Some convergence results related to a stable branching random walk

Mei Zhang

Beijing Normal University

May 11, 2017 @ BNU

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ



This talk is based on two joint works. One is with H. He and J. Liu, the other is with J. Liu.

- Model and motivation
- Results on derivative martingale
- Results on additive martingale
- Second order limits of minimal position
- Sketch of proofs

Branching random walk

- It starts with an initial particle located at the origin.
- At time 1, the particle dies, producing some new particles, positioned according to Θ.
- At time 2, these particles die, each giving birth to new particles positioned (with respect to the birth place) according to Θ.
- The process goes on with the same mechanism. We assume each particle produces new particles independently.

For each vertex x on the branching tree, we denote the position by V(x). The family of random variables (V(x)) is referred as a branching random walk (Biggins ('10)). We assume

$$\mathbf{E}(\sum_{|x|=1} 1) > 1$$
, (supercritical)

$$\mathbf{E}(\sum_{|x|=1} e^{-V(x)}) = 1, \quad \mathbf{E}(\sum_{|x|=1} V(x)e^{-V(x)}) = 0, \quad \text{(boundary case)}$$
(1)

where |x| denotes the generation of x. (V(x)) can be reduced to this case by some renormalization, if Θ is not bounded from below (see Jaffuel ('12)).

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Additive martingale

$$W_n := \sum_{|x|=n} e^{-V(x)}$$
, (additive martingale)

- $V(x) \equiv 0$: (W_n) degenerates to a supercritical GW process.
- V(x) ≠ 0: (W_n) converges almost surely to 0 under (1) (supercritical + boundary case, Biggins ('77), Lyon ('97)).

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

It is natural to ask

At which rate W_n goes to 0?

Related work:

- Galton-Watson processes: Seneta ('68), Heyde ('70).
- Branching random walk:
 - General case: Biggins and Kyprianou ('96, '97).
 - Boundary case: Hu and Shi ('09), Aidekon and Shi ('14).

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Derivative martingale

$$D_n := \sum_{|x|=n} V(x) e^{-V(x)},$$
 (derivative martingale)

Related work:

- Non-boundary case: Barral ('00), Biggins ('91,'92);
- Boundary case: Biggins and Kyprianou ('04), Chen ('15), etc.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Related results on derivative martingale

Suppose that

$$\mathbf{E}(\sum_{|x|=1} V^2(x)e^{-V(x)}) < \infty.$$
 (2)

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Theorem A (Biggins and Kyprianou ('04)) Assume (1) and (2) hold. Then there exists a nonnegative random variable D_{∞} such that

$$D_n \to D_\infty, \ \mathbf{P}-a.s.$$

Theorem B (Chen ('15)) Assume (1) and (2) hold. Then $P(D_{\infty} > 0) > 0$ if and only if the following condition holds:

$$\mathbf{E}[X(\log_+ X)^2 + \widetilde{X}\log_+ \widetilde{X}] < \infty, \tag{3}$$

where $\log_+ y := 0 \vee \log y$ and

$$X := \sum_{|x|=1} e^{-V(x)}, \quad \widetilde{X} := \sum_{|x|=1} V(x)_+ e^{-V(x)}, \tag{4}$$

with $V(x)_+ := V(x) \lor 0$.

When D_{∞} is nontrivial, $\mathbf{P}(D_{\infty} > 0)$ equals to the nonextinction probability of the branching tree. Define

 $\mathbf{P}^*(\cdot) := \mathbf{P}(\cdot | \mathsf{non extinction})$

Obviously $W_n \rightarrow 0$, \mathbf{P}^* -*a.s.* **Theorem C** (Aidekon and Shi (2014)) Assume (1), (2) and (3) hold. Under \mathbf{P}^* , we have

$$n^{1/2}W_n \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}^*} \left(\frac{2}{\pi\sigma^2}\right)^{1/2} D_{\infty},$$
 (5)

where $D_{\infty} > 0$ is the random variable in Theorem A, and

$$\sigma^2 := \mathbf{E} \Big(\sum_{|x|=1} V(x)^2 e^{-V(x)} \Big) < \infty.$$

Stable branching random walk

In this paper, instead of (2) and (3), we shall study (V(x)) under (1) and $(\alpha \in (1,2))$:

(i)
$$\mathbf{E} \left(\sum_{|x|=1} I_{\{V(x) \le -y\}} e^{-V(x)} \right) = o(y^{-\alpha}), \quad y \to +\infty,$$
 (6)
(ii) $\mathbf{E} \left(\sum_{|x|=1} I_{\{V(x) \ge y\}} e^{-V(x)} \right) \sim Cy^{-\alpha}, \quad y \to +\infty,$ (7)
(iii) $\mathbf{E} (X(\log_+ X)^{\alpha} + \widetilde{X}(\log_+ \widetilde{X})^{\alpha-1}) < \infty.$ (8)

Under (6) and (7), the step of the one-dimensional random walk (S_n) associated with (V(x)) belongs to the domain of attraction of a stable law.

