

Explosion of continuous-state branching processes with competition in Lévy environment

Rugang Ma¹ and Xiaowen Zhou²

Abstract Using the Lyapunov criteria arguments, we find sufficient conditions on explosion/nonexplosion for continuous-state branching processes with competition in Lévy random environment. In particular, we identify the necessary and sufficient conditions on explosion/nonexplosion when the competition function is a power function and the Lévy measure of the associated branching mechanism is stable.

Keywords Continuous-state branching processes, competition, random environment, explosion, Foster-Lyapunov criteria.

MR(2020) Subject Classification : 60J80; 60H20.

1 Introduction

Continuous-state branching processes in random environment arise as scaling limits of Bienaymé-Galton-Watson processes that were introduced in Smith [24] and Smith and Wilkinson [25]; see Kurtz [12] for early work on diffusion approximations of branching processes in random environment. A recent study of the Feller branching processes in Brownian environment can be found in Böinghoff and Hutzenthaler [6] where asymptotics of the survival probability is studied for different regimes. The introduction of branching processes under the continuous-state setting allows to apply the stochastic differential equations (SDEs for short) and Lévy processes techniques in its study. We refer to Kyprianou [11] and Li [18] for comprehensive introduction on continuous-state branching processes and the associated stochastic equations.

To understand the effect of random environment on demography of the branching process, continuous-state branching process with catastrophes was first proposed in Bansaye et al. [2] as a continuous-state branching process in Lévy environment (CBLE for short) where the random environment is modelled by a Lévy process with sample paths of bounded variation. More general CBLEs were introduced and studied in He et al. [10] and Palau and Pardo [22] as unique non-negative strong solutions to certain SDEs driven by Brownian motions and Lévy processes associated to both the branching mechanism and the ran-

¹School of Statistics and Mathematics, Central University of Finance and Economics, Beijing, China. Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Concordia University, Montreal, Canada. Supported by the disciplinary funding of Central University of Finance and Economics and by NSERC (RGPIN-2021-04100). Email: marg@cufe.edu.cn.

²Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Concordia University, Montreal, Canada. Supported by NSERC (RGPIN-2021-04100). Email: xiaowen.zhou@concordia.ca. Corresponding author.

dom environment. We refer to Bansaye et al. [3] for discussions on the convergence of discrete-state population models to CBLEs.

The quenched Laplace transform for the branching process in random environment can be expressed using random cumulant semigroups conditional on the environment. A necessary and sufficient condition in terms of Grey's condition was shown in [10] for the CBLE to become extinct. The speed of extinction was also obtained in Bansaye et al. [4] for CBLE for which the Lévy environment process fluctuates.

In another development on continuous-state branching processes, a logistic branching process was introduced in Lambert [13] to incorporate competition among individuals in the continuous-state branching process. Foucart [9] studied the boundary behavior of continuous-state branching processes with logistic competition and obtain an integral test on explosion/nonexplosion. A general competition mechanism was introduced in Ba and Pardoux [1] and Ma [19]. Under a moment condition $\int_0^\infty (z \wedge z^2) \mu(dz) < \infty$ on the Lévy measure μ for the branching mechanism, [19] established the Lamperti transformation between continuous-state branching processes with competition and strong solutions of stochastic equations driven by Lévy processes without negative jumps; see also Berestycki et al. [5] for flows of continuous-state branching processes with competition. We refer to Li et al. [17] for recent work on ergodic results of continuous state branching processes with immigration and competition. The continuous state branching process with immigration and competition in a Lévy random environment was introduced in [22] with its long term behaviours studied. The extinction and coming down from infinity behaviours were also studied in Leman and Pardo [14] for CBLEs with competition.

The explosion/nonexplosion conditions for continuous-state branching processes are well known; see Grey [8] for an integral test on Laplace exponent of the associated branching mechanism. An integral test on explosion/nonexplosion was further proved in Leman and Pardo [15] for continuous-state branching process in Brownian environment with a special branching mechanism that is associated to the Laplace transform of a subordinator and with logistic competition. It was also pointed out that a continuous-state branching process in Lévy environment is conservative, i.e. the explosion can not happen, if the Lévy measure μ for the branching mechanism satisfies the moment condition; see Lemma A.1 of [4]. On the other hand, it is known that large enough competition can prevent explosion from happening; see Foucart [9] and Li et al. [16]. Some sufficient conditions of explosion were found in [16] for general continuous-state nonlinear branching processes whose competition mechanism is a general function and the Lévy measure μ for the branching mechanism satisfies the moment condition. To our best knowledge, the explosion/nonexplosion conditions for CBLEs with general competition and with general Lévy measure μ have not been studied systematically.

Integral tests on explosion/nonexplosion are not available anymore for the above-mentioned branching processes with general competitions, and as an effective alternative, the approach of Foster-Lyapunov criteria comes into play. The Foster-Lyapunov criteria find successful applications in characterizing the boundary behaviours of SDEs related to the continuous-state branching processes; see Li et al. [16] and Ma et al. [20]. We are not

aware of previous applications of Foster-Lyapunov criteria in the study of CBLEs.

In this paper, applying the Foster-Lyapunov criteria arguments to suitable test functions we find sufficient conditions on explosion/nonexplosion for CBLEs with general competition. In particular, we identify necessary and sufficient conditions on explosion/nonexplosion when the competition function is a power function and jump part of the branching mechanism is an α -stable process for $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, which helps to determine the interplay between competition and large jumps of the branching on the explosion. As a corollary we also show that the Neveu's CBLE with competition can not explode. These results suggest that the random environment can neither cause the explosion nor prevent the explosion from happening.

