dh)$ is an $\mathcal{F}$-Poisson random measure with intensity $dsdv\pi_0(dh)$. More trivially, $N_m := N_m^1 + N_m^2$ is an $\mathcal{F}$-Poisson random measure and the intensity of $N_m^1(ds, dh)$ is $ds\pi_0(dh)$ with $\pi_0 := \pi_0^1 + \pi_0^2$. Besides, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. $\mathcal{M}_b$ has no jumps in common with $N_m$.

Similarly, the process $W := (Y^1 + Y^2)^{-1/2} \cdot (\sqrt{Y^1} \cdot W^1 + \sqrt{Y^2} \cdot W^2)$ defined on $[0, \zeta^1 \land \zeta^2 \land \tau^1_0 \land \tau^2_0)$ and extended by the increments of $W^1$ thereafter, is a standard $\mathcal{F}$-Brownian motion. Again more trivially, $B := (\sigma^m_1)^2 + (\sigma^m_2)^2)^{-1}(\sigma^m_1B^1 + \sigma^m_2B^2)$ (or just $B := B^1$, say, if $\sigma^m_1 = \sigma^m_2 = 0$) is a standard $\mathcal{F}$-Brownian motion. In addition, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. the covariance process of $W$ and $B$ vanishes.

From the preceding it follows [3, Theorem II.6.3] that the processes $\mathcal{M}_b, N_m, B$ and $W$ are independent. Let $Y$ be the CBM corresponding to the initial value $X_0 := X_0^1 + X_0^2$ and these drivers according to (2.2). Its branching mechanism is $\Psi_b$, its migration mechanism is $\Psi_m$ and its initial value is $\mu$. Taking the sum of (2.2) corresponding to $Y^1$ and $Y^2$ we get the remainder of the claim (by the uniqueness of $Y$ as a solution to (2.2)).

Corollary 2.7. CBMs are stochastically monotone in the starting law, with the (natural) convention that the coffin state is set equal to $\infty$, $[0, \infty]$ having the usual order: if $\mu'$ is another law on $\mathcal{B}_{[0,\infty)}$ with $\mu \leq \mu'$ (in first-order stochastic dominance) then $\mathbb{E}_\mu[G] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mu'}[G]$ for any measurable map $G : [0, \infty)^{[0,\infty)} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ satisfying $(\omega \leq \omega' \Rightarrow G(\omega) \leq G(\omega'))$ for $\{\omega, \omega'\} \subset [0, \infty)^{[0,\infty)}$ ($G$ is $\uparrow$ relative to the natural partial order induced on $[0, \infty)^{[0,\infty)}$).

Proof. Coupling. In the context of Proposition 2.6 take $X^2$ constant and equal to $X^2_0$ (so $\Psi^2_m = 0$). $Y$ and $Y^1$ have the same branching and migration mechanisms but $Y$ starts above $Y^1$ a.s.-$\mathbb{P}$. Also, $\zeta^1 \land \tau^1_0 \land \tau^2_0 = \zeta^1 \land \zeta^2 \land \tau^1_0 \land \tau^2_0$ and $Y = Y^1 + Y^2$ on $[0, \tau^1_0 \land \tau^2_0 \land \zeta)$; on the event $\{\tau^2_0 < \tau^1_0 \land \zeta\}$, a.s.-$\mathbb{P}$, $\zeta = \zeta^1$ and $Y = Y^1$ on $[\tau^2_0, \zeta)$. It follows that $Y \geq Y^1$ everywhere a.s.-$\mathbb{P}$ [with the convention that the coffin state is set equal to $\infty$, $[0, \infty]$ having the usual order].

3. First passage times and explosions

To avoid the analysis of a myriad of special cases, which are perhaps not of particular interest in the present context, we assume for the remainder of this text that (in the notation of the Lamperti transform, Proposition 2.4)

neither $X$ nor $L$ have a.s. monotone paths.

