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Abstract

Let \( R_t \) be the position of the rightmost particle at time \( t \) in a time-homogeneous one-dimensional branching diffusion process. Let \( \gamma(\alpha, t) \) be the \( \alpha^{th} \) quantile of \( R_t \) under \( P^0 \), where \( P^x \) denotes the probability measure of the branching diffusion process starting with a single particle at position \( x \). We show that \( \gamma(\alpha, t) \) is a limiting quantile of \( R_t \) under \( P^x \) in the sense that \( \lim_{t \to \infty} P^x\{R_t \leq \gamma(\alpha, t)\} \) exist for all \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \) and all \( x \in \mathbb{R} \). If the underlying diffusion is recurrent, we show that, after an appropriate rescaling of space, the \( P^x \) distribution of \( R_t - t \) converges weakly to a non-trivial limiting distribution \( w_x \).
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0. Introduction

The simplest example of a branching diffusion process in one-dimension is branching Brownian motion, defined as follows. Starting at time $t = 0$ and position $x \in \mathbb{R}$, a particle begins a Brownian motion $X_1(t)$. At a random time $T$, independent of the motion $X_1(t)$ and with the unit exponential distribution, the particle undergoes a binary fission, creating a daughter particle, which begins its own Brownian motion $X_2(t)$ starting at $(T, X_1(T))$. Each particle repeatedly undergoes binary fissions following (independent) exponentially distributed gestation periods, creating new particles which behave as the original. At any given time $t \geq 0$, the state of the process is specified by the positions $(X_j(t))_{1 \leq j \leq N(t)}$ of the particles in existence at time $t$, indexed according to the order of birth.

A remarkable feature of the branching Brownian motion is that the distribution of the right frontier $R_t = \max(X_1(t), \ldots, X_{N(t)}(t))$ is asymptotically a "travelling wave" with velocity $\sqrt{2}$. In particular, if $\gamma(1/2, t)$ is the median of the distribution of $R_t$ under $P^0$ ($P^x$ denotes the probability measure governing the process when the initial point is $x$), then

\begin{equation}
\lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{\gamma(1/2, t)}{t} = \sqrt{2} \quad \text{and}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\lim_{t \to \infty} P^0\{R_t \leq \gamma(1/2, t) + y\} = w_0(y),
\end{equation}

where $w_0(y)$ is a proper, continuous c.d.f. (cf. [5]). There is also a conditional analogue of (1.2):

\begin{equation}
\lim_{r \to \infty} \lim_{t \to \infty} P^0\{R_t \leq \gamma(1/2, t) + y | \mathcal{F}_r\} = \exp\{-Ze^{-\sqrt{2}y}\}
\end{equation}

for a certain r.v. $Z$ valued in $(0, \infty)$ where $\mathcal{F}_r = \sigma((X_j(s)) : s \leq r)$ (cf. [2]). This exhibits the travelling wave $w_0(y)$ as a translation mixture of the extreme value law $\exp\{-e^{-\sqrt{2}y}\}$.

The purpose of this paper is to study the distribution of $R_t$ for a more general class of one-dimensional branching diffusion processes in which the motions of individual particles are governed by a (more or less) arbitrary diffusion law (see below) and the rate of fission is position dependent (as in [3]–[4]). It is clear that (0.2) cannot hold in this generality, because the local drift, diffusion, and fission rate coefficients may vary wildly at $\infty$. Nevertheless, we shall prove that the distribution of $R_t$ varies regularly in time in the sense
that

\[(0.4) \quad \lim_{t \to \infty} \mathbb{P}^x\{R_{t-s} \leq \gamma(\alpha, t)\} = g(\alpha, s, x)\]

exists for all \(\alpha \in (0, 1)\) and \(s, \ x \in \mathbb{R}\), where \(\gamma(\alpha, t)\) is the \(\alpha^{th}\) quantile of the distribution of \(R_t\) under \(P^0\) (Th. 3.2 below). Thus, although \(R_t - \gamma(1/2, t)\) may not converge in law as \(t \to \infty\), the quantiles \(\gamma(\alpha, t)\) change with \(t\) in a somewhat regular manner. Furthermore, we shall prove that if \(\lim_{s \to \infty} g\left(\frac{1}{2}, s, x\right) = 1\) and \(\lim_{s \to -\infty} g\left(\frac{1}{2}, s, x\right) = 0\), which is always the case if the underlying diffusion is recurrent, then there exists a homeomorphism \(f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}\) such that

\[(0.5) \quad \lim_{t \to \infty} \mathbb{P}^x\{f(R_t) \leq t + y\} = g(1/2, y, x) \quad \forall \ x, y \in \mathbb{R}.\]

Thus, the "rescaled" branching diffusion exhibits the travelling wave phenomenon (Th. 3.6).

