

## On the Stationary Measures of Critical Branching Processes

Ch. Pommerenke

Fachbereich Mathematik, Technische Universität, D-1000 Berlin 12

**Abstract.** Let  $Z_n$  ( $n=0, 1, \dots$ ) be an aperiodic critical Galton-Watson process and let  $\sigma^2$  be the (possibly infinite) variance of  $Z_1$ . Let  $\eta_k$  ( $k=1, 2, \dots$ ) denote the stationary measure of the process. Kesten, Ney and Spritzer proved in 1966 that

$$\eta_k \rightarrow 2/\sigma^2 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty \quad (*)$$

under the additional assumption that

$$EZ_1^2 \log Z_1 < \infty. \quad (**)$$

In the present paper, (\*) is proved without the assumption (\*\*). The proof uses complex function theory.

### 1. Introduction

Let  $Z_n$  ( $n=0, 1, \dots$ ) be a *Galton-Watson branching process* starting from  $Z_0=1$ . In the standard interpretation,  $Z_n$  is the random number of individuals in the  $n$ -th generation; these individuals propagate independently and the probability that an individual has  $k$  direct descendants ( $k=0, 1, \dots$ ) is always  $p_k$ . This process is called *critical* if the average number of direct descendants is 1, that is if  $p_1 + 2p_2 + 3p_3 \dots = 1$ ; we assume  $p_0 > 0$  because otherwise we have the trivial case  $p_1 = 1$ ,  $p_k = 0$  ( $k \geq 2$ ). The process is called *aperiodic* if there does not exist  $m \geq 2$  such that  $p_k = 0$  for  $k \neq \mu m$  ( $\mu=0, 1, \dots$ ). We refer to the books of Harris [4] and Athreya and Ney [1] for the theory of branching processes.

We describe now this process in analytical terms. The generating function of  $Z_1$ ,

$$f(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_k z^k \quad (p_k \geq 0 \text{ aperiodic, } p_0 > 0), \quad (1.1)$$

is analytic in the unit disk  $\mathbb{D}$  and satisfies

$$f(1) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_k = 1, \quad f'(1) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k p_k = 1. \tag{1.2}$$

The variance of  $Z_1$  is given by

$$\sigma^2 = f''(1) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k(k-1) p_k \leq +\infty. \tag{1.3}$$

The iterates  $f_n = f \circ \dots \circ f$  are the generating functions of  $Z_n$ . The limit

$$h(z) \equiv \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \eta_k z^k = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f_n(z) - f_n(0)}{f_{n+1}(0) - f_n(0)} \tag{1.4}$$

exists locally uniformly in  $\mathbb{D}$  and satisfies

$$h(f(z)) = h(z) + 1 \quad (z \in \mathbb{D}); \tag{1.5}$$

see [9], [1, Th. I8.2]. Similar results hold for the iteration of power series with complex coefficients that satisfy  $f(\mathbb{D}) \subset \mathbb{D}$ ; see [10, Chapt. VI], [8, 2, 3].

It follows from (1.5) that  $\eta_k$  ( $k = 1, 2, \dots$ ) is the stationary measure of the process, that is

$$\eta_k = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} P(Z_{n+1} = k \mid Z_n = j) \eta_j \quad (k = 1, 2, \dots; n = 1, 2, \dots). \tag{1.6}$$

It is unique (up to a multiplicative constant) in the critical case under consideration [1, Sect. II2].

**Theorem.** *For every aperiodic critical Galton-Watson process with variance  $\sigma^2 \leq +\infty$ , the stationary measure satisfies*

$$\eta_k \rightarrow 2/\sigma^2 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty. \tag{1.7}$$

This limit relation was proved by Kesten, Ney and Spitzer [6] under the additional assumption

$$E(Z_1^2 \log^+ Z_1) \equiv \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^2 p_k \log k < \infty. \tag{1.8}$$

We do not even assume that the variance is finite.

Our proof is complex analytic and is modeled after Hayman's proof of the asymptotic form of the Bieberbach conjecture for univalent functions [5, Th. 5.7]. The new feature is the unrestricted limit relation

$$(1-z)h(z) \rightarrow 2/\sigma^2 \quad \text{as } z \rightarrow 1, z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Its proof uses strongly the assumption that  $f$  has non-negative coefficients.