We call such CBMs non-degenerate. Then $\Psi_b$ and $\Psi_m$ are Laplace exponents of spectrally positive Lévy processes (in the narrow sense). (To be fair, this assumption is less innocuous than it sounds, since it excludes for instance squared Bessel processes of negative dimension [4, Definition 3] (stopped on hitting zero), which are instances of CBMs.)

Let $\xi$ be the canonical process on the space of càdlàg nonnegative real paths with lifetime; set $\sigma_a := \inf\{t \in [0, \infty) : \xi_t \leq a\}$ for $a \in [0, \infty)$ and let $l$ be the lifetime. We trust that no confusion can arise when it comes to the notation $\sigma_a$ viz. the diffusion coefficients $\sigma_b$ and $\sigma_m$ (we will never use $b$ and $m$ for the first-passage level).

Denote by $\Psi_b^{-1}$ and $\Psi_m^{-1}$ the right-continuous inverses of $\Psi_b$ and $\Psi_m$, respectively. In the next theorem the case $\bar{a} = 0$ is mainly of interest, but the inclusion of $\bar{a} > 0$ does not really make the proof any longer or more difficult, and it allows to procure some information on the cumulative progeny process $\int_0^\cdot \xi_x ds$. 

Theorem 3.1 (First passage times of CBMs). Let $\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}$ be from $[0, \infty)$. Assume the probabilities $(\mathbb{R}_x)_{x \in [0, \infty)}$ correspond to a non-degenerate CBM. Suppose $\Psi_m(\Psi_b^{-1}(\tilde{\alpha})) < \alpha$ (i.e. $\Psi_b^{-1}(\tilde{\alpha}) < \Psi_m^{-1}(\alpha)$ and $\alpha > 0$ or $\Psi_b^{-1}(\tilde{\alpha}) > 0$), or else suppose that $\Phi := \Psi_b^{-1}(\tilde{\alpha}) = \Psi_m^{-1}(\alpha) > 0$. Put
\[
\Phi_{\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}}(x) := \int_{\Psi_b^{-1}(\tilde{\alpha})}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{\Psi_b(z) - \tilde{\alpha}} \exp\left( -xz - \int_{\Psi_m^{-1}(\alpha)}^{z} \frac{\Psi_m(u) - \alpha}{\Psi_b(u) - \tilde{\alpha}} du \right), \quad x \in [0, \infty),
\]
or $\Phi_{\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}}(x) := e^{-\Psi_x}, \quad x \in [0, \infty)$, according as to whether $\Psi_m(\Psi_b^{-1}(\tilde{\alpha})) < \alpha$ or $\Psi_b^{-1}(\tilde{\alpha}) = \Psi_m^{-1}(\alpha) > 0$. Then for $a \leq x$ from $[0, \infty)$,
\[
\mathbb{R}_x [e^{-\alpha_\sigma_a} \int_0^{\sigma_a} \xi_t; \sigma_a < \iota] = \frac{\Phi_{\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}}(x)}{\Phi_{\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}}(\sigma_a)}.
\]

Remark 3.2. Any $\theta \in (\Psi_b^{-1}(\tilde{\alpha}), \infty)$ may replace $\Psi_m^{-1}(\alpha)$ in (3.1), it changes it only by a multiplicative constant, which is immaterial. The delimiter $\Psi_m^{-1}(\alpha)$ seems most natural because it precisely separates the area of positivity and negativity of the integrand. Eq. (3.1) may be compared with the CBI case [3, Eq. (11)]. It is somewhat agreeable that it actually attains a more “symmetric” form when viewed through the lense of Laplace exponents of spectrally positive Lévy processes (as opposed to one spectrally positive Lévy process and one subordinator).

