

Long-time behaviour of supercritical finite circular mechanism branching processes

Junping Li^{1,*}, *Guangdong University of Science & Technology; Central South University*

Mixuan Hou², *Central South University*

Abstract

Let $\{Z_n^{a*b} : n \geq 0\}$ be a discrete-time branching process with circular mechanism $a * b$. For mechanism a , the offspring distribution is $\{a_j : j \geq 0\}$. For mechanism b , the offspring distribution is $\{b_j : j \geq 0\}$. Let $m_a = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} ja_j$ and $m_b = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} jb_j$. The extinction property of such branching processes is first studied. It is proved that $W_n = Z_n^{a*b} / \Gamma_n$ ($\Gamma_n = (m_a m_b)^k$ for $n = 2k$ and $\Gamma_n = (m_a m_b)^k m_a$ for $n = 2k + 1$) is an integrable martingale and hence converges to some random variable W . Then, under assumption that $a_0 = b_0 = 0, a_1, b_1 > 0$ and $a_j, b_j \neq 1$ for any $j \geq 1$, we study the rates of convergence to zero as $k \rightarrow \infty$ of

$$P(|\frac{Z_{2k+1}^{a*b}}{Z_{2k}^{a*b}} - m_a| > \varepsilon), \quad P(|\frac{Z_{2k}^{a*b}}{Z_{2k-1}^{a*b}} - m_b| > \varepsilon),$$

$$P(|W_k - W| > \varepsilon),$$

$$P(|\frac{Z_{2k+1}^{a*b}}{Z_{2k}^{a*b}} - m_a| > \varepsilon \mid W \geq \delta), \quad P(|\frac{Z_{2k}^{a*b}}{Z_{2k-1}^{a*b}} - m_b| > \varepsilon \mid W \geq \delta)$$

for $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ under various moment conditions on $\{a_j\}$ and $\{b_j\}$. It is shown that the rates for the first two are geometric while the last three rates are always supergeometric under a finite moment generating function hypothesis.

Keywords: Branching processes with circular mechanism; Extinction; Large deviation; Geometric; Supergeometric.

AMS 2000 SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION: PRIMARY 60J27
SECONDARY 60J35

1. Introduction

The Markov branching processes (MBPs) play an important role in the classical field of stochastic processes. The basic property of MBP is the branching property, i.e., different individuals act independently when giving birth or death and the system stops when there is no particle in it. The general discussions of Markov branching processes can be found in Asmussen & Jagers [2], Asmussen & Hering [3], Athreya & Ney [5], Harris [10]. Furthermore, some generalized branching systems are studied. For example, Yamazato [20] investigated a branching process with immigration which only

¹ Corresponding author. Postal address: Guangdong University of Science & Technology, Dongguan, 523083, China; Central South University, Changsha, 410083, China. E-mail: jpli@mail.csu.edu.cn

² Postal address: School of Mathematics and Statistics, Central South University, Changsha, 410083, China. E-mail address: 270576372@qq.com

occurs at state zero. Chen [7] and Chen, Li & Ramesh [8] considered general branching processes with or without resurrection. Li & Chen [11] and Li, Chen & Pakes [12] considered branching processes with state-independent immigration. Li & Liu [14] considered branching process with migration and immigration. Sevast'yanov [18] and Vatutin [19] considered the interacting branching processes. Chen, Li & Ramesh [8] and Chen, Pollett, Zhang & Li [9] considered weighted Markov branching process.

It is well-known that the evolution of a branching system is controlled by its branching mechanism. However, in realistic situations, the branching mechanism at different time may be different. Therefore, the evolution behavior of the system will be controlled by all the branching mechanisms involved.

In order to clearly describe the model considered in this paper, we first give the following definitions.

Let (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) be a probability space and denote

$$\mathcal{P} = \{\mathbf{a} = \{a_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty} : a_k \geq 0, \forall k \geq 0 \text{ and } \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k = 1\}, \quad (1.1)$$

i.e., \mathcal{P} is the set of all probability distributions on \mathbf{Z}_+ . Obviously, \mathcal{P} is a Borel subset of Banach space l_{∞} . An element $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{P}$ is also called a branching mechanism in a branching model, which is the offspring distribution of the particles in the system. For any $\mathbf{a} = \{a_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty} \in \mathcal{P}$, define

$$f(\mathbf{a}; s) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k s^k, \quad |s| \leq 1.$$

Denote $m_{\mathbf{a}} = f'(\mathbf{a}; 1) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k a_k$ and $\rho_{\mathbf{a}}$ the smallest nonnegative root of $f(\mathbf{a}; s) = s$.

Let $\{\xi_n : n \geq 0\}$ be sequence of measurable mappings from (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) to $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{B})$, where \mathcal{B} is the Borel σ -algebra generated by the subspace product topology. Obviously, $\xi = \{\xi_n : n \geq 0\}$ can be regarded as the environmental process.

Definition 1.1. (i) A \mathbf{Z}_+ -valued process $\{Z_n : n \geq 0\}$ is called a branching process in random environment ξ , if it satisfies

$$E[s^{Z_{n+1}} | \mathcal{F}_n(\xi)] = [f(\xi_n; s)]^{Z_n}, \quad |s| \leq 1, \quad n \geq 0$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}_n(\xi) = \sigma(Z_k, \xi_i : 0 \leq k \leq n, i \geq 0)$$

(ii) If $\xi = \{\xi_n : n \geq 0\}$ is Markovian, then $\{(Z_n, \xi_n) : n \geq 0\}$ is a Markovian process. $\{Z_n : n \geq 0\}$ is called a branching process in Markovian environment ξ .

Definition 1.2. Let $\{Z_n : n \geq 0\}$ be a branching process in random environment ξ , where $\xi = \{\xi_n : n \geq 0\}$. If for any $n \geq 0$, there exist $\mathbf{a}^{(n)} \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\xi_n = \mathbf{a}^{(n)}$, then $\{Z_n : n \geq 0\}$ is called a branching process in deterministic environment $\{\mathbf{a}^{(n)}\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$. In particular, if there further exists m such that $\mathbf{a}^{(n)} = \mathbf{a}^{(k)}$ if $n = k \bmod(m+1)$, then $\{Z_n : n \geq 0\}$ is called a branching process with circular branching mechanism, or is simply called an $\mathbf{a}^{(0)} * \dots * \mathbf{a}^{(m)}$ -Galton-Watson process in the following.

In this paper, we mainly consider the long-time behaviour of $\mathbf{a}^{(0)} * \dots * \mathbf{a}^{(m)}$ -Galton-Watson processes. For the sake of convenience, we only consider the case of $\mathbf{a} * \mathbf{b}$ -Galton-Watson processes, where $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{P}$. The general case can be similarly discussed.

Let $\{Z_n^{\mathbf{a} * \mathbf{b}} : n \geq 0\}$ be an $\mathbf{a} * \mathbf{b}$ -Galton-Watson process. Obviously, $\{Z_n^{\mathbf{a} * \mathbf{a}} : n \geq 0\}$ is just the Galton-Watson process with single branching mechanism \mathbf{a} . In the following, $\{Z_n^{\mathbf{a} * \mathbf{a}} : n \geq 0\}$ is rewritten as $\{Z_n^{\mathbf{a}} : n \geq 0\}$ and $\{Z_n^{\mathbf{b} * \mathbf{b}} : n \geq 0\}$ is rewritten as $\{Z_n^{\mathbf{b}} : n \geq 0\}$. The main aim of this paper is to discuss the extinction property of $\mathbf{a} * \mathbf{b}$ -Galton-Watson processes and the convergence rates of

$$P(|\frac{Z_{2k}^{\mathbf{a} * \mathbf{b}}}{Z_{2k-1}^{\mathbf{a} * \mathbf{b}}} - m_b| \geq \varepsilon \mid Z_0^{\mathbf{a} * \mathbf{b}} = 1), P(|\frac{Z_{2k+1}^{\mathbf{a} * \mathbf{b}}}{Z_{2k}^{\mathbf{a} * \mathbf{b}}} - m_a| \geq \varepsilon \mid Z_0^{\mathbf{a} * \mathbf{b}} = 1) \quad (1.2)$$

and

$$P(|W_k - W| \geq \varepsilon \mid Z_0^{\mathbf{a} * \mathbf{b}} = 1) \quad (1.3)$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$, where $W_k = Z_k^{\mathbf{a} * \mathbf{b}} / \Gamma_k$.

Athreya [4] considered the above large deviation rates for supercritical Galton-Watson branching processes. Based on Athreya [4], Liu & Zhang [17], Li & Li [15] considered the last decay rates large deviation results for Galton-Watson process with immigration and show that the last decay rates are supergeometric. Li, Cheng & Li [13] considered the above three decay rates for single-type continuous time branching processes.

2. Extinction property of $\mathbf{a} * \mathbf{b}$ -Galton-Watson processes

In this section, we discuss the basic property and the extinction behaviour of $\mathbf{a} * \mathbf{b}$ -Galton-Watson processes. We first give some preliminaries.

The following lemma 2.1 is due to Athreya and Ney [5] and the proof is omitted.

Lemma 2.1. *For any $\mathbf{a} = \{a_k\}_{k=0}^\infty \in \mathcal{P}$, $f(\mathbf{a}; s)$ is a convex increasing function on $[0, 1]$. If $m_a \leq 1$ then $f(\mathbf{a}; s) > s$ for all $s \in [0, 1)$ and $f(\mathbf{a}; s) = s$ has exactly one root 1 on $[0, 1]$. Furthermore, if $m_a < 1$ then 1 is a simple root while if $m_a = 1$, then 1 is a root of multiplicity 2. If $m_a > 1$, then $f(\mathbf{a}; s) = s$ has exactly two roots ρ_a and 1 on $[0, 1]$ with $0 \leq \rho_a < 1$ such that $f(\mathbf{a}; s) > s$ for $s \in [0, \rho_a)$ and $f(\mathbf{a}; s) < s$ for $s \in (\rho_a, 1)$. Both ρ_a and 1 are simple.*

For $\mathbf{a} = \{a_k\}_{k=0}^\infty, \mathbf{b} = \{b_k\}_{k=0}^\infty \in \mathcal{P}$, let $\rho_a, \rho_b, \rho_{ab}$ and ρ_{ba} denote the smallest nonnegative roots of $f(\mathbf{a}; s) = s, f(\mathbf{b}; s) = s, f(\mathbf{a}; f(\mathbf{b}; s)) = s$ and $f(\mathbf{b}; f(\mathbf{a}; s)) = s$, respectively.