The rest of the paper is arranged as follows. We introduce the CBLE with competition and the Foster-Lyapunov type criteria for the explosion and nonexplosion of CBLE with competition in Section 2. Our main results are stated and proved in Section 3.

2 CBLEs with competition and the Foster-Lyapunov type criteria

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$ be a filtered probability space satisfying the usual hypotheses. Let ϕ be a branching mechanism given by

$$\phi(\lambda) = -b_1\lambda + b_2^2\lambda^2 + \int_0^\infty (e^{-\lambda z} - 1 + \lambda z \mathbf{1}_{\{z < 1\}})\mu(dz), \quad \lambda \geq 0, \quad (2.1)$$

where $b_1, b_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $(1 \wedge z^2)\mu(dz)$ is a finite measure on $(0, \infty)$. To model the mechanism of random environment, let $(L(t))_{t \geq 0}$ be a Lévy process with Lévy-Itô decomposition:

$$\begin{aligned} L(t) = & \beta t + \sigma B^{(e)}(t) + \int_0^t \int_{[-1,1]} (e^z - 1) \tilde{N}^{(e)}(ds, dz) \\ & + \int_0^t \int_{[-1,1]^c} (e^z - 1) N^{(e)}(ds, dz), \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

where $\beta \in \mathbb{R}, \sigma \geq 0$, $(B^{(e)}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is a Brownian motion, $N^{(e)}(ds, dz)$ is a Poisson random measure on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}$ with intensity $ds\nu(dz)$ satisfying $\int_{\mathbb{R}} (1 \wedge z^2)\nu(dz) < \infty$ and $\tilde{N}^{(e)}(ds, dz) = N^{(e)}(ds, dz) - ds\nu(dz)$.

Let $b_0(y)$ be a competition mechanism, that is, $y \mapsto b_0(y)$ is a continuous non-decreasing function on $[0, \infty)$ with $b_0(0) = 0$. A CBLE with competition can be constructed as the unique strong solution of following stochastic equation:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t = & Y_0 + \int_0^t (b_1 Y_s - b_0(Y_s)) ds + \int_0^t \sqrt{2b_2^2 Y_s} dB^{(b)}(s) + \int_0^t \int_0^1 \int_0^{Y_{s-}} z \tilde{N}^{(b)}(ds, dz, du) \\ & + \int_0^t \int_1^\infty \int_0^{Y_{s-}} z N^{(b)}(ds, dz, du) + \int_0^t Y_{s-} dL(s), \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

where $(B^{(b)}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is a Brownian motion, $N^{(b)}(ds, dz, du)$ is a Poisson random measure on \mathbb{R}_+^3 with intensity $ds\mu(dz)du$, and $\tilde{N}^{(b)}(ds, dz, du) = N^{(b)}(ds, dz, du) - ds\mu(dz)du$. We also assume that $(B^{(b)}(t))_{t \geq 0}$, $(B^{(e)}(t))_{t \geq 0}$, $N^{(b)}(ds, dz, du)$ and $N^{(e)}(ds, dz)$ are independent of each other.

For $u \geq 0$, let

$$\tau_u^- := \inf\{t \geq 0 : Y(t) \leq u\} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_u^+ := \inf\{t \geq 0 : Y(t) \geq u\}$$

and

$$\tau_0 := \tau_0^- \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_\infty := \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \tau_u^+$$

with the convention $\inf \emptyset = \infty$. Throughout this paper, we use notation

$$\mathbb{P}_{y_0}\{\cdot\} = \mathbb{P}\{\cdot | Y_0 = y_0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}_{y_0}[\cdot] = \mathbb{E}[\cdot | Y_0 = y_0], \quad y_0 \geq 0.$$

A $[0, \infty]$ -valued process $(Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ with càdlàg path is a solution to SDE (2.3) if it satisfies (2.3) up to explosion time τ_∞ and $Y_t := \infty$ for all $t \geq \tau_\infty$. It is known that SDE (2.3) has a unique non-negative strong solution; see Theorem 1 of [22].

Let L be the generator of the process $(Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$. By Itô's formula we get for $g \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$,

$$\begin{aligned} Lg(y) &= [\beta y + b_1 y - b_0(y)]g'(y) + \left(\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 y^2 + b_2^2 y\right)g''(y) \\ &\quad + y \int_0^1 [g(y+z) - g(y) - g'(y)z]\mu(dz) + y \int_1^\infty [g(y+z) - g(y)]\mu(dz) \\ &\quad + \int_{[-1,1]} [g(ye^z) - g(y) - y(e^z - 1)g'(y)]\nu(dz) \\ &\quad + \int_{[-1,1]^c} [g(ye^z) - g(y)]\nu(dz). \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

The Foster-Lyapunov criteria are first used to classify the boundaries for Markov chains via conditions on the generators; see Meyn and Tweedie [21] and Chen [7] for earlier results. These techniques are applied in [16, 20] and Ren et al. [23] to study the boundary behaviours for SDEs associated to continuous-state branching processes. By a simple modification of the proof of Proposition 2.1 in [23] we have the following proposition on solution Y to SDE (2.3):

Proposition 2.1 *If there exist a sequence of strictly positive constants $(d_n)_{n \geq 1}$ and non-negative functions $g_n \in C^2((0, \infty))$ satisfying, for all large enough $n \geq 1$,*

$$(i) \quad \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} g_n(y) = \infty,$$

$$(ii) \quad Lg_n(y) \leq d_n g_n(y) \text{ for all } y \in [1/n, \infty),$$

then $\mathbb{P}_{y_0}\{\tau_\infty < \infty\} = 0$ for any $y_0 > 0$.

