

THE WAVE SPEED OF AN FKPP EQUATION WITH JUMPS VIA COORDINATED BRANCHING

TOMMASO ROSATI¹ AND ANDRÁS TÓBIÁS²

(20 January 2022)

Abstract: We consider a Fisher–KPP equation with nonlinear selection driven by a Poisson random measure. We prove that the equation admits a unique wave speed $\mathfrak{s} > 0$ given by

$$\frac{\mathfrak{s}^2}{2} = \int_{[0,1]} \frac{\log(1+y)}{y} \mathfrak{R}(dy),$$

where \mathfrak{R} is the intensity of the impacts of the driving noise. Our arguments are based on upper and lower bounds via a quenched duality with a coordinated system of branching Brownian motions.

MSC 2010. 60H15; 60J80; 35C07; 92D25.

Keywords: Fisher-KPP; Coordinated branching; Wave speed; Moment duality.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Fisher-KPP equation is a classical model in spatial population genetics

$$\partial_t u_t = \frac{1}{2} \Delta u_t + \mathbf{r} u_t (1 - u_t), \quad u(0, x) = u_0(x) \in [0, 1], \quad (t, x) \in [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}, \quad (1.1)$$

which describes the evolution of the density of one favoured genetic type over another disadvantaged one, where the advantage is given by a selection force of strength $\mathbf{r} > 0$.

Instead of the classical equation, this work is concerned with the analysis of a Fisher-KPP model in which selection acts at discrete jump times. We fix a positive measure \mathfrak{R} on $[0, 1]$ and denote with \mathcal{R} a Poisson random measure on $[0, \infty) \times (0, 1]$ with intensity $dt \otimes \frac{1}{y} \mathfrak{R}(dy)$. Then we consider the following equation driven by \mathcal{R} :

$$du_t = \frac{1}{2} \Delta u_t dt + \mathbf{r} u_t (1 - u_t) dt + \int_{(0,1]} y u_{t-} (1 - u_{t-}) \mathcal{R}(dt, dy), \quad u(0, x) = u_0(x), \quad (1.2)$$

where $\mathbf{r} = \mathfrak{R}(\{0\})$ corresponds to the continuous component of the equation. The biological motivation behind the choice of such a noise is to model *rare selection*, or better strong temporary selective advantages of fit individuals due to extreme behaviour of a (subordinator) random environment, as opposed to the classical, constantly present but *weak* selection corresponding to models with continuous forcing. Such strong evolutionary events involve a macroscopic portion of the underlying population. They are therefore linked to some form of “coordination” between individuals.

The purpose of this article is to focus on a prominent dynamical feature of the Fisher-KPP equation – its wave speed – and attempt a first description of how it is affected by extreme selection events. For the classical equation it is well known that there exists a travelling wave solution of speed $\sqrt{2\mathbf{r}}$, that captures the asymptotic evolution of the front

¹Imperial College London, t.rosati@imperial.ac.uk

²TU Berlin, Straße des 17. Juni 136, 10623 Berlin, tobias@math.tu-berlin.de

of an invading gene, say when the initial distribution is of the form $u_0(x) = \mathbf{1}_{[0,\infty)}(x)$. Our main result states that the wave speed $\mathfrak{s} > 0$ of the stochastic equation is given by

$$\frac{\mathfrak{s}^2}{2} = \int_{[0,1]} \log(1+y) \frac{1}{y} \mathfrak{R}(dy), \quad (1.3)$$

and therefore shows quantitatively how extreme selection events slow down the invading speed, compared to the deterministic equation (1.1) with $\mathbf{r} = \mathfrak{R}([0,1])$ (this is the natural choice because it is consistent with our definitions in the case $\mathfrak{R} = \mathfrak{r}\delta_0$): that the wave speed is strictly smaller than the deterministic one follows for instance by averaging (1.2) and using Jensen's inequality.

The size of the gap between the speed \mathfrak{s} of the stochastic equation and the speed $\sqrt{2\mathbf{r}}$ of the associated deterministic one depends on the nature of the noise. In a so-called *pushed* regime [16] (for example in presence of a genetic drift term) the effect can be surprisingly strong also for small noise, as demonstrated in the seminal work by Mueller, Mytnik and Quastel [20]. In our case, the nonlinearity is smooth and concave: We are in the *pulled* regime, where the effect of noise is weaker and most importantly the speed of the wave is governed by the linearisation of the equation near $u = 0$.

Now, the Lyapunov exponent of the linearised equation is in turn described the long-time behaviour of the dual process and the wave speed can be easily rewritten as the speed of the rightmost particle of the dual. This correspondence is very well understood: For the deterministic equation the dual is given by a Branching Brownian Motion (BBM) [14, 19]. In the BBM each particle moves as an independent Brownian motion and branches into two identical offspring at a constant rate \mathbf{r} (see [12, 13, 14]). In our setting, the dual is given by a *coordinated branching Brownian motion* (CBBM), see also the discussion of existing literature below. The main difference with respect to the BBM is that particles tend to reproduce simultaneously rather than independently: If n particles are alive at a given time, for any $1 \leq k \leq n$, any k -tuple of particles decides to simultaneously produce one offspring per particle at rate $\int_{[0,1]} y^k (1-y)^{n-k} \frac{1}{y} \mathfrak{R}(dy)$.

To study the speed of the rightmost particle of the CBBM, we consider a general approach developed by Kyprianou and Englaender [17, 8] (cf. also the references therein), which uses a martingale argument to study the local survival of branching (or super-) processes. As a rule-of-thumb, it states that the speed of the rightmost particle equals $\sqrt{2\lambda}$, where λ is the Lyapunov exponent of the underlying system. A subtlety when applying their argument is that the *quenched* and *annealed* Lyapunov exponents might differ: An environment exhibiting such a behaviour is called *strongly catalytic*. While the classical BBM is not strongly catalytic, this is the case for our coordinated process. This imposes a fundamental challenge to our analysis, as the correct prediction for the wave speed appears by formally using the rule-of-thumb with the *quenched* Lyapunov exponent $\lambda = \frac{\mathfrak{s}^2}{2}$, as in (1.3) (note that this corresponds to the growth rate of the total mass of the CBBM), while an attempt to make the martingale argument rigorous breaks down, because the gap between quenched and annealed implies that now the martingales at hand are not uniformly integrable. We observe that this issue is related to the gap between the stochastic and the deterministic equation we already addressed, as the annealed Lyapunov exponent is given by $\mathbf{r} = \mathfrak{R}([0,1])$ (which is a strict upper bound on our speed, unless $\mathfrak{R} = \mathfrak{r}\delta_0$).

Our approach to overcome this problem is to distinguish between ‘large reproduction events’ in which individuals participate in an event with probability $y \in (\delta, 1]$, and ‘small reproduction events’ where individuals participate with probability $y \in (0, \delta]$, for some $\delta \in (0, 1]$. Then we proceed to obtain upper and lower bounds on the speed \mathfrak{s} , which depend on δ but converge to the correct speed as $\delta \downarrow 0$. For the upper bound, we use a quenched dual, where we condition on the location and impact of ‘large’ reproduction events. We then use the martingale argument outlined above to deal with small jumps, which now affect the speed only with by a factor $\mathfrak{R}((0, \delta])$. Instead, for large reproduction events we use time changes and a ‘channeling’ argument based on elementary large-deviation estimates to

obtain the expected contribution to the speed. For the lower bound we use comparison to remove the mass of \mathfrak{R} in the interval $(0, \delta]$ and then can proceed with similar calculations to those we use the upper bound.

Overall, the novelty of our work consists in quantifying the effect of extreme selective events on the speed of invasion of the favoured of two genetic types. In future, we hope to extend these results to a much broader class of models, potentially including dormancy [4, 5], mutation, genetic drift and spatially localized selective events [2]. Finally, we note that we only consider the highest order (linear) term in the wave speed. For the original Fisher-KPP equation many, more refined results are available [7, 18] and would be interesting to extend to the present setting. Similarly, the existence of a (generalized) travelling wave (and not just the speed of propagation) is left open.

1.1. Related literature. Recently, the study of the effect of extreme selective or reproductive events on evolutionary models has seen a flurry of activity. An archetypal non-spatial model for such an evolution is the Λ -coalescent, in which a measure Λ , corresponding to our \mathfrak{R} , determines the proportion of individuals participating in a merger event [22, 23]: see also [11] for one of the first examples of coordinated reproduction in the context of contact processes, and [9] (and the references therein) for a general framework regarding coordination in reproduction, death and migration. In the study of non-spatial models, extreme selection and reproduction events – which are in correspondence via duality – have been recently addressed by [1, 6, 10].

For example, Cordero and Véchambre [6] derive an analogue of our equation, with genetic drift and no spatial component, as the scaling limit of a microscopic particle system and study its long-time behaviour (similar scaling limits and results have been obtained in [1, 10] in related models). Although these works do not consider our spatial setting, they share key aspects of our approach. In particular, the use of duality and the study of the long-time behaviour of the processes through conditioning or averaging over the environment are essential in our arguments.

We also note that extreme evolutionary events in a spatial setting have received much attention over the past years in relation to the study of spatial Λ -Fleming-Viot (SLFV) models introduced by Barton, Etheridge and Véber [2]. Unlike our equation, in this class of processes reproductive events are localized in space, which is a natural assumption and an interesting direction for future extensions of our result.

1.2. Structure of the paper. This article is divided as follows. In Section 2.1 we present our model and in Section 2.2 we state our main results, along with the crucial points of their proofs. The technical details of the proofs are carried out in the rest of the paper. Section 3 is devoted to upper and lower bounds on the wave speed via quenched duality arguments. In Section 4 we prove the existence and uniqueness of strong solutions to (1.2) as well as (quenched and annealed) duality. The latter results do not come as a surprise, but require a proof and a precise statement.

1.3. Acknowledgments. TR gratefully acknowledges financial support through the Royal Society grant RP\R1\191065. We thank J. Blath, N. Hansen, F. Hermann, A. González Casanova, N. Kurt, F. Nie and M. Wilke Berenguer for interesting discussions and comments.

1.4. Notations. We write $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$ and denote $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, let \mathcal{M} be the space of finite positive Borel measures on $[0, 1]$ with the topology of weak convergence. For a set \mathcal{X} and two functions $f, g: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we write $f \lesssim g$ if there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $f(x) \leq cg(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. We further denote with $C^k(\mathbb{R})$ (for $k \in \mathbb{N}$) the space of bounded and k times differentiable functions $\varphi: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with continuous and bounded derivatives. Similarly, for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we indicate with C^α the space of bounded and α -Hölder continuous functions and with C_{loc} the space of continuous (and not necessarily uniformly bounded) functions. Moreover, for any polish space E we indicate

with $\mathbb{D}([0, \infty); E)$ the space of càdlàg paths with values in E endowed with the Skorokhod topology (similarly for $[0, \infty)$ replaced by some finite interval $[0, T]$).