We shall also prove an analogue of the conditional law (0.3):

\[(0.6) \quad \lim_{r \to \infty} \lim_{t \to \infty} \mathbb{P}^x\{R_{t-s} \leq \gamma(\alpha, t)\mid \mathcal{F}_r\} = Y_{\alpha, s}\]

exists a.s. \((P^x)\) for all \(\alpha \in (0, 1)\) and \(s, \ x \in \mathbb{R}\) (cf. (4.2)). Moreover, for each \(\alpha\), the random function \(Y_{\alpha, s}\) assumes one of the following forms a.s. \((P^x)\):

\[(0.7) \quad Y_{\alpha, s} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s > U_\alpha, \\ 0 & \text{if } s < U_\alpha; \end{cases}\]

\[(0.8) \quad Y_{\alpha, s} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s < U_\alpha, \\ 0 & \text{if } s > U_\alpha; \end{cases}\]

\[(0.9) \quad Y_{\alpha, s} = \exp\{-Z_\alpha e^{-C_\alpha s}\},\]

where \(C_\alpha\) is a real constant and \(U_\alpha, \ Z_\alpha\) are random variables satisfying \(-\infty \leq U_\alpha \leq \infty\) and \(0 \leq Z_\alpha \leq \infty\) (Th. 5.1). For a given value of \(\alpha\), only one of the forms (0.7)–(0.9) can occur with positive \(P^x\)-probability. In cases (0.7)–(0.8) the behavior of \(R_t\) is "ultimately predictable" in the sense that the observed quantile \(Q_t = \inf\{\alpha: R_t \leq \gamma(\alpha, t)\}\) stabilizes as \(t \to \infty\) (Prop. 5.2). The random variables \(U_\alpha\) and \(\log Z_\alpha\) may be thought of as random
"stabilization times". In section 7 we shall present examples to show that each of the three types of possible behavior (0.7), (0.8), (0.9) actually occurs. The reader should perhaps consult these examples before reading secs. 2–7.

The travelling wave phenomenon (0.2) occurs for many branching diffusions other than branching Brownian motion (cf. [3]–[4], for example; also Ex. 7.2, 7.3, 7.5 below). In sec. 6 we investigate the implications of our general results (0.4)–(0.9) for such processes. We will show that if (0.2) occurs then the quantiles \( \gamma(\alpha, t) \) must move linearly in \( t \) (as \( t \to \infty \)). Furthermore, we will show that the representations (0.7)–(0.9) simplify in this case by finding simple relations among the quantities \( U_\alpha, Z_\alpha, C_\alpha \) for different \( \alpha \). We shall also give a simple sufficient condition for (0.9), and thus for the wave front to be a translation mixture of extreme value distributions \( \exp\{ -e^{-C_\gamma} \} \) (Prop. 6.5). Finally, we call the reader's attention to Ex. 7.2, which exhibits a peculiar feature. In this example the underlying particle motion is the standard Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process and the fission rate is 1; under any \( P^x \),

\[
R_t - \sqrt{t} \xrightarrow{D} 0.
\]

This shows that \( R_t \), suitably recentered, may converge in distribution even when \( R_t \) does not grow at a linear rate. However, Th. 3.6 implies that if \( R_t/t \xrightarrow{D} 0 \) and \( R_t - \gamma(\frac{1}{2}, t) \) converges in distribution then the limit distribution must be degenerate.

1. Branching Diffusion Processes

The individual particles in our processes will move according to a conservative, nonsingular diffusion process in \( (-\infty, \infty) \). In particular, there are no killings and no shunts ([1], ch. 3–4). A conservative, nonsingular diffusion in \( (-\infty, \infty) \) is determined by its scale function \( S(x) \) and its speed measure \( \mu(dx) \) ([1], sec. 4.2); we assume for simplicity that \( \mu \) has no atoms. An important fact that we will use repeatedly is that for a one-dimensional diffusion process with no shunts the transition probabilities \( P(t, x, dy) \) satisfy

\[
P(t, x, dy) = p(t, x, y)\mu(dy),
\]

\[
p(t, x, y) > 0 \quad \forall \ t > 0, \quad \forall \ x, y \in \mathbb{R}
\]

(c.f. [1], sec. 4.11 and problem 4.11.5). Since \( \mu(J) > 0 \) for every nonempty, open interval \( J \), it follows that \( P(t, x, J) > 0 \quad \forall \ t > 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \) and \( J \) open and nonempty. Recall also
that diffusion processes have continuous sample paths — this is crucial for many of our arguments.

Individual particles reproduce as follows. The initial particle, moving along its trajectory \( X_1(t) \), produces offspring at a random time \( T_1 \), where

\[
P(T_1 > t | X_1(s), s \geq 0) = \exp\left\{- \int_0^t \beta(X_1(s)) ds \right\}
\]

and \( \beta(x) \geq 0 \) is a continuous function. Observe that \( T_1 \) may be \( \infty \) with positive probability. Conditional on the path \( X_1(s), s \geq 0 \), and the value of \( T_1 \), the number of offspring produced at time \( T_1 \) is governed by a probability distribution \( \{p_n(X_1(T_1))\}_{n \geq 1} \), where \( p_n(x) \) are continuous functions of \( x \) satisfying \( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} p_n(x) = 1 \). The original particle and each of the offspring produced at time \( T_1 \) then follow (conditionally) independent paths governed by the law of the underlying diffusion, and obey the same reproduction law as the original particle. We make no assumptions about \( \beta(x) \) and \( \{p_n(x)\}_{n \geq 1} \) except that there are no "explosions", i.e., the number \( N(t) \) of particles born before time \( t \) is finite with probability 1. If \( \beta(x) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} np_n(x) < C \forall x \in \mathbb{R} \), then the fact that \( e^{-Ct}N(t) \) is a non-negative supermartingale implies that there are no explosions.