Lemma 2.2. (i) $\rho_{ab} = f(\mathbf{a}; \rho_{ba})$ and $\rho_{ba} = f(\mathbf{b}; \rho_{ab})$.

(ii) If $m_a \cdot m_b \leq 1$, then $\rho_{ab} = \rho_{ba} = 1$.

(iii) If $m_a \cdot m_b > 1$ and $\rho_a = \rho_b$, then

$$\rho_{ab} = \rho_{ba} = \rho_a.$$

(iv) If $m_a \cdot m_b > 1$ and $\rho_a < \rho_b$, then

$$\rho_a < \rho_{ab} < \rho_{ba} < \rho_b.$$

Proof. Define

$$\alpha(s) = f(\mathbf{a}; f(\mathbf{b}; s)), \quad \beta(s) = f(\mathbf{b}; f(\mathbf{a}; s))$$

and $\alpha_1(s) = \alpha(s)$, $\alpha_n(s) = \alpha(\alpha_{n-1}(s))$, $n \geq 2$ and $\beta_1(s) = \beta(s)$, $\beta_n(s) = \beta(\beta_{n-1}(s))$, $n \geq 2$. Then

$$\rho_{ab} = \alpha_n(\rho_{ab}) = f(\mathbf{a}; f(\mathbf{b}; \alpha_{n-1}(\rho_{ab}))) = f(\mathbf{a}; \beta_{n-1}(f(\mathbf{b}; \rho_{ab}))).$$

Noting that $\beta_{n-1}(f(\mathbf{b}; \rho_{ab})) \rightarrow \rho_{ba}$ yields $\rho_{ab} = f(\mathbf{a}; \rho_{ba})$. Similarly, $\rho_{ba} = f(\mathbf{b}; \rho_{ab})$. (i) is proved. (ii) follows from $\alpha'(1) = \beta'(1) = m_a \cdot m_b \leq 1$.

If $m_a \cdot m_b > 1$, then $\alpha'(1) = \beta'(1) = m_a \cdot m_b > 1$ and hence $\rho_{ab}, \rho_{ba} < 1$. If further $\rho_a = \rho_b$, then $\rho_a = \rho_b < 1$ and

$$\alpha(\rho_a) = f(\mathbf{a}; f(\mathbf{b}; \rho_b)) = f(\mathbf{a}; \rho_b) = f(\mathbf{a}; \rho_a) = \rho_a.$$

Similarly, $\beta(\rho_a) = \rho_a$. Hence, $\rho_{ab} = \rho_{ba} = \rho_a$. (iii) is proved.

Now, we prove (iv). it is obvious that $\rho_{ab}, \rho_{ba} < 1$ since $m_a \cdot m_b > 1$. If $\rho_a < \rho_b < 1$, by the property of $f(\mathbf{a}; s)$ and $f(\mathbf{b}; s)$,

$$\alpha(\rho_a) = f(\mathbf{a}; f(\mathbf{b}; \rho_a)) > f(\mathbf{a}; \rho_a) = \rho_a$$

and

$$\alpha(\rho_b) = f(\mathbf{a}; f(\mathbf{b}; \rho_b)) = f(\mathbf{a}; \rho_b) < \rho_b.$$

Hence, $\rho_a < \rho_{ab} < \rho_b$.

If $\rho_a < \rho_b = 1$, by the property of $f(\mathbf{a}; s)$ and $f(\mathbf{b}; s)$,

$$\alpha(\rho_a) = f(\mathbf{a}; f(\mathbf{b}; \rho_a)) > f(\mathbf{a}; \rho_a) = \rho_a$$

and hence, $\rho_a < \rho_{ab} < \rho_b = 1$. The proof is complete. \square \square

Let $\{Z_n^{a*b} : n \geq 0\}$ be a $\mathbf{a}^* \mathbf{b}$ -Galton-Watson process with $Z_0^{a*b} = 1$, where $\mathbf{a} = \{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty, \mathbf{b} = \{b_n\}_{n=0}^\infty \in \mathcal{P}$. It is easy to see that Z_n^{a*b} can be rewritten as

$$\begin{cases} Z_{2k+1}^{a*b} = \sum_{i=1}^{Z_{2k}^{a*b}} X_{2k,i}^{(a)}, & k \geq 0, \\ Z_{2k+2}^{a*b} = \sum_{i=1}^{Z_{2k+1}^{a*b}} X_{2k+1,i}^{(b)}, & k \geq 0, \end{cases}$$

where $\{X_{2k,i}^{(a)} : k \geq 0, i \geq 1\}$ and $\{X_{2k+1,i}^{(b)} : k \geq 0, i \geq 1\}$ are independent identically distributed random variable sequences with probability distribution $P(X_{2k,1}^{(a)} = j) = a_j$ and $P(X_{2k+1,1}^{(b)} = j) = b_j$ respectively. Moreover, $\{X_{2k,i}^{(a)} : k \geq 0, i \geq 1\}$ is independent with $\{X_{2k+1,i}^{(b)} : k \geq 0, i \geq 1\}$.

Define

$$\begin{cases} f_0(\mathbf{ab}; s) = s, \\ f_{2n+1}(\mathbf{ab}; s) = f_{2n}(\mathbf{ab}; f(\mathbf{a}; s)), & n \geq 0, \\ f_{2n+2}(\mathbf{ab}; s) = f_{2n+1}(\mathbf{ab}; f(\mathbf{b}; s)), & n \geq 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

Theorem 2.1. Let $\{Z_n^{a*b} : n \geq 0\}$ be an $a*b$ -Galton-Watson process. Then

(i) The probability generating function of Z_n^{a*b} is given by

$$E[s^{Z_n^{a*b}}] = f_n(\mathbf{ab}; s). \quad (2.2)$$

(ii) The mean and variance of Z_n^{a*b} are given by

$$E[Z_n^{a*b}] = \begin{cases} m^k, & \text{if } n = 2k, \\ m^k m_a, & \text{if } n = 2k + 1 \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

and

$$\text{Var}(Z_n^{a*b}) = \begin{cases} \frac{\sigma^2 m^{k-1} (m^k - 1) m_a^2}{(m-1)} + \sigma_a^2 m^k, & n = 2k + 1 \\ \frac{\sigma^2 m^{k-1} (m^k - 1)}{(m-1)}, & n = 2k \\ \sigma_a^2, & n = 1 \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

where $\sigma_a^2 = \text{Var}(Z_1^a)$, $\sigma_b^2 = \text{Var}(Z_1^b)$, $m = m_a m_b$ and $\sigma^2 = \sigma_a^2 m_b^2 + \sigma_b^2 m_a$.

Proof. We first prove (i). If $n = 1$, then

$$E[s^{Z_1^{a*b}}] = E[s^{X_{0,1}^{(a)}}] = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k s^k = f(\mathbf{a}; s) = f_1(\mathbf{ab}; s).$$

If $n = 2$, then

$$E[s^{Z_2^{a*b}}] = E[s^{\sum_{i=1}^{Z_1^{a*b}} X_{1,i}^{(b)}}] = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} P(Z_1^{a*b} = j) \cdot E[s^{\sum_{i=1}^j X_{1,i}^{(b)}}] = f(\mathbf{a}; f(\mathbf{b}; s)) = f_2(\mathbf{ab}; s).$$

Suppose (2.2) holds true for n . Then, if $n = 2k$, we have

$$E[s^{Z_{2k+1}^{a*b}}] = E[s^{\sum_{i=1}^{Z_{2k}^{a*b}} X_{2k,i}^{(a)}}] = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} P(Z_{2k}^{a*b} = j) \cdot (E[s^{X_{2k,1}^{(a)}}])^j = f_{2k}(\mathbf{ab}; f(\mathbf{a}; s)) = f_{2k+1}(\mathbf{ab}; s).$$

Similarly, if $n = 2k + 1$, then $E[s^{Z_{2k+2}^{a*b}}] = f_{2k+2}(\mathbf{ab}; s)$. Therefore, (i) is proved.

Now we prove (ii). By (2.1),

$$E[Z_{2k+1}^{a*b}] = f'_{2k}(\mathbf{ab}; 1) \cdot f'(\mathbf{a}; 1) = m_a \cdot f'_{2k}(\mathbf{ab}; 1), \quad k \geq 0,$$

$$E[Z_{2k+2}^{a*b}] = f'_{2k+1}(\mathbf{ab}; 1) \cdot f'(\mathbf{b}; 1) = m_b \cdot f'_{2k+1}(\mathbf{ab}; 1), \quad k \geq 0,$$

which implies (2.3) since $E[Z_0^{a*b}] = 1$ and $E[Z_1^{a*b}] = m_a$. On the other hand,

$$\frac{d^2 f_{2k+1}(\mathbf{ab}; s)}{ds^2} = f''_{2k}(\mathbf{ab}; f(\mathbf{a}; s)) \cdot (f'(\mathbf{a}; s))^2 + f'_{2k}(\mathbf{ab}; f(\mathbf{a}; s)) \cdot f''(\mathbf{a}; s), \quad k \geq 0.$$

Denote $V_n = E[Z_n^{a*b}(Z_n^{a*b} - 1)]$. Then

$$V_{2k+1} = V_{2k} \cdot m_a^2 + m^k \cdot (\sigma_a^2 - m_a + m_a^2), \quad k \geq 0.$$

Similarly,

$$V_{2k+2} = V_{2k+1} \cdot m_b^2 + m^k m_a \cdot (\sigma_b^2 - m_b + m_b^2), \quad k \geq 0.$$