2. SETTING AND MAIN RESULTS

2.1. The model. The main object of interest in this work is the wave speed \mathfrak{s} of the solution to (1.2). It will be convenient to consider the following class of initial conditions, for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$

$$C_{0,1}^\alpha = \{u \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}; [0, 1]) \text{ such that } \overline{\{x : u(x) \notin \{0, 1\}\}} \text{ is compact}\},$$

for which the wave speed is naturally defined below.

Definition 2.1. *We say that $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathbb{R}$ is the wave speed associated to (1.2) if for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and all $u_0 \in C_{0,1}^\alpha$ the following hold.*

- (1) *For every $\lambda > \mathfrak{s}$ and any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} u_t(x + \lambda t) = 0$ in probability.*
- (2) *For every $\lambda < \mathfrak{s}$ and any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} u_t(x + \lambda t) = 1$ in probability.*

Remark 2.2. *Our initial conditions are chosen to be Hölder continuous, to simplify the statements that will follow. We could consider also discontinuous initial data, e.g. $u_0(x) = \mathbb{1}_{[0, \infty)}(x)$, at the cost of introducing blow-ups at time $t = 0$ in the solution theory for (1.2).*

The study of the wave speed of (1.2) passes through the analysis of the dual process, which consists of a system of Brownian motions with coordinated branching, where the parameter y interpolates between no coordination ($y = 0$), where all particles act independently, and full coordination ($y = 1$), where all particles reproduce at once. In this backwards picture the measure \mathfrak{R} captures the reproduction rate.

Notation 2.3. *To describe the state space of our particle systems we introduce the set*

$$\mathcal{P} = \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Then to every point \mathbf{x} of \mathcal{P} we can associate a length $\ell(\mathbf{x}) = n \iff \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. In particular, \mathcal{P} is a Polish space with the distance $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = |\ell(\mathbf{x}) - \ell(\mathbf{y})| + \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| \mathbb{1}_{\{\ell(\mathbf{x}) = \ell(\mathbf{y})\}}$, where $\|\cdot\|$ indicates the Euclidean norm. To concisely express our duality formulas, let us introduce the following notation

$$\varphi^{\mathbf{x}} = \prod_{i=1}^n \varphi(x_i), \quad \forall \varphi \in C_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}), \quad \mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{P}.$$

In addition, for $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{P}$ we write the concatenation

$$\mathbf{x} \sqcup \mathbf{y} = (x_1, \dots, x_{\ell(\mathbf{x})}, y_1, \dots, y_{\ell(\mathbf{y})}) \in \mathcal{P}.$$

The way in which we use duality requires the introduction of an additional parameter $\delta \in (0, 1]$. We will then consider a dual *conditional* on jumps with impact $y > \delta$. We start by distinguishing small from large jumps with the following notation.

Definition 2.4. *For any $\delta \in (0, 1]$ and $\mathfrak{R} \in \mathcal{M}([0, 1])$ define*

$$\mathfrak{R}_\delta^-(A) = \mathfrak{R}(A \cap [0, \delta]), \quad \mathfrak{R}_\delta^+(A) = \mathfrak{R}(A \cap (\delta, 1]).$$

*In general, we call **compatible** with δ any couple of measures $\mu_\delta = (\mu_\delta^-, \mu_\delta^+) \in \mathcal{M}^2$ with support in $[0, \delta]$ and $[\delta, 1]$ respectively with $\mu_\delta^+(\{\delta\}) = 0$. Finally, for any compatible measures μ_δ we introduce the Poisson point process with intensity μ_δ^+ :*

$$\mathcal{S}_\delta = \{(t_i, y_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq [0, \infty) \times (\delta, 1], \quad (2.1)$$

which is characterised by the fact that $0 < t_1 < \dots < t_i < t_{i+1}$, and $t_i \uparrow \infty$, and is linked to the Poisson random measure

$$\mathcal{R}_\delta^+(dt, dy) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \delta_{t_i}(dt) \delta_{y_i}(dy).$$

We observe that formally we can rewrite the noise \mathcal{R} in (1.2) as

$$\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_\delta^- + \mathcal{R}_\delta^+,$$

with \mathcal{R}_δ^- a Poisson random measure with intensity \mathfrak{R}_δ^- . To be precise, \mathcal{R} is in general not a measure, but can only be interpreted when integrated against functions that vanish near $y = 0$ sufficiently fast. More precisely, \mathcal{R}_δ^- is associated with a Poisson point process $\{(s_i, z_i) : i \in I\}$ of intensity $dt \otimes \frac{1}{y} \mathfrak{R}(dy)$ on $[0, \infty) \times (0, \delta]$, with countable index set $I \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ (so both the points (s_i, z_i) and the index set I are random). Then for measurable functions $f : [0, \infty) \times (0, \delta] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\int_{[0, \infty) \times (0, \delta]} \min\{|f(t, y)|, 1\} \frac{1}{y} \mathfrak{R}(dy) dt < \infty, \quad (2.2)$$

the integral

$$\int_{[0, \infty) \times (0, \delta]} f(t, y) \mathcal{R}(dt, dy) := \sum_{i \in I} f(s_i, z_i) \quad (2.3)$$

is almost surely finite, as discussed in the context of Campbell's theorem in [15, Section 3]. We can now introduce the dual process to (1.2) *conditional* on the realisation of \mathcal{S}_δ . We highlight that the FKPP equation and its conditional dual share the same jump times \mathcal{S}_δ (to be precise, the dual process *may* jump at a time contained in \mathcal{S}_δ but does not necessarily do so), whereas they do not share the jump times associated to smaller impacts.

Definition 2.5. *For any $\delta \in (0, 1]$ and any couple $\mu_\delta = (\mu_\delta^-, \mu_\delta^+)$ compatible with δ , let \mathcal{S}_δ be the Poisson point process defined by (2.1). We say that $(\mathbf{C}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a μ_δ -coordinated branching Brownian motion (μ_δ -CBBM) with initial condition $\mathbf{C}_0 = \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{P}$ if, conditional on the realisation of \mathcal{S}_δ , the process \mathbf{C}_t is a \mathcal{P} -valued Markov process with the following dynamics:*

- (1) **Diffusion.** *Let $\mathbf{C}_t = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ at time $t > 0$. Then each individual x_i moves in \mathbb{R} according to a Brownian motion, independent of all other individuals, until one of the following two jumps occur.*
- (2) **Large reproduction events.** *For every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, assume that at time t_j (of the Poisson point process \mathcal{S}_δ) there are currently n individuals $\mathbf{C}_{t_j} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then we observe one of the following transitions, for any subset $\mathcal{I} \subseteq [n]$:*

$$(x_i)_{i \in [n]} \rightarrow (x_i)_{i \in [n]} \sqcup (x_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+|\mathcal{I}|} \quad \text{with probability } y_j^{|\mathcal{I}|} (1 - y_j)^{n-|\mathcal{I}|}.$$

- (3) **Small reproduction events.** *Assume that at time $t \geq 0$ there are currently n individuals $\mathbf{C}_t = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then for any subset $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{I} \subseteq [n]$ we have the following coordinated transition:*

$$(x_i)_{i \in [n]} \rightarrow (x_i)_{i \in [n]} \sqcup (x_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+|\mathcal{I}|} \quad \text{at rate } \int_{[0, \delta]} y^{|\mathcal{I}|} (1 - y)^{n-|\mathcal{I}|} \frac{1}{y} \mu_\delta^-(dy).$$

We observe that for $\delta = 1$ we have $\mathcal{S}_\delta = \emptyset$. Then the dynamics of the CBBM do not have a discrete reproduction component, and in this case the process is the *unconditional* dual of (1.2). The duality between the CBBM and the FKPP equation will be established in Proposition 3.1.

The necessity of dealing with $\delta \in (0, 1)$ (and in particular, we will eventually consider the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$) is forced upon us to capture the exact wave speed of (1.2). In fact the martingale problem for the \mathfrak{R}_1 -CBBM (or alternatively, [9, Lemma 3]) implies the following (in fact $e^{-rt} I_t$ is a martingale, although it is in general *not* uniformly integrable).

Proposition 2.6 (Invariance of expectation). *Let $\mathbf{C} = (\mathbf{C}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be an \mathfrak{R}_1 -CBBM and write $I_t = \ell(\mathbf{C}_t)$ for the total number of particles at time $t \geq 0$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}[I_t] = I_0 e^{rt}, \quad \text{with } \mathbf{r} = \mathfrak{R}([0, 1]). \quad (2.4)$$

Now, it is generally understood that in the present case, in which the nonlinearity in (1.2) is concave, the wave speed is determined by the growth of the linearisation near $u = 0$ of the equation: this is referred to as the *pulled* regime [16]. Moreover, the growth of the linearisation is roughly equivalent to that of the dual process.

On the other hand, Jensen's inequality guarantees that the speed of (1.2) is strictly slower than in the classical case (with same total mass for the reproduction), since

$$\partial_t \mathbb{E}[u_t] \leq \frac{1}{2} \Delta \mathbb{E}[u_t] + \mathbf{r} \mathbb{E}[u_t] (1 - \mathbb{E}[u_t]) ,$$

where we used that $M_t^f = \int_0^t \int_0^1 y f_s \mathcal{R}(dy, ds) - \int_0^t \mathbf{r} f_s ds$ is a martingale for bounded, adapted f . Hence we are faced with an apparent conundrum, as the speed predicted by (2.4) is exactly the deterministic (annealed) one, which we now know to be incorrect.

The issue is that the coordinated process \mathbf{C}_t , unlike classical branching processes, is strongly catalytic: its almost sure growth rate is strictly smaller than its annealed growth rate, captured by (2.4). For this reason, classical martingale arguments do not work directly.

Our approach is therefore to use the conditioning as a way to obtain the almost sure growth rate. As usual for Poisson point processes, one has to take particular care of the small jumps: for this reason we consider a fixed parameter $\delta > 0$. Small jumps are then dealt with via the argument we just explained, through Jensen's inequality and martingales. This delivers a wrong estimate, but now with an error of order $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$, in such a way that as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ we obtain the correct speed.

2.2. Main results. Now we are ready to present our main results. We start by proving well-posedness of (1.2).

Theorem 2.7. *Fix any $\mathfrak{R} \in \mathcal{M}$ and let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space supporting a Poisson point process \mathcal{S} on $[0, \infty) \times (0, 1]$ with intensity measure $\frac{1}{y} \mathfrak{R}(dy) \otimes dt$. Let \mathcal{F}_t be the right-continuous filtration generated by $\mathcal{S}^t = \mathcal{S} \cap ([0, t] \times (0, 1])$. For any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and any initial condition u_0 in $C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}; [0, 1])$ there exists a unique (up to modifications on a nullset) adapted process*

$$u: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{D}([0, \infty); C^\alpha([0, 1]; \mathbb{R}))$$

that solves (1.2) on $[0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ (with the derivatives interpreted in the sense of distributions and the integral against \mathcal{R} interpreted in the sense of sums over Poisson point processes, cf. (2.3) for $\delta = 1$) with $u(0, \cdot) = u_0(\cdot)$.

