

G. ALSMEYER, A. IKSANOV, S. POLOTSKIY, AND U. RÖSLER

EXPONENTIAL RATE OF L_p -CONVERGENCE OF INTRINSIC MARTINGALES IN SUPERCRITICAL BRANCHING RANDOM WALKS

Let $W_n, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ be an intrinsic martingale with almost sure limit W in a supercritical branching random walk. We provide criteria for the L_p -convergence of the series $\sum_{n \geq 0} e^{an}(W - W_n)$ for $p > 1$ and $a > 0$. The result may be viewed as a statement about the exponential rate of convergence of $\mathbb{E}|W - W_n|^p$ to zero.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

We start by recalling the definition of branching random walk. Consider a population starting from one ancestor located at the origin and evolving like a Galton–Watson process but with the generalization that individuals may have infinitely many children. All individuals are residing at points on the real line, and the displacements of children relative to their mother are described by a copy of a locally finite point process $\mathcal{M} = \sum_{i=1}^J \delta_{X_i}$ on \mathbb{R} , and, for different mothers, these copies are independent. Note once again that the random variable $J = \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$ giving the offspring number may be infinite with positive probability. For $n \in \mathbb{N}_0 := \{0, 1, \dots\}$, let \mathcal{M}_n be the point process that defines the positions of the individuals of the n -th generation on \mathbb{R} . The sequence $\mathcal{M}_n, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ is called a *branching random walk (BRW)*. In what follows, we always assume that $\mathbb{E}J > 1$ (supercriticality) which ensures the survival of the population with positive probability.

Every BRW is uniquely associated with a *weighted branching process (WBP)* to be formally introduced next: Let $\mathbf{V} := \bigcup_{n \geq 0} \mathbb{N}^n$ be the infinite Ulam–Harris tree of all finite sequences $v = v_1 \dots v_n$ with root \emptyset ($\mathbb{N}^0 := \{\emptyset\}$) and edges connecting each $v \in \mathbf{V}$ with its successors vi , $i = 1, 2, \dots$. The length of v is denoted as $|v|$. Call v an individual and $|v|$ its generation number. Associate a nonnegative random variable $L_i(v)$ (weight) with every edge (v, vi) of \mathbf{V} and define recursively $L_\emptyset := 1$ and $L_{vi} := L_i(v)L_v$. The random variable L_v can be interpreted as the total multiplicative weight assigned to the unique path from the root \emptyset to v . For any $u \in \mathbf{V}$, put similarly $L_\emptyset(u) := 1$ and $L_{vi}(u) := L_i(v)L_v(u)$. Then $L_v(u)$ gives the total weight of the path from u to uv . Provided that $L_i(v), v \in \mathbf{V}, i \in \mathbb{N}$, consists of i.i.d. random variables, the pair (\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{L}) with $\mathbf{L} := (L_v(u)), v \in \mathbf{V}, u \in \mathbf{V}$ is called a WBP with associated BRW $\mathcal{M}_n, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ defined as $\mathcal{M}_n = \sum_{|v|=n} \delta_{\log L_v}(\cdot \cap \mathbb{R})$. The quantities $\log L_v > -\infty$ for $v \in \mathbb{N}^n$ are thus the positions of the individuals alive in the generation n . Note that, if $u\mathbf{V} := \{uv : v \in \mathbf{V}\}$ denotes the subtree of \mathbf{V} rooted at u , then the WBP on this subtree is given by $(u\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{L}(u))$, where $\mathbf{L}(u) := (L_u(v)), v \in \mathbf{V}$.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 60G42, 60J80; Secondary 60E99.

Key words and phrases. supercritical branching random walk; weighted branching process; martingale; random series; L_p -convergence, Burkholder's inequality.

A.Iksanov, S. Polotskiy, and U. Rösler were supported by the German Research Foundation (project No. 436UKR 113/93/0-1). The research leading to the present paper has been mainly conducted during visits to University of Kiev (Rösler), to University of Kiel (Iksanov and Polotskiy), and to University of Münster (Iksanov). The financial support obtained from these institutions is gratefully acknowledged.

Next, we define

$$Z_n := \sum_{|v|=n} L_v \quad \text{and} \quad m(r) := \mathbb{E} \sum_{|v|=n} L_v^r$$

for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $r > 0$ and suppose that $m(1) < \infty$. If m is differentiable at r , then

$$(1) \quad m'(r) = \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{|v|=1} L_v^r \log L_v \right).$$

In those cases where the right-hand expectation exists but is $-\infty$ or $+\infty$ (which can only happen when r is a left or right endpoint of the possibly degenerate interval $\{r : m(r) < \infty\}$), we take (1) as the definition of $m'(r)$.

Let \mathcal{F}_0 be the trivial σ -field, $\mathcal{F}_n := \sigma(L_i(v) : i \in \mathbb{N}, |v| < n)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathcal{F}_\infty := \sigma(\mathcal{F}_n : n \in \mathbb{N}_0)$. The sequence $(W_n, \mathcal{F}_n), n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, where

$$(2) \quad W_n := \frac{Z_n}{m^n(1)},$$

forms a nonnegative martingale with mean one and is thus a.s. convergent to a limiting variable W , say, satisfying $\mathbb{E}W \leq 1$. It has been extensively studied in the literature, but the first results were obtained in [11] and [5]. Note that $\mathbb{P}\{W > 0\} > 0$ if, and only if, $W_n, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ is uniformly integrable. An ultimate uniform integrability criterion was given in [1], and the earlier results can be found in [5], [14], [12], and [10].

Possibly after the switching to the WBP $(\mathbf{V}, (L_v(w)/m^{|v|}(1), v, w \in \mathbf{V}))$, it is no loss of generality to assume throughout that

$$m(1) = 1.$$

We further impose the condition

$$(3) \quad \mathbb{P}\{W_1 = 1\} < 1$$

which avoids the trivial situation where $\mathbb{P}\{W_n = 1\} = 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and hence $\mathbb{P}\{W = 1\} = 1$.

Other WBPs appearing in this work are the aforementioned $(u\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{L}(u))$ for any $u \in \mathbf{V}$ and $(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{L}^r)$, where $\mathbf{L}^r := (L_v^r(w)), v, w \in \mathbf{V}$. The counterparts of Z_n, W_n for these processes are denoted $Z_n(u), W_n(u)$ and $Z_n^{(r)}, W_n^{(r)}$, respectively, so $Z_n(u) := \sum_{|v|=n} L_v(u)$, $Z_n^{(r)} := \sum_{|v|=n} L_v^r$, and $W_n^{(r)} := \frac{Z_n^{(r)}}{m^n(r)}$.

The main results of this paper will provide necessary and sufficient conditions for the L_p -convergence ($p > 1$) of the series

$$(4) \quad A := \sum_{n \geq 0} e^{an} (W - W_n)$$

for fixed $a > 0$. More precisely, we will derive equivalent necessary and sufficient conditions in the simpler case $p \geq 2$, while a necessary and a slightly stronger sufficient condition are presented in the surprisingly intriguing case $1 < p < 2$. Plainly, our results give information on the rate of convergence of $\mathbb{E}|W - W_n|^p$ to zero, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. It is therefore useful to recall conditions (which can be found in [13, Theorem 2.1], [10, Corollary 5] or [2, Theorem 3.1]) ensuring that this expectation does go to 0 or, equivalently, that the martingale $\{W_n : n \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ converges in L_p .

Proposition 1.1. *Suppose (3) and $p > 1$. Then the conditions*

$$\mathbb{E}W_1^p < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad m(p) < 1$$

are necessary and sufficient for

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}|W - W_n|^p = 0,$$

and the latter is equivalent to $\sup_{n \geq 0} \mathbb{E}W_n^p < \infty$ as well as to $\mathbb{E}W^p \in (0, \infty)$.