We will generally consider only branching diffusion processes initiated by a single particle located at position \( x \) at time \( t = 0 \); the notation \( P^x \) will be used for the probability measure governing the process. (Sometimes we will let the initial point be a random variable with distribution \( \nu \), in which case \( P^\nu \) will denote the probability measure.) The state of the process at time \( t \) consists of the locations \( (X_j(t)) \) of the particles in existence at \( t \) \((j = 1, 2, \ldots, N(t))\). In some arguments we will need several copies of the branching diffusion process, e.g., \( (X_j(t)) \) and \( (\tilde{X}_j(t)) \); in such cases we will use the same notational convention for all random variables associated with the processes, e.g., \( \tilde{N}_j(t) = \# \) particles in \( (\tilde{X}_j(t)) \) at time \( t \), \( \tilde{R}_j(t) = \max (\tilde{X}_1(t), \ldots, \tilde{X}_{\tilde{N}_j(t)}(t)) \). Whenever several branching diffusion processes occur in the same context, they will always have the same diffusion law \( (S(x), \mu(dx)) \) and reproduction law \( (\beta(x), \{p_n(x)\}) \), although they may have different initial points. Sometimes it will be convenient to let a branching diffusion process begin at a time \( t \) other than 0.

Conditional on its history up to time \( s \), the future of a branching diffusion process \( (X_j(t)) \) after \( s \) consists of a superposition of \( N(s) \) independent branching diffusion process
began at positions $X_1(s), X_2(s), \ldots, X_{N(s)}(s)$ at time $s$. This is the Markov property for branching diffusion processes. The strong Markov property also holds: this says the same thing as the Markov property, but with the fixed time $s$ replaced by a finite stopping time $\tau$. In some situations, e.g., coupling arguments, $\sigma((X_j(s)), s \leq t)$ is not the natural filtration. We define an admissible filtration to be a filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ such that $(X_j(t))$ is adapted to $(\mathcal{F}_t)$ and the strong Markov property holds, i.e., for any stopping time $\tau < \infty$ the distribution of $(X_j(t+\tau), t \geq 0)$ conditional on $\mathcal{F}_\tau$ is the same as that of $N(\tau)$ independent branching diffusion processes begun at $X_1(\tau), \ldots, X_{N(\tau)}(t)$. 
2. Comparison Principles

Let \( v(x) \) be a Borel measurable function of \( x \in \mathbb{R} \) such that \( 0 \leq v \leq 1 \); for \( t \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{R} \) define

\[
(2.1) \quad u(t,x) = E^x \prod_{j=1}^{N(t)} v(X_j(t)).
\]

**LEMMA 2.1:** \( u(t,x) \) is a jointly continuous function of \( (t,x) \in (0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R} \). Moreover, if \( v \) is continuous at \( x \) then \( u \) is continuous at \( (0,x) \).

**PROOF:** The joint continuity of \( u \) in \( (t,x) \) for \( t > 0 \) follows from a simple coupling argument, since \( 0 \leq v \leq 1 \). (If independent branching diffusion processes \((X_j(s))\) and \((X'_j(s))\) are started at \( x \) and \( x' \), respectively, then with high probability the paths \( X_1(s) \) and \( X'_1(s+\epsilon) \) will meet at some \( s \ll t \) before a fission has occurred on either path, provided \( |x - x'| \) and \( |\epsilon| \) are small. On this event the processes may be coupled, hence the products in the definitions of \( u(t,x) \) and \( u(t+\epsilon,x') \) are equal with high probability, and thus \( |u(t,x) - u(t+\epsilon,x')| \) is small.)

Let \( v \) be continuous at \( x \), and let \( \epsilon \) and \( |x' - x| \) be small. If \((X_j(s))\) is a branching diffusion process started at \( x' \) then with high probability no fission occurs by time \( \epsilon \) and \( X_1(\epsilon) \) is near \( x \), which implies \( |v(X_1(\epsilon)) - v(x)| \) is small, and therefore that \( u(\epsilon,x') \approx v(x) \).

\[\Box\]

**LEMMA 2.2:** For every \( x \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq s, \)

\[
(2.2) \quad u(t,x) = E^x \prod_{j=1}^{N(s)} u(t-s, X_j(s)).
\]

Furthermore, if \( Y_t(s) = \prod_{j=1}^{N(s)} u(t-s, X_j(s)) \) for \( 0 \leq s \leq t \), then \( Y_t(s) \) is a martingale relative to any admissible filtration \((\mathcal{F}_s)_{s \geq 0}\), under any \( P^x, x \in \mathbb{R}\).