This result is a consequence of Proposition 4.4. For the solution we just constructed we can describe the wave speed as follows.

Theorem 2.8. *For every $\mathfrak{R} \in \mathcal{M}$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and any initial condition $u_0 \in C^\alpha$, the solution u to the FKPP equation (1.2) with initial condition u_0 (as in Theorem 2.7) has wave speed $\mathfrak{s} > 0$ in the sense of Definition 2.1 given by*

$$\frac{\mathfrak{s}^2}{2} = \int_{[0, 1]} \log(1 + y) \frac{1}{y} \mathfrak{R}(dy) . \quad (2.5)$$

Again, we follow the convention $\int_{\{0\}} \log(1 + y) \frac{1}{y} \mathfrak{R}(dy) = \mathfrak{R}(\{0\}) = \mathfrak{r}$.

Proof. We follow two different arguments for the lower and upper bounds to the wave speed (the two conditions in Definition 2.1).

Step 1. Let us start with the upper bound, so fix any $\lambda > \mathfrak{s}$. Our aim will be to prove that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} u_t(x - \lambda t) = 0 ,$$

which implies the required convergence in probability. For this purpose consider $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and define $\mathfrak{R}_\delta = (\mathfrak{R}_\delta^-, \mathfrak{R}_\delta^+)$ as in Definition 2.4, associated to the decomposition $\mathcal{R} =$

$\mathcal{R}_\delta^- + \mathcal{R}_\delta^+$, where \mathcal{R}_δ^+ is the random measure associated to the Poisson point process \mathcal{S}_δ with intensity \mathfrak{R}_δ^+ . Then let \mathbb{E}^δ indicate the expectation conditional on \mathcal{S}_δ , namely

$$\mathbb{E}^\delta[f] = \mathbb{E}[f|\mathcal{S}_\delta] .$$

Since $u_t(x)$ takes values in $[0, 1]$ by dominated convergence it thus suffices to prove that \mathbb{P} -almost surely

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}^\delta u_t(x - \lambda t) = 0 .$$

Here we use the conditional duality of Proposition 3.1 to bound

$$\mathbb{E}^\delta(1 - u_t)(x - \lambda t) = \mathbb{E}^\delta(1 - u_0)^{\mathbf{C}_t^{\mathbf{x}(\lambda, t)}} ,$$

where $\mathbf{C}_t^{\mathbf{x}(\lambda, t)}$ is an \mathfrak{R}_δ -CBBM as in Definition 2.5, started in $\mathbf{x}(\lambda, t) = x - \lambda t \in \mathbb{R}^1$. Now since $u_0 \in C_{0,1}^\alpha$ there exists an $a \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $u_0(x) = 0$ for all $x \leq a$. In particular

$$\mathbb{E}^\delta(1 - u_0)^{\mathbf{C}_t^{\mathbf{x}(\lambda, t)}} \geq \mathbb{E}^\delta(1 - \mathbb{1}_{[a, \infty)})^{\mathbf{C}_t^{\mathbf{x}(\lambda, t)}} = \mathbb{P}^\delta(\mathbf{S}_t \leq a + \lambda t - x) ,$$

where $\mathbf{S}_t = \max \mathbf{C}_t^0$ is the rightmost particle of an \mathfrak{R}_δ -CBBM \mathbf{C}_t^0 started in $\mathbf{x} = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^1$. Hence it now suffices to show that for any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}^\delta(\mathbf{S}_t \geq \lambda t + x_0) = 1 .$$

Now this result follows from Proposition 3.5, up to choosing δ sufficiently small so that for \mathfrak{c}_δ as in (3.2)

$$\mathfrak{s} \leq \sqrt{2\mathfrak{c}_\delta} < \lambda .$$

Step 2. Let us now pass to the lower bound. That is, choose $\lambda < \mathfrak{s}$ and, similarly to above, let us prove that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} u_t(x - \lambda t) = 1$. As before we can fix $\delta \in (0, 1)$, so that it suffices to prove that \mathbb{P} -almost surely

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}^\delta u_t(x - \lambda t) = 1 .$$

Then by the duality of Proposition 3.1 we have

$$\mathbb{E}^\delta(1 - u_t)(x - \lambda t) = \mathbb{E}^\delta(1 - u_0)^{\mathbf{C}_t^{\mathbf{x}(\lambda, t)}} \leq \mathbb{E}^\delta(1 - u_0)^{\underline{\mathbf{C}}_t^{\mathbf{x}(\lambda, t)}} .$$

Here $\mathbf{C}_t^{\mathbf{x}(t, x)}$ is an \mathfrak{R}_δ -CBBM, with $\mathfrak{R}_\delta = (\mathfrak{R}_\delta^-, \mathfrak{R}_\delta^+)$ started in $\mathbf{x}(t, x) = x - \lambda t \in \mathbb{R}^1$, and $\underline{\mathbf{C}}_t^{\mathbf{x}(t, x)}$ is an \mathfrak{R}_δ -CBBM associated to compatible measures $\underline{\mathfrak{R}}_\delta = (\mathfrak{r}\delta_0, \mathfrak{R}_\delta^+)$, started in $\mathbf{x}(\lambda, t)$. Then we can use that by definition

$$\mathfrak{r}\delta_0 \leq \mathfrak{R}_\delta^- ,$$

in the sense of measures, so that we can couple \mathbf{C}_t and $\underline{\mathbf{C}}_t$ in such a way that $\underline{\mathbf{C}}_t \subseteq \mathbf{C}_t$, which implies the desired estimate. In particular it now suffices to prove that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}^\delta(1 - u_0)^{\underline{\mathbf{C}}_t^{\mathbf{x}(\lambda, t)}} = 0 .$$

Again, we find $b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $u_0(x) = 1$ for all $x \geq b$, so that

$$\mathbb{E}^\delta(1 - u_0)^{\underline{\mathbf{C}}_t^{\mathbf{x}(\lambda, t)}} \leq \mathbb{P}^\delta(\underline{\mathbf{S}}_t \geq \lambda t - x + b) ,$$

where $\underline{\mathbf{S}}_t = \max \underline{\mathbf{C}}_t^0$, the latter being a $(\mathfrak{r}\delta_0, \mathfrak{R}_\delta^+)$ -CBBM started in $\underline{\mathbf{C}}_0^0 = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^1$. Now by Proposition 3.6 we know that if $\delta \in (0, 1)$ is chosen to be sufficiently small such that for $\underline{\mathfrak{c}}_\delta$ as in (3.4)

$$\lambda < \sqrt{2\underline{\mathfrak{c}}_\delta} \leq \mathfrak{s} ,$$

then $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}^\delta(\underline{\mathbf{S}}_t \geq \lambda t - x + b) = 1$, \mathbb{P} -almost surely. The proof is concluded. \square

3. WAVE SPEED

3.1. Conditional dual. As we have already discussed, we will consider the solution to (1.2) conditional on the large jumps \mathcal{R}_δ^+ . In particular, the solution u to (1.2) can be formally rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} du_t = & \frac{1}{2} \Delta u_t dt + \mathfrak{r} u_t (1 - u_t) dt \\ & + \int_{(0, \delta]} y u_{t-} (1 - u_{t-}) \mathcal{R}_\delta^-(dy, dt) + \int_{(\delta, 1]} y u_{t-} (1 - u_{t-}) \mathcal{R}_\delta^+(dy, dt). \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

Here the integral against \mathcal{R}_δ^- should be interpreted in the sense of (2.3). Then, let \mathbb{E}^δ indicate expectation conditional on \mathcal{S}_δ as in (2.1), or equivalently conditional on \mathcal{R}_δ^+ as in Definition 2.4:

$$\mathbb{E}^\delta[f] = \mathbb{E}[f | \mathcal{S}_\delta].$$

We find the following duality relation.

Proposition 3.1. *Fix $\mathfrak{R} \in \mathcal{M}$ and, for any $\delta \in (0, 1]$, let $\mathfrak{R}_\delta = (\mathfrak{R}_\delta^-, \mathfrak{R}_\delta^+)$ be as in Definition 2.4. Then, let u be a martingale solution to (3.1), associated to \mathfrak{R} in the sense of Definition 4.3. Furthermore, for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{P}$, let $(\mathbf{C}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be an \mathfrak{R}_δ -CBBM started in \mathbf{x} as in Definition 2.5. Then for any $t > 0$*

$$\mathbb{E}^\delta(1 - u_t)^{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbb{E}^\delta[(1 - u_0)^{\mathbf{C}_t}].$$

The proof of this proposition is carried out in Section 4.2. The last ingredient we will need in the study of the wave speed is the following almost sure asymptotic property for \mathcal{S}_δ .

Lemma 3.2. *For any $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $\varepsilon \in [0, \infty)$ let \mathcal{S}_δ be defined as in (2.1) and associated to $\mathfrak{R}_\delta = (\mathfrak{R}_\delta^-, \mathfrak{R}_\delta^+)$ as in Definition 2.4. Then for*

$$\mathfrak{d}_{\delta, \varepsilon}(t) = \sum_{j: t_j \leq t} \log(1 + y_j + \varepsilon), \quad \mathfrak{d}_{\delta, \varepsilon} = \int_{(\delta, 1]} \log(1 + y + \varepsilon) \frac{1}{y} \mathfrak{R}(dy),$$

it holds that almost surely that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathfrak{d}_{\delta, \varepsilon}(t) = \mathfrak{d}_{\delta, \varepsilon}.$$

For simplicity we will write $\mathfrak{d}_\delta(t)$ for $\mathfrak{d}_{\delta, 0}(t)$ in the case $\varepsilon = 0$ (and similarly for \mathfrak{d}_δ).

3.2. Upper bound on the speed. We start by establishing an upper bound on the quenched growth rate of the dual process.

Proposition 3.3. *Fix $\mathfrak{R} \in \mathcal{M}$ and, for any $\delta \in (0, 1]$, let $\mathfrak{R}_\delta = (\mathfrak{R}_\delta^-, \mathfrak{R}_\delta^+)$ be as in Definition 2.4. Let \mathbf{C}_t be an \mathfrak{R}_δ -CBBM started in $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^1$. Then for $I_t^\delta = \ell(\mathbf{C}_t)$ we have almost surely*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log I_t^\delta \leq \mathfrak{R}_\delta^-([0, \delta]) + \int_{(\delta, 1]} \log(1 + y) \frac{1}{y} \mathfrak{R}_\delta^+(dy) =: \mathfrak{c}_\delta. \quad (3.2)$$

Note that since $\log(1 + y) \frac{1}{y} \leq 1$ we always have

$$\int_{(0, 1]} \log(1 + y) \frac{1}{y} \mathfrak{R}(dy) \leq \mathfrak{c}_\delta,$$

which reflects the fact that in the following we obtain an *upper* bound on the wave speed.