Now we are ready to formulate our main results.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose (3), $a > 0$ and $p \in (1, 2)$. Then A converges in L_p and almost surely if*

$$(5) \quad \mathbb{E}W_1^r < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad e^a m^{1/r}(r) < 1 \quad \text{for some } r \in [p, 2].$$

Conversely, the L_p -convergence of A implies

$$(6) \quad \mathbb{E}W_1^p < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{r \in [p, 2]} e^a m^{1/r}(r) \leq 1.$$

Remark 1.1. In the case where the function $r \mapsto m^{1/r}(r)$ attains its minimum at some $\theta < p$, i.e. $m(\theta)^{1/\theta} < m^{1/p}(p)$ for some $1 < \theta < p$, our analysis will actually show that the L_p -convergence of A even implies

$$\mathbb{E}W_1^p < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad e^a m^{1/p}(p) < 1,$$

see Remark 4.1 after the proof of Theorem 1.1. Similarly, if the function $r \mapsto m^{1/r}(r)$ attains its minimum at some $\theta \geq 2$, the L_p -convergence of A implies

$$\mathbb{E}W_1^p < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad e^a m^{1/2}(2) < 1.$$

In other words,

$$\inf_{r \in [p, 2]} e^a m^{1/r}(r) = 1$$

in condition (6) is possible only if the last infimum is attained at some $r \in [p, 2)$.

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose (3), $a > 0$ and $p \geq 2$. Then A converges in L_p if, and only if,*

$$(7) \quad \mathbb{E}W_1^p < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad e^a (m^{1/2}(2) \vee m^{1/p}(p)) < 1,$$

and, in this case, A converges also almost surely.

Remark 1.2. Suppose that A in (4) exists in the sense of convergence in probability, and let $A(v)$ be the corresponding series for the subtree $v\mathbf{V}$. The quantities $A(v)$, $|v| = 1$, are independent copies of A and independent of L_v , $|v| = 1$. Moreover, the equation

$$(8) \quad A \stackrel{d}{=} e^a \sum_{|v|=1} L_v A(v) + W - 1$$

holds true (in fact, even with " $=$ " instead of " $\stackrel{d}{=}$ "). Albeit looking like a stochastic fixed point equation, it is not, for $A(v)$ are *not* independent of the random variable W .

2. SIZE-BIASING AND SPINAL TREES

In the following, we will briefly present some required material on size-biasing and spinal trees in connection with BRW. Generally speaking, size-biasing has proved to be a very effective tool from harmonic analysis in the study of various branching models. Here, we restrict ourselves to a rather informal description of those facts that are needed in this article.

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ denote the underlying probability space. As W_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ constitutes a nonnegative mean one martingale, we can uniquely define a new probability measure $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\infty)$ via the projections

$$d\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{|\mathcal{F}_n} = W_n d\mathbb{P}_{|\mathcal{F}_n}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Fix n and define a random variable Ξ_n taking values in $\mathbf{V}_n := \{v \in \mathbf{V} : |v| = n\}$ such that

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}(\Xi_n = v \mid \mathcal{F}_\infty) = \frac{L_v}{W_n}.$$

Hence, $\Xi_n, n \in \mathbb{N}$ picks a node in \mathbf{V}_n in accordance with the size-biased distribution obtained from $L_v, v \in \mathbf{V}_n$. Let (Ξ_0, \dots, Ξ_n) denote the vertices visited by the path connecting the root $\Xi_0 := \emptyset$ with Ξ_n . It is not difficult to verify that, conditioned upon \mathcal{F}_∞ , this random vector constitutes a Markov chain on the subtree $\mathbf{V}_{\leq n} := \{v \in \mathbf{V} : |v| \leq n\}$ with one-step transition probabilities

$$P(v, vi) := \frac{L_i(v)W_k(v)}{W_{k+1}(vi)}, \quad v \in \mathbf{V}_k, \quad vi \in \mathbf{V}_{k+1}.$$

Though suppressed in the notation, it should be noticed that $P(\cdot, \cdot)$ depends on n and on \mathcal{F}_∞ . The thus obtained random line of individuals (Ξ_0, \dots, Ξ_n) in $\mathbf{V}_{\leq n}$ is called its *spine*, and the main observation stated in Proposition 2.1 below is that these individuals produce offspring and pick a position in a different way than the other population members.

Define

$$\mathcal{I}_k := \{i \in \mathbb{N} : \Xi_{k-1}i \neq \Xi_k \text{ and } L_i(\Xi_{k-1}) > 0\}$$

to be the random set of labels i such that $\Xi_{k-1}i$ is a nonspinal offspring in the generation k of the spinal mother Ξ_{k-1} . Notice that \mathcal{I}_k may be empty. Define further

$$\mathcal{G}_n := \sigma\left(\left(\Xi_k, L_{\Xi_k}, \mathcal{I}_k\right)_{1 \leq k \leq n}, \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \delta_{L_i(\Xi_{k-1})}\right),$$

$\mathbf{S} = \{(v, L_v) : v \in \mathbf{V}\}$ and $\mathbf{S}_{\leq n} := \{(v, L_v) : |v| < n\}$. Following our usual convention, by $\mathbf{S}_{\leq n}(v)$, we denote the shifted counterpart of $\mathbf{S}_{\leq n} = \mathbf{S}_{\leq n}(\emptyset)$ rooted at v , more precisely

$$\mathbf{S}_{\leq n}(v) := \{(vw, L_w(v)) : |w| < n\}.$$

The following proposition, of which parts (a)–(d) appear in a similar form in [9], provides all relevant information on the distribution of $\mathbf{S}_{\leq n}$ and the spine under $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}$.

Proposition 2.1. *The following assertions hold true under the probability measure $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}$ for any fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$:*

- (a) *The random vectors $(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} \delta_{L_i(\Xi_{k-1})}, L_{\Xi_k}/L_{\Xi_{k-1}})$, $1 \leq k \leq n$, are independent and identically distributed with the same distribution as $(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1} \delta_{L_i}, L_{\Xi_1})$.*
- (b) *Conditioned upon \mathcal{G}_n , the shifted weighted subtrees $\mathbf{S}_{\leq n-|v|}(v)$, $v \in \bigcup_{k=1}^n \mathcal{I}_k$, are independent, and $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}(\mathbf{S}_{\leq n-|v|}(v) \in \cdot \mid \mathcal{G}_n) \equiv \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{S}_{\leq n-|v|} \in \cdot)$.*
- (c) *Putting $\Pi_k := L_{\Xi_k}$ and $Q_k := \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} L_i(\Xi_{k-1})$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the random vectors $(\Pi_k/\Pi_{k-1}, Q_k, |\mathcal{I}_k|)$, $1 \leq k \leq n$, are independent copies of $(\Pi_1, Q_1, |\mathcal{I}_1|)$. Moreover, $\widehat{\mathbb{E}} \log \Pi_1 = m'(1)$ if $m'(1)$ exists, while $\widehat{\mathbb{E}} \log \Pi_1$ does not exist, otherwise.*
- (d) *For any nonnegative measurable $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$*

$$(9) \quad \widehat{\mathbb{E}}f(\Pi_n) = \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{|v|=n} L_v f(L_v)\right).$$

- (e) *For any nondecreasing and concave function $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$,*

$$(10) \quad \widehat{\mathbb{E}}f(W_n) \leq \widehat{\mathbb{E}}f\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \Pi_k Q_{k+1}\right).$$

We omit the proof of this result and mention only that parts (a)–(d) follow along similar arguments as those provided for supercritical Galton–Watson trees by Lyons et al. [15]. Equality (9) may also be found in [7]. Part (e) has been derived by Alsmeyer and Iksanov [1], see their argument to derive formula (60).