I want to thank C.C. Cowen for drawing my attention to the connection between analytic iteration theory and branching processes. I also want to thank H. Hering and P.E. Ney for our exchange of letters.

**2. Some Auxiliary Results**

Let (1.1) and (1.2) be satisfied and let  $h$  be defined by (1.4). An analytic function  $g$  is called *univalent* in a domain  $G$  if  $g(z_1) \neq g(z_2)$  for distinct  $z_1, z_2 \in G$ .

**Lemma 1.** *There exists  $\rho > 0$  such that  $f$  and  $h$  are univalent in*

$$G = \mathbb{D} \cap \{|z - 1| < \rho\}. \tag{2.1}$$

*Proof.* By (1.1) and (1.2), the derivative  $f'$  is continuous in the closed unit disk  $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$  and  $f'(1) = 1$ . Hence we can determine  $\rho > 0$  such that  $\operatorname{Re} f'(z) > 0$  for  $z \in G$ . Thus

$$\operatorname{Re} \frac{f(z_2) - f(z_1)}{z_2 - z_1} = \int_0^1 \operatorname{Re} f'(z_1 + (z_2 - z_1)t) dt > 0$$

for distinct  $z_1, z_2 \in G$  and  $f$  is therefore univalent in  $G$ .

We obtain from  $|f'(z)| \leq 1$  by integration that

$$|1 - f(z)| \leq |1 - z| \quad \text{for } z \in \mathbb{D}. \tag{2.2}$$

It follows that  $f(G) \subset G$  and thus that  $f_n(G) \subset G$  for all  $n$ . Hence  $f_n$  is univalent in  $G$  and therefore also  $h$ , by (1.4).

**Lemma 2.** *The derivative  $h'$  has a continuous extension to  $\overline{\mathbb{D}} \setminus \{1\}$ .*

*Proof.* If  $z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}} \setminus \{1\}$  then, by (1.2),

$$|f(z)| \cong \left| \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_k z^k \right| < \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_k = 1; \tag{2.3}$$

equality cannot hold because  $(p_k)$  is aperiodic and  $p_0 > 0$ . We obtain from (1.5) by differentiation that

$$h'(z) = h'(f(z))f'(z) \quad (z \in \mathbb{D}). \tag{2.4}$$

Since  $f'$  is continuous in  $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$  and since  $f(\overline{\mathbb{D}} \setminus \{1\}) \subset \mathbb{D}$  by (2.3), it follows that  $h'$  is continuous in  $\overline{\mathbb{D}} \setminus \{1\}$ .

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $\sigma \leq +\infty$  and  $c = 2/\sigma^2$ . Then*

$$(1 - x)h(x) \rightarrow c \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow 1 - 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{2.5}$$

*Proof* (See [1, p. 88]). It follows from (1.5) that

$$h(f_n(z)) = h(z) + n. \tag{2.6}$$

Hence we obtain that, for  $0 < x < 1$  and  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$(1 - f_n(x))h(f_n(x)) = (1 - f_n(x))h(x) + (1 - f_n(x))n \rightarrow c$$

because  $(1 - f_n(x))n \rightarrow c$  [1, p. 19]. It is easy to see that this implies (2.5).

We come now to our main lemma.

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $\sigma < \infty$  and  $c = 2/\sigma^2$ . Then*

$$(1 - z)h(z) \rightarrow c \quad \text{as } z \rightarrow 1, z \in \mathbb{D}. \tag{2.7}$$

*Proof.* (a) We show first that  $(1 - z)h(z)$  has the *angular* limit  $c$  at 1. If  $\psi$  is univalent and  $\neq 0$  in  $\mathbb{D}$  then [5, Th. 5.1]

$$\left| \frac{\psi'(s)}{\psi(s)} \right| \leq \frac{4}{1 - |s|^2} \quad (s \in \mathbb{D}). \tag{2.8}$$

Let the univalent function  $\varphi$  map  $\mathbb{D}$  onto  $G$  such that  $\varphi(1) = 1$  and  $\varphi(\xi)$  is real for real  $\xi$ . Then  $1 - \varphi(s)$  and  $\psi(s) = h(\varphi(s))$  are univalent and  $\neq 0$  in  $\mathbb{D}$  (if  $\rho$  is sufficiently small). Hence  $g(s) = (1 - \varphi(s))\psi(s)$  ( $s \in \mathbb{D}$ ) satisfies

$$(1 - |s|^2) \left| \frac{g'(s)}{g(s)} \right| \leq \frac{(1 - |s|^2)|\varphi'(s)|}{|1 - \varphi(s)|} + \frac{(1 - |s|^2)|\psi'(s)|}{|\psi(s)|} \leq 8$$

by (2.8). We conclude that  $g$  is a normal function [7, Sect. 9.1].