Remark 3.4. *Although we only prove an upper bound on the growth rate of I_t^δ , the arguments we present for the lower bound of the wave speed allow to also prove a lower bound to the growth of I^δ by comparing I^δ to the a process where we do not have any jumps with impact $y \in (0, \delta]$ (and everything else being left unvaried). Alternatively, one can also use*

the same comparison, but in combination with the “channelling” argument that we will use in Section 3.4. Overall, one would thus obtain that almost surely (independently of δ !)

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log I_t^\delta = c .$$

The proof of Proposition 3.3 will be carried out in Section 3.4. Using the previous result, we obtain an upper bound on the wave speed via a quenched version of the so-called many-to-one lemma, cf. [3, Section 3.6].

Proposition 3.5. *Fix $\mathfrak{R} \in \mathcal{M}$ and, for any $\delta \in (0, 1]$, let $\mathfrak{R}_\delta = (\mathfrak{R}_\delta^-, \mathfrak{R}_\delta^+)$ be as in Definition 2.4. Let \mathbf{C}_t be an \mathfrak{R}_δ -CBBM started in $\mathbf{x} = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^1$. Then for any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbf{S}_t = \max \mathbf{C}_t$ we have, for any $\lambda > \sqrt{2c_\delta}$, \mathbb{P} -almost surely*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}^\delta(\mathbf{S}_t > \lambda t + x_0) = 0 .$$

Proof. Without loss of generality we restrict to the case $x_0 = 0$. Let us also write $\mathbf{C}_t = (C_t^{(i)})_{i \in [I_t^\delta]}$ for $t > 0$ and $I_t^\delta = \ell(\mathbf{C}_t)$, where we assume that the ordering of particles is exchangeable (which can e.g. be achieved via reshuffling the indices at the time of any reproduction event uniformly in a right-continuous manner). Then, at any given time $t \geq 0$, conditional on I_t^δ , the particles are identically (but not independently) distributed and their marginal law is the one of a Brownian motion $(B_s)_{s \geq 0}$ at time t , namely

$$\mathbb{P}^\delta(C_t^{(i)} > x | I_t^\delta) = \mathbb{P}^\delta(B_t > x) .$$

Hence, conditional on the jump times, we obtain that for $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^\delta(\mathbf{S}_t > x | I_t^\delta) &= \mathbb{P}^\delta(\exists i \in [I_t^\delta]: C_t^{(i)} > x | I_t^\delta) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}^\delta \left[\sum_{i \in [I_t^\delta]} \mathbf{1}_{\{C_t^{(i)} > x\}} \middle| I_t^\delta \right] \mathbf{1}_{\{I_t^\delta \geq e^{(c_\delta + \varepsilon)t}\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{I_t^\delta < e^{(c_\delta + \varepsilon)t}\}} \\ &\leq I_t^\delta \mathbb{P}^\delta(B_t > x) \mathbf{1}_{\{I_t^\delta \leq e^{(c_\delta + \varepsilon)t}\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{I_t^\delta > e^{(c_\delta + \varepsilon)t}\}} . \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the Gaussian tail bound

$$\int_{-\infty}^t \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-y^2/2} dy \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi t}} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}}, \quad t \geq 0$$

implies that for $\varepsilon, \lambda > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}^\delta(\mathbf{S}_t > \lambda t | I_t^\delta) \mathbf{1}_{\{I_t^\delta \leq e^{(c_\delta + \varepsilon)t}\}} \leq e^{(c_\delta + \varepsilon)t - \frac{\lambda^2 t}{2}}$$

holds almost surely, whence for $\lambda > \sqrt{2(c_\delta + \varepsilon)}$ we obtain by Proposition 3.3 that almost surely

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}^\delta(\mathbf{S}_t > \lambda t) \leq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ e^{(c_\delta + \varepsilon)t - \frac{\lambda^2 t}{2}} + \mathbb{P}^\delta(I_t^\delta > e^{(c_\delta + \varepsilon)t}) \right\} = 0 . \quad (3.3)$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ can be chosen arbitrarily small, the result follows. \square

3.3. Lower bound on the speed. To obtain the lower bound let us introduce the sequence of constants

$$\mathfrak{r} + \int_{(\delta, 1]} \log(1+y) \frac{1}{y} \mathfrak{R}_\delta^+(dy) =: \underline{\mathfrak{c}}_\delta , \quad (3.4)$$

which immediately satisfy $\underline{\mathfrak{c}}_\delta \leq \frac{\mathfrak{r}^2}{2}$. Then the main result of this section is the next proposition.

Proposition 3.6. *Fix $\mathfrak{R} \in \mathcal{M}$ and, for any $\delta \in (0, 1]$, let $\mathfrak{R}_\delta = (\mathfrak{R}_\delta^-, \mathfrak{R}_\delta^+)$ be as in Definition 2.4. Let \mathbf{C}_t be an $(\mathfrak{r}\delta_0, \mathfrak{R}_\delta^+)$ -CBBM started in $\mathbf{x} = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^1$. Then for any $0 < \lambda < \sqrt{2\underline{\mathfrak{c}}_\delta}$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}^\delta(\mathbf{S}_t > \lambda t + x_0) = 1$.*

To prove this result, let us associate to the $(\tau\delta_0, \mathfrak{R}_\delta^+)$ -CBBM \mathbf{C}_t started in $\mathbf{x} = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^1$ a measure-valued process

$$X_t = \sum_{i=1}^{n(t)} \delta_{x_i(t)}, \quad (3.5)$$

where we assume that at time $t \geq 0$, $\mathbf{C}_t = (x_1(t), \dots, x_{n(t)}(t))$. Then, in the spirit of [17, 8] we will link the wave speed to the local survival of the $X_t(\cdot + \lambda t)$.

Proof. Consider the measure-valued process X of (3.5). Now, let $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be any closed interval (that is a set of the form $I = [a, b]$ for $a < b$) and observe that the following implication holds, as long as $\lambda' > \lambda$:

$$\left\{ \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_t(I + \lambda' t) > 0 \right\} \implies \left\{ \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} (\mathbf{S}_t - \lambda t + x_0) > 0 \right\}.$$

In particular, our result follows if we prove that there exists a collection of intervals

$$\{I_\lambda : \lambda \in (0, \sqrt{2\underline{\mathfrak{c}}_\delta})\},$$

such that

$$\mathbb{P}^\delta \left(\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_t(I_\lambda + \lambda t) > 0 \right) = 1, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-almost surely, for all } 0 < \lambda < \sqrt{2\underline{\mathfrak{c}}_\delta}.$$

This is exactly the content of Lemma 3.7 below. The fact that the result holds uniformly over $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ follows from the consideration that $I_\lambda \uparrow \mathbb{R}$ as $\lambda \uparrow \sqrt{2\underline{\mathfrak{c}}_\delta}$, which is also a consequence of Lemma 3.7. \square

Lemma 3.7. *Let X be the measure-valued process of (3.5). Then for any $0 < \lambda < \sqrt{2\underline{\mathfrak{c}}_\delta}$ there exists a closed interval $I_\lambda \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ such that \mathbb{P} -almost surely*

$$\mathbb{P}^\delta \left(\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_t(I_\lambda + \lambda t) > 0 \right) = 1.$$

Moreover, we can choose the sets I_λ to be increasing, with $I_\lambda \uparrow \mathbb{R}$ as $\lambda \uparrow \sqrt{2\underline{\mathfrak{c}}_\delta}$.

Proof. First of all we observe that instead of considering $X_t(I + \lambda t)$ (that is shifting the interval) we can consider Brownian motions with a drift λ to the left in the definition of X_t . Consider intervals of the form $I(R) = [-R, R]$ for $R > 0$: below we will choose a sufficiently large value $R(\lambda)$ and prove the desired result for $I_\lambda = I(R(\lambda))$.

Step 1: Continuity of the principal eigenvalue. For any $R > 0$ let $(P_t^{\lambda, R})_{t \geq 0}$ be the heat semigroup with drift λ and Dirichlet boundary conditions on $\partial I(R)$, acting on $L^2(I(R))$. Namely, for any $\varphi \in L^2(I(R))$, $P_t^{\lambda, R} \varphi$ satisfies $P_0^{\lambda, R} \varphi = \varphi$ and solves

$$\partial_t P_t^{\lambda, R} \varphi(x) = \left(\frac{1}{2} \Delta + \lambda \partial_x \right) P_t^{\lambda, R} \varphi(x), \quad x \in (-R, R), \quad P_t^{\lambda, R} \varphi(\pm R) = 0, \quad \forall t > 0.$$

Let us denote with $\mu(\lambda, R) = \sup \frac{1}{t} \log \sigma(P_t^{\lambda, R})$ the principal eigenvalue of $\frac{1}{2} \Delta + \lambda \partial_x$ on $I(R)$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions (here σ indicates the spectrum, and the definition of μ does not depend on $t > 0$). Then, we observe that by [21, Theorem 4.1]

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\lambda, R) = -\frac{\lambda^2}{2}, \quad (3.6)$$

the latter being the principal (generalised) eigenvalue of $\frac{1}{2} \Delta + \lambda \partial_x$ on \mathbb{R} . In particular, since $0 < \lambda < \sqrt{2\underline{\mathfrak{c}}_\delta}$, we can choose an $R(\lambda)$ such that for some $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\mu_\lambda = \mu(\lambda, R(\lambda)) \geq -\underline{\mathfrak{c}}_\delta + \varepsilon. \quad (3.7)$$

In particular we can choose the sets $I_\lambda = [-R(\lambda), R(\lambda)]$ to be increasing to \mathbb{R} , by imposing $R(\lambda) > R(\lambda')$ for $\lambda > \lambda'$ and $R(\lambda) \rightarrow \infty$ for $\lambda \rightarrow \sqrt{2\underline{\mathfrak{c}}_\delta}$ (the second condition is naturally satisfied in any case, in view of the previous considerations).