For any $\theta \geq 0$ such that $m(\theta) < \infty$, the previously defined size-biasing can clearly be done as well with respect to $W_n^{(\theta)}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ by introducing the probability measure $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_\theta$ on \mathcal{F}_∞ defined via the projections

$$d\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{\mathcal{F}_n}^{(\theta)} = W_n^{(\theta)} d\mathbb{P}_{|\mathcal{F}_n}$$

for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Notice that

$$(11) \quad \frac{d\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{\mathcal{F}_n}^{(\theta)}}{d\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{|\mathcal{F}_n}} = \frac{\Pi_n^{\theta-1}}{m^n(\theta)}$$

for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, because

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathbb{P}}^{(\theta)}(B) &= \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{|v|=n} \frac{L_v^\theta}{m^n(\theta)} \mathbf{1}_B\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(W_n \sum_{|v|=n} \frac{L_v}{W_n} \frac{L_v^{\theta-1}}{m^n(\theta)} \mathbf{1}_B\right) \\ &= \widehat{\mathbb{E}}\left(\sum_{|v|=n} \widehat{\mathbb{P}}(\Xi_n = v | \mathcal{F}_\infty) \frac{L_v^{\theta-1}}{m^n(\theta)} \mathbf{1}_B\right) \\ &= m^{-n}(\theta) \widehat{\mathbb{E}}\left(\Pi_n^{\theta-1} \mathbf{1}_B\right) \end{aligned}$$

for all $B \in \mathcal{F}_n$.

3. AUXILIARY RESULTS

The next result will be crucial for our further analysis as explained in the subsequent Remark 3.1.

Lemma 3.1. *For any fixed $a > 0$, the series A in (4) converges a.s. (in L_p for $p > 1$) if, and only if, the same holds true for the series*

$$(12) \quad A' := \sum_{n \geq 0} b_n (W_{n+1} - W_n),$$

where $b_n := \sum_{k=0}^n e^{ak} = (e^a - 1)^{-1} (e^{a(n+1)} - 1)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. In this case, $A' = A$ a.s.

Proof. Define $A_m := \sum_{n=0}^m e^{an} (W - W_n)$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} A_m &= \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=0}^m e^{an} \sum_{k=n}^l (W_{k+1} - W_k) \\ &= \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^l (W_{k+1} - W_k) \sum_{n=0}^{k \wedge m} e^{an} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_{k \wedge m} (W_{k+1} - W_k) \\ (13) \quad &= b_m (W - W_m) + A'_{m-1} \quad \text{a.s.}, \end{aligned}$$

where $A'_{m-1} := \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} b_k (W_{k+1} - W_k)$. Now, if A in (4) converges a.s., then

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} b_m (W - W_m) = 0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Thus, by letting m to tend to infinity in (13), we see that A' converges a.s. and equals A . Conversely, given the almost sure convergence of A' , a tail sum analog of Kronecker's lemma (see [3, Lemma 4.2]) ensures that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{an}(W - W_n) = 0$ a.s. This allows us, in turn, to read (13) backwards, thus concluding the a.s. convergence of A , as well as $A = A'$ a.s.

If A is L_p -convergent for some $p > 1$, then $\|A_m - A\|_p \rightarrow 0$ and, therefore, $e^{am}\|W - W_m\|_p = \|A_{m+1} - A_m\|_p \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Now use (13) to infer with the help of Minkowski's inequality

$$\|A'_{m-1}\|_p \leq b_m\|W - W_m\|_p + \|A_m\|_p$$

and, thereupon, the L_p -boundedness of the martingale $A'_n, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Consequently (see, e.g., [16, Proposition IV-2-7] and its proof), A' defined in (12) converges a.s. as well as in L_p . Conversely, if A' is L_p -convergent, then, by an appeal to Burkholder's inequality, (see Lemma 3.4 below)

$$\begin{aligned} b_m^p \mathbb{E}|W - W_m|^p &\leq C b_m^p \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{n \geq m} (W_{n+1} - W_n)^2 \right)^{p/2} \\ &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{n \geq m} b_n^2 (W_{n+1} - W_n)^2 \right)^{p/2} \\ &\leq C \mathbb{E}|A' - A'_{m-1}|^p \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where $C \in (0, \infty)$ is a generic constant that may differ from line to line. With this result, relation (13) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_{m+n} - A_m\|_p &\leq b_m\|W - W_m\|_p + b_{m+n}\|W - W_{m+n}\|_p + \|A'_{m+n-1} - A'_{m-1}\|_p \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{k \geq m} b_k\|W - W_k\|_p + \|A'_{m+n-1} - A'_{m-1}\|_p \\ &\rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } m, n \rightarrow \infty \end{aligned}$$

and thus the asserted L_p -convergence of A . \square

Remark 3.1. (a) As, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$A'_n = \frac{e^a}{e^a - 1} \sum_{k=0}^n e^{ak} (W_{k+1} - W_k) - \frac{1}{e^a - 1} (W_{n+1} - 1),$$

the proof of Lemma 3.1 can be easily extended to show further that A converges a.s. (or in L_p for $p > 1$) if, and only if, this holds true for

$$(14) \quad \widehat{A} := \sum_{n \geq 0} e^{an} (W_{n+1} - W_n).$$

In this case, \widehat{A} is readily seen to satisfy

$$(15) \quad \widehat{A} \stackrel{d}{=} e^a \sum_{|v|=1} L_v \widehat{A}_v + W_1 - 1,$$

with \widehat{A}_v being independent copies of \widehat{A} which are also independent of W_1 . Hence, unlike (8) for A , (15) constitutes a proper stochastic fixed point equation.

(b) The motivation behind dealing with \widehat{A} in (14) hereafter rather than A in (4) stems from the fact that the partial sums $\widehat{A}_n := \sum_{k=0}^n e^{ak} (W_{k+1} - W_k)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, constitute a martingale, whereas those associated with A do not. This entails that \widehat{A} forms a

martingale limit (like A') and, as such, is easier to deal with. Indeed, as far as the L_p -convergence ($p > 1$) is concerned, the well-known property of martingales (already used in the previous proof) tells us that it suffices to prove $\mathbb{E}|\widehat{A}|^p < \infty$ or, equivalently, L_p -boundedness of \widehat{A}_n (see [16, Proposition IV-2-7]).

The proof of Theorem 1.1 hinges to a large extent on Proposition 3.1 on the functions $s_n(r)$ defined below. The connection is provided by an application of Burkholder's inequality which, in turn, is stated for reference as Lemma 3.4 at the end of this section.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $1 < p < 2$, and let $W_n, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ be uniformly integrable with $\mathbb{E}W_1^p < \infty$. Then the function*

$$[1, 2] \ni r \mapsto s_n(r) := \mathbb{E}(Z_n^{(r)})^{p/r} = \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{|v|=n} L_v^r\right)^{p/r}$$

is decreasing and bounded by $\sup_{n \geq 0} \mathbb{E}W_n^p$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore,

$$(16) \quad s_n(r) \begin{cases} \leq s_k(r)s_{n-k}(r), & \text{if } r \in [1, p], \\ \geq s_k(r)s_{n-k}(r), & \text{if } r \in [p, 2] \end{cases}$$

for $0 \leq k \leq n$, and

$$(17) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n^{1/n}(r) \begin{cases} = \inf_{j \geq 1} s_j^{1/j}(r), & \text{if } r \in [1, p], \\ = \sup_{j \geq 1} s_j^{1/j}(r), & \text{if } r \in [p, 2]. \end{cases}$$

Proof. The first assertion follows immediately from $s_n(1) = \mathbb{E}W_n^p$ and

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{|v|=n} L_v^r\right)^{p/r} = \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{|v|=n} L_v^{q \cdot (r/q)}\right)^{p/r} < \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{|v|=n} L_v^q\right)^{p/q}$$

for any $1 \leq q < r \leq 2$, where the supercritical branching and the strict superadditivity of $x \mapsto x^{r/q}$ have been utilized. As for (16), we obtain in the case $r \in [p, 2]$ with the help of Jensen's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} s_n(r) &= \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{|v|=k} L_v^r Z_{n-k}^{(r)}(v)\right)^{p/r} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left((Z_k^{(r)})^{p/r} \left(\sum_{|v|=k} \frac{L_v^r}{Z_k^{(r)}} Z_{n-k}^{(r)}(v)\right)^{p/r}\right) \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}\left((Z_k^{(r)})^{p/r} \sum_{|v|=k} \frac{L_v^r}{Z_k^{(r)}} (Z_{n-k}^{(r)}(v))^{p/r}\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left((Z_k^{(r)})^{p/r} \sum_{|v|=k} \frac{L_v^r}{Z_k^{(r)}} \mathbb{E}\left((Z_{n-k}^{(r)}(v))^{p/r} \mid \mathcal{F}_k\right)\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left((Z_k^{(r)})^{p/r} \sum_{|v|=k} \frac{L_v^r}{Z_k^{(r)}} s_{n-k}(r)\right) \\ &= s_k(r)s_{n-k}(r) \end{aligned}$$

for all $0 \leq k \leq n$, and this further yields, by the superadditivity of $\log s_n(r)$, that $s_n(r)^{1/n}$ converges as $n \rightarrow \infty$ with a limit satisfying (17). If $r \in [1, p]$, and thus $x \mapsto x^{p/r}$ is convex, the above estimation holds with reverse inequality sign. \square