By the above two equalities,

$$\begin{aligned} V_{2k+2} &= m^2 \cdot V_{2k} + m^k m_b^2 \cdot (\sigma_a^2 - m_a + m_a^2) + m^k m_a \cdot (\sigma_b^2 - m_b + m_b^2) \\ &= m^2 \cdot V_{2k} + m^k (m_b^2 \sigma_a^2 - m m_b + m^2 + m_a \sigma_b^2 - m + m m_b) \\ &= m^2 \cdot V_{2k} + m^k (\sigma^2 + m^2 - m), \quad k \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$V_{2k} = \frac{m^{k-1}(m^k - 1)\sigma^2}{m - 1} + m^{2k} - m^k, \quad k \geq 0$$

and

$$V_{2k+1} = \frac{m^{k-1}(m^k - 1)m_a^2\sigma^2}{m - 1} + m^{2k}m_a^2 - m^k m_a + m^k \sigma_a^2, \quad k \geq 0.$$

Hence,

$$\text{Var}(Z_{2k}^{a*b}) = V_{2k} + m^k - m^{2k} = \frac{m^{k-1}(m^k - 1)\sigma^2}{m - 1}, \quad k \geq 0$$

and

$$\text{Var}(Z_{2k+1}^{a*b}) = V_{2k+1} + m^k m_a - m^{2k} m_a^2 = \frac{m^{k-1}(m^k - 1)m_a^2\sigma^2}{m - 1} + m^k \sigma_a^2, \quad k \geq 0.$$

The proof is complete. \square

\square

Define

$$Y_n = Z_{2n}^{a*b}, \quad n \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad H_n = Z_{2n}^{b*a}, \quad n \geq 0.$$

It is easy to see that $\{Y_n : n \geq 0\}$ and $\{H_n : n \geq 0\}$ are Galton-Watson processes with offspring generating functions $\alpha(s) = f(\mathbf{a}; f(\mathbf{b}; s))$ and $\beta(s) = f(\mathbf{b}; f(\mathbf{a}; s))$, respectively. The probability generating function $\alpha_n(s)$ of Y_n is given by

$$\alpha_0(s) = s, \quad \alpha_1(s) = \alpha(s), \quad \alpha_{n+1}(s) = \alpha(\alpha_n(s)), \quad n \geq 0.$$

The probability generating function $\beta_n(s)$ of H_n is given by

$$\beta_0(s) = s, \quad \beta_1(s) = \beta(s), \quad \beta_{n+1}(s) = \beta(\beta_n(s)), \quad n \geq 0.$$

The smallest nonnegative roots of $\alpha(s) = s$ and $\beta(s) = s$ are ρ_{ab} and ρ_{ba} .

The following lemma is due to Athreya and Ney [5] and the proof is omitted.

Lemma 2.3. Suppose that $a_0 + a_1 < 1, b_0 + b_1 < 1$.

- (i) $\alpha(s)$ and $\beta(s)$ are strictly convex and increasing on $[0, 1]$;
- (ii) $\alpha_n(s) \uparrow \rho_{ab}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for $s \in [0, \rho_{ab})$, while $\alpha_n(s) \downarrow \rho_{ab}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for $s \in (\rho_{ab}, 1)$; Similarly, $\beta_n(s) \uparrow \rho_{ba}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for $s \in [0, \rho_{ba})$, while $\beta_n(s) \downarrow \rho_{ba}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for $s \in (\rho_{ba}, 1)$.

Theorem 2.2. Let $\{Z_n^{a*b} : n \geq 0\}$ be an $a*b$ -Galton-Watson process. Then the extinction probability of $\{Z_n^{a*b} : n \geq 0\}$ with $Z_0^{a*b} = 1$ is ρ_{ab} , which is the smallest nonnegative root of $\alpha(s) = s$.

Proof. By Theorem 2.1, we only need to prove that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(\mathbf{ab}; s) = \rho_{ab}$ for all $s \in (0, 1)$. Without loss of generality, we assume $a_0, b_0 < 1$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(\mathbf{ab}; s) &= f(\mathbf{a}; s) \\ f_2(\mathbf{ab}; s) &= f(\mathbf{a}; f(\mathbf{b}; s)) = \alpha(s). \end{aligned}$$

Recursively,

$$\begin{aligned} f_{2n}(\mathbf{ab}; s) &= \alpha_n(s), \\ f_{2n+1}(\mathbf{ab}; s) &= \alpha_n(f(\mathbf{a}; s)). \end{aligned}$$

Since $f(\mathbf{a}; s) < 1$ for all $s \in [0, 1)$, by Lemma 2.3, we know that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_{2n}(\mathbf{ab}; s) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_{2n+1}(\mathbf{ab}; s) = \rho_{ab}.$$

Hence, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(\mathbf{ab}; s) = \rho_{ab}$ for all $s \in (0, 1)$. The proof is complete. □ □

3. Limit properties

In this section, we study the limit properties of Z_n^{a*b} . Since \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} are fixed, we omit the labels \mathbf{a} , \mathbf{b} to rewrite Z_n^{a*b} as Z_n in the following.

By Markov property, we have

$$E[Z_{n+1} \mid \sigma(Z_0, Z_1, \dots, Z_n)] = \begin{cases} m_a \cdot Z_{2k}, & n = 2k \\ m_b \cdot Z_{2k+1}, & n = 2k + 1. \end{cases}$$

Define

$$W_n = \frac{Z_n}{\Gamma_n},$$

where

$$\Gamma_n = \begin{cases} m^k, & \text{if } n = 2k \\ m^k m_a, & \text{if } n = 2k + 1. \end{cases}$$

It can be proved that W_n is an integrable martingale and hence converges to some random variable W .

Theorem 3.1. Suppose that $m_a, m_b > 1$, $\sigma_a^2, \sigma_b^2 < \infty$, and $Z_0 = 1$. Then

- (i) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E[(W_n - W)^2] = 0$;
- (ii) $E[W] = 1$, $\text{Var}(W) = \frac{\sigma^2}{m^2 - m}$;
- (iii) $P(W = 0) = \rho_{ab}$.

Proof. From (2.4),

$$E[W_n^2] = \frac{E[Z_n^2]}{\Gamma_n^2} = \begin{cases} \frac{\sigma^2(1-m^{-k})}{m^2-m} + \frac{\sigma_a^2}{m^k m_a^2} + 1, & n = 2k + 1 \\ \frac{\sigma^2(1-m^{-k})}{m^2-m} + 1, & n = 2k \end{cases}$$

and hence, $\sup_n E[W_n^2] = \lim_n E[W_n^2] = \frac{\sigma^2}{m^2-m} + 1 < \infty$. Now by standard martingale theory [6], (i) and (ii) follow.

If $r = P(W = 0)$ then $E[W] = 1$ implies $r < 1$. Furthermore,

$$r = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(W_n = 0) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(Z_n = 0) = \rho_{ab}.$$

The proof is complete. \square

By the proof of Theorem 2.2, we know that for any $s \in [0, 1)$, $f_n(\mathbf{ab}; s) \rightarrow \rho_{ab}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We shall now study the convergence rate. Define

$$Q_n(s) = \frac{f_n(\mathbf{ab}; s) - \rho_{ab}}{\gamma_n}, \quad (3.1)$$

where

$$\gamma_n = \begin{cases} [f'(\mathbf{a}; \rho_{ba}) \cdot f'(\mathbf{b}; \rho_{ab})]^k, & n = 2k, \\ [f'(\mathbf{a}; \rho_{ba}) \cdot f'(\mathbf{b}; \rho_{ab})]^k \cdot f'(\mathbf{a}, \rho_{ba}), & n = 2k + 1. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 3.2. Suppose that $m > 1$. Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Q'_{2k}(s) = Q'(s) \quad (3.2)$$

exists for $0 \leq s < 1$ and $Q'(s) > 0$ for all $s \in [0, 1)$. Furthermore, $\lim_{s \rightarrow \rho_{ab}} Q'(s) = 1$ and

$$\tilde{Q}'(s) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Q'_{2n+1}(s) = Q'(f(\mathbf{a}; s)) \cdot \frac{f'(\mathbf{a}; s)}{f'(\mathbf{a}; \rho_{ba})}. \quad (3.3)$$

Proof. Obviously,

$$Q'_n(s) = \frac{f'_n(\mathbf{ab}; s)}{\gamma_n} = \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha'_k(s)}{[f'(\mathbf{a}; \rho_{ba}) \cdot f'(\mathbf{b}; \rho_{ab})]^k}, & n = 2k, \\ \frac{\alpha'_k(f(\mathbf{a}; s))}{[f'(\mathbf{a}; \rho_{ba}) \cdot f'(\mathbf{b}; \rho_{ab})]^k} \cdot \frac{f'(\mathbf{a}; s)}{f'(\mathbf{a}; \rho_{ba})}, & n = 2k + 1. \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

Since $m = m_a m_b = f'(\mathbf{a}; 1) \cdot f'(\mathbf{b}; 1) = \alpha'(1) > 1$, by Theorem 1.11.1 of Arthreya [5], We know that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\alpha'_n(s)}{[f'(\mathbf{a}; \rho_{ba}) \cdot f'(\mathbf{b}; \rho_{ab})]^n} = Q'(s)$$

exists for all $s \in [0, 1)$ and $Q'(s) > 0$ for all $s \in [0, 1)$. Furthermore, $\lim_{s \rightarrow \rho_{ab}} Q'(s) = 1$. Hence, by (3.4),

$$\tilde{Q}'(s) > 0 \ (s \in [0, 1)) \text{ and } \lim_{s \rightarrow \rho_{ba}} \tilde{Q}'(s) = 1.$$

The proof is complete. \square

\square

Now define

$$Q(s) = \int_{\rho_{ab}}^s Q'(x) dx, \text{ for } 0 \leq s < 1,$$

$$\tilde{Q}(s) = \int_{\rho_{ba}}^s \tilde{Q}'(x) dx, \text{ for } 0 \leq s < 1.$$

Then we have

Corollary 3.1. *If $m > 1$. Then,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Q_{2n}(s) = Q(s).$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Q_{2n+1}(s) = \tilde{Q}(s).$$

Proof. By the bounded convergence theorem,

$$Q_{2n}(s) = Q_{2n}(s) - Q_{2n}(\rho_{ab}) = \int_{\rho_{ab}}^s Q'_{2n}(x) dx \rightarrow Q(s).$$

and

$$Q_{2n+1}(s) = Q_{2n+1}(s) - Q_{2n+1}(\rho_{ba}) = \int_{\rho_{ba}}^s Q'_{2n+1}(x) dx \rightarrow \tilde{Q}(s).$$