Step 2: Local survival. We now consider ε and $R(\lambda)$ as in (3.7) and define $I_\lambda = [-R(\lambda), R(\lambda)]$. Then we introduce a new process \overline{X}_t in which particles evolve as in X_t but are killed (i.e. they disappear from the measure) upon reaching the boundary of I_λ . By

comparison we obtain that $\overline{X}_t \leq X_t$ in the sense of positive measures. We will then start by proving that, \mathbb{P} -almost surely

$$\mathbb{P}^\delta \left(\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \overline{X}_t(I_\lambda) > 0 \right) > 0. \quad (3.8)$$

To prove this result let us fix φ_λ the eigenfunction on $L^2(I_\lambda)$ associated to μ_λ (note that $\varphi_\lambda(x) > 0$ for $x \in (-R(\lambda), R(\lambda))$ by the Krein–Rutman theorem, and $\varphi_\lambda \in C^\infty((-R(\lambda), R(\lambda)))$ via classical regularity estimates), so that we can write the martingale problem for $\overline{X}_t(\varphi_\lambda)$ as follows. Next consider the jump times $\{t_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ associated to \mathcal{S}_δ . If we fix some $j \in \mathbb{N}$, then we have that for $t_j \leq t < t_{j+1}$ the process

$$[t_j, t_{j+1}) \ni t \mapsto e^{-(\tau+\mu_\lambda)t} \overline{X}_t(\varphi_\lambda) = M_t^j$$

is a càdlàg martingale on $[t_j, t_{j+1})$, with predictable quadratic variation

$$\langle M^j \rangle_t = \int_{t_j}^t e^{-2(\tau+\mu_\lambda)r} \left[\tau \overline{X}_r(\varphi_\lambda^2) + \overline{X}_r((\partial_x \varphi_\lambda)^2) \right] dr,$$

where the first term comes from independent reproduction and the second one from the spatial motion of the particles. Next we consider the jumps at times t_j . We have

$$\overline{X}_{t_j}(\varphi_\lambda) - (1 + y_j) \overline{X}_{t_j-}(\varphi_\lambda) = \Delta N_j,$$

where ΔN_j is a martingale increment. Since every particle alive a time t_j reproduces with probability y_j independently of all other particles, N_j has the variance of a Bernoulli random variable with parameter y_j :

$$\langle \Delta N_j \rangle = y_j(1 - y_j) \overline{X}_{t_j-}(\varphi_\lambda^2).$$

Overall we can now conclude that the following is a càdlàg martingale:

$$L_t = e^{-(\tau+\mu_\lambda)t} \left(\prod_{j: t_j \leq t} (1 + y_j)^{-1} \right) \overline{X}_t(\varphi_\lambda).$$

In fact, for any $0 \leq s < t < \infty$ with $j(t) \in \mathbb{N}$ uniquely defined by $t \in [t_{j(t)}, t_{j(t)+1})$, and assuming that $j(s) < j(t)$ (otherwise the martingale property is inherited immediately from $M^{j(t)}$, with the notation $\Delta M_j = M_{t_{j+1}-}^j - M_{t_j}^j$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} L_t - L_s &= \left(\prod_{j \leq j(t)} (1 + y_j)^{-1} \right) \left[(M_t^{j(t)} - M_{t_{j(t)}}^{j(t)}) + \Delta N_j \right] \\ &+ \sum_{\ell=j(s)+1}^{j(t)-1} \left(\prod_{j \leq \ell} (1 + y_j)^{-1} \right) \left[\Delta M_j + \Delta N_j \right] \\ &+ \left(\prod_{j \leq j(s)} (1 + y_j)^{-1} \right) (M_{t_{j(s)+1}-}^{j(s)} - M_s^{j(s)}), \end{aligned}$$

which is a sum of martingale increments. Hence we have found a positive martingale L_t , which implies that there exists an almost sure limit $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} L_t = L_\infty \in [0, \infty)$. We want to prove that $\mathbb{E}^\delta L_\infty = L_0 > 0$, which amounts to proving that the martingale is uniformly integrable. Hence we will show that

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E}^\delta L_t^2 = L_0 + \sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E}^\delta \langle L \rangle_t < \infty. \quad (3.9)$$

We are thus left with computing the expected quadratic variation.

Let us now follow the notation of Lemma 3.2 and write $e^{\delta_\delta(t)} = \prod_{j \leq j(t)} (1 + y_j)$. Then for $t \in [t_j, t_{j+1})$ we find that

$$d\langle L \rangle_t = e^{-2(\tau+\mu_\lambda)t - 2\delta_\delta(t)} \left(\left[\overline{X}_t(\tau \varphi_\lambda^2 + (\partial_x \varphi_\lambda)^2) \right] dt + y_j(1 - y_j) \overline{X}_{t_j-}(\varphi_\lambda^2) \delta_{t_j}(t) \right).$$

The last ingredient to compute the $\mathbb{E}^\delta \langle L_t \rangle$ is the expected value of \overline{X}_t . From the definition of \overline{X} we find for $s \in [0, t]$ and any $\psi \in L^2(I_\lambda)$

$$d\mathbb{E}^\delta \overline{X}_s(P_{t-s}^{\lambda, R(\lambda)} \psi) = \mathfrak{r} \mathbb{E}^\delta \overline{X}_s(P_{t-s}^{\lambda, R(\lambda)} \psi) ds + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} y_j \mathbb{E}^\delta \overline{X}_s(P_{t-s}^{\lambda, R(\lambda)} \psi) \delta_{t_j}(s). \quad (3.10)$$

Hence for $\psi = \varphi_\lambda$ we find

$$\mathbb{E}^\delta \overline{X}_t(\varphi_\lambda) = e^{(\mathfrak{r} + \mu_\lambda)t + \sum_{j \leq t} \log(1 + y_j)} \varphi_\lambda(0).$$

In particular, we can rewrite $\mathbb{E}^\delta \langle L \rangle_t$ as the sum of two terms:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^\delta \langle L \rangle_t &= \int_0^t e^{-2(\mathfrak{r} + \mu_\lambda)s - 2\mathfrak{d}_\delta(s)} \left(\mathfrak{r} \mathbb{E}^\delta \overline{X}_s(\varphi_\lambda^2) + y_j(1 - y_j) \mathbb{E}^\delta \overline{X}_{t_j -}(\varphi_\lambda^2) \delta_{t_j}(s) \right) ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t e^{-2(\mathfrak{r} + \mu_\lambda)s - 2\mathfrak{d}_\delta(s)} \mathbb{E}^\delta \overline{X}_s((\partial_x \varphi_\lambda)^2) ds. \end{aligned}$$

The difference between the first and second line is that in the first line we can estimate $\overline{X}_s(\varphi_\lambda^2) \leq \|\varphi_\lambda\|_\infty \overline{X}_s(\varphi_\lambda)$, which is not possible for the term in the second line since $\varphi_\lambda(\pm R(\lambda)) = 0$, which does not hold for $(\partial_x \varphi_\lambda)^2$ (so here we will need some additional arguments). To fix the key point of the proof let us start with the first term. Using the previous computations we find

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^t e^{-2(\mathfrak{r} + \mu_\lambda)s - 2\mathfrak{d}_\delta(s)} \left(\mathfrak{r} \mathbb{E}^\delta \overline{X}_s(\varphi_\lambda^2) + y_j(1 - y_j) \mathbb{E}^\delta \overline{X}_{t_j -}(\varphi_\lambda^2) \delta_{t_j}(s) \right) ds \\ &\lesssim_{\mathfrak{r}, \|\varphi_\lambda\|_\infty} \int_0^t \exp \left\{ \left(-(\mathfrak{r} + \mu_\lambda) - \mathfrak{d}_\delta + o(1) \right) s \right\} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Here the $o(1)$ term is intended as $s \rightarrow \infty$, and is a consequence of Lemma 3.2. Now by (3.7)

$$-\mathfrak{r} - \mathfrak{d}_\delta - \mu_\lambda = -\underline{\mathfrak{c}}_\delta - \mu_\lambda \leq -\varepsilon.$$

In particular, the integral under consideration is converging for $t \rightarrow \infty$. Now, if we pass to the term involving $\mathbb{E}^\delta \overline{X}_s((\partial_x \varphi_\lambda)^2)$, we find by (3.10)

$$\mathbb{E}^\delta \overline{X}_s((\partial_x \varphi_\lambda)^2) = e^{\mathfrak{r}s + \mathfrak{d}_\delta(s)} P_s^{\lambda, R(\lambda)} (\partial_x \varphi_\lambda)^2(0).$$

Now at time $s = 1$ we can control the semigroup $P_1^{\lambda, R(\lambda)} (\partial_x \varphi_\lambda)^2 \leq C_\lambda \varphi_\lambda$, for some $C_\lambda > 0$, so that the term can be controlled following the same arguments as above, observing that

$$\mathbb{E}^\delta \overline{X}_s((\partial_x \varphi_\lambda)^2) \leq e^{\mathfrak{r}s + \mathfrak{d}_0 s + \mu_\lambda(s-1)} C_\lambda \varphi_\lambda(0),$$

which is of the same order as the bound used in the previous discussion. Hence (3.9) is proven, and since $L_0 > 0$ we deduce by (3.8)

$$\mathbb{P}^\delta(\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_t(I_\lambda + \lambda t) > 0) \geq \mathbb{P}^\delta(\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} L_t > 0) > 0.$$

Here we observe that the inclusion

$$\left\{ \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} L_t > 0 \right\} \subseteq \left\{ \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_t(I_\lambda + \lambda t) > 0 \right\}$$

holds because in the definition of L_t we find, by our assumptions on μ_λ , that

$$e^{-(\mathfrak{r} + \mu_\lambda)t} \left(\prod_{j: t_j \leq t} (1 + y_j)^{-1} \right) \leq e^{-\varepsilon t + o(1)},$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Step 3: Almost sure survival. To complete the proof of our result we have to now use (3.8) to obtain that $\mathbb{P}^\delta(\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_t(I_\lambda + \lambda t) > 0) = 1$: note that our result so far only proves that the survival happens with *positive* probability (but not necessarily almost surely). Also, in this last step it will be convenient to consider once again particles evolving without a drift

and instead view the intervals as moving (we did so already in the statement we just wrote). Let us now introduce the stopping times $\{\tau_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$:

$$\tau_0 = 0, \quad \tau_{j+1} = \inf \left\{ t \geq t_j + \frac{R(\lambda)}{2\lambda} \text{ such that } 0 \in \mathbf{C}_t \right\}.$$

We observe that no particles die, and all particles evolve as Brownian motions, so the stopping times are almost surely finite. Then define the measure valued processes $(\overline{X}_t^j)_{t \geq \tau_j}$ as follows. At time τ_j the measure $\overline{X}_{\tau_j}^j$ coincides with the restriction of the measure X_{τ_j} to the interval I_λ

$$\overline{X}_{\tau_j}^j = \sum_{x \in \mathbf{C}_{\tau_j} : x \in I_\lambda} \delta_x.$$

Then for $t > \tau_j$, the measure \overline{X}_t^j is associated to the evolution of the particles $\{x \in \mathbf{C}_{\tau_j} : x \in I_\lambda\}$ (by our definition of τ_j this set is not empty), including all their descendants, created by reproduction events, but where particles are killed if they reach the boundary of $I_\lambda + \lambda t$ at time $t \geq \tau_j$. In particular particles of \mathbf{C}_t whose ancestor at time τ_j did not lie in I_λ or whose ancestor at some time $\tau_j \leq s \leq t$ touched the boundary of $I_\lambda + \lambda s$ do not appear in the \overline{X}_t^j . Now we see that $(\overline{X}_{\tau_j+t}^j(I_\lambda + \lambda t))_{t \geq 0}$ is stochastically larger than $(\overline{X}_t(I_\lambda))_{t \geq 0}$, where \overline{X}_t is the process appearing in (3.8) (the fact that the first process is in general larger than and not identical to the latter one is due to the difference between the initial conditions: \overline{X}_t^j starts with potentially more than just one particle). In conclusion, we see by (3.8) that there exists a $\mathbf{p} \in (0, 1)$ such that \mathbb{P} -almost surely for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathbb{P}^\delta(\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \overline{X}_t^j(I_\lambda) > 0) \geq \mathbf{p}.$$