Note that $\log s_n(r)$ is always a superadditive or subadditive function but may be infinite. Precise information on the asymptotic value of $s_n^{1/n}(r)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ is provided by the next lemma. Put $g(r) := r^{-1} \log m(r)$ with the derivative

$$(18) \quad g'(r) = \frac{h(r)}{r^2} \quad \text{with } h(r) := \frac{rm'(r)}{m(r)} - \log m(r)$$

on the interior of $\mathbb{D} := \{r : m(r) < \infty\}$. Note that $[1, p] \subset \mathbb{D}$ if $W_n, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ is uniformly integrable and $\mathbb{E}W_1^p < \infty$. By supercriticality, the function m is strictly logconvex which, in turn, implies that h is increasing with at most one zero. Therefore, the function g possesses at most one minimum. Put

$$\vartheta := 2 \wedge \arg \inf_{r \geq 1} g(r) \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma := m^{1/\vartheta}(\vartheta).$$

If $\vartheta \in \text{int}(\mathbb{D})$ and thus m is differentiable at ϑ , then $g'(\vartheta) = 0$ may be rewritten as

$$(19) \quad \frac{m'(\vartheta)}{m(\vartheta)} = \frac{1}{\vartheta} \log m(\vartheta).$$

Let us also point out that $m(r) < 1$ and $m'(r) < 0$ for all $r \in (1, \vartheta)$ because $g(r)$ has the negative (right) derivative $m'(1)$ at 1 as a consequence of the uniform integrability of $W_n, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose the assumptions of Lemma 3.2 are true and, furthermore, $m(p) < 1$. Let ϑ, γ be as defined above. Then, if $p \leq \vartheta$,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n^{1/n}(r) = \begin{cases} m^{p/r}(r), & \text{if } r \in [1, \vartheta) \\ \gamma^p, & \text{if } r \in [\vartheta, 2], \end{cases}$$

while, if $p > \vartheta$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n^{1/n}(r) = \begin{cases} m^{p/r}(r), & \text{if } r \in [1, q) \\ m(p), & \text{if } r \in [q, 2], \end{cases}$$

where q is the unique value in $(1, \vartheta)$ such that $g(q) = g(p)$, i.e. $m^{1/q}(q) = m^{1/p}(p)$.

Notice that, in both cases above, the obtained limit function $s_\infty(r)$, say, is continuous at its "critical" value ϑ , respectively q . Also, this limit function for $p > \vartheta$ converges to one for $p = \vartheta$, for then q equals ϑ as well.

Proof. CASE A. $p \leq \vartheta$ and $r \in [\vartheta, 2]$. *Lower estimate*

Since $s_n(r)$ is decreasing in r , it suffices to show that

$$(20) \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n^{1/n}(2) \geq \gamma^p.$$

SUBCASE A.1. $\gamma = m^{1/\vartheta}(\vartheta)$ for $\vartheta \in (1, 2)$.

An old result by Biggins [4],[6] tells us that

$$\frac{\log M_n}{n} \rightarrow \frac{1}{\vartheta} \log m(\vartheta) \quad \text{a.s. on } \{W > 0\},$$

where $M_n := \max_{|v|=n} L_v$. By using this fact in combination with the obvious inequality

$$(Z_n^{(2)})^{p/2} \geq M_n^p \quad \text{on } \{W > 0\},$$

we infer with the help of Jensen's inequality and Fatou's lemma that

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n^{1/n}(2) &\geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}^{1/n}(M_n^p \mathbf{1}_{\{W>0\}}) \\ &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}^{1/n}\{W>0\} \mathbb{E}^{1/n}(M_n^p | W>0) \\ &\geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(M_n^{p/n} | W>0) \\ &= m^{p/\vartheta}(\vartheta) = \gamma^p. \end{aligned}$$

SUBCASE A.2. $\gamma = m^{1/2}(2)$ (thus $\vartheta = 2$) and W_1 is a.s. bounded.

Then $m(2) < 1$ and $m'(2) < 0$, as pointed out after (19). Moreover, the almost sure boundedness of W_1 trivially ensures the same for $W_1^{(2)}$, in particular, $\mathbb{E}W_1^{(2)} \log^+ W_1^{(2)} < \infty$. Therefore, the mean one martingale $W_n^{(2)}, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ is uniformly integrable (cf. e.g. [1, Theorem 1.3]) and, hence, convergent a.s. and in L_1 to a random variable $W^{(2)}$. Since $p/2 < 1$, we have $\mathbb{E}(W_n^{(2)})^{p/2} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}(W^{(2)})^{p/2}$ and, therefore,

$$s_n^{1/n}(2) = m^{p/2}(2) \mathbb{E}^{1/n}(W_n^{(2)})^{p/2} \rightarrow m^{p/2}(2) = \gamma^p,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Notice that we have indeed verified the stronger assertion that

$$(21) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{s_n(2)}{m^{p/2}(2)} = \mathbb{E}(W^{(2)})^{p/2}.$$

SUBCASE A.3. $\gamma = m^{1/2}(2)$, general situation.

Here, we use a truncation argument. For a constant $K > 0$, consider the WBP

$$(\mathbf{V}, (\bar{L}_v(w), v, w \in \mathbf{V}))$$

with

$$(22) \quad \bar{L}_i := L_i \mathbf{1}_{\{L_i \geq 1/K, W_1(v) \leq K\}}, \quad i \in \mathbb{N}, v \in \mathbf{V}.$$

This provides us with a thinning of the original WBP such that $\bar{m}(\theta) := \mathbb{E}(\sum_{i \geq 1} \bar{L}_i^\theta)$ satisfies

$$\bar{m}(\theta) < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{m}(\theta) \leq m(\theta)$$

for all $\theta > 0$. Moreover, in the obvious notation,

$$\bar{s}_n(\theta) \leq s_n(\theta)$$

for all $\theta \in [1, 2]$. Plainly, as $K \rightarrow \infty$, \bar{m} converges to m uniformly on compact subsets contained in the interior of \mathbb{D} . Hence, by choosing K large enough, we have, for the obviously defined $\bar{\gamma}$,

$$\bar{\gamma} \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\gamma$$

for any fixed $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. By applying the result obtained under Subcase A.2 to the normalized WBP $(\mathbf{V}, (\bar{L}_v(w)/\bar{m}^{|v|}(1), v, w \in \mathbf{V}))$, we now arrive at the desired conclusion here as well.

CASE A. $p \leq \vartheta$ and $r \in [\vartheta, 2]$. *Upper estimate*

The next step is to verify

$$(23) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n^{1/n}(r) \leq \gamma^p$$

for each $r \in [\vartheta, 2]$, which, in combination with $s_n(2) \leq s_n(r)$ and (20), clearly gives the assertion of the lemma for $r \in [\vartheta, 2]$ and $p \leq \vartheta$.

Suppose firstly that $p < \vartheta$. Fix any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\theta \in (p, \vartheta)$ such that $m^{1/\theta}(\theta) \leq (1+\varepsilon)\gamma < 1$. Then, by another use of Jensen's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n^{1/n}(r) &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n^{1/n}(\theta) \\ &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(m^{pn/\theta}(\theta) \mathbb{E}(W_n^{(\theta)})^{p/\theta} \right)^{1/n} \\ &\leq m^{p/\theta}(\theta) \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}^{p/n\theta} W_n^{(\theta)} \\ &= m^{p/\theta}(\theta) \\ &\leq (1 + \varepsilon)^p \gamma^p \end{aligned}$$

which shows (23), as $\varepsilon > 0$ was picked arbitrarily. Now, if $p = \vartheta$, we arrive at the same conclusion by choosing $\theta = p$ and $\varepsilon = 0$ in the above estimation.