(The many-to-one formula)

$$\mathbf{E}\Big[\sum_{|x|=n}g(V(x_1),\ldots,V(x_n))\Big]=\mathbf{E}\Big[e^{S_n}g(S_1,\ldots,S_n)\Big],$$

where (S_n) is a random walk, $E(S_1) = 0$ (by (1)) and S_1 belongs to the domain of attraction of a stable law with characteristic function (spectrally positive). see Biggins and Kyprianou (1997), Lyons (1997), Lyons et al (1995).

$$G(t) := \exp\left\{-c|t|^{\alpha} \left(1 - i\frac{t}{|t|} \tan\frac{\pi\alpha}{2}\right)\right\}, \ c > 0.$$

 $(2) \Leftrightarrow E(S_1^2) < \infty$

$$(6) + (7) \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} P(S_1 > y) \sim Cy^{-\alpha}, \\ P(S_1 < -y) = o(y^{-\alpha}), \end{cases} E(S_1^2) = \infty$$

Main results – derivative martingale

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Theorem 1 (HLZ ('17)) Assume (1), (6), (7). Then there exists a nonnegative random variable D_{∞} such that

$$D_n \to D_\infty, \ \mathbf{P}-a.s.$$

Moreover, if condition (8) holds, then $\mathbf{P}^*(D_{\infty} > 0) = 1$.

Main results – additive martingale

Theorem 2 (HLZ ('17)) Assume (1), (6)–(8). We have

$$n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}W_n \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}^*} \frac{\theta}{\Gamma(1-1/\alpha)}D_{\infty}.$$

where $D_{\infty} > 0$ is given in Theorem 1, and θ is a positive constant related to the renewal function of (S_n) .

Theorem 3 (LZ ('17)) Assume (1), (6)–(8). For any function $f \uparrow \infty$, we have \mathbf{P}^* –a.s.

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} W_n}{f(n)} = \begin{cases} 0 \\ \infty \end{cases} \Leftrightarrow \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{t f(t)} dt \begin{cases} < \infty \\ = \infty. \end{cases}$$

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \to \infty} n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} W_n = \infty \ \mathbf{P}^* - a.s.$$
(9)

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Minimal position

Denote $M_n = \min_{|x|=n} V(x)$.

The asymptotic behaviors of M_n : Biggins ('77), Lyons ('97), Addario-Berry and Reed ('09), Aidékon ('13), Bramson and Zeitouni ('06), Hu and Shi ('09), etc.

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \left(M_n - \frac{1}{2} \log n \right) = -\infty, \quad a.s. \quad (\text{Aidékon and Shi ('14)})$$
$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \frac{M_n - \frac{1}{2} \log n}{\log \log n} = -1, \qquad a.s. \quad (\text{Hu ('15)})$$

When $\mathbf{E}(\sum_{|x|=1}(V(x)_{+})^{3}e^{-V(x)}) < \infty$:

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{M_n - \frac{3}{2} \log n}{\log \log \log n} = 1. \qquad a.s. \quad (\mathsf{Hu} \ ('13))$$

The second order limits of M_n

Theorem 4 (LZ ('17)) Assume (1), (6)–(8). For any function f satisfying $f \uparrow \infty$, we have

$$\mathbf{P}^*(M_n - \frac{1}{\alpha}\log n < -f(n), \text{i.o.}) = \begin{cases} 0\\ 1 \Leftrightarrow \int_0^\infty \frac{dt}{te^{f(t)}} \begin{cases} < \infty\\ = \infty. \end{cases}$$

Choose $f_1 = \log \log n$ and $f_2 = (1 + \varepsilon) \log \log n$. Then

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \frac{M_n - \frac{1}{\alpha} \log n}{\log \log n} = -1, \ \mathbf{P}^* \text{-a.s}$$

Theorem 5 (LZ ('17)) Assume (1), (6)–(8).