If we further denote with $\mathcal{A}_j = \left\{ \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \overline{X}_t^j(I_\lambda) > 0 \right\}$, we see that the events \mathcal{A}_j are independent. In fact, since $\tau_{j+1} \geq \tau_j + \frac{R(\lambda)}{2\lambda}$ we have that the particles appearing in $\overline{X}_{\tau_j}^j$ and $\overline{X}_{\tau_j}^k$ for all $k \leq j$ are distinct (and will thus remain distinct for all times). Furthermore, in an $(\mathfrak{r}\delta_0, \mathfrak{R}_\delta^+)$ -CBBM, by construction all particles evolve independently, conditionally on \mathcal{S}_δ , as they share only the jump times from \mathcal{S}^δ (if we were to replace $\mathfrak{r}\delta_0$ with a generic measure \mathfrak{R}^- this would no longer be true). We thus find that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_j \cap \mathcal{A}_k) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_j)\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_k)$ for all $k, j \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the lemma follows by Borel–Cantelli. \square

3.4. Quenched growth rate. Our goal in this section is to verify Proposition 3.3. Recall that, as in Definition 2.4, $I_t^\delta = \ell(\mathbf{C}_t)$ for $t \geq 0$, where $(\mathbf{C}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is an $(\mathfrak{R}_\delta^-, \mathfrak{R}_\delta^+)$ -CBBM, and recall that we use the notation

$$\mathbf{c}_\delta = \mathfrak{R}_\delta^-([0, \delta]) + \int_{(\delta, 1]} \log(1+y) \frac{1}{y} \mathfrak{R}_\delta^+(dy). \quad (3.11)$$

Now, Proposition 3.3 is equivalent to the next lemma.

Lemma 3.8. *In the setting of Proposition 3.3, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ we have that \mathbb{P} -almost surely*

$$\mathbb{P}^\delta(\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} I_t^\delta e^{-(\mathbf{c}_\delta + \varepsilon)t} > 0) = 0. \quad (3.12)$$

The proof will follow two different arguments for small and large jumps. For small jumps we use a martingale approach: this leads to the term $\mathfrak{R}_\delta^-([0, \delta])$ in our wave speed upper bound. In particular, the martingale argument is not exact and delivers only a rough upper bound (but as $\delta \downarrow 0$ this error will be negligible). Instead for large jumps our argument is exact and builds on a time change argument, which is possible since jump times are now discrete.

Proof. For brevity, let us write I_t for I_t^δ and denote with $j(t) = \max\{j : t_j \leq t\}$. We have

$$I_t = \frac{I_t}{I_{t_{j(t)}}} \cdot \left(\prod_{j \leq j(t)} \frac{I_{t_j-}}{I_{t_{j-1}}} \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{j \leq j(t)} \frac{I_{t_j}}{I_{t_{j-}}} \right) \cdot I_0 .$$

Hence our result will follow if we prove the following three inequalities, which hold for some $c > 0$ independent of ε

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^{j(t)} \log \frac{I_{t_j-}}{I_{t_{j-1}}} &\leq \mathfrak{R}_\delta^-([0, \delta]) , \\ \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^{j(t)} \log \frac{I_{t_j}}{I_{t_{j-}}} &\leq \int_{(\delta, 1]} \log(1+y) \frac{1}{y} \mathfrak{R}_\delta^+(dy) + c\varepsilon , \\ \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \frac{I_t}{I_{t_{j(t)}}} &= 0 . \end{aligned}$$

We observe that the last equality follows analogously to the first inequality, so we restrict to proving the first two points.

Step 1: Martingale term. Let us start by proving the first bound. We can define the following discrete time process:

$$M_n = e^{-t_n \mathfrak{R}_\delta^-([0, \delta])} \prod_{j=1}^n \frac{I_{t_j-}}{I_{t_{j-1}}} ,$$

and we observe that $(M_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a discrete-time martingale with respect to the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_{t_n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, where \mathcal{F}_t is the filtration generated by $(\mathbf{C}_s)_{s \leq t}$. To see that the martingale property holds, we observe that \mathbf{C}_t has the law of an $(\mathfrak{R}_\delta^-, 0)$ -CBBM on every time interval $[t_j, t_{j+1})$. In particular, by Proposition 2.6, we see that

$$\mathbb{E}[M_n | \mathcal{F}_{t_{n-1}}] = e^{\mathfrak{R}_\delta^-([0, \delta])(t_n - t_{n-1})} e^{-t_n \mathfrak{R}_\delta^-([0, \delta])} \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{I_{t_j-}}{I_{t_{j-1}}} = M_{n-1} .$$

Since M_n is a positive martingale, it follows from the martingale convergence theorem and Fatou's lemma that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M_n \right] \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} M_n \leq \mathbb{E} M_0 = 1 .$$

We conclude that almost surely

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t_n} \sum_{j=1}^n \log \frac{I_{t_j-}}{I_{t_{j-1}}} \leq \mathfrak{R}_\delta^-([0, \delta]) ,$$

which proves the first bound (note that $\frac{t_{j(t)}}{t} \rightarrow 1$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$).

Step 2: Large jumps. Here we use a different argument, based on large deviation principles. In a nutshell, we will prove that as long as the solution is growing exponentially fast at the correct order, such exponential growth becomes ever more likely (and precise) in future. We observe that the process I_t does not depend on the spatial dynamics of the particles. In particular, for every $j \geq 1$, the increment $\frac{I_{t_j}}{I_{t_{j-}}}$ depends only on the number R_j of particles that participate in the j -th reproduction event:

$$\frac{I_{t_j}}{I_{t_{j-}}} = 1 + \frac{R_j}{I_{t_{j-}}} .$$

Recall also that every particle reproduces independently of any other particle at time t_j , with probability $y_j \in (\delta, 1]$. Our aim is then to prove that as $I_{t_{j-}}$ increases, the approximation

$$\frac{R_j}{I_{t_{j-}}} \simeq y_j$$

becomes ever more likely and precise. Following this description, let us consider, for some $\varepsilon \in (0, \delta)$ and $M \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathcal{G}_{0,M} := \left\{ \left| \frac{R_j}{I_{t_j^-}} - y_j \right| \leq \varepsilon, \forall j \in \{1, \dots, M\} \right\},$$

where the letter \mathcal{G} stands for being a “good” set. We can then find a $c(\varepsilon, \delta), n_0 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} I_0 \geq n_0 &\implies \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_{0,M}) \geq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_{0,M} | \mathcal{G}_{0,M-1}) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_{0,M-1}) \\ &\geq \left(1 - \exp \left\{ -c(\varepsilon, \delta) I_0 \prod_{j=1}^{M-1} (1 + y_j - \varepsilon) \right\} \right) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_{0,M-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where we used that on the set $\mathcal{G}_{0,M-1}$ we have $I_{t_{M-1}^-} \geq I_0 \prod_{j=1}^{M-1} (1 + y_j - \varepsilon)$ (note that all other reproduction events, not due to large jumps, only increase the value of I_t), together with the fact that, for a sequence $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of i.i.d. Bernoulli(p) random variables with $p \geq \delta > \varepsilon$

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i - p \right| \geq \varepsilon \right) \leq e^{-c(\varepsilon, \delta)n}, \quad \forall n \geq n_0.$$

In fact, it is standard to see that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i - p \right| \geq \varepsilon \right) \leq -\bar{c}(\varepsilon, p).$$

Here the rate function is given by the relative entropy

$$\bar{c}(\varepsilon, p) = \varepsilon \log \frac{\varepsilon}{p} + (1 - \varepsilon) \log \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{1 - p}.$$

Now we note that

$$\partial_p \bar{c}(\varepsilon, p) > 0 \iff \varepsilon < p,$$

so that in our setting, in which $\varepsilon < \delta \leq y_j$, we find $\bar{c}(\varepsilon, y_j) \geq \bar{c}(\varepsilon, \delta) > \bar{c}(\varepsilon, \varepsilon) = 0$. Hence, if $c(\varepsilon, \delta) = \frac{1}{2} \bar{c}(\varepsilon, \delta) > 0$, there exists an $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i - p \right| \geq \varepsilon \right) \leq e^{-c(\varepsilon, \delta)n}, \quad \forall n \geq n_0.$$

Iterating the previous bound down to $M = 1$ we obtain, always assuming $I_0 \geq n_0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_{0,M}) &\geq \prod_{n=1}^M \left(1 - \exp \left\{ -c(\varepsilon, \delta) I_0 \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} (1 + y_j - \varepsilon) \right\} \right) \\ &\geq 1 - \sum_{n=1}^M \exp \left\{ -c(\varepsilon, \delta) I_0 \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} (1 + y_j - \varepsilon) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we made use of the inequality $\prod_{n=1}^M (1 - \alpha_n) \geq 1 - \sum_{n=1}^M \alpha_n$, which holds for any sequence $\alpha_n \in (0, 1)$ by iterating the following bound:

$$\prod_{n=1}^M (1 - \alpha_n) = \prod_{n=2}^M (1 - \alpha_n) - \alpha_1 \prod_{n=2}^M (1 - \alpha_n) \geq \prod_{n=2}^M (1 - \alpha_n) - \alpha_1.$$

Finally, by monotonicity, with $\mathcal{G}_{0,\infty} = \bigcap_{M \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{G}_{0,M}$

$$I_0 \geq n_0 \implies \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}_{0,\infty}) \geq 1 - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \exp \left\{ -c(\varepsilon, \delta) I_0 \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} (1 + y_j - \varepsilon) \right\} \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Here we have chosen a potentially even large n_0 , so that the sum on the right-hand side is bounded by $\frac{1}{2}$ (we could have chosen any number in $(0, 1)$). The fact that the sum is converging follows for example from Lemma 3.2.

At this point, an application of Borel–Cantelli, together with Lemma 3.2, guarantees that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^{j(t)} \log \frac{I_{t_j}}{I_{t_j^-}} &\leq \int_{(\delta, 1]} \log(1+y+\varepsilon) \frac{1}{y} \mathfrak{R}_\delta^+(dy) \\ &\leq \int_{(\delta, 1]} \log(1+y) \frac{1}{y} \mathfrak{R}_\delta^+(dy) + \varepsilon \int_{(\delta, 1]} \frac{1}{1+y} \frac{1}{y} \mathfrak{R}_\delta^+(dy). \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of the second inequality, and thereby of the lemma. \square

4. EXISTENCE AND DUALITY

This section is devoted to proving existence and uniqueness of solution to (1.2), as well as duality. We will first construct unique solutions and observe that they satisfy a certain martingale problem. Then we use the martingale problem to establish duality.