Proposition 2.2 *If there exist a non-negative bounded and strictly increasing function $g \in C^2((0, \infty))$ and positive constants $d_0, \bar{y} > 0$ satisfying*

$$Lg(y) \geq d_0 g(y) \quad \text{for all } y \geq \bar{y},$$

then $\mathbb{P}_{y_0}\{\tau_\infty < \infty\} > 0$ for any $y_0 > \bar{y}$.

Proof. By the proof of Proposition 2.2 in Ren et al. [23] we have, for any $m > \bar{y}$,

$$\begin{aligned} t \mapsto M_t := & g(Y_{t \wedge \tau_m^+ \wedge \tau_{\bar{y}}^-}) e^{-d_0 t} + \int_0^t g(Y_{s \wedge \tau_m^+ \wedge \tau_{\bar{y}}^-}) d_0 e^{-d_0 s} ds \\ & - \int_0^t e^{-d_0 s} Lg(Y_s) 1_{\{s \leq \tau_m^+ \wedge \tau_{\bar{y}}^-\}} ds \end{aligned}$$

is a martingale. Then for any $m > y_0 > \bar{y}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{y_0} \left[g(Y_{t \wedge \tau_m^+ \wedge \tau_{\bar{y}}^-}) e^{-d_0 t} \right] + \int_0^t \mathbb{E}_{y_0} \left[d_0 e^{-d_0 s} g(Y_{s \wedge \tau_m^+ \wedge \tau_{\bar{y}}^-}) \right] ds \\ & = g(y_0) + \int_0^t \mathbb{E}_{y_0} \left[e^{-d_0 s} Lg(Y_s) 1_{\{s \leq \tau_m^+ \wedge \tau_{\bar{y}}^-\}} \right] ds. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $t \rightarrow \infty$, by the assumptions and the dominated convergence theorem we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{E}_{y_0} \left[d_0 e^{-d_0 s} g(Y_{s \wedge \tau_m^+ \wedge \tau_{\bar{y}}^-}) \right] ds & = g(y_0) + \int_0^\infty \mathbb{E}_{y_0} \left[e^{-d_0 s} Lg(Y_s) 1_{\{s \leq \tau_m^+ \wedge \tau_{\bar{y}}^-\}} \right] ds \\ & \geq g(y_0) + \int_0^\infty \mathbb{E}_{y_0} \left[e^{-d_0 s} d_0 g(Y_s) 1_{\{s \leq \tau_m^+ \wedge \tau_{\bar{y}}^-\}} \right] ds, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} g(y_0) & \leq \mathbb{E}_{y_0} \left[\int_{\tau_m^+ \wedge \tau_{\bar{y}}^-}^\infty d_0 e^{-d_0 s} g(Y_{\tau_m^+ \wedge \tau_{\bar{y}}^-}) ds \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E}_{y_0} \left[g(Y_{\tau_m^+ \wedge \tau_{\bar{y}}^-}) e^{-d_0 (\tau_m^+ \wedge \tau_{\bar{y}}^-)} \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E}_{y_0} \left[g(Y_{\tau_m^+}) e^{-d_0 \tau_m^+} 1_{\{\tau_m^+ < \tau_{\bar{y}}^-\}} \right] + \mathbb{E}_{y_0} \left[g(Y_{\tau_{\bar{y}}^-}) e^{-d_0 \tau_{\bar{y}}^-} 1_{\{\tau_m^+ > \tau_{\bar{y}}^-\}} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

Since $t \mapsto Y_t$ is right continuous, then $Y_{\tau_{\bar{y}}^-} \leq \bar{y} < y_0 < m \leq Y_{\tau_m^+}$. Notice that g is non-negative bounded and strictly increasing. Then

$$g(y_0) \leq \bar{g} \mathbb{E}_{y_0} \left[1_{\{\tau_m^+ < \tau_{\bar{y}}^-\}} e^{-d_0 \tau_m^+} \right] + g(\bar{y}),$$

where $\bar{g} := \sup_y g(y) < \infty$. Letting $m \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$g(y_0) \leq \bar{g} \mathbb{E}_{y_0} \left[1_{\{\tau_\infty \leq \tau_{\bar{y}}^-\}} e^{-d_0 \tau_\infty} \right] + g(\bar{y}).$$

That is

$$\bar{g} \mathbb{E}_{y_0} \left[1_{\{\tau_\infty \leq \tau_{\bar{y}}^-\}} 1_{\{\tau_\infty < \infty\}} \right] \geq g(y_0) - g(\bar{y}), \quad (2.6)$$

which implies

$$\mathbb{P}_{y_0}\{\tau_\infty < \infty\} \geq \frac{g(y_0) - g(\bar{y})}{\bar{g}} > 0.$$

This proves the desired result. \square

3 Main results

In this Section we provide the sufficient conditions for explosion and non-explosion of the CBLE with competition. Let $(Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be the unique strong solution of (2.3).

Let $B(p, q)$ denote the Beta function with parameters $p, q > 0$. By integration by parts and L'Hôpital's rule it is not hard to see the following:

Lemma 3.1 *For any $\delta, y > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we have*

$$\int_0^\infty [(y+z)^{-\delta} - y^{-\delta}] z^{-1-\alpha} dz = -\delta c_{\alpha, \delta} y^{-\alpha-\delta} \quad (3.1)$$

and

$$\int_0^\infty [\ln(y+z) - \ln y] z^{-1-\alpha} dz = c_{\alpha, 0} y^{-\alpha}, \quad (3.2)$$

where $c_{\alpha, \delta} := \alpha^{-1} B(\alpha + \delta, 1 - \alpha)$.

Remark 3.2 *Note that $c_{\alpha, 0} = \frac{\pi}{\alpha \sin(\alpha\pi)}$.*

For two σ -finite measures μ_1 and μ_2 on $(0, \infty)$, we write $\mu_1(dz) \leq \mu_2(dz)$ if $\mu_1(B) \leq \mu_2(B)$ for any Borel set B in $(0, \infty)$. We first present a sufficient condition on explosion of the solution Y to SDE (2.3).