**PROOF:** By (2.1)

\[
Y_t(s) = \prod_{j=1}^{N(s)} E^{X_j(s)} \prod_{i=1}^{N_j(t-s)} v(X_{ij}(t)),
\]

where \( X_{ij}(t), i = 1, \ldots, N_j(t) \), denote the positions at time \( t \) of the progeny of the particle at \( X_j(s) \) at time \( s \). By the Markov property of \((X_j(t))\) (conditional on \( \mathcal{F}_s \) the future
has the same law as an aggregation of $N(s)$ independent branching processes, started at $X_1(s), \ldots, X_{N(s)}(s))$,

$$Y_t(s) = E^x(\prod_{j=1}^{N(t)} u(X_j(t))|\mathcal{F}_s).$$

Thus, $Y_t(s)$ is a martingale, and (2.2) follows from $u(t, x) = Y_t(0) = E^x(Y_t(s)).$ □

Let $A$ be an open subset of $(0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ and let $(X_j(t))$ be a branching diffusion process started at some $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Define a new process $(\tilde{X}_j(t))$ by “freezing” any particle in $(X_j(t))$ the instant it hits $A$, not allowing it any further movement or reproduction. Thus, let $\tau_j = \inf\{t: (t, X_j(t)) \in A\}$ and define $X_j^*(t) = X_j(t \wedge \tau_j)$; then $(\tilde{X}_j(t))$ is the subset of $(X_j^*(t))$ obtained by deleting the path of any particle $j'$ born of a particle $j$ after time $\tau_j$ (see Fig. 1). Let $\tilde{N}(t)$ be the number of particles in the collection $(\tilde{X}_j(t))$ at time $t$.

— Figure 1 Here —

**LEMMA 2.3:** For any $t > 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$u(t, x) = E^x \prod_{j=1}^{\tilde{N}(t)} u(t - (\tau_j \wedge t), \tilde{X}_j(t \wedge \tau_j)).$$

**PROOF:** It follows from Lemma 2.2 that for any stopping time $\nu \leq t$,

$$u(t, x) = E^x \prod_{j=1}^{N(\nu)} u(t - \nu, X_j(\nu)).$$

Let $0 \leq \nu_1 \leq \nu_2 \leq \ldots$ be the successive times at which paths in the collection $(X_j(t))$ reach (the boundary of) $A$. At time $\nu_1$ one of the particles, say the $i^{th}$, has reached $\partial A$. Consider (2.4) with $\nu = \nu_1 \wedge t$; freeze the factor $u(t - \nu, X_i(\nu))$ corresponding to the particle that has just reached $\partial A$, then apply (2.4) to each of the other factors with $\nu = \nu_2 \wedge t$. Proceeding recursively through $\nu_3 \wedge t$, $\nu_4 \wedge t$, $\ldots$, at each step freezing the factor corresponding to any particle that has reached $\partial A$, we obtain (2.3). □

Let $v_1(x)$ and $v_2(x)$ be Borel measurable functions of $x \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $0 \leq v_i \leq 1$, and let $u_1(t, x)$ and $u_2(t, x)$ be defined by (2.1) with $v = v_1$ and $v = v_2$, respectively.
Lemma 2.4 (Majorization Principle): If \( v_1(x) \geq v_2(x) \) for each \( x \in \mathbb{R} \) then \( u_1(t,x) \geq u_2(t,x) \) for each \( (t,x) \in (0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R} \). If in addition \( v_1(x) > v_2(x) \) for every \( x \) in some nonempty open interval, then \( u_1(t,x) > u_2(t,x) \) for every \( (t,x) \in (0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R} \).

Proof: By definition, \( u_i(t,x) = E^\pi \prod_{j=1}^{N(t)} v_i(X_j(t)) \). If \( v_1 \geq v_2 \) then the integrand for \( i = 1 \) is \( \geq \) that for \( i = 2 \), so \( u_1 \geq u_2 \). To prove the second statement we will show that if \( v_1 > v_2 \) in the interval \((a,b)\), then for every \((t,x) \in (0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}\) there is positive \( P^\pi \)-probability that
\[
\prod_{j=1}^{N(t)} v_1(X_j(t)) > \prod_{j=1}^{N(t)} v_2(X_j(t)).
\]

Let \( A = \{ N(t) = 1 \} \); then \( P^\pi(A \cap B) > 0 \), where \( B = \{ X_1(t) \in (a,b) \} \); then \( P^\pi(B) > 0 \) (cf. Problem 5, sec. 4.11 of [1]). Since \( B \subset B \) it follows that \( P^\pi(A \cap B) > 0 \).

Lemma 2.5 (Sign-Change Lemma): If
\[
(2.5) \quad v_2(x) \geq v_1(x) \quad \forall x > x_0 \quad \text{and}
\]
\[
(2.6) \quad v_2(x) \leq v_1(x) \quad \forall x < x_0
\]
then
\[
(2.7) \quad u_2(t,x_1) > u_1(t,x_1) \Rightarrow u_2(t,x) > u_1(t,x) \quad \forall x \geq x_1; \text{and}
\]
\[
(2.8) \quad u_2(t,x_2) < u_1(t,x_2) \Rightarrow u_2(t,x) < u_1(t,x) \quad \forall x \leq x_2.
\]

Proof: It suffices to prove (2.7). Assume \( v_2(x_0) < v_1(x_0) \). The same argument with slight modification works when \( v_2(x_0) \geq v_1(x_0) \).

Define \( A = \{ (s,x): 0 < s < t \text{ and } u_1(t-s,x) > u_2(t-s,x) \} \); by Lemma 2.1, \( A \) is an open subset of \((0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}\).