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{M_n - (1 + \frac{1}{\alpha}) \log n}{\log \log \log n} \ge 1, \ \mathbf{P}^* - \mathsf{a.s.}$$

Sketch of proofs – estimates for (S_n)

In the proofs, we depend heavily on the probability estimations for (S_n) , and some properties for (S_n) conditioned to stay in $[-x,\infty)$. We refer to Vatutin and Wachtel ('09) and prove more inequalities. For example,

$$\sum_{l\geq 0} \mathbf{P}_z(S_l \leq x, \underline{S}_l \geq 0) \leq c \, (1+x)^{\alpha-1} (1+\min(x,z));$$

$$E\left(f\left(\frac{S_n+x}{n^{1/\alpha}}\right)\mathbf{1}_{\{\underline{S}_n\ge-x\}}\right) = \frac{R(x)}{\Gamma(1-\frac{1}{\alpha})n^{1/\alpha}} \left(\int_0^\infty f(t)p_\alpha(t)dt + o_n(1)\right)$$

uniformly in $x \in [0, d_n]$ with $d_n = o(n^{1/\alpha})$. And $\mathbf{E}(M_\alpha) = \frac{\Gamma(1-\frac{1}{\alpha})}{\theta} (M_\alpha \leftrightarrow p_\alpha)$.

It originated from Harris ('99), was formalized for BBM by Kyprianou ('04), and later be used for BRW by Biggins and Kyprianou ('04) and then Aidekon and Shi ('14).

Define $\underline{V}(x) := \min_{y \in \langle \emptyset, x \rangle} V(y)$. We use the renewal function R(u) of (S_n) to introduce the truncated processes ($\beta > 0$):

$$W_n^{\beta} := \sum_{|x|=n} e^{-V(x)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\underline{V}(x) \ge -\beta\}}, \qquad (\sim W_n)$$
$$D_n^{\beta} := \sum_{|x|=n} R(V(x) + \beta) e^{-V(x)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\underline{V}(x) \ge -\beta\}}. \quad (\sim \theta D_n)$$

Note that $\lim_{u\to\infty} \frac{R(u)}{u} = \theta \in (0,\infty)$ for $S_1 \in D(\alpha,-1)$.

Sketch of proofs - Spine decomposition (1)

$$\left. \frac{d \mathbf{P}^{\beta}}{d \mathbf{P}} \right|_{\mathcal{F}_n} := \frac{D_n^{\beta}}{R(\beta)}, \quad \text{(change of probabilities)}$$

 $\hat{\Theta}$ is the point process (V(x), |x| = 1) under \mathbf{P}^{β} . The branching random walk (V(x)) under \mathbf{P}^{β} can be described as follows:

At time 0, $V(\omega_0^\beta) = 0$. At each step n, all particles produce according to Θ , except ω_n^β according to $\hat{\Theta}$. ω_{n+1}^β is chosen to be y among the children of ω_n^β proportional to $R_\beta(V(y))e^{-V(y)}\mathbf{1}_{\{\underline{V}(y)\geq -\beta\}}$. Hence there is a "spine" in the branching tree.

The spine process $(V(\omega_n^{\beta}), n \ge 0)$ under \mathbf{P}^{β} is distributed as $(S_n)_{n\ge 0}$ conditioned to stay above $-\beta$ under \mathbf{P} (Biggins and Kyprianou ('04)).

Denote the natural filtration of (V(x)) by $(\mathcal{F}_n).$ With $W_n,$ define ${\bf Q}$ such that

$$\mathbf{Q}\big|_{\mathcal{F}_n} := W_n \cdot \mathbf{P}\big|_{\mathcal{F}_n}, \quad n \ge 1.$$

We give a description of (V(x)) under **Q**.

 $V(\omega_0) = 0$. each particle v in the *n*th generation dies and produces independently as (V(x), |x| = 1) under $\mathbf{P}_{V(v)}$, except ω_n producing as (V(x), |x| = 1) under $\mathbf{Q}_{V(\omega_n)}$. ω_{n+1} is chosen to be x among the children of ω_n , proportionally to $e^{-V(x)}$.

 $(V(\omega_n))_{n\geq 0}$ under **Q** has the distribution of $(S_n)_{n\geq 0}$ under **P** (Lyons ('97)).

Proof of Theorem 1:

• prove $D_n^\beta o D_\infty^\beta$ (truncated martingale convergence)

• prove
$$D_n \to D_\infty$$
.

• prove $\mathbf{P}(D_{\infty}^{\beta} > 0) > 0$. ((D_{n}^{β}) is uniformly integrable)

• prove $\mathbf{P}^*(D_\infty > 0) = 1$. $(D_\infty^\beta \le c D_\infty$, a.s.)

Proof of Theorem 2: We first have

$$\begin{split} \mathbf{E}^{\beta} & \left(\frac{W_{n}^{\beta}}{D_{n}^{\beta}}\right) \sim \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-1/\alpha)n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}, \\ \mathbf{E}^{\beta} & \left(\left(\frac{W_{n}^{\beta}}{D_{n}^{\beta}}\right)^{2}\right) \sim \frac{1}{\left(\Gamma(1-1/\alpha)\right)^{2}n^{\frac{2}{\alpha}}}. \end{split}$$

Therefore $\lim_{n\to\infty} n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \left(\frac{W_n^{\beta}}{D_n^{\beta}} \right) = \Gamma(1 - \frac{1}{\alpha})$, in probability (\mathbf{P}^{β}) Finally, we manage to change the setting from \mathbf{P}^{β} to \mathbf{P} .