Theorem 3.3 *Suppose that there exist constants $b_0 \geq 0$, $q_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $\bar{a}, A > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that*

$$b_0(y) \leq b_0 y^{q_0} \quad \text{for all } y \geq A \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{a} z^{-1-\alpha} \mathbf{1}_{\{z \geq A\}} dz \leq \mathbf{1}_{\{z \geq A\}} \mu(dz).$$

Then $\mathbb{P}_{y_0} \{\tau_\infty < \infty\} > 0$ for large enough $y_0 > 0$ if one of the following conditions holds:

- (i) $b_0 = 0$;
- (ii) $q_0 < 2 - \alpha$ and $b_0 > 0$;
- (iii) $q_0 = 2 - \alpha$ and $0 < b_0 < \bar{a} c_{\alpha, 0}$.

Proof. Without loss of generality we can assume that $A > 1$. Given $\delta \in (0, \infty)$, let $g(y) = e^{-y^{-\delta}}$ for $y \geq 0$. Then

$$g'(y) = \delta y^{-\delta-1} g(y) \quad \text{and} \quad g''(y) = [\delta^2 y^{-2\delta-2} - \delta(1+\delta)y^{-\delta-2}] g(y).$$

It follows that $g'(y) > 0$ and $g''(y) > -\delta(1+\delta)y^{-\delta-2}g(y)$, which implies that

$$\int_0^1 [g(y+z) - g(y) - z g'(y)] \mu(dz) = \int_0^1 z^2 g''(\xi_1) \mu(dz)$$

$$\geq -\delta(1+\delta)y^{-\delta-2}g(y+1)\int_0^1 z^2\mu(dz) \quad (3.3)$$

for some $\xi_1 \in [y, y+1]$, and

$$\int_1^A [g(y+z) - g(y)]\mu(dz) \geq 0. \quad (3.4)$$

Moreover, by the assumptions and (3.1) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_A^\infty [g(y+z) - g(y)]\mu(dz) \\ & \geq \bar{a} \int_A^\infty [g(y+z) - g(y)]z^{-1-\alpha} dz \\ & = \bar{a}g(y) \int_A^\infty [e^{-(y+z)^{-\delta}+y^{-\delta}} - 1]z^{-1-\alpha} dz \\ & \geq \bar{a}g(y) \int_A^\infty [-(y+z)^{-\delta} + y^{-\delta}]z^{-1-\alpha} dz \\ & = \bar{a}g(y) \int_0^\infty [-(y+z)^{-\delta} + y^{-\delta}]z^{-1-\alpha} dz - \bar{a}g(y) \int_0^A [-(y+z)^{-\delta} + y^{-\delta}]z^{-1-\alpha} dz \\ & = \bar{a}g(y)\delta c_{\alpha,\delta}y^{-\alpha-\delta} - \bar{a}g(y)\delta\xi_2^{-1-\delta} \int_0^A z^{-\alpha} dz \\ & \geq g(y)\delta\bar{a}c_{\alpha,\delta}y^{-\alpha-\delta} - g(y)\delta\bar{a}(1-\alpha)^{-1}A^{1-\alpha}y^{-1-\delta}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

where $\xi_2 \in [y, y+A]$. In view of (3.3)-(3.5) we get

$$\begin{aligned} & y \int_0^1 [g(y+z) - g(y) - zg'(y)]\mu(dz) + y \int_1^\infty [g(y+z) - g(y)]\mu(dz) \\ & \geq g(y)\delta\bar{a}c_{\alpha,\delta}y^{1-\alpha-\delta} - g(y)\delta\bar{a}(1-\alpha)^{-1}A^{1-\alpha}y^{-\delta} \\ & \quad - g(y+1)\delta(1+\delta)y^{-\delta-1} \int_0^1 z^2\mu(dz). \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

On the other hand, it is obvious that for any fixed $\delta > 0$ there exists a large enough $y_\delta > 0$ such that $g''(y) < 0$ for all $y > y_\delta$. Since $|e^z - 1| \leq 3|z|$ for $z \in [-1, 1]$, then for all $y > ey_\delta$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{[-1,1]} [g(ye^z) - g(y) - y(e^z - 1)g'(y)]\nu(dz) \\ & \geq 9y^2[g''(\xi_3) \int_{-1}^0 z^2\nu(dz) + g''(\xi_4) \int_0^1 z^2\nu(dz)] \end{aligned}$$

for some $\xi_3 \in [ye^{-1}, y]$ and $\xi_4 \in [y, ye]$. This together with $g''(y) > -\delta(1+\delta)y^{-\delta-2}$ yields, for all $y > ey_\delta$,

$$\int_{[-1,1]} [g(ye^z) - g(y) - y(e^z - 1)g'(y)]\nu(dz)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq -9\delta(1+\delta)y^2 \left[\xi_3^{-\delta-2} \int_{-1}^0 z^2 \nu(dz) + \xi_4^{-\delta-2} \int_0^1 z^2 \nu(dz) \right] \\
&\geq -9\delta(1+\delta)y^{-\delta} \left[e^{\delta+2} \int_{-1}^0 z^2 \nu(dz) + \int_0^1 z^2 \nu(dz) \right]. \tag{3.7}
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since g is strictly increasing and takes values in $[0, 1]$, we have

$$\int_1^\infty [g(ye^z) - g(y)]\nu(dz) \geq 0.$$

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_1^\infty [g(ye^z) - g(y)]\nu(dz) &= \int_1^\infty [e^{-(ye^z)^{-\delta}} - e^{-y^{-\delta}}]\nu(dz) \\
&= g(y) \int_1^\infty [e^{-(y^{-\delta}e^{-\delta z})+y^{-\delta}} - 1]\nu(dz) \\
&= g(y) \int_1^\infty [e^{y^{-\delta}(1-e^{-\delta z})} - 1]\nu(dz) \\
&\rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } y \rightarrow \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\int_{[-1,1]^c} [g(ye^z) - g(y)]\nu(dz) \geq \int_{-\infty}^{-1} [g(ye^z) - g(y)]\nu(dz) \geq -g(y)\nu((-\infty, -1]). \tag{3.8}$$