CASE B. $p \leq \vartheta$ and $r \in [1, \vartheta)$. *Lower estimate*

Here, we must verify

$$(24) \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n^{1/n}(r) \geq m^{p/r}(r).$$

In view of the truncation (22) described under Subcase A.3, it is no loss of generality to assume directly that W_1 (and thus $W_1^{(r)}$ as well) is a.s. bounded, and $m(\theta) < \infty$ for all $\theta > 0$. Write

$$(25) \quad s_n(r) = m^{pn/r}(r) \mathbb{E}(W_n^{(r)})^{p/r}$$

for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and consider the WBP $(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{L}^r)$. Since

$$\theta \mapsto m^{-\theta}(r) \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{|v|=1} L_v^{r\theta} \right) = m(r\theta)/m^\theta(r)$$

has the derivative

$$\frac{rm'(r\theta)}{m^\theta(r)} - \log m(r) \frac{m(r\theta)}{m^\theta(r)}$$

taking the value of $r \left(\frac{m'(r)}{m(r)} - \log m^{1/r}(r) \right) = r^2 g'(r) < 0$ at $\theta = 1$, we infer (see [1, Theorem 1.3]) that $W_n^{(r)}$ converges a.s. and in L_1 to the random variable $W^{(r)}$ which entails, in turn, (24) because, by (25) and an appeal to Jensen's inequality and Fatou's lemma,

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n^{1/n}(r) &= m^{p/r}(r) \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}^{1/n} (W_n^{(r)})^{p/r} \\ &= m^{p/r}(r) \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}^{1/n} (W^{(r)} > 0) \mathbb{E}^{1/n} \left((W_n^{(r)})^{p/r} \middle| W^{(r)} > 0 \right) \\ &\geq m^{p/r}(r) \mathbb{E} \left(\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (W_n^{(r)})^{p/rn} \middle| W^{(r)} > 0 \right) \\ &= m^{p/r}(r). \end{aligned}$$

CASE B. $p \leq \vartheta$ and $r \in [1, \vartheta)$. *Upper estimate*

The converse

$$(26) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n^{1/n}(r) \leq m^{p/r}(r)$$

follows quite easily from (25), for $\mathbb{E}(W_n^{(r)})^{p/r} \leq \mathbb{E}^{p/r} W_n^{(r)} = 1$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ in the case $r \in [p, \vartheta]$ by Jensen's inequality, while, in the case $r \in [1, p)$, we have

$$\sup_{n \geq 0} \mathbb{E}(W_n^{(r)})^{p/r} < \infty$$

as a consequence of $\mathbb{E}(W_1^{(r)})^{p/r} \leq m^{-p/r}(r) \mathbb{E}W_1^p < \infty$ and

$$E\left(\sum_{|v|=1} \left(\frac{L_v}{m(r)} W_1^{(r)}\right)^{p/r}\right) = \frac{m(p)}{m^{p/r}(r)} = e^{p(g(p)-g(r))} < 1$$

(apply Proposition 1.1 to $W_n^{(r)}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$).

CASE C. $p > \vartheta$ and $r \in [1, q)$. *Upper estimate.*

Notice that $m(\vartheta) < \infty$. As $g(\vartheta) < g(p) < 0 = g(1)$, there exists a unique $1 < q < \vartheta$ such that $g(q) = g(p)$, i.e. $m(q)^{1/q} = m(p)^{1/p}$. Then, for $r \in [1, q)$, the previously given arguments are easily seen to carry over to the present situation, thus showing (26).

CASE C. $p > \vartheta$ and $r \in [1, q)$. *Lower estimate.*

By Jensen's inequality,

$$s_n(r) \geq \mathbb{E}^{p/q}(Z_n^{(r)})^{q/r}.$$

But $\mathbb{E}(Z_n^{(r)})^{q/r}$, call it $\tilde{s}_n(r)$, is just the counterpart of $s_n(r)$ for $q < \vartheta$ instead of p . Therefore, $\tilde{s}_n^{1/n}(r) \rightarrow m^{q/r}(r)$ by what has been shown under Case B. It follows that $s_n^{1/n}(r)$ has also the required lower bound, which completes the proof of

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n^{1/n}(r) = m^{p/r}(r)$$

for all $r \in [1, q)$.

CASE D. $p > \vartheta$ and $r \in [q, 2]$. *Upper estimate.*

Since $s_n(q) = \inf_{\theta < q} s_n(\theta)$, we obtain, as a consequence of Case B,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n^{1/n}(r) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n^{1/n}(q) \leq \inf_{\theta \in [1, q)} m^{p/\theta}(\theta) = m^{p/q}(q) = m(p).$$

CASE D. $p > \vartheta$ and $r \in [q, 2]$. *Lower estimate.*

The proof for Case C will now be completed by showing that

$$(27) \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n^{1/n}(2) \geq m(p)$$

(since $s_n(r)$ is decreasing in r), what is the most delicate part of the whole proof. Once again, possibly after a suitable truncation as described in (22), it is no loss of generality to assume that $W_1 \leq K$ for some $K \geq 1$, $J \leq N$ for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$, and $m(\theta) < \infty$ for all $\theta > 0$. Notice also that, by subadditivity of $x \mapsto x^{p/2}$, we find

$$(28) \quad s_n(2) \leq m^n(p)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Put $\beta := 1 - (p/2) \in (0, 1)$. Recall the notation introduced in Section 2 in connection with the size-biased probability measure $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} (Z_n^{(2)})^{p/2} &= \left(\Pi_n^2 + \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} L_v^2 Z_{n-k}^{(2)}(\Xi_{k-1} i) \right)^{p/2} \\ &\leq K^p \left(\Pi_n^p + \sum_{k=1}^n \Pi_{k-1}^p (\Lambda_{n,k}^{(2)})^{p/2} \right) \quad \widehat{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s.}, \end{aligned}$$

where, for $1 \leq k \leq n$,

$$\Lambda_{n,k}^{(2)} := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_k} Z_{n-k}^{(2)}(\Xi_{k-1} i).$$

Use Proposition 2.1(b) to see that, conditioned upon \mathcal{G}_n , the $Z_{n-k}^{(2)}(\Xi_{k-1}i), i \in \mathcal{I}_k$, are i.i.d. under $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}$ with the same distribution as $Z_{n-k}^{(2)}$ under \mathbb{P} . By combining this with another subadditivity argument, we obtain $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s.

$$\widehat{\mathbb{E}}((\Lambda_{n,k}^{(2)})^{p/2}|\mathcal{G}_n) \leq \widehat{\mathbb{E}}\left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1}(Z_{n-k}^{(2)}(\Xi_{k-1}i))^{p/2} \middle| \mathcal{G}_n\right) \leq |\mathcal{I}_1| \mathbb{E}(Z_{n-k}^{(2)})^{p/2}$$

for $k = 1, \dots, n$. As $|\mathcal{I}_1| \leq N$ for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$, by truncation, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathbb{E}}((Z_n^{(2)})^{p/2}|\mathcal{G}_n) &\leq K^p N \left(\Pi_n^p + \sum_{k=1}^n \Pi_{k-1}^p \mathbb{E}(Z_{n-k}^{(2)})^{p/2} \right) \\ &= K^p N \sum_{k=0}^n \Pi_k^p s_{n-k}(2) \quad \widehat{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