Formula (3.1) above, and (3.3) to follow below, may seem at first sight to appear “out of the blue”. Of course it is not so. First, they may be guessed from the discrete counterparts [14, Corollary 4.14, Theorem 4.2], using [14, Remark 4.16], as was actually the case. Second, in absence of the former, they could be got by solving the relevant o.d.e. problems (though it still involves “guessing” the “Laplace transform/completely monotone” forms [14, Remark 4.16], as was actually the case. Second, in absence of the former, they could be got by solving the relevant o.d.e. problems (though it still involves “guessing” the “Laplace transform/completely monotone” forms of (3.1) & (3.3), cf. the discrete case [14 pp. 7-8]). With the luxury of the discrete analogs being available, the first option seems decidedly preferable (or anyway faster/easier).

Proof. We focus on the case when $\Psi_m(\Psi_b^{-1}(\tilde{\alpha})) < \alpha$, the version with $\Psi_b^{-1}(\tilde{\alpha}) = \Psi_m^{-1}(\alpha) > 0$ is similar (also easier) and is left to the reader.

First, $\Phi_{\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}} : [0, \infty) \to (0, \infty)$ is well-defined, finite, $\downarrow \downarrow$, continuous and vanishing at infinity, which is easy to see using the assumption $\Psi_m(\Psi_b^{-1}(\tilde{\alpha})) < \alpha$ by recalling that $\Psi_m - \alpha$ is continuous with $\lim_{\infty} \Psi_m = \infty$, also strictly negative on $(0, \Psi_m^{-1}(\alpha))$ and strictly positive on $\Psi_m^{-1}(\alpha), \infty)$, with the analogous observation being true for $\Psi_b$. Differentiating under the integral sign we see also that $\Phi_{\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}}$ is $C^2$ (indeed $C^\infty$) on $(0, \infty)$ (maybe or maybe not at zero, we do not need it).

We let $\mu = \delta_x$ be the initial distribution of the CBM $Y$, thus $\mathbb{R}_x$ is the $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}^\mu$-law of $Y = Y^\mu$. If necessary, taking the limit as $\alpha \downarrow 0$, we see by monotone (or bounded) convergence on the l.h.s. and by monotone and dominated convergence on the r.h.s. of (3.2), that we may (and we do) assume $\alpha > 0$ (indeed one can first replace the delimiter $\Psi_m^{-1}(\alpha)$ with $\Psi_m^{-1}(0)$ in the expression for $\Phi_{\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}}$, then pass to the limit $\alpha \downarrow 0$ by monotone convergence on $z \in (\Psi_b^{-1}(\tilde{\alpha}), \Psi_m^{-1}(0))$ and by dominated convergence on $z \in (\Psi_m^{-1}(0), \infty))$. Because $Y$ is quasi-left continuous, due to the continuity of $\Phi_{\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}}$ and because now $\alpha > 0$, we further infer that it suffices to establish the Laplace transform formula for $a > 0$ (one can pass to the limit $a \downarrow 0$ by bounded convergence on the l.h.s. and by continuity of $\Phi_{\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}}$ on the r.h.s. of (3.2)). Thus we may and do assume $a > 0$.

Let now $M$ be the process of Theorem 2.1 [v] [H] with $f = \Phi_{\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}}$, stopped at $\tau_a$. Notice that $Y_{\tau_a} = a$ a.s.-$\mathbb{P}$ on $\{\tau_a < \zeta\}$ (since $Y$ has no negative jumps a.s.), while $\lim_{t \downarrow \zeta} f(Y_t)e^{-\alpha t - \tilde{\alpha} t} \int_0^t Y_r dr = 0$ a.s.-$\mathbb{P}$ on $\{\tau_a = \infty\} = \{\tau_a < \infty\}$ (since $\alpha > 0$ and $\Phi_{\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}}$ vanishes at infinity). Therefore, by Theorem 2.1 [v] [H] cf. Remark 2.3 and because martingales have a constant expectation, the Laplace transform formula (3.2) reduces further to establishing that $\Phi_{\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}}$ is $C^2$, bounded on $[a, \infty)$ and satisfies
\[
\mathcal{A}\Phi_{\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}}(x) = \alpha \Phi_{\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}}(x) + \tilde{\alpha} x \Phi_{\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}}(x), \quad x \in [a, \infty).
\]
This however is a straightforward computation made easy by the fact that we are working on restriction to $x \in [a, \infty) \subset (0, \infty)$ (justifying differentiation under the integral sign):