Combining (2.4) and (3.6)-(3.8), we have, for all y large enough,

$$\begin{aligned}
Lg(y) &= [\beta y + b_1 y - b_0(y)]\delta y^{-\delta-1}g(y) + \left(\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 y^2 + b_2^2 y\right)[\delta^2 y^{-2\delta-2} - \delta(1+\delta)y^{-\delta-2}]g(y) \\
&\quad + y \int_0^1 [g(y+z) - g(y) - g'(y)z]\mu(dz) + y \int_1^\infty [g(y+z) - g(y)]\mu(dz) \\
&\quad + \int_{[-1,1]} [g(ye^z) - g(y) - y(e^z - 1)g'(y)]\nu(dz) + \int_{[-1,1]^c} [g(ye^z) - g(y)]\nu(dz) \\
&\geq g(y)\delta \left[(\beta + b_1)y^{-\delta} - b_0 y^{q_0-1-\delta} - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2(1+\delta)y^{-\delta} - b_2^2(1+\delta)y^{-1-\delta} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \bar{a}c_{\alpha,\delta}y^{1-\alpha-\delta} - \bar{a}(1-\alpha)^{-1}A^{1-\alpha}y^{-\delta} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - g(y)^{-1}g(y+1)(1+\delta)y^{-\delta-1} \int_0^1 z^2 \mu(dz) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \delta^{-1}\nu((-\infty, -1]) - 9(1+\delta)y^{-\delta}e^{y^{-\delta}}e^{\delta+2} \int_{-1}^1 z^2 \nu(dz) \right] \\
&= g(y)\delta [\bar{a}c_{\alpha,\delta}y^{1-\alpha-\delta} - b_0 y^{q_0-1-\delta} - \delta^{-1}\nu((-\infty, -1]) - O(y^{-\delta})] \\
&=: g(y)\delta G_\delta(y), \tag{3.9}
\end{aligned}$$

where $O(y^{-\delta}) \rightarrow 0$ as $y \rightarrow \infty$ for any $\delta > 0$.

Since $\alpha < 1$, we can first choose δ small enough such that $1 - \alpha - \delta > 0$. If condition (ii) holds, then $1 - \alpha - \delta > q_0 - 1 - \delta$. Therefore, $G_\delta(y) \rightarrow \infty$ as $y \rightarrow \infty$ under condition (i) or (ii). If condition (iii) holds, we can choose δ small enough such that $1 - \alpha - \delta > 0$

and $b_0 < \bar{a}c_{\alpha,\delta}$, then we also have $G_\delta(y) \rightarrow \infty$ as $y \rightarrow \infty$. This together with (3.9) implies that there is a \bar{y} large enough such that $Lg(y) \geq g(y)$ for all $y \geq \bar{y}$. By Proposition 2.2 we obtain the desired result. \square

We next present a sufficient condition on nonexplosion of process Y .

Theorem 3.4 *Suppose that there exist constants $b_0 \geq 0$, $q_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $\bar{a}, A > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ such that*

$$b_0(y)\mathbf{1}_{\{\alpha < 1\}} \geq b_0y^{q_0}\mathbf{1}_{\{\alpha < 1\}} \quad \text{for all } y \geq A \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{1}_{\{z \geq A\}}\mu(dz) \leq \bar{a}z^{-1-\alpha}\mathbf{1}_{\{z \geq A\}}dz.$$

Then $\mathbb{P}_{y_0}\{\tau_\infty < \infty\} = 0$ for any $y_0 > 0$ if one of the following conditions holds:

- (i) $\alpha \geq 1$;
- (ii) $q_0 > 2 - \alpha > 1$ and $b_0 > 0$;
- (iii) $q_0 = 2 - \alpha > 1$ and $b_0 \geq \bar{a}c_{\alpha,0}$.

Proof. For $k \geq 2$, we consider the following stochastic equation:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t^{(k)} &= Y_0^{(k)} + \int_0^t (\beta Y_s^{(k)} + b_1 Y_s^{(k)} - b_0(Y_s^{(k)}))ds + \int_0^t \sqrt{2b_2^2 Y_s^{(k)}} dB^{(b)}(s) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \sigma Y_s^{(k)} dB^{(e)}(s) + \int_0^t \int_0^1 \int_0^{Y_{s-}^{(k)}} z \tilde{N}^{(b)}(ds, dz, du) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_1^\infty \int_0^{Y_{s-}^{(k)}} z N^{(b)}(ds, dz, du) + \int_0^t \int_{[-1,1]} Y_{s-}^{(k)} (e^z - 1) \tilde{N}^{(e)}(ds, dz) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{(-\infty, -1) \cup (1, k]} Y_{s-}^{(k)} (e^z - 1) N^{(e)}(ds, dz). \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

By Theorem 1 in Palau and Pardo [22], for any $k \geq 2$, equation (3.10) has a unique strong solution $(Y_t^{(k)})_{t \geq 0}$. Clearly, $(Y_t^{(k)})_{t \geq 0}$ consists in truncation of large jumps due to environment. Let L_k be the generator of $(Y_t^{(k)})_{t \geq 0}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} L_k g(y) &= (\beta y + b_1 y - b_0(y))g'(y) + \left(\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 y^2 + b_2^2 y\right)g''(y) \\ &\quad + y \int_0^1 [g(y+z) - g(y) - g'(y)z]\mu(dz) + y \int_1^\infty [g(y+z) - g(y)]\mu(dz) \\ &\quad + \int_{[-1,1]} [g(ye^z) - g(y) - y(e^z - 1)g'(y)]\nu(dz) \\ &\quad + \int_{(-\infty, -1) \cup (1, k]} [g(ye^z) - g(y)]\nu(dz). \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

We first prove that for any fixed $k \geq 2$, process $(Y_t^{(k)})_{t \geq 0}$ does not explode. Without loss of generality we assume $A > 1$.