We shall prove that if \( u_2(t,x_1) > u_1(t,x_1) \) and if (2.5)--(2.6) hold then there is a continuous path \( \gamma(s), 0 \leq s \leq t, \) such that \( \gamma(0) = x_1, \gamma(t) > x_0, \) and \((s,\gamma(s)) \in A^c\).
\( \forall 0 < s < t \). Suppose not; then every continuous path \( \gamma(s) \), \( 0 \leq s \leq t \) such that \( \gamma(0) = x_1 \) must either enter \( A \) or terminate at \( \gamma(t) \leq x_0 \). But then Lemma 2.3 implies that \( u_2(t, x_1) \leq u_1(t, x_1) \), a contradiction.

The path \( \gamma(s) \) satisfies \( u_2(t - s, \gamma(s)) \geq u_1(t - s, \gamma(s)) \) for each \( 0 < s < t \). Since \( \gamma(0) = x_1 \) and \( u_2(t, x_1) > u_1(t, x_1) \), and since \( u_1, u_2 \) are continuous, there exists \( \delta > 0 \) such that \( u_2(t - s, \gamma(s)) > u_1(t - s, \gamma(s)) \) for \( 0 \leq s \leq \delta \). Define \( A^* = \{ (s, x) : 0 < s < t \) and \( x < \gamma(s) \} \); observe that any path \( \beta(s) \) such that \( \beta(0) \geq x_1 \) and such that \( (s, \beta(s)) \) enters \( A^* \) must cross \( (s, \gamma(s)) \) as it enters \( A^* \) (see Fig. 2). We now apply Lemma 2.3 to calculate \( u_1(t, x) \), \( u_2(t, x) \) for \( x \geq x_1 \), this time using the region \( A^* \) instead of \( A \). Since \( (\tau_j, \tilde{X}_j(\tau_j)) \) is on \( (s, \gamma(s)) \) if \( \tau_j < t \) and \( X_j(t) \geq \gamma(t) > x_0 \) if \( t \leq \tau_j \),

\[
u_2(t - (\tau_j \wedge t), \tilde{X}_j(\tau_j \wedge t)) \geq u_1(t - (\tau_j \wedge t), \tilde{X}_j(\tau_j \wedge t)) \quad \forall 1 \leq j \leq \tilde{N}(t).
\]

Furthermore, strict inequality occurs with positive \( P^x \)-probability, because there is positive probability that \( (s, X_1(s)) \) crosses \( (s, \gamma(s)) \) for some \( s \leq \delta \) ([1], sec. 4.11, Problem 5). Thus, by Lemma 2.3, \( u_2(t, x) > u_1(t, x) \) for \( x \geq x_1 \).

— Figure 2 Here —

Lemma 2.5 states that if (2.5)–(2.6) hold then for each \( t > 0 \) the difference \( u_2(t, x) - u_1(t, x) \), as a function of \( x \), has at most one sign change, from \( - \) to \( + \). A trivial but noteworthy consequence of Lemma 2.5 is that if (2.5)–(2.6) hold then

\[
u_2(t, x_1) \geq u_1(t, x_1) \Rightarrow u_2(t, x) \geq u_1(t, x) \quad \forall x \geq x_1;
\]

(2.9)

\[
u_2(t, x_2) \leq u_1(t, x_2) \Rightarrow u_2(t, x) \leq u_1(t, x) \quad \forall x \leq x_2;
\]

(2.10)

Say that a Borel function \( H: \mathbb{R} \to [0, 1] \) is a martingale function if \( \forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \forall t \geq 0 \)

\[
u_{2.11} H(x) = E^x \prod_{j=1}^{N(t)} H(X_j(t)).
\]

Note that a pointwise limit of martingale functions is again a martingale function, by the dominated convergence theorem.
LEMMA 2.6: Let $H(x)$ be a martingale function. If $H(x) = 0$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}$ then $H(x) = 0 \ \forall \ x \in \mathbb{R}$, and if $H(x) = 1$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}$ then $H(x) = 1 \ \forall \ x \in \mathbb{R}$.

PROOF: If $H(x) = 0$ then for any $t > 0$, $H(X_1(t)) = 0$ a.s. $(P^x)$, because conditional on $X_1(t)$ there is positive $P^x$-probability that $N(t) = 1$. Now under any $P^x$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, the distribution of $X_1(t)$ is equivalent to the speed measure $\mu(dy)$. Consequently, the distributions of $X_1(t)$ under the measures $P^x$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, are all equivalent to each other, so that, $\forall \ x \in \mathbb{R}, P^x\{H(X_1(t)) = 0\} = 1$. This clearly implies that $H(x) = 0 \ \forall \ x \in \mathbb{R}$, in view of (2.11).