$$A \Phi_{\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}}(x) = L_{\Psi_m} \Phi_{\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}}(x) + xL_{\Psi_b} \Phi_{\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}}(x)$$

$$= \int_{\Psi^{-1}_b(\tilde{\alpha})}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{\Psi_b(z) - \tilde{\alpha}} \exp \left( -xz - \int_{\Psi^{-1}_b(\tilde{\alpha})}^{z} \frac{\Psi_m(u) - \alpha}{\Psi_b(u) - \tilde{\alpha}} du \right) \left( \Psi_m(z) + x\Psi_b(z) \right)$$

$$= \int_{\Psi^{-1}_b(\tilde{\alpha})}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{\Psi_b(z) - \tilde{\alpha}} \exp \left( -xz - \int_{\Psi^{-1}_b(\tilde{\alpha})}^{z} \frac{\Psi_m(u) - \alpha}{\Psi_b(u) - \tilde{\alpha}} du \right)$$

$$\times \left( \Psi_m(z) - \alpha + \alpha + x(\Psi_b(z) - \tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{\alpha}) \right)$$

$$= \alpha \Phi_{\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}}(x) + \tilde{\alpha} x \Phi_{\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}}(x)$$

$$+ \int_{\Psi^{-1}_b(\tilde{\alpha})}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{\Psi_b(z) - \tilde{\alpha}} \exp \left( -xz - \int_{\Psi^{-1}_b(\tilde{\alpha})}^{z} \frac{\Psi_m(u) - \alpha}{\Psi_b(u) - \tilde{\alpha}} du \right)$$

$$+ x \int_{\Psi^{-1}_b(\tilde{\alpha})}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{\Psi_b(z) - \tilde{\alpha}} \exp \left( -xz - \int_{\Psi^{-1}_b(\tilde{\alpha})}^{z} \frac{\Psi_m(u) - \alpha}{\Psi_b(u) - \tilde{\alpha}} du \right)$$

$$= \alpha \Phi_{\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}}(x) + \tilde{\alpha} x \Phi_{\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}}(x) - \left[ \exp \left( -xz - \int_{\Psi^{-1}_b(\tilde{\alpha})}^{z} \frac{\Psi_m(u) - \alpha}{\Psi_b(u) - \tilde{\alpha}} du \right) \right]_{z=\Psi^{-1}_b(\tilde{\alpha})}$$

$$= \alpha \Phi_{\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}}(x) + \tilde{\alpha} x \Phi_{\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}}(x),$$

where the penultimate equality is integration by parts and the last equality is by elementary estimation using $\Psi_m(\Psi^{-1}_b(\tilde{\alpha})) < \alpha$ (at $z = \infty$ it is trivial, at $z = \Psi^{-1}_b(\tilde{\alpha}) + 1$ one gets a divergent integral of the form $\sim \int_{0^+} du$). \qed

**Corollary 3.3.** Assume the probabilities $(\mathbb{R}_x)_{x \in [0, \infty)}$ correspond to a non-degenerate CBM. Then $\mathbb{R}_x(\sigma_0 < \infty) > 0$ for all $x \in [0, \infty)$ and $\lim_{\xi^-} \xi = \infty$ a.s. on $\{\sigma_0 = \infty\}$, in particular there is no phenomenon of extinguishing.

**Proof.** It is clear from the strict positivity of the scale function of \[5.1\] that $\mathbb{R}_x(\sigma_0 < \infty) > 0$ for all $x \in [0, \infty)$. Suppose per absurdum that $\lim_{\xi^-} Y \neq \infty$ with positive $\mathbb{P}$-probability on $\{\tau_0 = \infty\}$. Then for some $N \in [0, \infty)$, on an event $A$ of positive $\mathbb{P}$-probability, the process $Y$ will be $\leq N$ at arbitrarily large times, but never hit zero.