The proof is complete. \square

\square

Theorem 3.3. *$(Q(s), \tilde{Q}(s))$ is the unique solution of the functional equations*

$$\begin{cases} Q(f(\mathbf{a}; s)) = f'(\mathbf{a}; \rho_{ba}) \cdot \tilde{Q}(s), \\ \tilde{Q}(f(\mathbf{b}; s)) = f'(\mathbf{b}; \rho_{ab}) \cdot Q(s), \end{cases} \quad (3.5)$$

subject to

$$Q(\rho_{ab}) = 0, \tilde{Q}(\rho_{ba}) = 0 \text{ and } \lim_{s \rightarrow \rho_{ab}} Q'(s) = 1, \lim_{s \rightarrow \rho_{ba}} \tilde{Q}'(s) = 1. \quad (3.6)$$

Proof. Substituting $f(\mathbf{a}; s)$ or $f(\mathbf{b}; s)$ for s in the definition of $Q_n(s)$,

$$Q_{2k}(s) = \frac{f_{2k}(\mathbf{ab}; s) - \rho_{ab}}{\gamma_{2k}} = \frac{f_{2k-1}(\mathbf{ab}; f(\mathbf{b}; s)) - \rho_{ab}}{\gamma_{2k-1} \cdot f'(\mathbf{b}; \rho_{ab})} = \frac{Q_{2k-1}(f(\mathbf{b}; s))}{f'(\mathbf{b}; \rho_{ab})}.$$

Taking limits on both sides yields the second equality of (3.5). The first equality of (3.5) can be similarly proved.

As for the uniqueness, note that if $(Q(s), \tilde{Q}(s))$ and $(Q_0(s), \tilde{Q}_0(s))$ are two solutions of (3.5) subject to (3.6), then

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\tilde{Q}(s) - \tilde{Q}_0(s)| &= f'(\mathbf{a}; \rho_{ba})^{-1} |Q(f(\mathbf{a}; s)) - Q_0(f(\mathbf{a}; s))| \\
 &= f'(\mathbf{a}; \rho_{ba})^{-1} f'(\mathbf{b}; \rho_{ab})^{-1} \cdot |\tilde{Q}(f(\mathbf{b}; f(\mathbf{a}; s))) - \tilde{Q}_0(f(\mathbf{b}; f(\mathbf{a}; s)))| \\
 &= \gamma_{2k}^{-1} |\tilde{Q}(f_{2k}(\mathbf{ba}; s)) - \tilde{Q}_0(f_{2k}(\mathbf{ba}; s))| \\
 &\leq |\hat{Q}_{2k}(s)| \cdot \left\{ \left| 1 - \frac{\tilde{Q}(f_{2k}(\mathbf{ba}; s))}{f_{2k}(\mathbf{ba}; s) - \rho_{ba}} \right| + \left| 1 - \frac{\tilde{Q}_0(f_{2k}(\mathbf{ba}; s))}{f_{2k}(\mathbf{ba}; s) - \rho_{ba}} \right| \right\}, \tag{3.7}
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\hat{Q}_n(s) = \frac{f_n(\mathbf{ba}; s) - \rho_{ba}}{\gamma'_n},$$

$$\gamma'_n = \begin{cases} [f'(\mathbf{b}; \rho_{ab}) \cdot f'(\mathbf{a}; \rho_{ba})]^k, & n = 2k, \\ [f'(\mathbf{b}; \rho_{ab}) \cdot f'(\mathbf{a}; \rho_{ba})]^k f'(\mathbf{b}; \rho_{ab}), & n = 2k + 1. \end{cases}$$

Now for any $s \in [0, 1)$, $f_{2k}(\mathbf{ba}; s) \rightarrow \rho_{ba}$ and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\tilde{Q}(f_{2k}(\mathbf{ba}; s))}{f_{2k}(\mathbf{ba}; s) - \rho_{ba}} = \lim_{s \rightarrow \rho_{ba}} \tilde{Q}'(s) = 1, \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\tilde{Q}_0(f_{2k}(\mathbf{ba}; s))}{f_{2k}(\mathbf{ba}; s) - \rho_{ba}} = \lim_{s \rightarrow \rho_{ba}} \tilde{Q}'_0(s) = 1.$$

Similarly, we have

$$|Q(s) - Q_0(s)| \leq |\hat{Q}_{2k-1}(s)| \cdot \left\{ \left| 1 - \frac{Q(f_{2k-1}(\mathbf{ab}; s))}{f_{2k-1}(\mathbf{ab}; s) - \rho_{ab}} \right| + \left| 1 - \frac{Q_0(f_{2k-1}(\mathbf{ab}; s))}{f_{2k-1}(\mathbf{ab}; s) - \rho_{ab}} \right| \right\}, \tag{3.8}$$

and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Q(f_{2k-1}(\mathbf{ab}; s))}{f_{2k-1}(\mathbf{ab}; s) - \rho_{ab}} = \lim_{s \rightarrow \rho_{ab}} Q'(s) = 1, \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Q_0(f_{2k-1}(\mathbf{ab}; s))}{f_{2k-1}(\mathbf{ab}; s) - \rho_{ab}} = \lim_{s \rightarrow \rho_{ab}} Q'_0(s) = 1.$$

On the other hand, by a similar argument of Theorem 3.2 and Corollary 3.1, we know that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \hat{Q}_{2k}(s)$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \hat{Q}_{2k+1}(s)$ exist and are finite for all $s \in [0, 1)$. Therefore, by (3.7) and (3.8), we have $Q(s) = Q_0(s)$ and $\tilde{Q}(s) = \tilde{Q}_0(s)$ for all $s \in [0, 1)$. The proof is complete. \square \square

Since $Q(s)$ and $\tilde{Q}(s)$ are limits of power series, we may write

$$Q(s) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} q_k s^k, \quad s \in [0, 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{Q}(s) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \tilde{q}_k s^k, \quad s \in [0, 1). \tag{3.9}$$

4. Large deviation

We now discuss the large deviation rates of $\{Z_n : n \geq 0\}$. By Theorem 2.1, we know that $E\{s^{Z_n} | Z_0 = 1\} = f_n(\mathbf{ab}; s)$. In the following, we study the rate of convergence of $f_n(\mathbf{ab}; s)$ and its inverse $g_n(\mathbf{ab}; s)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

For convenience of our discussion, we assume that

$$a_0 = b_0 = 0, a_j, b_j \neq 1, \quad \forall j \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad m_a = f'(\mathbf{a}; 1), m_b = f'(\mathbf{b}; 1) < \infty$$

in the following.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $a_0 = b_0 = 0, a_1, b_1 > 0$. Then $\rho_a = \rho_{ab} = \rho_{ba} = \rho_b = 0$ and there exist $0 \leq q_j < \infty, 0 \leq \tilde{q}_j < \infty$ ($j \geq 1$) with $q_1 = \tilde{q}_1 = 1$ such that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f_{2n}(\mathbf{ab}; s)}{(a_1 b_1)^n} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} q_j s^j \equiv Q(s) < \infty, \quad s \in [0, 1) \quad (4.1)$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f_{2n+1}(\mathbf{ab}; s)}{(a_1 b_1)^n a_1} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \tilde{q}_j s^j \equiv \tilde{Q}(s) < \infty, \quad s \in [0, 1). \quad (4.2)$$

Furthermore, $(Q(s), \tilde{Q}(s))$ is the unique solution of the functional equations

$$\begin{cases} Q(f(\mathbf{a}; s)) = a_1 \tilde{Q}(s) \\ \tilde{Q}(f(\mathbf{b}; s)) = b_1 Q(s) \end{cases}$$

subject to

$$Q(0) = 0, \tilde{Q}(0) = 0; \quad Q(s), \tilde{Q}(s) < \infty; \quad Q(1), \tilde{Q}(1) = \infty.$$

Consequently, for all $1 \leq i, j < \infty$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{P(Z_{2n} = j | Z_0 = i)}{(a_1 b_1)^{in}} = q_j^{*(i)} \quad (4.3)$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{P(Z_{2n+1} = j | Z_0 = i)}{(a_1 b_1)^{in} a_1^i} = \tilde{q}_j^{*(i)}, \quad (4.4)$$

where $q_j^{*(i)}, \tilde{q}_j^{*(i)}$ satisfy $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} q_j^{*(i)} s^j = Q^i(s)$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \tilde{q}_j^{*(i)} s^j = \tilde{Q}^i(s)$ for $s \in [0, 1)$.

Proof. All the assertions excepting (4.3) and (4.4) follow directly from Theorems 3.2-3.3 and Corollary 3.1. while (4.3) and (4.4) follow from (4.1) and (4.2) since $E[s^{Z_n} | Z_0 = i] = (E[s^{Z_n} | Z_0 = 1])^i = f_n^i(\mathbf{ab}; s)$. \square \square

We shall have occasion to use the inverse functions $g(\mathbf{a}; s)$ of $f(\mathbf{a}; s)$ and $g(\mathbf{b}; s)$ of $f(\mathbf{b}; s)$ defined by

$$f(\Delta; g(\Delta; s)) = s \quad \text{for } 0 \leq s < \infty, \quad \Delta = \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}.$$

For $0 \leq s \leq 1$, $g(\mathbf{a}; s), g(\mathbf{b}; s)$ are well defined and $g(\mathbf{a}; s), g(\mathbf{b}; s) \geq s$. Also since $f(\mathbf{a}; s), f(\mathbf{b}; s) \geq s$ for $s \geq 1$, $g(\mathbf{a}; s), g(\mathbf{b}; s)$ are well defined for $s \in [1, f(\mathbf{a}; s_0)]$ and $s \in [1, f(\mathbf{b}; s_0)]$ respectively and $g(\mathbf{a}; s), g(\mathbf{b}; s) \leq s$. Let $g_n(\mathbf{ab}; s)$ and $g_n(\mathbf{ba}; s)$ be the inverse functions of $f_n(\mathbf{ab}; s)$ and $f_n(\mathbf{ba}; s)$ respectively. It is easy to see that

$$\begin{cases} g_1(\mathbf{ab}; s) = g(\mathbf{a}; s) \\ g_{2n}(\mathbf{ab}; s) = g(\mathbf{b}; g_{2n-1}(\mathbf{ab}; s)), \quad n \geq 1 \\ g_{2n+1}(\mathbf{ab}; s) = g(\mathbf{a}; g_{2n}(\mathbf{ab}; s)), \quad n \geq 0 \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} g_1(\mathbf{ba}; s) = g(\mathbf{b}; s) \\ g_{2n}(\mathbf{ba}; s) = g(\mathbf{a}; g_{2n-1}(\mathbf{ba}; s)), \quad n \geq 1 \\ g_{2n+1}(\mathbf{ba}; s) = g(\mathbf{b}; g_{2n}(\mathbf{ba}; s)), \quad n \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, $g_n(\mathbf{ab}; s)$ and $g_n(\mathbf{ba}; s)$ are nondecreasing with n for $s \in [0, 1]$ and nonincreasing with n for $s \in [1, f(\mathbf{a}; s_0)]$ and $s \in [1, f(\mathbf{b}; s_0)]$ respectively.