For $n \geq 9$, let $g_n \in C^2((0, \infty))$ be a non-decreasing function with $g_n(y) = \ln \ln(n^2 y)$ for $y \geq 1/(ne)$ and $g_n(y) = 0$ for $y \leq 1/(2ne)$. Then for any $y \geq 1/n$,

$$g'_n(y) = (\ln n^2 y)^{-1} y^{-1} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad g''_n(y) = -(\ln n^2 y)^{-2} y^{-2} - (\ln n^2 y)^{-1} y^{-2} < 0.$$

It follows that

$$\int_0^1 [g_n(y+z) - g_n(y) - z g'_n(y)] \mu(dz) \leq 0 \quad (3.12)$$

and

$$\int_1^A [g_n(y+z) - g_n(y)] \mu(dz) \leq y^{-1} (\ln n^2 y)^{-1} \int_1^A z \mu(dz) \quad (3.13)$$

for $y \geq 1/n$. By the assumption on μ we have

$$\int_A^\infty [g_n(y+z) - g_n(y)] \mu(dz) \leq \bar{a} \int_A^\infty [g_n(y+z) - g_n(y)] z^{-1-\alpha} dz. \quad (3.14)$$

If $\alpha \geq 1$, by integration by parts and L'Hôpital's rule we get for $y \geq 1/n$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_A^\infty [g_n(y+z) - g_n(y)] z^{-1-\alpha} dz \\ & \leq \int_A^\infty [g_n(y+z) - g_n(y)] z^{-2} dz \\ & = A^{-1} [\ln \ln n^2(y+A) - \ln \ln n^2 y] + \int_A^\infty \frac{1}{z(y+z) \ln n^2(y+z)} dz \\ & \leq (y \ln n^2 y)^{-1} + (\ln n^2 y)^{-1} \int_A^\infty \frac{1}{z(y+z)} dz \\ & = y^{-1} (\ln n^2 y)^{-1} [1 + \ln(1 + y/A)]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

From (3.12)-(3.15) we get

$$\begin{aligned} & y \int_0^1 [g_n(y+z) - g_n(y) - z g'_n(y)] \mu(dz) + y \int_1^\infty [g_n(y+z) - g_n(y)] \mu(dz) \\ & \leq y \int_1^A [g_n(y+z) - g_n(y)] \mu(dz) + y \int_A^\infty [g_n(y+z) - g_n(y)] \mu(dz) \\ & \leq (\ln n^2 y)^{-1} \left[\int_1^A z \mu(dz) + \bar{a} (1 + \ln(1 + y/A)) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

On the other hand, since $g''_n(y) \leq 0$ for $y \geq 1/(ne)$,

$$\int_{[-1,1]} [g_n(ye^z) - g_n(y) - y(e^z - 1)g'_n(y)] \nu(dz) \leq 0 \quad (3.17)$$

for $y \geq 1/n$. Set

$$\gamma_n(y, z) := \ln(\ln n^2 y + z) - \ln(\ln n^2 y) = \ln\left(1 + \frac{z}{\ln n^2 y}\right).$$

Clearly, $y \mapsto \gamma_n(y, z)$ is strictly decreasing and $\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_n(y, z) = 0$ for all $z > 0$. Then we can use the monotone convergence to conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{(-\infty, -1) \cup (1, k]} [g_n(ye^z) - g_n(y)] \nu(dz) \\
& \leq \int_1^k [\ln(\ln n^2 y + z) - \ln(\ln n^2 y)] \nu(dz) \\
& = \int_1^k \gamma_n(y, z) \nu(dz) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } y \rightarrow \infty.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

For all $y \geq 1/n$, by (3.11) and (3.16)-(3.18) and using $b_0 \geq 0$ and $g'' < 0$ we see that, if condition (i) holds, then

$$\begin{aligned}
L_k g_n(y) & \leq (\beta y + b_1 y) (\ln n^2 y)^{-1} y^{-1} + (\ln n^2 y)^{-1} \left[\int_1^A z \mu(dz) + \bar{a}(1 + \ln(1 + y/A)) \right] \\
& \quad + \int_{(-\infty, -1) \cup (1, k]} [g_n(ye^z) - g_n(y)] \nu(dz) \\
& \leq (\ln n^2 y)^{-1} \left[\beta + b_1 + \int_1^A z \mu(dz) + \bar{a}(1 + \ln(1 + y/A)) \right] + \int_1^k \gamma_n(y, z) \nu(dz) \\
& =: G_{n,k}(y).
\end{aligned}$$

Clearly, for any $n \geq 9$, $G_{n,k}(y)$ converges to some constant as $y \rightarrow \infty$ and then $G_{n,k}(y)$ is bounded on $[1/n, \infty)$. Since $g_n(y) \geq 1$ on $[1/n, \infty)$, then for all $n \geq 9$ there exists a constant d_n such that $L_k g_n(y) \leq d_n g_n(y)$. By Proposition 2.1 we have $(Y_t^{(k)})_{t \geq 0}$ does not explode for all $k \geq 2$.