Fix some $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$. Consider the sequence $(S_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of random times defined as follows. Let $S_1 :=$ (the first time $Y$ enters $[0, N] + e^{(1)}_{\alpha}$), where $e^{(1)}_{\alpha}$ is an independent, exponentially with rate $\alpha$ distributed amount of time. Then let $S_2 :=$ (the first time $Y$ enters $[0, N]$ after $S_1$) + $e^{(2)}_{\alpha}$, where $e^{(2)}_{\alpha}$ is an exponentially with rate $\alpha$ distributed amount of time, independent of $(Y, e^{(1)}_{\alpha})$. And so on (possibly one has to enlarge the probability space to grant oneself access to the $e^{(k)}_{\alpha}, k \in \mathbb{N}$). Perhaps $S_k = \infty$ at some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ in which case $S_{l+1} = \infty$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}_l$. But anyway $A \subset \{S_k < \infty$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Now, $Y$ always has a strictly positive chance $\beta > 0$ to hit zero before an independent exponential random time of rate $\alpha$ has elapsed, no matter where in $[0, N]$ it starts. On $A$ it must fail to do so infinitely many times over. By the strong Markov property it is impossible. (Of course a sufficiently large deterministic time could also be used in lieu of the $e^{(k)}_{\alpha}, k \in \mathbb{N}$.) \qed

**Corollary 3.4.** Assume the probabilities $(\mathbb{R}_x)_{x \in [0, \infty)}$ correspond to a non-degenerate CBM. Suppose further $(\Psi_b)'(0^+) > 0$ (in particular $\Psi^{-1}_b(0) = 0$), while $(\Psi_m)'(0^+) < -\infty$. Then $\mathbb{R}_x(\sigma_0 < \infty) = 1$ for all $x \in [0, \infty)$.

It means that under the stipulated conditions the migrations cannot offset the branching to turn the process from one that a.s. becomes extinct to one for which this would not be the case.
Proof. Suppose to the contrary that $\mathbb{P}(\tau_0 = \infty) > 0$. By Corollary \ref{cor:0.1}(and \cite[Theorem 12.3]{w}) $\zeta = \infty$ a.s.-$\mathbb{P}$. By Corollary \ref{cor:0.1} \( \lim_{t \to \infty} Y = \infty \) a.s.-$\mathbb{P}$ on \{ $\tau_0 = \infty$ \}. By the strong law of large numbers for Lévy processes and the Lamperti transform it cannot be ($L$ is drifting to $-\infty$ linearly with strictly negative rate, while \( \lim_{t \to \infty} X_t/t < \infty \) a.s.-$\mathbb{P}$).

Corollary 3.5. Assume the probabilities $(\mathbb{R}_x)_{x \in [0, \infty)}$ correspond to a non-degenerate CBM and $\Psi_m^{-1}(0) \geq \Psi_m^{-1}(0) > 0$. Then $\mathbb{R}_x(\sigma_0 < 1) < 1$ for all $x \in (0, \infty)$.

Proof. Take $\alpha = \bar{\alpha} = a = 0$ in \ref{thm:0.1}.

Theorem 3.6 (Explosion times of CBMs). Let $\alpha, \bar{\alpha}$ be from $[0, \infty)$. Assume the probabilities $(\mathbb{R}_x)_{x \in [0, \infty)}$ correspond to a non-degenerate CBM and $\Psi_m(\Psi_m^{-1}(\bar{\alpha})) < \alpha$. If $\bar{\alpha} = 0$ we assume further that $\int_{0+} |\Psi_b|^{-1} < \infty$ (explosivity condition for the associated CSBP with branching mechanism $\Psi_b$ \cite[Theorem 12.3]{w}, in particular necessarily then $\Psi_m^{-1}(0) > 0$). Put

$$\Psi_{\alpha, \bar{\alpha}}(x) := 1 - \alpha Z_{\alpha, \bar{\alpha}}(x) := 1 - \alpha \int_0^{\Psi_m^{-1}(\bar{\alpha})} \frac{dz}{\bar{\alpha} - \Psi_b(z)} \exp \left( -xz - \int_0^x \frac{\alpha - \Psi_m(u)}{\bar{\alpha} - \Psi_b(u)} du \right),$$