Since  $g(\xi) = (1 - \varphi(\xi))h(\varphi(\xi)) \rightarrow c$  as  $\xi \rightarrow 1 - 0$  by Lemma 3, it follows from a result on normal functions [7, Th. 9.3] that  $g$  has the angular limit  $c$  at 1. Since  $\varphi$  is analytic at 1 and  $\varphi'(1) \neq 0$  (by the reflection principle), we conclude that

$$(1 - z)h(z) \rightarrow c \quad \text{as } z \rightarrow 1, |\arg(1 - z)| < \alpha \tag{2.9}$$

for each  $\alpha < \pi/2$ .

(b) We set

$$w \equiv u + iv = \frac{1}{1 - z}, \quad F(w) = \frac{1}{1 - f(z)}, \quad H(w) = h(z). \tag{2.10}$$

Then  $F$  and  $H$  are analytic in the halfplane  $\{u + iv : u > \frac{1}{2}\}$ . The iterates  $F_n$  are given by  $F_n(w) = 1/(1 - f_n(z))$ . Hence it follows from (2.2) that

$$|F_{n+1}(w)| = |F(F_n(w))| \geq |F_n(w)| \quad (u > \frac{1}{2}). \tag{2.11}$$

Integration by parts shows that, for  $z \in \mathbb{D}$ ,

$$\frac{f(z) - z}{(1 - z)^2} = \int_0^1 (1 - t) f''(1 - (1 - z)t) dt. \tag{2.12}$$

Since  $\sigma < \infty$  we see from (1.3) that  $f''$  is continuous in  $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ . Hence it follows from (2.12) that

$$\frac{f(z) - z}{(1 - z)^2} \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} f''(1) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} = \frac{1}{c} \quad (z \rightarrow 1) \tag{2.13}$$

and thus, by (2.10),

$$F(w) - w = \frac{f(z) - z}{(1 - z)^2} \frac{1 - z}{1 - f(z)} \rightarrow \frac{1}{c} \quad (|w| \rightarrow \infty, u > \frac{1}{2}).$$

Hence we conclude from (2.11) that

$$\frac{1}{n} (F_n(w) - w) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{v=0}^{n-1} [F(F_v(w)) - F_v(w)] \rightarrow \frac{1}{c} \quad (|w| \rightarrow \infty) \tag{2.14}$$

uniformly in  $n$ . Hence there exists  $R$  such that  $|F_n(w) - w - n/c| < n/(2c)$  for  $|w| > R, u > 1/2, n \in \mathbb{N}$  and thus

$$\frac{|\operatorname{Im} F_n(w)|}{\operatorname{Re} F_n(w)} < \frac{|v| + n/(2c)}{n/(2c)} = 2c \frac{|v|}{n} + 1. \tag{2.15}$$

(c) We assume now  $|w| > R$  and  $|v| \geq u \geq 1$ . Setting  $n = \lceil |v| \rceil$  we obtain from (2.15) that

$$\frac{|\operatorname{Im} F_n(w)|}{\operatorname{Re} F_n(w)} < 2c \frac{n+1}{n} + 1 \leq 4c + 1. \tag{2.16}$$

It follows from (2.10) and (2.9) that, in particular,

$$\frac{H(w)}{w} \rightarrow c \quad \text{as } |w| \rightarrow \infty, \quad \frac{|v|}{u} \leq 4c + 1. \tag{2.17}$$

Since  $H(w) = H(F_n(w)) - n$  by (2.10) and (1.5), we obtain

$$\frac{H(w)}{w} = \left( \frac{H(F_n(w))}{F_n(w)} \frac{F_n(w) - w}{n} - 1 \right) \frac{n}{w} + \frac{H(F_n(w))}{F_n(w)}.$$

We let now  $|w| \rightarrow \infty$ ; note that  $n$  depends on  $w$ . It follows from (2.16) and (2.17) that  $H(F_n(w))/F_n(w) \rightarrow c$  and from (2.14) that  $(F_n(w) - w)/n \rightarrow 1/c$ . Since  $|n/w| \leq (|v| + 1)/|w| \leq 2$  we conclude that

$$H(w)/w \rightarrow c \quad \text{as } |w| \rightarrow \infty \tag{2.18}$$

if  $|v| \geq u$ . The case  $|v| \leq u$  follows from (2.17). Thus (2.18) always holds, and by (2.10) this is equivalent to the assertion (2.7).