Now use $\mathbb{E}(Z_n^{(2)})^{p/2} = \widehat{\mathbb{E}}(\Pi_n(Z_n^{(2)})^{-\beta})$, which follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(Z_n^{(2)})^{p/2} &= \widehat{\mathbb{E}}\left(\sum_{|v|=n} \frac{L_v^2}{W_n} (Z_n^{(2)})^{-\beta}\right) \\ &= \widehat{\mathbb{E}}\left(\sum_{|v|=n} \widehat{\mathbb{P}}(\Xi_n = v|\mathcal{F}_\infty) L_v (Z_n^{(2)})^{-\beta}\right) \\ &= \widehat{\mathbb{E}}\left(\sum_{|v|=n} \mathbf{1}_{\{\Xi_n=v\}} L_v (Z_n^{(2)})^{-\beta}\right) = \widehat{\mathbb{E}}\left(\Pi_n(Z_n^{(2)})^{-\beta}\right), \end{aligned}$$

to obtain by an appeal to Jensen's inequality for $x \mapsto x^{(p-2)/p}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(Z_n^{(2)})^{p/2} &= \widehat{\mathbb{E}}\left(\Pi_n \widehat{\mathbb{E}}((Z_n^{(2)})^{-\beta}|\mathcal{G}_n)\right) \\ &\geq \widehat{\mathbb{E}}\left(\frac{\Pi_n}{\widehat{\mathbb{E}}((Z_n^{(2)})^{p/2}|\mathcal{G}_n)^{(2-p)/p}}\right) \\ &\geq C \widehat{\mathbb{E}}\left(\frac{\Pi_n}{\left(\sum_{k=0}^n \Pi_k^p s_{n-k}(2)\right)^{(2-p)/p}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

for some $C > 0$. Recall the definition of $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_p$ in Section 2 and that (see (11))

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}^{(p)}(B) = \frac{1}{m^n(p)} \widehat{\mathbb{E}}\left(\Pi_n^{p-1} \mathbf{1}_B\right)$$

for any $B \in \mathcal{F}_n$. The last expectation can be further estimated as

$$\begin{aligned} &\widehat{\mathbb{E}}\left(\frac{\Pi_n}{\left(\sum_{k=0}^n s_{n-k}(2) \Pi_k^p\right)^{(2-p)/p}}\right) \\ &= m^n(p) \widehat{\mathbb{E}}^{(p)}\left(\frac{\Pi_n^{2-p}}{\left(\sum_{k=0}^n s_{n-k}(2) \Pi_k^p\right)^{(2-p)/p}}\right) \\ &= m^n(p) \widehat{\mathbb{E}}^{(p)}\left(\frac{1}{\left(\sum_{k=0}^n s_{n-k}(2) (\Pi_n/\Pi_k)^p\right)^{(2-p)/p}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= m^n(p) \widehat{\mathbb{E}}^{(p)} \left(\frac{1}{\left(\sum_{k=0}^n s_k(2) \Pi_k^p \right)^{(2-p)/p}} \right) \\
&\geq m^n(p) \widehat{\mathbb{E}}^{(p)} \left(\frac{1}{\left(\sum_{k=0}^n m^k(p) \Pi_k^p \right)^{(2-p)/p}} \right) \\
&\geq m^n(p) \widehat{\mathbb{E}}^{(p)} \left(\frac{1}{\left(\sum_{k \geq 0} (\Pi_k^*)^p \right)^{(2-p)/p}}, \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where (28) has been utilized for the penultimate inequality and where $\Pi_k^* := \Pi_k / m^{k/p}(p)$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Since $\widehat{\mathbb{E}}^{(p)} \Pi_1^\theta = \frac{m(p+\theta)}{m(p)}$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, we find

$$\widehat{\mathbb{E}}^{(p)} \log \Pi_1^* = \frac{m'(p)}{m(p)} - \frac{1}{p} \log m(p) = \frac{h(p)}{p}.$$

Now use $p > \vartheta$ to infer $\widehat{\mathbb{E}}^{(p)} \ln \Pi_1^* > 0$ and thereupon that

$$1 < \Sigma := \sum_{k \geq 0} (\Pi_k^*)^{-p} < \infty \quad \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_p\text{-a.s.},$$

in particular $\nu := \widehat{\mathbb{E}}^{(p)} \Sigma^{-(2-p)/p} \in (0, 1)$. We finally arrive at

$$(29) \quad m^n(p) \geq s_n(2) = \mathbb{E} Z_n^{p/2} \geq \nu m^n(p)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, which clearly implies the desired assertion (27). The proof of Proposition 3.1 is thus completed. \square

The next lemma is needed for the proof of Theorem 1.2 and examines the asymptotic behavior of $\mathbb{E} W_n^p$ when $\mathbb{E} W_1^p < \infty$ and $m(p) \geq 1$. It may also be viewed as a useful complement to Proposition 1.1. Let us mention that we have not tried to obtain the best possible estimates. Actually, for our purposes, only factors of exponential growth have meaning. Hence, we content ourselves with quite crude estimates when dealing with factors of subexponential growth.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $p > 1$ and $\mathbb{E} W_1^p < \infty$.*

- (a) *If $p \in (1, 2]$, then $\mathbb{E} W_n^p = O(n)$ if $m(p) = 1$ and $\mathbb{E} W_n^p = O(m^n(p))$ if $m(p) > 1$.*
- (b) *If $p > 2$, then $\mathbb{E} W_n^p = O(n^{p-1})$ if $m(p) = 1$ and $\mathbb{E} W_n^p = O(n^{b(p-1)} m^n(p))$ for $p \in (b+1, b+2]$, $b \in \mathbb{N}$, if $m(p) > 1$.*

We note in advance that the lemma will later be applied to the martingale $\{W_n^{(2)} : n \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ rather than to $\{W_n : n \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$.

Proof. (a) Use Proposition 2.1(e) with $f(x) = x^{p-1}$ to infer

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} W_n^p &\leq \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} M_1 M_2 \cdots M_k Q_{k+1} \right)^{p-1} \\
&\leq \widehat{\mathbb{E}} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (M_1 M_2 \cdots M_k)^{p-1} Q_{k+1}^{p-1} \right) = \widehat{\mathbb{E}} Q^{p-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \widehat{\mathbb{E}}^k M^{p-1},
\end{aligned}$$

where the subadditivity of f in the next to last inequality has been utilized, and (M, Q) denotes a generic copy of (M_n, Q_n) . In view of Proposition 2.1, $\widehat{\mathbb{E}} Q^{p-1} = \mathbb{E} W_1^p$ and $\widehat{\mathbb{E}} M^{p-1} = m(p)$, and the result follows.

(b) Put $\varphi_n(s) := \mathbb{E}e^{-sW_n}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then

$$\varphi_n(s) = \mathbb{E} \prod_{|v|=1} \varphi_{n-1}(sL_v), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Differentiating this equality yields

$$(30) \quad \varphi'_n(s) = \sum_{|v|=1} \varphi'_{n-1}(sL_v) L_v \prod_{u \neq v} \varphi_{n-1}(sL_u), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

It is known and readily checked that $-\varphi'_n(s)$ is the Laplace transform of W_n under the size-biased measure $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}$. Let V_n be a random variable with $\mathbb{P}(V_n \in \cdot) = \widehat{\mathbb{P}}(W_n \in \cdot)$ (the use of V_n is for our convenience and allows us to do all subsequent calculations under \mathbb{P} only). Then (30) is equivalent to the distributional identity

$$(31) \quad V_n \stackrel{d}{=} MV_{n-1} + T_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

where (M, T_n) is a random vector independent of V_{n-1} and with distribution

$$(32) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{(M, T_n) \in B\} &= \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{|u|=1} L_u \mathbf{1}_B \left(L_u, \sum_{v \neq u} L_v W_{n-1}(v) \right) \right) \\ &= \widehat{\mathbb{P}} \left\{ \left(\Pi_1, \sum_{v \in \mathcal{I}_1} L_v W_{n-1}(v) \right) \in B \right\}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \end{aligned}$$

where $B \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is any Borel set. An application of Minkowski's inequality in L_{p-1} yields

$$(33) \quad \|V_n\|_{p-1} \leq \|M\|_{p-1} \|V_{n-1}\|_{p-1} + \|T_n\|_{p-1}.$$

Arguing in the same way as in the proof of Lemma 4.2 in [13], we find

$$(34) \quad \|T_n\|_{p-1} \leq \|W_{n-1}\|_{p-1} (\mathbb{E}W_1^p)^{1/(p-1)}.$$

For the remaining discussion, we distinguish between two cases:

CASE 1. $m(p) = 1$

Note that $\|M\|_{p-1}^{p-1} = \widehat{\mathbb{E}}\Pi_1^{p-1} = m(p) = 1$ and that $m(p-1) < 1$ (by log-convexity of m). Hence, $\sup_{n \geq 0} \|W_n\|_{p-1} < \infty$ by Proposition 1.1, and we obtain from (33) that $\|V_n\|_{p-1} = O(n)$ or, equivalently,

$$\mathbb{E}W_n^p = \mathbb{E}V_n^{p-1} = O(n^{p-1}).$$

CASE 2. $m(p) > 1$

Assume first that $p \in (2, 3]$. Then we conclude from (34) and the already established part of the lemma that $\|T_n\|_{p-1} = O(m^{n/(p-1)}(p))$, regardless of the (finite) value of $m(p-1)$. By (32), $\|M\|_{p-1} = m^{1/(p-1)}(p)$. We conclude from (33) that $\|V_n\|_{p-1} = O(nm^{n/(p-1)}(p))$ or, equivalently, that

$$\mathbb{E}W_n^p = \mathbb{E}V_n^{p-1} = O(n^{p-1}m^n(p)).$$

The subsequent proof proceeds by induction on b . Suppose that we have already verified that $\mathbb{E}W_n^p = O(n^{b(p-1)}m^n(p))$ when $p \in (b+1, b+2]$. In order to prove $\mathbb{E}W_n^p = O(n^{(b+1)(p-1)}m^n(p))$ when $p \in (b+2, b+3]$, it suffices to note that

$$\|T_n\|_{p-1} = O(n^b m^{n/(p-1)}(p))$$

and that any solution to the recursive inequality

$$c_n \leq dc_{n-1} + O(n^b d^n), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad c_0 = 1,$$

with $d > 1$ satisfies $c_n = O(n^{b+1} d^n)$. This completes the proof. \square

We mention in passing that the distributional identity (31) obtained above with the help of Laplace transforms (see (30)) can also be derived by a probabilistic argument using the results stated in Section 2 on size biasing and spinal trees. However, we refrain from supplying further details.

As we will make the multiple use of a version of Burkholder's inequality (see [8, Theorem 1 on p. 396]), it is stated here for ease of reference.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $p > 1$ and $\{Z_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a martingale with $Z_0 = 0$ and a.s. limit Z . Then $\mathbb{E}|Z|^p < \infty$ if and only if $\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{n \geq 0}(Z_{n+1} - Z_n)^2\right)^{p/2} < \infty$. If one of these holds, then*

$$c_p \left\| \left(\sum_{n \geq 0} (Z_{n+1} - Z_n)^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_p \leq \|Z\|_p \leq C_p \left\| \left(\sum_{n \geq 0} (Z_{n+1} - Z_n)^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_p,$$

where $c_p := (p-1)/(18p^{3/2})$ and $C_p := 18p^{3/2}/(p-1)^{1/2}$.

4. PROOFS OF THEOREMS 1.1 AND 1.2

Before proceeding with the proof of the main results, put $\mu_p := \mathbb{E}|W_1 - 1|^p$, $R := \sum_{n \geq 0} e^{2an}(W_{n+1} - W_n)^2$ and recall that $W_n(v)$ denotes the copy of W_n pertaining to the subtree $v\mathbf{V}$ rooted at v . Then

$$(35) \quad W_{n+1} - W_n = \sum_{|v|=n} L_v(W_1(v) - 1)$$

for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Let us also stipulate hereafter that $C \in (0, \infty)$ denotes a generic constant which may differ from line to line.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. In view of Burkholder's inequality (Lemma 3.4), it is clear that the L_p -convergence of $\widehat{A} = \sum_{n \geq 0} e^{an}(W_{n+1} - W_n)$ holds true if, and only if, R exists in $L_{p/2}$. Suppose the latter is true and recall that $\gamma = \inf\{m^{1/r}(r) : r \in [1, 2]\}$. Then, by a double use of Jensen's inequality in combination with Burkholder's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}R^{p/2} &= \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{n \geq 0} \left(\sum_{|v|=n} e^{an} L_v(W_1(v) - 1) \right)^2 \right)^{p/2} \\ &\geq N^{p/2} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left(\sum_{|v|=n} e^{an} L_v(W_1(v) - 1) \right)^2 \right)^{p/2} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{N^{1-p/2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{|v|=n} e^{an} L_v(W_1(v) - 1) \right|^p \\ &\geq \frac{C}{N^{1-p/2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{|v|=n} e^{2an} L_v^2(W_1(v) - 1)^2 \right)^{p/2} \\ &= \frac{1}{N^{1-p/2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} e^{pan} \mathbb{E} \left(Z_n^{(2)} \sum_{|v|=n} \frac{L_v^2}{Z_n^{(2)}} (W_1(v) - 1)^2 \right)^{p/2} \\ &\geq \frac{C\mu_p}{N^{1-p/2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} e^{pan} \mathbb{E}(Z_n^{(2)})^{p/2} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{C\mu_p}{N^{1-p/2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} e^{pan} s_n(2).$$

This proves the necessity of $\mu_p < \infty$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{pan} s_n^{1/n}(2) \leq 1$. But the last limit equals either $e^{pa} \gamma^p$ (if $p \leq \vartheta$) or $e^{pa} m(p)$ by an appeal to Proposition 3.1. Therefore, we have proved the necessity of $e^a \inf_{r \in [p, 2]} m^{1/r}(r) \leq 1$ as claimed.

Now suppose that $\mu_r < \infty$ and $e^a m^{1/r}(r) < 1$ for some $r \in [p, 2]$. By an appeal to Burkholder's inequality in combination with the subadditivity of $x \mapsto x^{p/2}$ and $x \mapsto x^{r/2}$, we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}R^{p/2} &\leq \sum_{n \geq 0} e^{pan} \mathbb{E}|W_{n+1} - W_n|^p \\ &\leq C \sum_{n \geq 0} e^{pan} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{|v|=n} L_v^2 (W_1(v) - 1)^2 \right)^{p/2} \\ &\leq C \sum_{n \geq 0} e^{pan} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{|v|=n} L_v^r |W_1(v) - 1|^r \right)^{p/r}. \end{aligned}$$

Use Jensen's inequality to see that

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{|v|=n} L_v^r |W_1(v) - 1|^r \right)^{p/r} \leq \mu_r^{p/r} m^{p/r}(r)$$

and thus

$$\mathbb{E}R^{p/2} \leq C \mu_r^{p/r} \sum_{n \geq 0} e^{pan} m^{p/r}(r) < \infty.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1. \square

Remark 4.1. If $p > \vartheta$, i.e. $m^{1/\vartheta}(\vartheta) < m^{1/p}(p) = \min_{r \in [p, 2]} m^{1/r}(r)$, the proof of Proposition 3.1 (see (29)) has actually shown that $\nu m^n(p) \leq s_n(2) \leq m^n(p)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and some $\nu \in (0, 1)$. In this case, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}R^{p/2} \geq \frac{\mu_p}{N^{1-p/2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} e^{pan} s_n(2) \geq \frac{\nu \mu_p}{N^{1-p/2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} e^{pan} m^n(p)$$

and thereby conclude that the L_p -convergence of \hat{A} or, equivalently, $\mathbb{E}R^{p/2} < \infty$ can only hold true if $e^a m^{1/p}(p) < 1$. In the case where the function $r \mapsto m^{1/r}(r)$ attains its minimum at some $\theta \geq 2$, we arrive at a similar conclusion, because then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m^{-np/2}(2) s_n(2)$ exists and is positive by (21). This confirms our assertions stated in Remark 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We show firstly the necessity of condition (7) and thus assume that the series A in (4) converges in L_p . By Lemma 3.1 and Remark 3.1(a), the same holds true for \hat{A} , and, by an appeal to Lemma 3.4,

$$(36) \quad \mathbb{E}R^{p/2} < \infty.$$

As $p \geq 2$, the function $x \mapsto x^{p/2}$ is superadditive and thus

$$(37) \quad \sum_{n \geq 0} e^{pan} \mathbb{E}|W_{n+1} - W_n|^p \leq \mathbb{E}R^{p/2} < \infty.$$