(3.3)

$x \in [0, \infty)$. Then for $a \leq x$ from $[0, \infty)$:

(i) when $\int_{0+} |\Psi_b|^{-1} < \infty$,

$$\mathbb{R}_x[e^{-\alpha l}; 1 < \sigma_a] = \Psi_{\alpha, 0}(x) - \frac{\Phi_{\alpha, 0}(x)}{\Phi_{\alpha, 0}(a)} \Psi_{\alpha, 0}(a);$$

(3.4)

(ii) for $\bar{\alpha} > 0$,

$$\mathbb{R}_x \left[ \int_0^{\sigma_a \wedge l} e^{-\alpha s - \bar{\alpha} \int_0^s \Psi_b \cdot d\sigma} \right] = Z_{\alpha, \bar{\alpha}}(x) - \frac{\Phi_{\alpha, \bar{\alpha}}(x)}{\Phi_{\alpha, \bar{\alpha}}(a)} Z_{\alpha, \bar{\alpha}}(a).$$

(3.5)

Like in Theorem \ref{thm:0.1} the case $\bar{\alpha} = 0$ is the one that is mainly of interest here. Though, \ref{thm:0.3} has the following interpretation. The quantity

$$\alpha \mathbb{R}_x \left[ \int_0^{\sigma_a \wedge l} e^{-\alpha s - \bar{\alpha} \int_0^s \Psi_b \cdot d\sigma} \right] = \int_0^\infty \alpha e^{-\alpha s} \mathbb{R}_x[e^{-\bar{\alpha} \int_0^s \Psi_b \cdot d\sigma}; s < \sigma_a \wedge l] ds$$

is the probability that a CBM starting from $x$, and that is killed independently at rate $\alpha$, neither has reached $a$ nor has exploded nor has its running progeny process $\int_0^\infty \Psi_b \cdot d\sigma$ exceeded an independent exponential random variable of rate $\bar{\alpha}$, before it is killed. In the Lamperti transform it corresponds to, ceteris paribus, $X$ being killed at rate $\alpha$, $L$ being killed at rate $\bar{\alpha}$, and then asking for the probability that starting from $x$, the process $Y$ is killed by $X$ before it has had a chance to be killed by $L$, to reach $a$, or to explode.

Proof. $\Psi_{\alpha, \bar{\alpha}}: [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ is well-defined, finite, $\mathbb{R}^+$, continuous with limit 1 at infinity, which follows easily from the assumptions made. These properties in turn are mirrored in those of $Z_{\alpha, \bar{\alpha}}$. Next, we check that

$$A \Psi_{\alpha, \bar{\alpha}}(x) = \alpha \Psi_{\alpha, \bar{\alpha}}(x) + \bar{\alpha} x \Psi_{\alpha, \bar{\alpha}}(x) - \alpha x,$$

$x \in (0, \infty)$,

which again is just straightforward computation:

$$A \Phi_{\alpha, \bar{\alpha}}(x) = D^{\Psi_m} \Phi_{\alpha, \bar{\alpha}}(x) + x D^{\Psi_b} \Phi_{\alpha, \bar{\alpha}}(x)$$

$$= -\alpha \int_0^{\Psi_m^{-1}(\bar{\alpha})} \frac{dz}{\bar{\alpha} - \Psi_b(z)} \exp \left( -xz - \int_0^x \frac{\alpha - \Psi_m(u)}{\bar{\alpha} - \Psi_b(u)} du \right) (\Psi_m(z) + x \Psi_b(z))$$