4.1. Existence and uniqueness. Let us start by defining the generator associated to the nonlinearity of (1.2). To be precise, the first definition will be associated to the space-independent equation. The extension to the spatial case passes through cylinder functions, as explained in the subsequent definition of martingale solutions. Here the set C_c^∞ indicates the space of smooth functions with compact support in \mathbb{R} . Throughout these construction, we recall that in Definition 2.4 we have divided

$$\mathfrak{R} = \mathfrak{R}_\delta^- + \mathfrak{R}_\delta^+.$$

Definition 4.1. Fix any $\mathfrak{R} \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\delta \in (0, 1]$. For any smooth function $\varphi \in C_c^\infty$ and an $F \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ define the cylinder function

$$C(\mathbb{R}) \ni u \mapsto F_\varphi(u) = F(\langle u, \varphi \rangle),$$

and for any such F_φ we define the generator $\mathcal{L}^{\mathfrak{R}_\delta^-} F_\varphi: C(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow C(\mathbb{R})$ by

$$\mathcal{L}^{\mathfrak{R}_\delta^-} (F_\varphi)(u) = \int_{(0, 1]} \{F_\varphi(u + yu(1-u)) - F_\varphi(u)\} \frac{1}{y} \mathfrak{R}_\delta^-(dy), \quad \forall u \in C(\mathbb{R}).$$

We observe that the integral is well defined at $y = 0$ for every u , since

$$F_\varphi(u + yu(1-u)) - F_\varphi(u) = F'(\langle u, \varphi \rangle)y + o(y),$$

for $y \rightarrow 0$ as $F \in C^1$.

Remark 4.2. In particular, we can bound

$$|\mathcal{L}^{\mathfrak{R}_\delta^-} (F)(u)| \lesssim \|F\|_{C^1 \mathfrak{R}_\delta^-((0, \delta])}.$$

Next we give a precise definition of martingale solutions to the stochastic FKPP equation. We use the following convention. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $F \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R})$ and for any smooth functions $\varphi_i \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ write, for $s \in [0, T]$, $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and any $u: [0, \infty) \rightarrow C(\mathbf{T}^d)$:

$$F_s = F\left(\{\langle u_s, \varphi_i \rangle\}_{i=1}^n\right), \quad \partial_j F_s = \partial_j F\left(\{\langle u_s, \varphi_i \rangle\}_{i=1}^n\right),$$

as well as

$$F_s^j: C(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow C(\mathbb{R}), \quad F_s^j(\eta) = F\left(\langle u_s, \varphi_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle \eta, \varphi_j \rangle, \dots, \langle u_s, \varphi_n \rangle\right).$$

We also recall that for \mathcal{S}_δ as in Definition 2.4 we let \mathbb{P}^δ be the (random) probability distribution

$$\mathbb{P}^\delta(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A} | \mathcal{S}_\delta),$$

and we let \mathcal{F}_t^δ be the filtration generated by

$$\mathcal{F}_t^\delta = \sigma(\mathcal{S}_t^\delta), \quad \mathcal{S}_t^\delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{S}^t \cup \mathcal{S}_\delta = (\mathcal{S} \cap ([0, t] \times (0, 1])) \cup \mathcal{S}_\delta.$$

Definition 4.3 (Conditional martingale solution). *Fix any $\mathfrak{R} \in \mathcal{M}$ as well as $\delta \in (0, 1]$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $u_0 \in C^\alpha$. Let u be a stochastic process over a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ taking values in $\mathbb{D}([0, \infty); C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}; [0, 1]))$. Let $\mathcal{S}_\delta = \{(t_i, y_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a Poisson point process as in Definition 2.4, defined on the same probability space.*

We say that u is a martingale solution to Equation (1.2) on $[0, \infty)$ with initial condition u_0 , conditional on \mathcal{S}_δ , if $u(0, \cdot) = u_0(\cdot)$ and the following conditions are satisfied for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$:

(1) *The process*

$$M_t^F := F_t - F_{t_j} - \sum_{j=1}^n \int_{t_j}^t D_s^{j,F} ds$$

is an \mathcal{F}_t^δ -càdlàg centered martingale on $[t_j, t_{j+1})$, with $D_s^{j,F}$ being the drift:

$$D_s^{j,F} = \partial_j F_s \cdot \left(\langle u_s, \frac{1}{2} \Delta \varphi_j \rangle + \langle \mathbf{r} u_s (1 - u_s), \varphi_j \rangle \right) + \mathcal{L}^{\mathfrak{R}_\delta^-} (F_s^j)(u_s).$$

(2) *The martingale M_t^F has predictable quadratic variation, for $t \in [t_j, t_{j+1})$*

$$\langle M^F \rangle_t = \sum_{j=1}^n \int_{t_j}^t \mathcal{L}^{\mathfrak{R}_\delta^-} ((F_s^j)^2)(u_s) - 2F_s^j(u_s) \mathcal{L}^{\mathfrak{R}_\delta^-} (F_s^j)(u_s) ds.$$

(3) *And finally $u_{t_j} = u_{t_j-} + y_j u_{t_j-} (1 - u_{t_j-})$.*

To prove the next proposition let us introduce, for $p \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\delta \in [0, 1]$, whenever the integral is convergent

$$\mathbf{r}^{\delta,p} = \int_{(\delta,1]} y^p \mathfrak{R}(dy) \in (0, \infty), \quad (4.1)$$

so that for example in this definition $\mathbf{r}^{0,1} = \mathfrak{R}([0, 1]) = \mathbf{r}$.

Proposition 4.4. *Fix any $\mathfrak{R} \in \mathcal{M}$, as well as $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space supporting a Poisson point process $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_1$ as in Definition 2.4. For every $u_0 \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}; [0, 1])$ there exists a unique solution*

$$u: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{D}([0, \infty); C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}; [0, 1]))$$

to (1.2) in the sense of Theorem 2.7. Moreover such u satisfies for any $\delta \in (0, 1]$ the conditional martingale problem of Definition 4.3.

Proof. To construct solutions our approach is to build an approximating sequence $\{u^\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)}$ associated to Poisson point processes that has only finitely many jumps. For this reason, for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ we recall that the measure $\mathcal{R}_\varepsilon^+$ is the restriction of the Poisson random measure \mathcal{R} to $[0, \infty) \times (\varepsilon, 1]$, as in from Definition 2.4 (we call \mathcal{R} a Poisson random measure, but it can only be integrated against functions that vanish sufficiently quickly near $y = 0$, cf. (2.3) for $\delta = 1$).

In this way the Poisson random measure $\mathcal{R}_\varepsilon^+(dy, dt)$ has intensity $\frac{1}{y} \mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon^+(dy) \otimes dt$ with finite total mass and we recall the representation through the locally finite Poisson point process $\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon = \{(t_i, y_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$

$$\mathcal{R}_\varepsilon^+ = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \delta_{(t_i, y_i)}.$$

Let now $u^\varepsilon \in \mathbb{D}([0, \infty); C^\alpha)$ be the solution to:

$$\partial_t u_t^\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2} \Delta u_t^\varepsilon + \mathbf{r} u_t^\varepsilon (1 - u_t^\varepsilon) + \int_{(\varepsilon, 1]} y u_{t-}^\varepsilon (1 - u_{t-}^\varepsilon) \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon^+(dy, dt), \quad (4.2)$$

with initial condition u_0 . Here solutions are defined by the following constraints for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$

$$u_t^\varepsilon = P_{t-t_i} u_{t_i}^\varepsilon, \quad \forall t \in [t_i, t_{i+1}), \quad u_{t_i} = u_{t_i-} + y_i u_{t_i-} (1 - u_{t_i-}),$$

where P_t is the heat semigroup

$$P_t \varphi(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi t}} \varphi(y) e^{-\frac{|x-y|^2}{2t}} dy.$$

Step 1: Existence and uniqueness. Since the only issue comes from the Poisson jumps let us assume without loss of generality that $\mathfrak{r} = 0$. We start by proving that the sequence $\{u^\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)}$ is Cauchy in $\mathbb{D}([0, T]; C(\mathbb{R}; [0, 1]))$ for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and any $T > 0$. Fix any two $0 < \bar{\varepsilon} < \varepsilon < 1$ and let v^ε be the difference $v^\varepsilon = u^\varepsilon - u^{\bar{\varepsilon}}$. Then v^ε solves

$$\begin{aligned} dv^\varepsilon &= \frac{1}{2} \Delta v^\varepsilon dt + \int_{(0,1]} y v^\varepsilon (1 - u^\varepsilon - u^{\bar{\varepsilon}}) \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon^+(dy, dt) + \int_{(0,1]} y u^{\bar{\varepsilon}} (1 - u^{\bar{\varepsilon}}) \mathbf{1}_{(\bar{\varepsilon}, \varepsilon)}(y) \mathcal{R}_{\bar{\varepsilon}}^+ \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \Delta v^\varepsilon dt + \int_{(0,1]} y v^\varepsilon \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon^+(dy, dt) + \int_{(0,1]} y \mathbf{1}_{(\bar{\varepsilon}, \varepsilon)}(y) \mathcal{R}_{\bar{\varepsilon}}^+, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that the solution takes values in $[0, 1]$. Using that $v^\varepsilon(0, \cdot) = 0$, we find the upper bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_t^\varepsilon\| &\leq \int_0^t \int_{(0,1]} y \mathbf{1}_{(\bar{\varepsilon}, \varepsilon)}(y) \exp \left\{ \int_s^t \int_{(0,1]} \log(1 + \bar{y}) \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon^+(dr, d\bar{y}) \right\} \mathcal{R}_{\bar{\varepsilon}}^+(dy, ds) \\ &\leq \int_0^t \int_{(0,1]} y \mathbf{1}_{(0, \varepsilon)}(y) \exp \left\{ \int_s^t \int_{(0,1]} \log(1 + \bar{y}) \mathcal{R}(dr, d\bar{y}) \right\} \mathcal{R}(dy, ds), \end{aligned}$$

where the integrals are defined in the sense of Campbell's theorem (see (2.3), or [15, Section 3] for further details). Now, the right-hand side decreases to zero as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, so that the claimed convergence follows.

We observe that the same argument delivers also uniqueness of solutions, if we replace $u^{\bar{\varepsilon}}$ with any solution u to (1.2).

Step 2: Regularity. To obtain better regularity for the solution u , namely that u belongs to $\mathbb{D}([0, \infty); C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}; [0, 1]))$ it now suffices to bound

$$\sup_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u_t^\varepsilon\|_{C^\alpha} < C < \infty,$$

for some random constant $C > 0$. In fact we could bound directly the regularity of u , but the latter bound will be also useful to establish the martingale problem.