The next proposition shows that the rate of convergence of $g_n(\mathbf{ab}; \cdot)$ is geometric.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $f(\mathbf{a}; s_0) < \infty$ for some $s_0 > 1$. Then, for $1 \leq s \leq f(\mathbf{a}; s_0)$, we have $g_n(\mathbf{ab}; s)$, $g_n(\mathbf{ba}; s) \downarrow 1$ and*

$$R_n(s) := \Gamma_n \cdot (g_n(\mathbf{ab}; s) - 1) \downarrow R(s), \quad (4.5)$$

$$\tilde{R}_n(s) := \tilde{\Gamma}_n \cdot (g_n(\mathbf{ba}; s) - 1) \downarrow \tilde{R}(s), \quad (4.6)$$

where $\tilde{\Gamma}_n = m^n \Gamma_n^{-1}$ and $(R(\cdot), \tilde{R}(\cdot))$ is the unique solution of the functional equations

$$\begin{cases} R(f(\mathbf{a}; s)) = m_a \tilde{R}(s), \\ \tilde{R}(f(\mathbf{b}; s)) = m_b R(s), \end{cases} \quad s \in [1, f(\mathbf{a}; s_0)] \quad (4.7)$$

subject to

$$\begin{cases} 0 < R(s), \tilde{R}(s) < \infty \text{ for } s \in [1, f(\mathbf{a}; s_0)], \\ R(1) = \tilde{R}(1) = 0, \quad R'(1) = \tilde{R}'(1) = 1. \end{cases} \quad (4.8)$$

The proof of Proposition 4.2 is similar to that of Theorem 3.3 and is omitted.

We now discuss the decay rates of $P(|\frac{Z_{2k}}{Z_{2k-1}} - m_b| > \varepsilon)$ and $P(|\frac{Z_{2k+1}}{Z_{2k}} - m_a| > \varepsilon)$.

Theorem 4.1. *If $a_0 = b_0 = 0, a_1, b_1 > 0$ and $f(\mathbf{a}; s_0) + f(\mathbf{b}; s_0) < \infty$ for some $s_0 > 1$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there exists $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ such that*

$$\phi_a(n, \varepsilon) = P(|\bar{X}_n - m_a| > \varepsilon) = o(\lambda^n) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (4.9)$$

$$\phi_b(n, \varepsilon) = P(|\bar{Y}_n - m_b| > \varepsilon) = o(\lambda^n) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (4.10)$$

where $\bar{X}_n = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{n}$ being the mean of n i.i.d. r.v. $\{X_i\}$ with distribution $\{a_j\}$, and $\bar{Y}_n = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i}{n}$ being the mean of i.i.d. r.v. $\{Y_i\}$ with distribution $\{b_j\}$. Furthermore,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{a_1^k b_1^k} P(|\frac{Z_{2k+1}}{Z_{2k}} - m_a| > \varepsilon \mid Z_0 = 1) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \phi_a(j, \varepsilon) q_j < \infty \quad (4.11)$$

and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{a_1^k b_1^{k-1}} P(|\frac{Z_{2k}}{Z_{2k-1}} - m_b| > \varepsilon \mid Z_0 = 1) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \phi_b(j, \varepsilon) \tilde{q}_j < \infty, \quad (4.12)$$

where $\{q_j\}$ and $\{\tilde{q}_j\}$ are defined via $Q(s) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} q_j s^j$ and $\tilde{Q}(s) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \tilde{q}_j s^j$ ($0 \leq s < 1$), being the unique solution of functional equations

$$\begin{cases} Q(f(\mathbf{a}; s)) = a_1 \tilde{Q}(s) \\ \tilde{Q}(f(\mathbf{b}; s)) = b_1 Q(s) \end{cases}$$

subject to

$$Q(0) = 0, \quad \tilde{Q}(0) = 0 \text{ and } \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} Q'(s) = 1, \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \tilde{Q}'(s) = 1.$$

Proof. First note that

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_a(n, \varepsilon) &= P(|\bar{X}_n - m_a| > \varepsilon) \\ &\leq P(\alpha^{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i} > \alpha^{n(m_a+\varepsilon)}) + P(\beta^{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i} > \beta^{n(m_a-\varepsilon)}) \\ &\leq [\alpha^{-(m_a+\varepsilon)} f(\mathbf{a}; \alpha)]^n + [\beta^{-(m_a-\varepsilon)} f(\mathbf{a}; \beta)]^n\end{aligned}$$

for any $\alpha > 1$ and $\beta < 1$. To prove (4.9), we only need to show that $\alpha_0^{-(m_a+\varepsilon)} f(\mathbf{a}; \alpha_0) < 1$, $\beta_0^{-(m_a-\varepsilon)} f(\mathbf{a}; \beta_0) < 1$ for some $\alpha_0 > 1$ and $\beta_0 < 1$. Indeed, consider

$$F(\alpha) = f(\mathbf{a}; \alpha) - \alpha^{m_a+\varepsilon}.$$

It is easy to know $F(1) = 0$, and $F'(\alpha) = f'(\mathbf{a}; \alpha) - \alpha^{m_a+\varepsilon-1}(m_a + \varepsilon)$. When $\alpha \downarrow 1$, we have $F'(\alpha) \rightarrow m_a - (m_a + \varepsilon) < 0$. Thus, there exists $\alpha_0 > 1$ such that $f(\mathbf{a}; \alpha_0) < \alpha_0^{m_a+\varepsilon}$, and hence $\alpha_0^{-(m_a+\varepsilon)} f(\mathbf{a}; \alpha_0) < 1$. Similarly, consider

$$G(\beta) = f(\mathbf{a}; \beta) - \beta^{m_a-\varepsilon}.$$

Then we have $G(1) = 0$, and $G'(\beta) = f'(\mathbf{a}; \beta) - \beta^{m_a-\varepsilon-1}(m_a - \varepsilon)$. When $\beta \uparrow 1$, we have $G'(\beta) \rightarrow m_a - (m_a - \varepsilon) > 0$. Thus, there exists $\beta_0 < 1$ such that $\beta_0^{-(m_a-\varepsilon)} f(\mathbf{a}; \beta_0) < 1$. (4.9) is proved. Similarly, (4.10) holds true.

Next prove (4.11) and (4.12). By branching property,

$$\begin{aligned}P(|\frac{Z_{2k+1}}{Z_{2k}} - m_a| > \varepsilon | Z_0 = 1) &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} P(Z_{2k} = j) P(|\frac{Z_{2k+1}}{Z_{2k}} - m_a| > \varepsilon | Z_{2k} = j) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} P(Z_{2k} = j) P(|\frac{\sum_{i=1}^j X_i}{j} - m_a| > \varepsilon) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} P(Z_{2k} = j) \phi_a(j, \varepsilon).\end{aligned}$$

Let $h_{2k}(j) = \phi_a(j, \varepsilon) P(Z_{2k} = j) a_1^{-k} b_1^{-k}$. Take C such that $\phi_a(j, \varepsilon) \leq C\lambda^j$. Then

$$h_{2k}(j) \leq C\lambda^j P(Z_{2k} = j) a_1^{-k} b_1^{-k} =: r_{2k}(j).$$

Hence

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} r_{2k}(j) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} C\lambda^j P(Z_{2k} = j) a_1^{-k} b_1^{-k} = C f_{2k}(\mathbf{ab}; \lambda) a_1^{-k} b_1^{-k} \rightarrow C Q(\lambda) < \infty.$$

Thus $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} h_{2k}(j) < \infty$ and $h_{2k}(j) \rightarrow \phi_a(j, \varepsilon) q_j$.

$$\begin{aligned}P(|\frac{Z_{2k}}{Z_{2k-1}} - m_b| > \varepsilon | Z_0 = 1) &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} P(Z_{2k-1} = j) P(|\frac{Z_{2k}}{Z_{2k-1}} - m_b| > \varepsilon | Z_{2k-1} = j) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} P(Z_{2k-1} = j) P(|\frac{\sum_{i=1}^j Y_i}{j} - m_b| > \varepsilon) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} P(Z_{2k-1} = j) \phi_b(j, \varepsilon).\end{aligned}$$

Let $h_{2k-1}(j) = \phi_b(j, \varepsilon)P(Z_{2k-1} = j)a_1^{-k}b_1^{-k+1}$. Take C such that $\phi_b(j, \varepsilon) \leq C\lambda^j$. Then

$$h_{2k-1}(j) \leq C\lambda^j P(Z_{2k-1} = j)a_1^{-k}b_1^{-k+1} =: r_{2k-1}(j).$$

Hence

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} r_{2k-1}(j) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} C\lambda^j P(Z_{2k-1} = j)a_1^{-k}b_1^{-k+1} = Cf_{2k-1}(ab, \lambda)a_1^{-k}b_1^{-k+1} \rightarrow C\tilde{Q}(\lambda) < \infty.$$

Thus $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} h_{2k-1}(j) < \infty$ and $h_{2k-1}(j) \rightarrow \phi_b(j, \varepsilon)\tilde{q}_j$. The proof is complete. \square \square

The next theorem and corollary establish (4.11), (4.12) under conditions weaker than $f(\mathbf{a}; s_0) + f(\mathbf{b}; s_0) < \infty$ for some $s_0 > 1$.