$$= \alpha \Psi_{\alpha, \bar{\alpha}}(x) + \bar{\alpha} x \Psi_{\alpha, \bar{\alpha}}(x) - \alpha - \bar{\alpha} x + \alpha \int_0^{\Psi_m^{-1}(\bar{\alpha})} \frac{dz}{\bar{\alpha} - \Psi_b(z)} \exp \left( -xz - \int_0^x \frac{\alpha - \Psi_m(u)}{\bar{\alpha} - \Psi_b(u)} du \right)$$
$\alpha x \int_0^{\Psi_b^{-1}(\bar{a})} dz \exp \left( -xz - \int_0^z \frac{\alpha - \Psi_m(u)}{\bar{a} - \Psi_b(u)} du \right)\\
= \alpha \Psi_{a, \bar{a}}(x) + \bar{a} x \Psi_{a, \bar{a}}(x) - \alpha - \bar{a} x - \alpha \left[ \exp \left( -xz - \int_0^z \frac{\alpha - \Psi_m(u)}{\bar{a} - \Psi_b(u)} du \right) \right]_{b = 0}^{\Psi_b^{-1}(\bar{a})}\\
= \alpha \Psi_{a, \bar{a}}(x) + \bar{a} x \Psi_{a, \bar{a}}(x) - \alpha x.

It follows from Theorem 2.1(v) that for any $a \in (0, \infty)$, the process

$$M_t := \Psi_{a, \bar{a}}(Y(t)) e^{-\alpha t - \bar{a} \int_0^t Y_s ds - \Psi_{a, \bar{a}}(x)} + \bar{a} \int_0^t e^{-\alpha s - \bar{a} \int_0^s Y_u du} Y_s ds,$$

$$= -\alpha \left( Z_{a, \bar{a}}(Y(t)) e^{-\alpha t - \bar{a} \int_0^t Y_s ds} - \Psi_{a, \bar{a}}(x) + \int_0^t e^{-\alpha s - \bar{a} \int_0^s Y_u du} ds \right), \quad t \in [0, \zeta),$$

stopped at $\tau_a$, is a local martingale on $[0, \zeta)$ under $\mathbb{P}^\delta$, $x \in [a, \infty)$.

Setting $\bar{a} = 0$ we get because martingales have a constant expectation (the first form of $M$ is the most convenient, exploiting $\lim_{\infty} \Psi_{a, 0} = 1$), and from (32), the $\mathbb{R}_+$-Laplace transform for the explosion time $l$ on $\{l < \sigma_a\}$, $x \in [a, \infty)$, $a \in (0, \infty)$. Letting $a \downarrow 0$ gives (3.4) also for the case $a = 0$.

For $\bar{a} > 0$, we get similarly (3.3) (but now the second form of $M$ appears to be more handy, using $\lim_{\infty} Z_{a, \bar{a}} = 0$).

\begin{corollary}
The CSBP with branching mechanism $\Psi_b$ is explosive (equivalently, $\int_{0^+} |\Psi_b|^{-1} < \infty$ [9 Theorem 12.3]) iff the CBM process $Y$ is explosive (i.e. $\mathbb{P}^\mu(\zeta < \infty) > 0$ for some, equivalently, all initial distributions $\mu$ that are not concentrated at 0).
\end{corollary}

\begin{proof}
We already know that if for some initial distribution $\mu$ (that is not concentrated at 0), $\mathbb{P}^\mu(\zeta < \infty) > 0$, then the CSBP with branching mechanism $\Psi_b$ is explosive (Corollary 2.5). Now suppose the latter, i.e. $\int_{0^+} |\Psi_b|^{-1} < \infty$. Taking $a = 0$ in (3.4) we get $\mathbb{R}_+(l < \infty) > 0$ for $x \in (0, \infty)$ (just because $\Psi_{a, 0}$ is $\uparrow \uparrow$, while $\Phi_{a, 0}$ is $\downarrow \downarrow$).
\end{proof}
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