For this purpose we can write u^ε in its mild formulation, as a convolution with the heat semigroup:

$$u_t^\varepsilon = P_t u_0 + \int_0^t \int_{(0,1]} y P_{t-s} u_{s-}^\varepsilon (1 - u_{s-}^\varepsilon) \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon^+(dy, ds).$$

Then we can use classical Schauder estimate, which captures the regularisation of the Laplacian

$$\|P_t \varphi\|_{C^{\alpha+\beta}} \leq t^{-\frac{\beta}{2}} \|P_t \varphi\|_{C^\alpha}, \quad \forall \alpha \in (0, \infty) \setminus \mathbb{N}, \quad \beta \geq 0, \quad \alpha + \beta \in (0, \infty) \setminus \mathbb{N}.$$

Here for $\gamma \in (0, \infty) \setminus \mathbb{N}$ we define C^γ to be the space of $[\gamma]$ -times differentiable functions with $\gamma - [\gamma]$ continuous derivatives. Then we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_t^\varepsilon\|_{C^\alpha} &\lesssim \|u_0\|_{C^\alpha} + \int_0^t \int_{(0,1]} y \|u_\varepsilon (1 - u_\varepsilon)\|_\infty t^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon^+(dy, ds) \\ &\lesssim \|u_0\|_{C^\alpha} + \int_0^t t^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} y \mathcal{R}(dy, ds), \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

where the latter integral is again defined by (2.3). Hence our upper bound is proven. We observe that we can additionally deduce the following moment bound:

$$\sup_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|u_t^\varepsilon\|_{C^\alpha} \right] < \infty. \quad (4.4)$$

Step 3: Martingale problem. To conclude the proof of the proposition, we have to show that any limit point of u^ε solves the martingale problem of Definition 4.3. Since the proof does not vary, we restrict to establishing this property for $\delta = 1$. Hence, consider F as in Definition 4.3. It is straightforward to establish the martingale problem for u^ε (where we are in presence on locally finite jumps). Namely, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} M_t^{F,\varepsilon} &:= F(u_t^\varepsilon) - F(u_0) \\ &\quad - \sum_{j=1}^n \int_0^t \partial_j F(u_s^\varepsilon) \cdot \langle u_s^\varepsilon, \frac{1}{2} \Delta \varphi_j \rangle + \mathcal{L}^{\mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon^+}(F_s^{j,\varepsilon})(u_s^\varepsilon) ds \end{aligned}$$

is a càdlàg martingale, with

$$F_s^{j,\varepsilon}(u) = F(\langle u_s^\varepsilon, \varphi_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle \eta, \varphi_j \rangle, \dots, \langle u_s^\varepsilon, \varphi_n \rangle).$$

Moreover, $M_t^{F,\varepsilon}$ has predictable quadratic variation

$$\langle M^{F,\varepsilon} \rangle_t = \sum_{j=1}^n \int_0^t \mathcal{L}^{\mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon^+}((F_s^{j,\varepsilon})^2)(u_s) - 2F_s^{j,\varepsilon}(u_s) \mathcal{L}^{\mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon^+}(F_s^{j,\varepsilon})(u_s) ds.$$

Now, since $\{u^\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)}$ converges almost surely in $\mathbb{D}([0, T]; \mathcal{C}^{\bar{\alpha}})$, we find that also $M^{F,\varepsilon}$ converges almost surely to M^F in $\mathbb{D}([0, T]; \mathbb{R})$, for M^F as in Definition 4.3. To conclude that M^F is a martingale, we can bound, as above, using (4.4)

$$\sup_{\varepsilon \in (0,1)} \mathbb{E} |M_T^{F,\varepsilon}|^2 < \infty.$$

Hence by uniform integrability the limiting point $M^{F,\varepsilon}$ is also a martingale, and a similar argument shows that it has the required predictable quadratic variation. \square

4.2. Duality. In this section we establish Proposition 3.1. For $u \in C_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$ let us recall the notation

$$u^{\mathbf{C}_t} = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell(\mathbf{C}_t)} u(C_t^{(i)}).$$

Moreover, for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{P}$ of the form $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we write

$$\mathbf{x} \dagger x_i = (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}.$$

Similarly, we say that $\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{P}$ is a subset of \mathbf{x} , namely $\mathbf{b} \subseteq \mathbf{x}$, if $\mathbf{b} = (x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_m})$, for some $m \leq n$. Then we write

$$\mathbf{x} \dagger \mathbf{b} = (\dots (\mathbf{x} \dagger x_{i_1}) \dots \dagger x_{i_m}).$$

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Our aim is to prove that for any $t > 0$ the process

$$[0, t] \ni s \mapsto \mathbb{E}^\delta (1 - u_{t-s})^{\mathbf{C}_s} \text{ is constant.} \quad (4.5)$$

To see that this is the case we can use the martingale problem of Definition 4.3 to see that for any fixed $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{P}$ and $t_i > 0$ a jump time of \mathcal{S}_δ

$$(1 - u_t)^{\mathbf{x}} - \int_{t_i}^t \sum_{x \in \mathbf{x}} (1 - u_s)^{\mathbf{x} \dagger x} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \Delta (1 - u_s)(x) + \mathfrak{R}([0, \delta])(u_s(u_s - 1))(x) \right\} ds.$$

is a square integrable martingale for $t \in [t_i, t_{i+1})$. Note that this quantity is well defined, since u is smooth for strictly positive times: $u_s \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ for $s > 0$ (this follows analogously to the bound of (4.3)). Similarly, for any $u \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ we have that

$$(1-u)^{\mathbf{C}_t} - \int_0^t \sum_{x \in \mathbf{x}} (1-u)^{x \dagger x} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \Delta(1-u)(x) + \mathfrak{R}([0, \delta])((1-u)^2 - (1-u))(x) \right\} ds$$

is a square integrable martingale on $[t_i, t_{i+1})$. Clearly, the two drifts are identical, since $(1-u)^2 - (1-u) = u^2 - u$. In particular, upon taking expectations we find that for $t \in [t_i, t_{i+1})$

$$s \mapsto \mathbb{E}^\delta(1-u_{t-s})^{\mathbf{C}_s} \text{ is constant on } [t_i, t).$$

Then, at time t_i , we find for $z_t = 1 - u_t$

$$\begin{aligned} (1-u_{t_i})^{\mathbf{x}} &= (1-u_{t_i-} - y_i u_{t_i-} (1-u_{t_i-}))^{\mathbf{x}} \\ &= (z_{t_i-} - y_i (1-z_{t_i-}) z_{t_i-})^{\mathbf{x}} \\ &= ((1-y_i) z_{t_i-} + y_i z_{t_i-}^2)^{\mathbf{x}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence in particular

$$\begin{aligned} (1-u_{t_i})^{\mathbf{x}} - (1-u_{t_i-})^{\mathbf{x}} &= \left\{ \sum_{\mathbf{b} \subseteq \mathbf{x}} y_i^{\ell(\mathbf{b})} (1-y_i)^{\ell(\mathbf{x} \dagger \mathbf{b})} z_{t_i-}^{\mathbf{x} \dagger \mathbf{b}} (z_{t_i-}^2)^{\mathbf{b}} \right\} - z_{t_i-}^{\mathbf{x}} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{b} \subseteq \mathbf{x}} y_i^{\ell(\mathbf{b})} (1-y_i)^{\ell(\mathbf{x} \dagger \mathbf{b})} \left\{ z_{t_i-}^{\mathbf{x} \dagger \mathbf{b}} (z_{t_i-}^2)^{\mathbf{b}} - z_{t_i-}^{\mathbf{x}} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{b} \subseteq \mathbf{x}} y_i^{\ell(\mathbf{b})} (1-y_i)^{\ell(\mathbf{x} \dagger \mathbf{b})} = 1.$$

This corresponds again to the branching mechanism of \mathbf{C}_t , so that we can deduce that $\mathbb{E}^\delta(1-u_{t-s})^{\mathbf{C}_s}$ is constant for $s \in (0, t)$. Taking the limit $s \downarrow 0$ and $s \uparrow t$ delivers the result on the closed interval $[0, t]$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] V. Bansaye, M.-E. Caballero, and S. Méléard. Scaling limits of population and evolution processes in random environment. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 24:paper no. 19, 38, 2019.
- [2] N. H. Barton, A. M. Etheridge, and A. Véber. A new model for evolution in a spatial continuum. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 15:no. 7, 162–216, 2010.
- [3] J. Berestycki. *Topics on Branching Brownian motion*. available at: http://www.stats.ox.ac.uk/~berestycki/Articles/EBP18_v2.pdf, 2014.
- [4] J. Blath, M. Hammer, and F. Nie. The stochastic Fisher-KPP equation with seed bank and on/off branching-coalescing Brownian motion. *arXiv:2005.01650*, 2020.
- [5] J. Blath, D. Jacobi, and F. Nie. How the interplay of dormancy and selection affects the wave of advance of an advantageous gene. *arXiv:2106.08655*, 2021.
- [6] F. Cordero and G. Véchambre. Moran model and Wright–Fisher diffusion with selection and mutation in a one-sided random environment. *arXiv:1911.12089*, 2019.
- [7] A. Cortines, L. Hartung, and O. Luidor. The structure of extreme level sets in branching Brownian motion. *Ann. Probab.*, 47(4):2257–2302, 2019.
- [8] J. Engländer and A. E. Kyprianou. Local extinction versus local exponential growth for spatial branching processes. *Ann. Probab.*, 32(1A):78–99, 2004.
- [9] A. González Casanova, N. Kurt, and A. Tóbiás. Particle systems with coordination. *ALEA Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat.*, 18(2):1817–1844, 2021.
- [10] A. González Casanova, D. Spanò, and M. Wilke-Berenguer. The effective strength of selection in random environment. *arXiv:1903.12121*, 2019.
- [11] D. Griffeath. The binary contact path process. *Ann. Probab.*, 11(3):692–705, 1983.
- [12] N. Ikeda, M. Nagasawa, and S. Watanabe. Branching Markov processes. I. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.*, 8:233–278, 1969.
- [13] N. Ikeda, M. Nagasawa, and S. Watanabe. Branching Markov processes. II. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.*, 8:365–410, 1969.
- [14] N. Ikeda, M. Nagasawa, and S. Watanabe. Branching Markov processes. III. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.*, 9:95–160, 1969.
- [15] J. F. C. Kingman. *Poisson processes*, volume 3 of *Oxford Studies in Probability*. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1993. MR1207584.
- [16] C. Kuehn. Travelling waves in monostable and bistable stochastic partial differential equations. *Jahresber. Dtsch. Math.-Ver.*, 122(2):73–107, 2020.
- [17] A. E. Kyprianou. Asymptotic radial speed of the support of supercritical branching Brownian motion and super-Brownian motion in \mathbb{R}^d . *Markov Process. Related Fields*, 11(1):145–156, 2005.
- [18] S. P. Lalley and T. Sellke. A conditional limit theorem for the frontier of a branching Brownian motion. *Ann. Probab.*, 15(3):1052–1061, 1987.
- [19] H. P. McKean. Application of Brownian motion to the equation of Kolmogorov-Petrovskii-Piskunov. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 28(3):323–331, 1975.
- [20] C. Mueller, L. Mytnik, and J. Quastel. Effect of noise on front propagation in reaction-diffusion equations of KPP type. *Invent. Math.*, 184(2):405–453, 2011.
- [21] R. G. Pinsky. *Positive harmonic functions and diffusion*, volume 45 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [22] J. Pitman. Coalescents with multiple collisions. *Ann. Probab.*, 27(4):1870–1902, 1999.
- [23] S. Sagitov. The general coalescent with asynchronous mergers of ancestral lines. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 36(4):1116–1125, 1999.