Theorem 4.2. Assume $a_0 = b_0 = 0, a_1, b_1 > 0$ and that there exist constants C_ε and $r > 0$ such that $a_1b_1(m_a m_b)^r > 1$, $\phi_a(k, \varepsilon), \phi_b(k, \varepsilon) \leq C_\varepsilon/k^r$ for all k , where $\phi_a(k, \varepsilon), \phi_b(k, \varepsilon)$ are defined in (4.9), (4.10). Then (4.11), (4.12) hold.

Proof. Notice that

$$P(|\frac{Z_{2n+1}}{Z_{2n}} - m_a| > \varepsilon | Z_0 = 1) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \phi_a(k, \varepsilon)P(Z_{2n} = k).$$

By assumption,

$$h_{2n}(k) := \frac{\phi_a(k, \varepsilon)P(Z_{2n} = k)}{a_1^n b_1^n} \leq \frac{C_\varepsilon}{k^r} \frac{P(Z_{2n} = k)}{a_1^n b_1^n} =: h'_{2n}(k), \text{ say.}$$

By (4.1),

$$\begin{aligned} h_{2n}(k) &\rightarrow q_k \phi_a(k, \varepsilon) =: h(k), \text{ say} \\ h'_{2n}(k) &\rightarrow C_\varepsilon \frac{q_k}{k^r}. \end{aligned}$$

If we show that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} h'_{2n}(k) \rightarrow \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} C_\varepsilon \frac{q_k}{k^r} < \infty,$$

then by a slight modification of the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, we get that

$$(a_1^{-n}b_1^{-n}) \cdot P(|\frac{Z_{2n+1}}{Z_{2n}} - m_a| > \varepsilon | Z_0 = 1) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} h_{2n}(k) \rightarrow \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} h(k) < \infty.$$

However,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^r} \frac{P(Z_{2n} = k)}{a_1^n b_1^n} = \frac{E[Z_{2n}^{-r}]}{a_1^n b_1^n}.$$

For any nonnegative r.v. X and $0 < p < \infty$,

$$E[X^{-p}] = E[\frac{1}{\Gamma(p)} \int_0^\infty e^{-tX} t^{p-1} dt] = \frac{1}{\Gamma(p)} \int_0^\infty E[e^{-tX}] t^{p-1} dt.$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{E[Z_{2n}^{-r}]}{a_1^n b_1^n} = \frac{1}{\Gamma(r)} \int_0^\infty \frac{f_{2n}(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{b}; e^{-t})}{a_1^n b_1^n} t^{r-1} dt = \frac{1}{\Gamma(r)} \int_0^1 \frac{f_{2n}(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{b}; s)}{a_1^n b_1^n} k(s) ds,$$

where

$$k(s) = \frac{|\log s|^{r-1}}{s}.$$

Since $f_{2n}(\mathbf{a}\mathbf{b}; s)/(a_1^n b_1^n) \uparrow Q(s)$, by the monotone convergence theorem

$$\Gamma(r) \frac{E[Z_{2n}^{-r}]}{a_1^n b_1^n} \uparrow \int_0^1 Q(s) k(s) ds.$$

So the proof of (4.11) will be complete if we show $\int_0^1 Q(s) k(s) ds < \infty$. Denote $l(s) := g(\mathbf{b}; g(\mathbf{a}; s))$. Then $l(s) := g(\mathbf{b}; g(\mathbf{a}; s))$ is the inverse of $\hat{l}(s) := f(\mathbf{a}; f(\mathbf{b}; s))$. Let $l_m(s)$ and $\hat{l}_m(s)$ be the m 'th iterate of $l(s)$ and $\hat{l}(s)$, respectively. Then, $l_m(\hat{l}_m(s)) = s$, $l_{m+1}(s) \geq l_m(s)$ and for $0 < s < 1$, $l_m(s) \uparrow 1$ and $\hat{l}_m(s) \downarrow 0$. Fix $0 < t_0 < 1$. Then $t_m = l_m(t_0) \uparrow 1$. Also since $Q(s)$ satisfies (3.5), (3.6),

$$\begin{aligned} I_m &= \int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} Q(s) k(s) ds = \int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \frac{\tilde{Q}(f(\mathbf{b}; s))}{b_1} k(s) ds \\ &= \int_{f(\mathbf{b}; t_m)}^{f(\mathbf{b}; t_{m+1})} \tilde{Q}(u) \frac{k(g(\mathbf{b}; u)) g'(\mathbf{b}; u) du}{b_1} = \int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} Q(s) \frac{k(l(s)) l'(s)}{a_1 b_1} ds \\ &= \int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} Q(s) k(s) \frac{k(l(s)) l'(s)}{a_1 b_1 k(s)} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Since $l'(s) = 1/\hat{l}'(s)$ and $|\log s|/(1-s) \rightarrow 1$ as $s \uparrow 1$,

$$\frac{k(l(s)) l'(s)}{a_1 b_1 k(s)} \rightarrow \frac{1}{a_1 b_1 m_a^r m_b^r},$$

where $m_a = f'(\mathbf{a}; 1)$, $m_b = f'(\mathbf{b}; 1)$. Thus if $a_1 b_1 m_a^r m_b^r > 1$, then for any $0 < (a_1 b_1 m_a^r m_b^r)^{-1} < \lambda < 1$, there exists an m_0 such that $k(l(s)) l'(s)/(a_1 b_1 k(s)) < \lambda$ for $s \geq l_{m_0}(t_0)$. Thus, $I_m \leq \lambda I_{m-1}$ for $m \geq m_0 + 2$. Hence,

$$\sum_{m=m_0+2}^{\infty} I_m \leq I_{m_0+1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda^j < \infty.$$

Therefore,

$$\int_0^1 Q(s) k(s) ds \leq \int_0^{t_{m_0}} Q(s) k(s) ds + \int_{t_{m_0}}^1 Q(s) k(s) ds < \infty.$$

On the other hand,

$$P(|\frac{Z_{2n}}{Z_{2n-1}} - m_b| > \varepsilon | Z_0 = 1) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \phi_b(k, \varepsilon) P(Z_{2n-1} = k).$$

By assumption,

$$h_{2n-1}(k) := \frac{\phi_b(k, \varepsilon)P(Z_{2n-1} = k)}{a_1^n b_1^{n-1}} \leq \frac{C_\varepsilon P(Z_{2n-1} = k)}{k^r \frac{a_1^n b_1^{n-1}}{k^r}} =: h'_{2n-1}(k), \quad \text{say.}$$

By (4.2),

$$\begin{aligned} h_{2n-1}(k) &\rightarrow \tilde{q}_k \phi_b(k, \varepsilon) =: h(k), \quad \text{say,} \\ h'_{2n-1}(k) &\rightarrow C_\varepsilon \frac{\tilde{q}_k}{k^r}. \end{aligned}$$

If we show that

$$\sum_k h'_{2n-1}(k) \rightarrow \sum_k C_\varepsilon \frac{\tilde{q}_k}{k^r} < \infty,$$

then by a slight modification of the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, we get that

$$a_1^{-n} b_1^{-n+1} \cdot P(|\frac{Z_{2n}}{Z_{2n-1}} - m_b| > \varepsilon | Z_0 = 1) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} h_{2n-1}(k) \rightarrow \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} h(k) < \infty.$$

However,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^r} \frac{P(Z_{2n-1} = k)}{a_1^n b_1^{n-1}} = \frac{E[Z_{2n-1}^{-r}]}{a_1^n b_1^{n-1}}.$$

For any nonnegative r.v. X and $0 < p < \infty$,

$$EX^{-p} = E\left[\frac{1}{\Gamma(p)} \int_0^\infty e^{-tX} t^{p-1} dt\right] = \frac{1}{\Gamma(p)} \int_0^\infty E[e^{-tX}] t^{p-1} dt.$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{E[Z_{2n-1}^{-r}]}{a_1^n b_1^{n-1}} = \frac{1}{\Gamma(r)} \int_0^\infty \frac{f_{2n-1}(\mathbf{ab}; e^{-t})}{a_1^n b_1^{n-1}} t^{r-1} dt = \frac{1}{\Gamma(r)} \int_0^1 \frac{f_{2n-1}(\mathbf{ab}; s)}{a_1^n b_1^{n-1}} k(s) ds,$$

where

$$k(s) = \frac{|\log s|^{r-1}}{s}.$$

Since $f_{2n-1}(\mathbf{ab}; s)/a_1^n b_1^{n-1} \uparrow \tilde{Q}(s)$, by the monotone convergence theorem

$$\Gamma(r) \frac{E[Z_{2n-1}^{-r}]}{a_1^n b_1^{n-1}} \uparrow \int_0^1 \tilde{Q}(s) k(s) ds.$$

So the proof (4.12) will be complete if we show $\int_0^1 \tilde{Q}(s) k(s) ds < \infty$. Denote $\eta(s) := g(\mathbf{a}; g(\mathbf{b}; s))$ and $\hat{\eta}(s) := f(\mathbf{b}; f(\mathbf{a}; s))$. Then, $\eta(s)$ is the inverse of $\hat{\eta}(s)$. Let $\eta_m(s)$ and $\hat{\eta}_m(s)$ be the m 'th iterate of $\eta(s)$

and $\hat{\eta}(s)$. Then, $\eta_m(\hat{\eta}_m(s)) = s$, $\eta_{m+1}(s) \geq \eta_m(s)$ and for $0 < s < 1$, $\eta_m(s) \uparrow 1$ and $\hat{\eta}_m(s) \downarrow 0$. Fix $0 < t_0 < 1$. Then $t_m := \eta_m(t_0) \uparrow 1$. Also since $\tilde{Q}(s)$ satisfies (3.5), (3.6),

$$\begin{aligned} I_m &= \int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \tilde{Q}(s)k(s)ds = \int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \frac{Q(f(\mathbf{a}; s))}{a_1} k(s)ds \\ &= \int_{f(\mathbf{a}; t_m)}^{f(\mathbf{a}; t_{m+1})} Q(u) \frac{k(g(\mathbf{a}; u))g'(\mathbf{a}; u)du}{a_1} = \int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} \tilde{Q}(s) \frac{k(\eta(s))\eta'(s)}{a_1 b_1} ds \\ &= \int_{t_{m-1}}^{t_m} \tilde{Q}(s)k(s) \frac{k(\eta(s))\eta'(s)}{a_1 b_1 k(s)} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\eta'(s) = 1/\hat{\eta}'(s)$ and $|\log s|/(1-s) \rightarrow 1$ as $s \uparrow 1$,

$$(k(\eta(s))\eta'(s)/(a_1 b_1 k(s))) \rightarrow 1/(a_1 b_1 m_a^r m_b^r),$$

where $m_a = f'(\mathbf{a}; 1)$, $m_b = f'(\mathbf{b}; 1)$. Thus if $a_1 b_1 m_a^r m_b^r > 1$, then for any $0 < (a_1 b_1 m_a^r m_b^r)^{-1} < \lambda < 1$, there exists an m_1 such that $k(\eta(s))\eta'(s)/(a_1 b_1 k(s)) < \lambda$ for all $s \geq \eta_{m_1}(t_0)$. Thus, $I_m \leq \lambda I_{m-1}$ for $m \geq m_1 + 2$. Hence,

$$\sum_{m=m_1+2}^{\infty} I_m \leq I_{m_1+1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda^j < \infty.$$