Proof of Theorems 3 and 4:

We only need to prove the the convergence part in Theorem 4, i.e.,

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{dt}{tf(t)} < \infty \Rightarrow \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} W_n}{f(n)} = 0, \quad \mathbf{P}^* \text{-a.s.}$$

and the divergence part in Theorem 3, i.e.,

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{dt}{t e^{f(t)}} = \infty \Rightarrow \mathbf{P}^*(M_n - \frac{1}{\alpha} \log n < -f(n), \quad \text{i.o.}) = 1.$$

We use estimations of (S_n) , (S_n) conditioned to stay above -x, and spine decompositions.

Proof of Theorem 5: We mainly use the following estimation and Borel-Cantelli lemma.

For any $\lambda > 0$, there is $c_9 > 0$ such that for each $n \ge 1$,

$$\mathbf{P}\left(M_n < \left(1 + \frac{1}{\alpha}\right)\log n - \lambda\right) \le c_9(1+\lambda)e^{-\lambda}.$$

(ロ)、(型)、(E)、(E)、 E) の(の)

- Aidekon, E.: Convergence in law of the minimum of a branching random walk. *Ann. Probab.* **41** 1362-1426. (2013)
- Aidekon, E. and Shi, Z.: The Seneta-Heyde scaling for the branching random walk. *Ann. Probab.* **42** 959-993. (2014)
- Aidekon, E. and Shi, Z.: Weak convergence for the minimal position in a branching random walk: asimple proof. *Pre. Math. Hung.* 61(1-2) 43-54. (2010)
- Biggins, J. D.: Martingale convergence in the branching random walk. *J. Appl. Probab.* **14** 25-37. (1977)

- Biggins, J. D.: Uniform convergence of martingales in the onedimensional branching random walk. In: Selected Proc. Sheffield Symp. Appl. Prob. 1989. IMS Lecture Notes Monogr. Ser. 18. eds I. V. Basawa and R. L. Taylor, Institute of Mathematical Statistics, Hayward, CA. 159-173. (1991)
- Biggins, J. D.: Uniform convergence of martingales in the branching random walk. *Ann. Prob.* **20** 137-151. (1992)
- Biggins, J. D.: Random walk conditioned to stay positive. J. London Math. Soc. 2(67) 259-272. (2003)
- Biggins, J. D.: Branching out. In Probability and Mathematical Genetics (N. H. Bingham and C. M. Goldie, eds.). London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series 378 113-134. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge. (2010)

- Biggins, J. D. and Kyprianou, A. E.: Branching random walk: Seneta-Heyde norming. In: *Trees (Versailles, 1995)* eds.: B. Chauvin et al. *Progr. Probab.* 40 31-49. Birkhäuser, Basel. (1996)
- Biggins, J. D. and Kyprianou, A. E.: Measure change in multitype branching random walk. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.* **36** 544-581. (2004)
- Biggins, J. D. and Kyprianou, A. E.: Fixed points of the s-moothing transform: The boundary case. *Electron. J. Probab.* 10 609-631. (2005)
- Biggins, J. D. and Kyprianou, A. E.: Seneta-Heyde norming in the branching random walk. *Ann. Probab.* **25** 337-360. (1997)

- Chen, X. X.: A necessary and sufficient condition for the nontrivial limit of the derivative martingale in a branching random walk. Adv. Appl. Prob. 47 741-760. (2015)
- Heyde, C. C.: Extension of a result of Seneta for the supercritical Galton-Watson process. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **41** 739-742. (1970)
- Hu, Y. and Shi, Z.: Minimal position and critical martingale convergence in branching random walks, and directed polymers on disordered trees. *Ann. Probab.* **37** 742-789. (2009)
- Jaffuel, B.: The critical barrier for the survival of the branching random walk with absorption. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist. 48 989-1009. (2012)

Lyons, R. (1997): A simple path to Biggins' martingale convergence for branching random walk. In: *Classical and Modern Branching Processes* (Eds.: Athreya, K.B. and Jagers, P.) *I-MA Volumes in Mathematics and its Applications* 84, 217–221. Springer, New York.

- Kyprianou, A. E.: Slow variation and uniqueness of solutions to the functional equation in the branching random walk. *J. Appl. Prob.* 35 795-802. (1998)
- Seneta, E.: On recent theorems concerning the supercritical Galton-Watson process. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **39** 2098-2102. (1968)
- Vatutin, V. A. and Wachtel, V.: Local probabilities for random walks conditioned to stay positive. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* 143 177-217. (2009)

Thank you !