We now focus on the case that $\alpha < 1$. Write $a = \ln n^2 y$ and $b = \ln n^2(y + z)$. We clearly have $0 < a < b$ for $y \geq 1/n$ and then $\ln b - \ln a \leq a^{-1}(b - a)$ by the concaveness of the logarithm. Thus,

$$g_n(y + z) - g_n(y) \leq (\ln n^2 y)^{-1} [\ln(y + z) - \ln y], \quad y \geq 1/n.$$

This combined with (3.2) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_A^\infty [g_n(y + z) - g_n(y)] z^{-1-\alpha} dz & \leq (\ln n^2 y)^{-1} \int_0^\infty [\ln(y + z) - \ln y] z^{-1-\alpha} dz \\
& = (\ln n^2 y)^{-1} c_{\alpha,0} y^{-\alpha}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

By (3.12)-(3.14) and (3.19) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& y \int_0^1 [g_n(y + z) - g_n(y) - z g'_n(y)] \mu(dz) + y \int_1^\infty [g_n(y + z) - g_n(y)] \mu(dz) \\
& \leq (\ln n^2 y)^{-1} \left[\int_1^A z \mu(dz) + \bar{a} c_{\alpha,0} y^{1-\alpha} \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

For all $y \geq 1/n$, one can use (3.11), (3.17), (3.18) and (3.20) to see that

$$L_k g_n(y) \leq [\beta y + b_1 y - b_0(y)] (\ln n^2 y)^{-1} y^{-1} + (\ln n^2 y)^{-1} \left[\int_1^A z \mu(dz) + \bar{a} c_{\alpha,0} y^{1-\alpha} \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int_{(-\infty, -1) \cup (1, k]} [g_n(ye^z) - g_n(y)] \nu(dz) \\
& \leq (\ln n^2 y)^{-1} \left[\beta + b_1 - b_0(y)y^{-1} + \bar{a}c_{\alpha,0}y^{1-\alpha} + \int_1^A z\mu(dz) \right] + \int_1^k \gamma_n(y, z)\nu(dz) \\
& =: \bar{G}_{n,k}(y).
\end{aligned}$$

Under the assumption $b_0(y) \geq b_0 y^{q_0}$ for all $y \geq A$, if either condition (ii) or condition (iii) holds, it is not hard to show that for all $k \geq 2$, $y \mapsto \bar{G}_{n,k}(y)$ is bounded above on $[1/n, \infty)$, and hence $(Y_t^{(k)})_{t \geq 0}$ does not explode by Proposition 2.1.

Now, let $(Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be the unique strong solution of (2.3). We proceed to show that $(Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ does not explode. Clearly, equation (2.3) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_t &= Y_0 + \int_0^t (\beta Y_s + b_1 Y_s - b_0(Y_s)) ds + \int_0^t \sqrt{2b_2^2 Y_s} dB^{(b)}(s) + \int_0^t \sigma Y_s dB^{(e)}(s) \\
&+ \int_0^t \int_0^1 \int_0^{Y_{s-}} z \tilde{N}^{(b)}(ds, dz, du) + \int_0^t \int_1^\infty \int_0^{Y_{s-}} z N^{(b)}(ds, dz, du) \\
&+ \int_0^t \int_{[-1,1]} Y_{s-} (e^z - 1) \tilde{N}^{(e)}(ds, dz) + \int_0^t \int_{[-1,1]^c} Y_{s-} (e^z - 1) N^{(e)}(ds, dz).
\end{aligned}$$

Define

$$Z(t) := \int_0^t \int_1^\infty z N^{(e)}(ds, dz)$$

and

$$\sigma_k := \inf\{t \geq 0 : Z(t) - Z(t-) \geq k\}.$$

Then $\{\sigma_k\}_{k \geq 2}$ is non-decreasing and $\sigma_k \rightarrow \infty$ a.s. as $k \rightarrow \infty$. On the other hand, by the definition of σ_k , it is easy to see that $(Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ satisfies (3.10) on the interval $[0, \sigma_k)$ for all $k \geq 2$. Then the uniqueness of the solution of (3.10) implies $Y_t = Y_t^{(k)}$ for $t < \sigma_k$. Since $(Y_t^{(k)})_{t \geq 0}$ does not explode for all $k \geq 2$, $\mathbb{P}_{y_0}\{\tau_\infty \geq \sigma_k\} = 1$ for all $k \geq 2$, letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ we have $\mathbb{P}_{y_0}\{\tau_\infty = \infty\} = 1$. That gives the desired result. \square

Remark 3.5 *It follows from Theorems 3.3 and 3.4 that the Lévy environment does not seem to be essential for the explosion to happen or not. Intuitively, this is due to the fact that, in contrast to the jumps corresponding to the branching mechanism in SDE (2.3), the jumps in the last terms of (2.3) arrive at the same rate as the Lévy process for the environment and do not speed up when the process Y takes large values.*

In the following corollaries, we consider the special case that

$$\mu(dz) = \bar{a}z^{-1-\alpha} dz \quad \text{for constants } \bar{a} > 0, \alpha \in (0, 2) \quad \text{and for all } z > 0. \quad (3.21)$$

Combining Theorems 3.3 and 3.4 we immediately have the following corollaries:

Corollary 3.6 *Suppose that (3.21) holds for $\alpha \geq 1$. Then $\mathbb{P}_{y_0}\{\tau_\infty < \infty\} = 0$ for all $y_0 > 0$.*

Remark 3.7 *Note that the process with $\alpha = 1$ corresponds to Neveu's CBLE with competition whose Lévy measure μ for the branching mechanism does not satisfy the finite moment condition, and the above nonexplosion result is not covered in [4] for the CSLE (without competition).*

Corollary 3.8 *Suppose that (3.21) holds for $\alpha < 1$ and there exist constants $q_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b_0, A \geq 0$ such that $b_0(y) = b_0 y^{q_0}$ for $y \geq A$. Then $\mathbb{P}_{y_0}\{\tau_\infty < \infty\} > 0$ for large enough $y_0 > 0$ if and only if one of the following conditions holds:*

- (i) $b_0 = 0$;
- (ii) $q_0 < 2 - \alpha$ and $b_0 > 0$;
- (iii) $q_0 = 2 - \alpha$ and $0 < b_0 < \bar{a}c_{\alpha,0}$.