### 3. Proof of the Theorem

(a) Let first  $\sigma < \infty$  and thus  $c = 2/\sigma^2 > 0$ . We set

$$g(z) = h(z) - \frac{c}{1-z} \quad (z \in \mathbb{D}). \tag{3.1}$$

Since  $g'(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k+1)(\eta_{k+1} - c) z^k$  we see that, for  $0 < r < 1$ ,

$$(k+1)(\eta_{k+1} - c) = \frac{1}{2\pi r^k} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} g'(r e^{it}) e^{-ikt} dt \quad (k=0, 1, \dots). \tag{3.2}$$

We set

$$r_k = \frac{k-1}{k+1}, \quad r'_k = \frac{k}{k+1} \quad (k=2, 3, \dots). \tag{3.3}$$

Since  $r_k^{k-1} \geq e^{-2}$  we obtain from (3.2) that

$$|\eta_{k+1} - c| \leq 2 \int_{r_k}^{r'_k} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |g'(re^{it})| r dt dr. \tag{3.4}$$

(b) Let  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$  be given and let  $\lambda = 1/\varepsilon^2$ . We denote by  $K_1, K_2, \dots$  constants independent of  $\varepsilon$  and  $k$ . Let  $\rho$  be as in Lemma 1. Then

$$G_k = \{z: r_k < |z| < r'_k, \lambda/k < |\arg z| < \rho\} \subset G \tag{3.5}$$

for  $k > k_1(\varepsilon)$ . It follows from Lemma 4 that

$$|h(z)| \leq \frac{K_1}{|1-z|} \leq \frac{K_2 k}{\lambda} \quad (z \in G_k). \tag{3.6}$$

Let  $k > k_1$ . We obtain from the Schwarz inequality that

$$\left(\iint_{G_k} |h'(z)| dx dy\right)^2 \leq \iint_{G_k} |h(z)|^{-\frac{2}{3}} |h'(z)|^2 dx dy \iint_{G_k} |h(z)|^{\frac{2}{3}} dx dy, \tag{3.7}$$

and since  $G_k \subset G$  the univalent substitution  $w = h(z)$  shows that the first right-hand integral is (see (3.6))

$$= \iint_{h(G_k)} |w|^{-\frac{2}{3}} du dv \leq \iint_{|w| \leq K_2 k/\lambda} |w|^{-\frac{2}{3}} du dv = K_3 (k/\lambda)^{\frac{2}{3}}.$$

Since  $|1 - re^{it}| \geq \sqrt{r} |1 - e^{it}|$ , the second right-hand integral in (3.7) is, by (3.6),

$$\leq K_4 \int_{r_k}^{r'_k} \int_{\lambda/k}^{\rho} |1 - e^{it}|^{-\frac{2}{3}} dt dr \leq \frac{K_5}{k+1} \left(\frac{k}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}} < K_5 (k\lambda)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$$

because of (3.3). Hence we obtain from (3.7) that

$$\int_{r_k}^{r'_k} \int_{\lambda/k}^{\rho} |h'(re^{it})| r dt dr \leq K_6 \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} = K_6 \varepsilon. \tag{3.8}$$

The integral over  $[\rho, \pi]$  instead of  $[\lambda/k, \rho]$  is  $\leq K_7 k^{-1}$  by Lemma 2 and (3.3). Furthermore

$$\int_{r_k}^{r'_k} \int_{\lambda/k}^{\pi} \frac{c}{|1 - re^{it}|^2} r dt dr \leq \frac{c}{k+1} \int_{\lambda/k}^{\pi} \frac{1}{|1 - e^{it}|^2} dt \leq \frac{K_8}{\lambda} \leq K_8 \varepsilon.$$

Hence we see from (3.1) and (3.8) that, for  $k > k_1(\varepsilon)$ ,

$$\int_{r_k}^{r'_k} \int_{\lambda/k}^{2\pi - \lambda/k} |g'(re^{it})| r dt dr \leq K_9 \varepsilon + K_{10} k^{-1} \tag{3.9}$$

because the range  $[\pi, 2\pi - \lambda/k]$  can be treated in a similar way.