A similar argument proves the second statement of the lemma. $\square$

3. Existence of a Travelling Wave

Recall that $R_t = \max(X_1(t), \ldots, X_{N(t)}(t))$. Define $u(t, x, y)$ to be the distribution function of $R_t$ under $P^x$, i.e.,

$$u(t, x, y) = P^x\{R_t \leq y\} = E^x \prod_{j=1}^{N(t)} 1\{X_j(t) \leq y\}. \tag{3.1}$$

For each $t > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $u(t, x, y)$ is a strictly increasing function of $y$, because for any $a < b$, $P^x\{N(t) = 1 \text{ and } a < X_1(t) < b\} > 0$ ([1], sec. 4.11, Problem 5 again). Thus, for $0 < \alpha < 1$ the $\alpha^{th}$ quantile $\gamma(\alpha, t)$ of $u(t, 0, \cdot)$ is the unique real number such that $u(t, 0, \gamma(\alpha, t)) = \alpha$, for $0 < \alpha < 1$, and $\gamma(\alpha, t)$ is strictly increasing in $\alpha$. For $\alpha = 0$ and $\alpha = 1$, we set $\gamma(0, t) = -\infty$ and $\gamma(1, t) = \infty$.

Let $-\infty < s_1 < s_2 < \infty$ and $-\infty < x_1 < x_2 < \infty$, and let $K = [s_1, s_2] \times [x_1, x_2] \subset \mathbb{R}^2$.

LEMMA 3.1: For any $\delta > 0$ the set $\{u(t + s, x, y) : t \geq \delta - s_1, y \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is a uniformly equicontinuous family of functions of $(x, s) \in K$.

PROOF: This follows from a simple coupling argument almost identical to that used in the proof of Lemma 2.1. $\square$

Equation (2.2) implies that for any $t > 0$, $s \geq 0$,

$$u(t + s, x, y) = E^x \prod_{j=1}^{N(s)} u(t, X_j(s), y). \tag{3.2}$$
Also, the Sign Change Lemma implies that if $t_1 < t_2$ then for any $y_1$, $y_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, $u(t_2, x, y_2) - u(t_1, x, y_1)$ has at most one sign change in $x$ (− to +), i.e.,

\[ u(t_2, x_1, y_2) > u(t_1, x_1, y_1) \Rightarrow u(t_2, x, y_2) > u(t_1, x, y_1) \quad \forall \; x \geq x_1; \]

\[ u(t_2, x_2, y_2) < u(t_1, x_2, y_1) \Rightarrow u(t_2, x, y_2) < u(t_1, x, y_1) \quad \forall \; x \leq x_2; \]

**THEOREM 3.2:** For each $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$, and $x \in \mathbb{R}$

\[(3.3) \quad g(\alpha, s, x) = \lim_{t \to \infty} u(t - s, x, \gamma(\alpha, t))
= \lim_{t \to \infty} P_{\mathbb{F}} \{ R_{t-s} \leq \gamma(\alpha, t) \} \]

exists, and the convergence is uniform for $(s, x)$ in any compact subset $K$ of $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$

**NOTE:** $g(\alpha, 0, 0) = \alpha \quad \forall \; \alpha \in (0, 1)$.

**PROOF:** It follows from Lemma 3.1 and the Arzela-Ascoli theorem that any sequence $t_n \to \infty$ has a subsequence $t_k \to \infty$ such that $u(t_k - s, x, \gamma(\alpha, t_k))$ converges uniformly for $(s, x) \in K$. Suppose that $t_1 < t'_1 < t_2 < t'_2 < \ldots \to \infty$ are such that

\[ u(t_k - s, x, \gamma(\alpha, t_k)) \to g(\alpha, s, x) \]

\[ u(t'_k - s, x, \gamma(\alpha, t'_k)) \to g'(\alpha, s, x). \]

We will show that $g \equiv g'$.

Since $t'_k > t_k$, $u(t'_k - s, x, \gamma(\alpha, t'_k)) - u(t_k - s, x, \gamma(\alpha, t_k))$ has at most one sign change in $x$, from − to +; consequently, $g'(\alpha, s, x) - g(\alpha, s, x)$ has at most one sign change, from − to +. On the other hand, since $t_{k+1} > t'_k$ the same argument shows that $g(\alpha, s, x) - g'(\alpha, s, x)$ has at most one sign change, also from − to +. Thus,

\[ g(\alpha, s, x) > g'(\alpha, s, x), \text{ some } x, \Rightarrow g(\alpha, s, x) \geq g'(\alpha, s, x) \quad \forall \; x; \]

\[ g(\alpha, s, x) < g'(\alpha, s, x), \text{ some } x, \Rightarrow g(\alpha, s, x) \leq g'(\alpha, s, x) \quad \forall \; x. \]

Suppose that for some $s > 0$, $g(\alpha, s, x) \geq g'(\alpha, s, x) \quad \forall \; x \in \mathbb{R}$ or $g(\alpha, s, x) \leq g'(\alpha, s, x) \quad \forall \; x \in \mathbb{R}$. By (3.2),

\[ \alpha = u(t_k, 0, \gamma(\alpha, t_k)) = E_0^{N(s)} \prod_{j=1}^{N(s)} u(t_k - s, X_j(s), \gamma(\alpha, t_k)), \]

\[ \alpha = u(t'_k, 0, \gamma(\alpha, t'_k)) = E_0^{N(s)} \prod_{j=1}^{N(s)} u(t'_k - s, X_j(s), \gamma(\alpha, t'_k)), \]
so by the Dominated Convergence Theorem
\[ \alpha = E^0 \prod_{j=1}^{N(s)} g(\alpha, s, X_j(s)) = E^0 \prod_{j=1}^{N(s)} g'(\alpha, s, X_j(s)). \]

It now follows that \( g(\alpha, s, X_1(s)) = g'(\alpha, s, X_1(s)) \) \( P^0\)-a.s. Since \( g(\alpha, s, x) \) and \( g'(\alpha, s, x) \) are continuous in \( x \) it follows that \( g(\alpha, s, x) = g'(\alpha, s, x) \forall x \in \mathbb{R} \). Together with the results of the preceding paragraph this shows that \( g(\alpha, s, x) = g'(\alpha, s, x) \) for all \( x \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( s > 0 \), and \( g(\alpha, 0, x) = g'(\alpha, 0, x) \) follows by continuity.