Remark 3.9 *Comparing with the integral test in Theorem 1.2 of [15], in which they only considered the special branching mechanism and Brownian environment and the logistic competition, that is, $b_0(y) = cy^2$ for some $c \geq 0$, the model we consider is more general and our results agree with that in [15]. For example, in the case that $\mu(dz)$ is α -stable with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $b_0(y) = cy^2$, we can immediately conclude from Corollary 3.8 that the process does not explode if $c > 0$ and the process explodes if $c = 0$, which recovers results for this case by the integral test in [15].*

Acknowledgements

Rugang Ma thanks Concordia University where this work was completed during his visit. Xiaowen Zhou thanks Clement Foucart for helpful comments and discussions.

References

- [1] Ba, M. and Pardoux, E. (2015): Branching processes with interaction and a generalized Ray-Knight theorem. *Annales de l'I.H.P. Probabilités et statistiques* **51**, 1290-1313.
- [2] Bansaye, V., Pardo, J.C. and Smadi, C. (2013): On the extinction of continuous state branching processes with catastrophes. *Electron. J. Probab.* **18**(106), 1-31.
- [3] Bansaye, V., Caballero M.-E. and Méléard S. (2019): Scaling limits of population and evolution processes in random environment. *Electron. J. Probab.* **24**(19), 1-38.
- [4] Bansaye, V., Pardo J.C. and Smadi, C. (2021): Extinction rate of continuous state branching processes in critical Lévy environments. *ESAIM: PS* **25**, 346-375.
- [5] Berestycki, J., Fittipaldi, M.C. and Fontbona, J. (2018): Ray-Knight representation of flows of branching processes with competition by pruning of Lévy trees, *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **172**, 725-788.

- [6] Böinghoff, C. and Hutzenthaler, M. (2012): Branching diffusions in random environment. *Markov Process. Relat. Fields* **18**, 269-310
- [7] Chen, M.-F. (2004): *From Markov Chains to Non-equilibrium Particle Systems*, 2nd ed. World Scientific, River Edge, NJ.
- [8] Grey, D.R. (1974): Asymptotic behavior of continuous time, continuous state-space branching processes. *J. Appl. Probab.* **11**, 669-677.
- [9] Foucart, C. (2019): Continuous-state branching processes with competition: duality and reflection at infinity. *Electron. J. Probab.* **24**, 33-38.
- [10] He, H., Li, Z.-H. and Xu, W. (2018): Continuous-state branching processes in Lévy random environments. *J. Theor. Probab.* **31**, 1-23.
- [11] Kyprianou, A.E. (2014). *Fluctuations of Lévy Processes with Applications*. Springer, Berlin.
- [12] Kurtz, T.G. (1978): Diffusion a approximations for branching processes, in *Branching Processes, Adv. Probab. Related Topics 5*, A. Joffe and P. Ney, eds., Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, pp. 445-450.
- [13] Lambert, A. (2005): The branching process with logistic growth. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **15**, 1506-1535.
- [14] Leman, H. and Pardo, J.C. (2021): Extinction and coming down from infinity of cb-processes with competition in a lévy environment. *J. Appl. Probab.* **25**, 128-139.
- [15] Leman, H. and Pardo, J.C. (2021): Extinction time of logistic branching processes in a Brownian environment. *ALEA, Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat.* **18**, 1859-1890.
- [16] Li, P.-S., Yang, X. and Zhou, X. (2019): A general continuous-state nonlinear branching process. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **29**, 2523-2555.
- [17] Li, P.-S., Li, Z.-H., Wang, J. and Zhou, X. (2022): Exponential ergodicity of branching processes with immigration and competition. arXiv: 2205.15499.
- [18] Li, Z.-H. (2011): *Measure-valued Branching Markov Processes*. Springer, Berlin.
- [19] Ma, R.(2015): Lamperti transformation for continuous-state branching processes with competition and applications. *Stat. Probab. Lett.* **107**, 11-17.
- [20] Ma, S., Yang, X. and Zhou, X. (2021): Boundary behaviors for a class of continuous-state nonlinear branching processes in critical cases. *Electron. Comm. Probab.* **26**(6), 1-10.
- [21] Meyn, S.P. and Tweedie, R.L. (1993): Stability of Markovian processes. III. Foster-Lyapunov criteria for continuous-time processes. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.* **25**, 518-548.
- [22] Palau, S. and Pardo, J.C.(2018): Branching processes in a lévy random environment. *Acta Appl. Math.* **153**(1), 55-79.
- [23] Ren, Y., Xiong, J., Yang, X. and Zhou, X. (2022): On the extinction-extinguishing dichotomy for a stochastic Lotka-Volterra type population dynamical system. *Stoch. Process. Appl.* **150**, 50-90.

- [24] Smith, W.L. (1968): Necessary conditions for almost sure extinction of a branching process with random environment. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **39**, 2136-2140.
- [25] Smith, W.L. and Wilkinson, W.E. (1969): On branching processes in random environments. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **40**, 814-827.