Therefore,

$$\int_0^1 \tilde{Q}(s)k(s)ds \leq \int_0^{t_{m_1}} \tilde{Q}(s)k(s)ds + \int_{t_{m_1}}^1 \tilde{Q}(s)k(s)ds < \infty.$$

The proof is complete. \square

Corollary 4.1. Assume $a_1, b_1 > 0$ and $E[(Z_1^a)^{2r+\delta}|Z_0^a = 1], E[(Z_1^b)^{2r+\delta}|Z_0^b = 1] < \infty$ for some $r \geq 1$ and $\delta > 0$ such that $a_1 m_a^r, b_1 m_b^r > 1$. Then (4.11), (4.12) hold.

Proof. Since $E[(Z_1^a)^{2r+\delta}|Z_0^a = 1] < \infty$ for some $r \geq 1$ and $\delta > 0$, we know that

$$C_{r,1} := \sup_k E \left| \sqrt{k} \frac{(\bar{X}_k - m_a)}{\sigma_a} \right|^{2r} < \infty.$$

Then by Markov's inequality,

$$\phi_a(k, \varepsilon) \leq \frac{E |\sqrt{k}(\bar{X}_k - m_a)|^{2r}}{(\varepsilon \sqrt{k})^{2r}} \leq \frac{C_{r,1}}{\varepsilon^{2r} k^r}.$$

Similarly,

$$C_{r,2} := \sup_k E \left| \sqrt{k} \frac{(\bar{Y}_k - m_b)}{\sigma_b} \right|^{2r} < \infty.$$

Then by Markov's inequality,

$$\phi_b(k, \varepsilon) \leq \frac{E |\sqrt{k}(\bar{Y}_k - m_b)|^{2r}}{(\varepsilon \sqrt{k})^{2r}} \leq \frac{C_{r,2}}{\varepsilon^{2r} k^r}.$$

Let $C_r = \max\{C_{r,1}, C_{r,2}\}$. Hence, we have $\phi_b(k, \varepsilon), \phi_a(k, \varepsilon) \leq \frac{C_r}{\varepsilon^{2r} k^r}$. Then applying Theorem 4.2, the proof is complete. \square

Now we consider the longtime behaviour of W_n . Let $\{\tilde{Z}_n : n \geq 0\}$ be the $\mathbf{b} \star \mathbf{a}$ -Galton-Watson process. Define

$$\tilde{W}_n = \frac{\tilde{Z}_n}{\tilde{\Gamma}_n}, \quad n \geq 0,$$

where $\tilde{\Gamma}_n = m^n \Gamma_n^{-1}$. Similar as W_n , \tilde{W}_n is also an integrable martingale and hence converges to some random variable \tilde{W} .

Theorem 4.3. *Assume that $f(\mathbf{a}; e^{\theta_0}), f(\mathbf{b}; e^{\theta_0}) < \infty$ for some $\theta_0 > 0$. Then there exists $\theta_1 > 0$ such that*

$$C_1 = \sup_n E[\exp(\theta_1 W_n)] < \infty \quad (4.13)$$

and

$$C_2 = \sup_n E[\exp(\theta_1 \tilde{W}_n)] < \infty. \quad (4.14)$$

Proof. Since $K := f(\mathbf{a}; s_0) < \infty$ for $s_0 = e^{\theta_0}$, we know that $f_2(\mathbf{ab}; s) \leq K$ if $0 \leq f(\mathbf{b}; s) \leq s_0$, that is, if $0 \leq s \leq g(\mathbf{b}; s_0)$. Similarly, $f_3(\mathbf{ab}; s) \leq K$ if $0 \leq f(\mathbf{a}; s) \leq g(\mathbf{b}; s_0)$, that is, if $0 \leq s \leq g(\mathbf{a}; g(\mathbf{b}; s_0))$. More generally,

$$f_n(\mathbf{ab}; s) \leq K \quad \text{if } 0 \leq s \leq g_{n-1}(\mathbf{ba}; s_0).$$

Now, since $W_n = Z_n/\Gamma_n$, $E[e^{\theta W_n} | Z_0 = 1] = f_n(\mathbf{ab}; e^{\theta/\Gamma_n})$. Thus

$$E[\exp(\theta W_n) | Z_0 = 1] \leq K,$$

if $\theta \leq \Gamma_n \log g_{n-1}(\mathbf{ba}; s_0)$. Since $g_n(\mathbf{ba}; s_0) \downarrow 1$, $\log g_n(\mathbf{ba}; s_0) \sim (g_n(\mathbf{ba}; s_0) - 1)$. By Proposition 4.2, $f(\mathbf{a}; s_0) < \infty$ for $s_0 > 1$ implies $\Gamma_n \log g_{n-1}(\mathbf{ba}; s_0) \rightarrow m_a \tilde{R}(s_0)$, which is positive and finite. Because of $g_n(\mathbf{ba}; s_0) > 1$ for all $n \geq 1$, we can choose

$$\theta_1 = \inf_n \Gamma_n \log g_{n-1}(\mathbf{ba}; s_0) \quad \text{and} \quad C_1 = K.$$

(4.13) is proved. (4.14) is similar. The proof is complete. \square \square

The next result shows that the decay rate of $P(|W_n - W| > \varepsilon)$ is supergeometric.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $f(\mathbf{a}; e^{\theta_0}) + f(\mathbf{b}; e^{\theta_0}) < \infty$ for some $\theta_0 > 0$. Then there exist constants C_4 and $\lambda > 0$ such that*

$$P(|W_n - W| > \varepsilon \mid Z_0 = 1) \leq C_4 \exp(-\lambda \varepsilon^{2/3} \Gamma_n^{1/3}). \quad (4.15)$$

Proof. First we need two estimates. Denote

$$\phi(\theta) = E[\exp(\theta W)] \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\phi}(\theta) = E[\exp(\theta \tilde{W})],$$

which are finite for all $\theta \leq \theta_1$. So, if $\{W^{(i)}\}_1^\infty, \{\tilde{W}^{(i)}\}_1^\infty$ are respectively *i.i.d.* copies of W and \tilde{W} , $S_k = \sum_{i=1}^k (W^{(i)} - 1)$, $\tilde{S}_k = \sum_{i=1}^k (\tilde{W}^{(i)} - 1)$, then for $\theta \leq \theta_1$,

$$E[\exp(\theta(S_k/\sqrt{k}))] = (\phi(\frac{\theta}{\sqrt{k}})e^{-\theta/\sqrt{k}})^k = (1 + \frac{1}{k} \frac{(\phi(\theta/\sqrt{k})e^{-\theta/\sqrt{k}} - 1)}{(\theta^2/k)} \theta^2)^k,$$

$$E[\exp(\theta(\tilde{S}_k/\sqrt{k}))] = (\tilde{\phi}(\frac{\theta}{\sqrt{k}})e^{-\theta/\sqrt{k}})^k = (1 + \frac{1}{k} \frac{(\tilde{\phi}(\theta/\sqrt{k})e^{-\theta/\sqrt{k}} - 1)}{(\theta^2/k)} \theta^2)^k.$$

However, since

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow 0} (\phi(u)e^{-u} - 1)/u^2 = \frac{1}{2} \text{Var}(W) < \infty$$

and

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow 0} (\tilde{\phi}(u)e^{-u} - 1)/u^2 = \frac{1}{2} \text{Var}(\tilde{W}) < \infty,$$

we have

$$\sup_{|u| \leq 1} |(\phi(u)e^{-u} - 1)/u^2| =: c_1 < \infty$$

and

$$\sup_{|u| \leq 1} |(\tilde{\phi}(u)e^{-u} - 1)/u^2| =: c_2 < \infty.$$

If $\theta_2 = \min(\theta_1, 1)$, $c = \max(c_1, c_2)$, then

$$\sup_{|\theta| \leq \theta_2} |\phi(\theta/\sqrt{k})e^{-\theta/\sqrt{k}}|^k, \sup_{|\theta| \leq \theta_2} |\tilde{\phi}(\theta/\sqrt{k})e^{-\theta/\sqrt{k}}|^k \leq e^c =: C_3.$$

We have used the fact that for $x > 0$, $(1 + x/k)^k \leq e^x$.