Now let \( s < 0 \); by (3.2) again
\[ u(t_k - s, x, \gamma(\alpha, t_k)) = E^z \prod_{j=1}^{N(-s)} u(t_k, X_j(-s), \gamma(\alpha, t_k)) \text{ and} \]
\[ u(t'_k - s, x, \gamma(\alpha, t'_k)) = E^z \prod_{j=1}^{N(-s)} u(t'_k, X_j(-s), \gamma(\alpha, t'_k)), \]
\[ \Rightarrow g(\alpha, s, x) = E^z \prod_{j=1}^{N(-s)} g(\alpha, 0, X_j(-s)) \text{ and} \]
\[ g'(\alpha, s, x) = E^z \prod_{j=1}^{N(-s)} g'(\alpha, 0, X_j(-s)). \]

But \( g(\alpha, 0, x) = g'(\alpha, 0, x) \forall x \in \mathbb{R} \), so it follows that \( g(\alpha, s, x) = g'(\alpha, s, x) \). This completes the proof that the limit in (3.3) exists. The local uniformity in \( (s, x) \) is an easy consequence of Lemma 3.1.

PROPOSITION 3.3: The function \( g(\alpha, s, x) \) has the following properties.

(3.4) \[ g(\alpha, s, x) = E^z \prod_{j=1}^{N(s')} g(\alpha, s + s', X_j(s')) \forall s' \geq 0; \]

(3.5) \[ g(\alpha, s, x) \text{ is strictly increasing in } \alpha; \]

(3.6) \[ g(\alpha, s, x) \text{ is jointly continuous in } \alpha, s, x; \]
(3.7) \( g(\alpha, s, x) = g(\alpha', s', x) \) for some \( x \Rightarrow g(\alpha, s + r, x) = g(\alpha', s' + r, x) \) \( \forall x, r \in \mathbb{R} \);

(3.8) \( \{g(\alpha, s + r, x): 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1, s \in \mathbb{R}\} \) is a uniformly equicontinuous family of functions of \((r, x) \in K\), for any compact \( K \subset \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \).

PROOF: (3.4) follows immediately from (3.2)–(3.3) by the Dominated Convergence Theorem.

By Lemma 3.1, the family \( \{u(t + s, x, y): t \geq \delta - s_1, y \in \mathbb{R}\} \) is a uniformly equicontinuous family of functions of \((s, x) \in [s_1, s_2] \times [x_1, x_2]\). Since each \( g(\alpha, s + r, x) \) is a uniform limit (locally) of functions in this collection, (3.8) follows.

Observe that \( \forall \alpha, \alpha' \in (0, 1), \forall s, s' \in \mathbb{R}, \) the function \( g(\alpha, s, x) - g(\alpha', s', x) \) has no sign change in \( x \). (This may be proved by an argument similar to that used in the proof of Theorem 3.2.) Thus, either \( g(\alpha, s, x) \geq g(\alpha', s', x) \) \( \forall x \in \mathbb{R} \) or \( g(\alpha, s, x) \leq g(\alpha', s', x) \) \( \forall x \in \mathbb{R} \).

If \( r < 0 \), then
\[
g(\alpha, s + r, x) = E^x \prod_{j=1}^{N(\alpha)} g(\alpha, s, X_j(-r))
\]
\[
g(\alpha', s' + r, x) = E^x \prod_{j=1}^{N(\alpha')} g(\alpha', s', X_j(-r)).
\]

Thus, if \( g(\alpha, s, x) = g(\alpha', s', x) \) \( \forall x \in \mathbb{R} \), it follows that \( g(\alpha, s + r, x) = g(\alpha', s' + r, x) \) \( \forall r \leq 0 \), \( x \in \mathbb{R} \). On the other hand, if \( g(\alpha, s, x) \geq g(\alpha', s', x) \) \( \forall x \in \mathbb{R} \) with strict inequality for some \( x \), then strict inequality must hold for all \( x \) in some open interval \( J \), since \( g(\alpha, s, x) \) and \( g(\alpha', s', x) \) are continuous functions of \( x \). But then the integral representations above imply that \( g(\alpha, s + r, x) > g(\alpha', s' + r, x) \) \( \forall r < 0 \), \( x \in \mathbb{R} \), because there is positive \( P^x \)-probability that \( X_1(-r) \in J \) and \( N(\alpha') = 1 \). Thus, \( g(\alpha, s, x) = g(\alpha', s', x) \) for some \( x \) implies \( g(\alpha, s + r, x) = g(\alpha', s + r, x) \) \( \forall r > 0 \), \( x \in \mathbb{R} \), which in turn implies equality \( \forall r \leq 0 \), \( x \in \mathbb{R} \). This proves (3.7).