(c) Since  $(1 - z)g(z) \rightarrow 0$  as  $z \rightarrow 1$  by (3.1) and Lemma 4, we can find  $k_2 = k_2(\varepsilon) > k_1$  such that

$$|(1 - z)g(z)| < \varepsilon^3 \quad \text{for } |\arg z| \leq \frac{\lambda}{k}, \quad r_k \leq |z| \leq r'_k.$$

Hence it follows from the Cauchy integral formula for the derivative that

$$\left| \frac{d}{dz} [(1 - z)g(z)] \right| < K_{10} \varepsilon^3 / (1 - r'_k) = K_{10} (k + 1) \varepsilon^3$$

for  $|\arg z| \leq \lambda/k$  and  $r_k \leq |z| \leq r'_k$  hence

$$\begin{aligned} |(1 - z)^2 g'(z)| &= \left| (1 - z)g(z) + (1 - z) \frac{d}{dz} [(1 - z)g(z)] \right| < \varepsilon^3 \\ &\quad + K_{11} \frac{\lambda}{k} (k + 1) \varepsilon^3 < K_{12} \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

because  $\lambda = \varepsilon^{-2}$ . Therefore we see that, for  $k > k_2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{r_k}^{r'_k} \int_{-\lambda/k}^{\lambda/k} |g'(re^{it})| r dt dr &\leq \int_{r_k}^{r'_k} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{K_{12} \varepsilon}{|1 - re^{it}|^2} dt dr \\ &= K_{12} \int_{r_k}^{r'_k} \frac{2\pi \varepsilon}{1 - r^2} dr \leq 2\pi K_{12} \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we conclude from (3.4) and (3.9) that

$$|\eta_{k+1} - c| \leq K_{13} \varepsilon + 2K_{10} k^{-1} \quad (k > k_2(\varepsilon)).$$

This proves  $\eta_k \rightarrow c$  ( $k \rightarrow \infty$ ) for the case  $\sigma < \infty$ .

(d) Let now  $\sigma = \infty$  and thus  $c = 0$ . Since  $\eta_k \geq 0$  by (1.1) and (1.4), we obtain from Lemma 3 that

$$|h(z)| \leq h(|z|) = o\left(\frac{1}{1 - |z|}\right) \quad (|z| \rightarrow 1). \tag{3.10}$$

It is well-known that (3.10) implies

$$\eta_k \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty \tag{3.11}$$

in the case that  $h$  is univalent in  $\mathbb{D}$ ; compare [7, Th. 5.3].

In our case we use the standard proof of (3.11) in the domain  $G = \mathbb{D} \cap \{|z - 1| < \rho\}$  where  $h$  is univalent, and we make trivial estimates in  $\mathbb{D} \setminus G$  where  $h'$  is bounded, by Lemma 2.

### References

1. Athreya, K.B., Ney, P.E.: Branching processes. Berlin-Heidelberg-New York: Springer 1972
2. Baker, I.N., Pommerenke, Ch.: On the iteration of analytic functions in a halfplane II. J. London Math. Soc. (2) **20**, 255-258 (1979)

3. Cowen, C.C.: Iteration and the solution of functional equations for functions analytic in the unit disk. To appear
4. Harris, T.E.: The theory of branching processes. Berlin-Göttingen-Heidelberg: Springer 1963
5. Hayman, W.K.: Multivalent functions. Cambridge University Press 1958
6. Kesten, H., Ney, P., Spitzer, F.: The Galton-Watson process with mean one and finite variance. *Theor. Probability Appl.* **11**, 513-540 (1966)
7. Pommerenke, Ch.: Univalent functions. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1975
8. Pommerenke, Ch.: On the iteration of analytic functions in a halfplane I. *J. London Math. Soc.* (2) **19**, 439-447 (1979)
9. Seneta, E.: The Galton-Watson process with mean one. *J. Appl. Probability* **4**, 489-495 (1967)
10. Valiron, G.: *Fonctions analytiques*. Paris: Presse Univ. de France 1954

Received March 20, 1980