Now we proceed with the proof the Theorem 4.4. We begin by noting that (see Theorem 2 on page 55 of Arthreya [5])

$$\begin{aligned} W - W_n &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (W_{n+m} - W_n) \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\Gamma_n} \sum_{j=1}^{Z_n} (\tilde{W}^{(j)} - 1), & \text{if } n \text{ is odd,} \\ \frac{1}{\Gamma_n} \sum_{j=1}^{Z_n} (W^{(j)} - 1), & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where $W^{(j)}$ (or $\tilde{W}^{(j)}$ if n is odd) is the limit r.v in the line of descent initiated by the j 'th parent of the n 'th generation of $\{Z_n\}$. By conditional independence,

$$P(W - W_n > \varepsilon | Z_0, Z_1, \dots, Z_n) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\psi}(Z_n, \Gamma_n \varepsilon), & \text{if } n \text{ is odd,} \\ \psi(Z_n, \Gamma_n \varepsilon), & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \end{cases}$$

where $\psi(k, \eta) = P(S_k \geq \eta)$, $\tilde{\psi}(k, \eta) = P(\tilde{S}_k \geq \eta)$. However,

$$P(S_k \geq \eta) = P\left(\frac{S_k}{\sqrt{k}} \geq \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{k}}\right) \leq C_3 \exp\left(-\frac{\theta_2 \eta}{\sqrt{k}}\right) \quad (\text{by our estimate}),$$

and

$$P(\tilde{S}_k \geq \eta) \leq C_3 \exp\left(-\frac{\theta_2 \eta}{\sqrt{k}}\right).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} P(W - W_n > \varepsilon) &= \begin{cases} E[\tilde{\psi}(Z_n, \Gamma_n \varepsilon)], & \text{if } n \text{ is odd} \\ E[\psi(Z_n, \Gamma_n \varepsilon)], & \text{if } n \text{ is even} \end{cases} \\ &\leq C_3 E[\exp(-\frac{\theta_2 \Gamma_n \varepsilon}{\sqrt{Z_n}})] \\ &= C_3 E[\exp(-\theta_2 \varepsilon \Gamma_n^{1/2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{W_n}})]. \end{aligned}$$

For $\lambda > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} E[\exp(-\lambda(1/\sqrt{W_n}))] &= \lambda \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda u} P(\frac{1}{\sqrt{W_n}} \leq u) du \\ &= \lambda \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda u} P(W_n \geq \frac{1}{u^2}) du \\ &\leq \lambda C_1 \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda u} \exp(-\frac{\theta_1}{u^2}) du \quad (\text{by Theorem 4.3}) \\ &= C_1 \int_0^\infty e^{-t} \exp(-\frac{\theta_1 \lambda^2}{t^2}) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$P(W - W_n > \varepsilon) \leq C_3 C_1 \int_0^\infty e^{-t} \exp(-\frac{\theta_1 \lambda_n^2}{t^2}) dt,$$

where $\lambda_n = \theta_2 \varepsilon \Gamma_n^{1/2}$. However, for $\lambda > 0$,

$$I(\lambda) := \int_0^\infty e^{-t} e^{-\lambda^2/t^2} dt = \int_0^{k(\lambda)} + \int_{k(\lambda)}^\infty \leq \exp(-\frac{\lambda^2}{k^2(\lambda)}) + e^{-k(\lambda)}.$$

Choose $k(\lambda) = \lambda^{2/3}$. Then $I(\lambda) \leq 2 \exp(-\lambda^{2/3})$. Thus

$$P(W - W_n > \varepsilon) \leq 2C_3 C_1 \exp(-(\sqrt{\theta_1} \theta_2 \varepsilon \Gamma_n^{1/2})^{2/3}) = C_4 \exp(-\lambda \Gamma_n^{1/3} \varepsilon^{2/3}),$$

where $C_4 = 2C_3 C_1$, $\lambda = (\sqrt{\theta_1} \theta_2)^{2/3}$. Similar arguments hold for $P(W_n - W > \varepsilon)$. The proof is complete. \square

The next result shows that, conditioned on W being positive, the rate of decay of $P(|\frac{Z_{n+1}}{Z_n} - D_n| > \varepsilon \mid W \geq \delta)$ is supergeometric.

Theorem 4.5. *Let $f(\mathbf{a}; e^{\theta_0}) + f(\mathbf{b}; e^{\theta_0}) < \infty$ for some $\theta_0 > 0$. Then there exist constants C_5 and $\lambda > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $\delta > 0$, we can find $0 < I(\varepsilon) < \infty$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} P(|\frac{Z_{n+1}}{Z_n} - D_n| > \varepsilon \mid W \geq \delta) &\leq C_5 \exp(-\delta \gamma I(\varepsilon) \Gamma_n) \\ &\quad + C_4 \exp(-\lambda(\delta(1 - \gamma))^{2/3} \Gamma_n^{1/3}), \end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

where

$$D_n = \begin{cases} m_b, & \text{if } n \text{ is odd} \\ m_a, & \text{if } n \text{ is even} \end{cases}$$

for every $0 < \gamma < 1$ and hence (for $\gamma = 1/2$)

$$P(|\frac{Z_{n+1}}{Z_n} - D_n| > \varepsilon \mid W \geq \delta) \leq C_6 \exp(-\lambda(\delta/2)^{2/3} \Gamma_n^{1/3}). \quad (4.17)$$

Proof. It is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} & P(|\frac{Z_{n+1}}{Z_n} - D_n| > \varepsilon \mid W \geq \delta) \\ = & P(|\frac{Z_{n+1}}{Z_n} - D_n| > \varepsilon, W \geq \delta) \frac{1}{P(W \geq \delta)} \\ = & p_\delta [P(|\frac{Z_{n+1}}{Z_n} - D_n| > \varepsilon, W_n \leq \delta\gamma, W \geq \delta) + P(|\frac{Z_{n+1}}{Z_n} - D_n| > \varepsilon, W_n \geq \delta\gamma, W \geq \delta)] \\ =: & p_\delta(\delta_{n1} + \delta_{n2}), \end{aligned}$$

where $0 < \gamma < 1$ and $p_\delta = 1/P(W \geq \delta)$. Clearly,

$$\delta_{n2} \leq P(|\frac{Z_{n+1}}{Z_n} - D_n| > \varepsilon, W_n \geq \delta\gamma) \leq C_5 \exp(-\delta\gamma I(\varepsilon) \Gamma_n),$$

where C_5 and $I(\varepsilon)$ are such that $P(|\bar{Y}_k| \geq \varepsilon) \leq C_5 e^{-kI(\varepsilon)}$, $P(|\bar{X}_k| \geq \varepsilon) \leq C_5 e^{-kI(\varepsilon)}$ and $\bar{Y}_k = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k Y_i}{k}$, $\{Y_i\}$ being *i.i.d.* as $Z_1^b - m_b$, $\bar{X}_k = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k X_i}{k}$, $\{X_i\}$ being *i.i.d.* as $Z_1^a - m_a$. (Such C_5 and $I(\varepsilon)$ exist by Chernoff type bounds since $f(\mathbf{a}; e^{\theta_1})$, $f(\mathbf{b}; e^{\theta_1}) < \infty$ for some $\theta_1 > 0$). Now

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{n1} & \leq P(W - W_n \geq \delta(1 - \gamma)) \\ & \leq C_4 \exp(-\lambda(\delta(1 - \gamma))^{2/3} \Gamma_n^{1/3}) \quad (\text{by Theorem 4.4}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & P(|\frac{Z_{n+1}}{Z_n} - D_n| > \varepsilon \mid W \geq \delta) \\ & \leq p_\delta (C_5 \exp(-\delta\gamma I(\varepsilon) \Gamma_n) + C_4 \exp(-\lambda(\delta(1 - \gamma))^{2/3} \Gamma_n^{1/3})). \end{aligned}$$

Since the only condition on γ is that $0 < \gamma < 1$ and the second term goes to zero slower than the first term, we can say that there exist C_6 and λ (C_6 may depend on γ) such that

$$P(|\frac{Z_{n+1}}{Z_n} - D_n| > \varepsilon \mid W \geq \delta) \leq C_6 \exp(-\lambda(\delta(1 - \gamma))^{2/3} \Gamma_n^{1/3}).$$

The proof is complete. □

Acknowledgement

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11771452, No. 11971486).

References

- [1] Anderson W. *Continuous-Time Markov Chains: An Applications-Oriented Approach*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991.
- [2] Asmussen S. & Jagers P. *Classical and modern branching processes*. Springer, Berlin, 1997.
- [3] Asmussen S. & Hering H. *Branching processes*. Birkhauser, Boston, 1983.
- [4] Athreya K.B. Large deviation rates for branching processes—I. Single type case[J]. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 1994: 779-790.
- [5] Athreya K.B. & Ney P.E.. *Branching processes*. Springer, New York, 1972.
- [6] Doob J.L. *Stochastic processes*. New York: J. Wiley, 1953.
- [7] Chen A.Y. Ergodicity and stability of generalised Markov branching processes with resurrection. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 2002, 39(4):786-803
- [8] Chen A.Y., Li J.P. & Ramesh N. Uniqueness and extinction of weighted Markov branching processes. *Methodol. Comput. Appl. Probab.*, 2005, 7(4):489-516
- [9] Chen A.Y., Pollett P., Li J.P. & Zhang H.J. A remark on the uniqueness of weighted Markov branching processes. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 2007, 44(1):279-283
- [10] Harris T.E. *The theory of branching processes*. Springer, Berlin and Newyork, 1963
- [11] Li J.P. & Chen A.Y. Markov branching processes with immigration and resurrection. *Markov Process. Related Fields*, 2006, 12(1):139-168
- [12] Li J.P., Chen A.Y. & Pakes A.G. Asymptotic properties of the Markov branching process with immigration. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 2012, 25(1):122-143.
- [13] Li J.P. Cheng L. Pakes A.G., Chen A.Y. & Li L.Y. Large deviation rates for branching processes. *Analysis and Applications*, 2020, 18(3): 447-468.
- [14] Li J.P. & Liu Z.M. Markov branching processes with immigration-migration and resurrection. *Sci. China Math.*, 2011, 54(1):1043-1062.
- [15] Li L.Y. & Li J.P. Large deviation rates for supercritical branching processes with immigration[J]. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 2021, 34,162-172.
- [16] Li Y.Y., Li J.P. & Chen A.Y. The down/up crossing properties of weighted Markov branching processes (in Chinese). *Scientia Sinica Mathematica*, 2022, 52(4):433-446
- [17] Liu J.N. & Zhang M. Large deviation for supercritical branching processes with immigration. *Acta Mathematica Sinica, English Series.*, 2016, 32(8):893-900.
- [18] Sevastyanov B.A. *On certain types of Markov processes* (in Russian). *Uspehi Mat. Nauk*, 1949, 4, 194.

- [19] Vatutin V.A. Asymptotic behavior of the probability of the first degeneration for branching processes with immigration. *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen*, 1974, 19(1):26-35
- [20] Yamazato M. Some results on continuous time branching processes with state-dependent immigration. *J. Math. Soc. Japan*, 1975, 27(3):479-496