It is clear from (35) that $W_{n+1} - W_n$ is the a.s. limit of a martingale (see, for example, [2, Section 3] for more details). Consequently, by another appeal to Lemma 3.4 and the aforementioned superadditivity, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}|W_{n+1} - W_n|^p &\geq C \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{|v|=n} L_v^2 (W_1(v) - 1)^2 \right)^{p/2} \\ &\geq C \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{|v|=n} L_v^p |W_1(v) - 1|^p \right) \\ &= C \mu_p m^n(p)\end{aligned}$$

for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. This inequality together with (37) imply the necessity of $\mathbb{E}W_1^p < \infty$ and $e^{ap}m(p) < 1$ for the L_p -convergence of A . Moreover, by Jensen's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{|v|=n} L_v^2 (W_1(v) - 1)^2 \right)^{p/2} &\geq \left(\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{|v|=n} L_v^2 (W_1(v) - 1)^2 \right) \right)^{p/2} \\ &= \mu_2^{p/2} m(2)^n,\end{aligned}$$

which together with (37) finally give the asserted necessity of $e^a m^{1/2}(2) < 1$.

Let us now turn to the sufficiency of conditions (7). By Lemma 3.1 and Remark 3.1(a), it suffices to verify the L_p -convergence of \widehat{A} . By combining (35), another use of Lemma 3.4, the convexity of $x \mapsto x^{p/2}$ and a conditioning with respect to \mathcal{F}_n , we infer

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}|W_{n+1} - W_n|^p &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{|v|=n} L_v^2 (W_1(v) - 1)^2 \right)^{p/2} \\ &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left(Z_n^{(2)} \sum_{|v|=n} \frac{L_v^2}{Z_n^{(2)}} (W_1(v) - 1)^2 \right)^{p/2} \\ &\leq C \mu_p \mathbb{E}(Z_n^{(2)})^{p/2}.\end{aligned}$$

Whence it is enough to verify

$$(38) \quad e^{pan} \mathbb{E}(Z_n^{(2)})^{p/2} = O(q^n) \quad \text{for some } q \in (0, 1),$$

hereafter. Indeed, it then follows that

$$(39) \quad e^{2an} \mathbb{E}^{2/p} |W_{n+1} - W_n|^p = O(q^{2n/p}).$$

Thereby with the help of Minkowski's inequality in $L_{p/2}$ and once more Lemma 3.4,

$$\mathbb{E}|\widehat{A}|^p \leq C \mathbb{E}R^{p/2} \leq C \left(\sum_{n \geq 0} e^{2an} \mathbb{E}^{2/p} |W_{n+1} - W_n|^p \right)^{p/2} < \infty.$$

So let us prove (38) for the case $p > 2$, for it trivially holds with $q = e^{2a}m(2)$ in the case $p = 2$. Notice that $\mathbb{E}(W_1^{(2)})^{p/2} \leq m^{-p/2}(2) \mathbb{E}W_1^p < \infty$. For the remaining discussion, we distinguish two cases:

CASE 1. $m(p) < m^{p/2}(2)$.

Then the second condition in (7) reads $e^a m^{1/2}(2) < 1$. By Proposition 1.1 applied to $W_n^{(2)}$ and $p/2$ instead of W_n and p , we obtain $\sup_{n \geq 0} \mathbb{E}(W_n^{(2)})^{p/2} < \infty$, and this ensures the validity of (38) with $q = e^{ap}m^{p/2}(2)$.

CASE 2. $m(p) \geq m^{p/2}(2)$.

Then the second condition in (7) takes the form $e^a m^{1/p}(p) < 1$. Lemma 3.3 applied to $W_n^{(2)}$ and $p/2$ instead of W_n and p provides us with $\mathbb{E}(W_n^{(2)})^{p/2} = O(n^c m^n(p) m(2)^{-pn/2})$ for $c > 0$. Consequently, $\mathbb{E}(Z_n^{(2)})^{p/2} = O(n^c m^n(p))$ which proves the validity of (38) with $q = \delta e^{p a} m(p)$ for some $\delta > 1$ sufficiently close to 1. The proof is herewith completed. \square

REFERENCES

1. G. Alsmeyer and A. Iksanov, *A log-type moment result for perpetuities and its application to martingales in supercritical branching random walks*. Electronic J. Probab. (2009) **14**, 289–313.
2. G. Alsmeyer and D. Kuhlbusch, *Double martingale structure and existence of ϕ -moments for weighted branching processes*. To appear in Münster J. Math. (2009)
3. S. Asmussen and H. Hering, *Branching Processes*. Birkhäuser, Boston, 1983.
4. J. Biggins, *The first- and last-birth problems for a multitype age-dependent branching process*. Adv. Appl. Probab. **8**, (1976), no. 1, 446–459.
5. J. Biggins, *Martingale convergence in the branching random walk*. J. Appl. Probab. **14**, (1977), no. 1, 25–37.
6. J. Biggins, *Chernoff's theorem in the branching random walk*. J. Appl. Probab. **14** (1977), no. 1, 630–636.
7. J. Biggins and A. Kyprianou, *Seneta-Heyde norming in the branching random walk*. Ann. Probab. **25**, (1997), no. 1, 337–360.
8. Y. Chow and H. Teicher, *Probability Theory: Independence, Interchangeability, Martingales*. Springer, New York, 1988.
9. Y. Hu and Z. Shi, *Minimal position and critical martingale convergence in branching random walks, and directed polymers on disordered trees*. Ann. Probab. **37**, (2009), no. 2, 742–789.
10. A. Iksanov, *Elementary fixed points of the BRW smoothing transforms with infinite number of summands*. Stoch. Proc. Appl. **114**, (2004), no. 1, 27–50.
11. J. Kingman, *The first birth problem for an age-dependent branching process*. Ann. Probab. **1**, (1975), no. 3 790–801.
12. Q. Liu, *Sur une équation fonctionnelle et ses applications: une extension du théorème de Kesten-Stigum concernant des processus de branchement*. Adv. Appl. Probab. **29**, (1997), no. 2, 353–373.
13. Q. Liu, *On generalized multiplicative cascades*. Stoch. Proc. Appl. **86**, (2000), no. 1, 263–286.
14. R. Lyons, *A simple path to Biggins' martingale convergence for branching random walk*. Classical and Modern Branching Processes, IMA Volumes in Mathematics and its Applications (K. Athreya and P. Jagers eds.), Springer, Berlin, pp. 217–221.
15. R. Lyons, R. Pemantle and Y. Peres, *Conceptual proofs of $L \log L$ criteria for mean behavior of branching processes*. Ann. Probab. **23**, (1995), no. 3, 1125–1138.
16. J. Neveu, *Discrete-Parameter Martingales*. North-Holland, Amsterdam-Oxford, 1975.

ADDRESS OF G. ALSMEYER

Current address: Institut für Mathematische Statistik, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster, Einsteinstraße 62, D-48149 Münster, Germany

E-mail address: gerolda@math.uni-muenster.de

ADDRESS OF A. IKSANOV

Current address: Faculty of Cybernetics, National T. Shevchenko University of Kiev, 01033 Kiev, Ukraine

E-mail address: iksan@unicyb.kiev.ua

ADDRESS OF S. POLOTSKIY

Current address: Faculty of Cybernetics, National T. Shevchenko University of Kiev, 01033 Kiev, Ukraine

E-mail address: pilot_ser@mail.ru

ADDRESS OF U. RÖSLER

Current address: Mathematisches Seminar, Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel, Ludewig-Meyn-Str. 4, D-24098 Kiel, Germany

E-mail address: roesler@math.uni-kiel.de