Let \( \alpha < \alpha' \). Then \( g(\alpha, 0, 0) = \alpha < \alpha' = g(\alpha', 0, 0) \); hence by (3.7), \( g(\alpha, s, x) < g(\alpha', s, x) \) \( \forall s, x \in \mathbb{R} \). This proves (3.5).
To prove (3.6) it suffices to show that $\lim_{\alpha \to \alpha_*} g(\alpha, s, x) = g(\alpha_*, s, x)$. For each $(s, x)$, in view of (3.8). First consider the case $0 < \alpha_* < 1$. By (3.5), $\lim_{\alpha \uparrow \alpha_*} g(\alpha, s, x) = g'(\alpha_*, s, x)$ and $\lim_{\alpha \downarrow \alpha_*} g(\alpha, s, x) = g''(\alpha_*, s, x)$ exist, and $g' \leq g \leq g''$. By (3.4),

$$g'(\alpha, s, x) = E^x \prod_{j=1}^{N(s')} g'(\alpha, s + s', X_j(s')) \text{ and }$$

$$g''(\alpha, s, x) = E^x \prod_{j=1}^{N(s')} g''(\alpha, s + s', X_j(s')) ;$$

consequently, by the same argument used to prove (3.7), either $g'(\alpha, s, x) < g''(\alpha, s, x)$ $\forall s, x \in \mathbb{R}$ or $g'(\alpha, s, x) = g''(\alpha, s, x) \forall s, x \in \mathbb{R}$. But $g(\alpha, 0,0) = \alpha \forall \alpha \in (0,1)$, so $\alpha = g'(\alpha, 0,0) = g''(\alpha, 0,0) \forall \alpha \in (0,1)$. Hence $g' \equiv g''$. This proves that $\lim_{\alpha \to \alpha_*} g(\alpha, s, x) = g(\alpha_*, s, x) \forall \alpha_* \in (0,1), \forall s, x \in \mathbb{R}$. The argument for $\alpha_* = 0$ and $\alpha_* = 1$ is essentially the same. □

**COROLLARY 3.4:** $g(\alpha, s, x) = g(g(\alpha, s, 0), 0, x)$.

**PROOF:** Since $g(g(\alpha, s, 0), 0, 0) = g(\alpha, s, 0)$, this follows from (3.7). □

**PROPOSITION 3.5:** The function $g(\alpha, s, x)$ is strictly increasing or strictly decreasing, or constant in $s$. Furthermore, for each $\alpha$ the same case holds simultaneously $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$.

**PROOF:** By (3.7), for any $s > 0$ one of the following is true

(i) $g(\alpha, r, x) < g(\alpha, s + r, x)$ $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$; or

(ii) $g(\alpha, r, x) > g(\alpha, s + r, x)$ $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$; or

(iii) $g(\alpha, r, x) = g(\alpha, s + r, x)$ $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Setting $r = ks, k \in \mathbb{Z}$, we get that exactly one of the following is true:

(i)' $g(\alpha, ks, x) < g(\alpha, (k + 1)s, x)$ $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, k \in \mathbb{Z}$; or

(ii)' $g(\alpha, ks, x) > g(\alpha, (k + 1)s, x)$ $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, k \in \mathbb{Z}$; or

(iii)' $g(\alpha, ks, x) = g(\alpha, (k + 1)s, x)$ $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, k \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

If we consider $s$ of the form $2^{-n}, n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$, it follows that $g(\alpha, s', x)$ is either strictly increasing in $s'$ $\forall x$, strictly decreasing in $s'$ $\forall x$, or constant in $s'$ $\forall x$ when $s'$ is restricted to
integer multiples of $2^{-n}$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. The proposition now follows from the continuity of $g$. \hfill \Box

**THEOREM 3.6:** Assume that

\begin{equation}
\lim_{s \to \infty} g(1/2, s, x) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{s \to -\infty} g(1/2, s, x) = 0 \quad \forall \ x \in \mathbb{R}.
\end{equation}

Then there exists an increasing homeomorphism $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that the rescaled branching diffusion process $(\tilde{X}_j(t))_{1 \leq j \leq \tilde{N}(t)}$ defined by $\tilde{N}(t) = N(t)$ and $\tilde{X}_j(t) = f(X_j(t))$ satisfies

\begin{equation}
\lim_{t \to \infty} P^x\{\tilde{R}_t \leq t + y\} = g(1/2, y, x) \quad \forall \ x, y \in \mathbb{R}.
\end{equation}

**Note:** (1) If the underlying diffusion process $X_1(t)$ is recurrent then (3.9)–(3.10) must hold. See Prop. 5.4 below for a more general sufficient condition.

(2) The hypotheses (3.9)–(3.10) imply that for each $x$ the function $g(1/2, s, x)$ is strictly increasing in $s$, by Prop. 3.5, and by (3.7) the same is true for $g(\alpha, s, x)$, all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Furthermore, $g(1/2, y, x)$ is jointly continuous in $x, y$, by (3.6). Thus, (3.11) implies that under each $P^x$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, the random variables $\tilde{R}_t - t$ converge in distribution to a proper, continuous, strictly increasing distribution function, as stated in the abstract.

**Proof of Th. 3.6:** First we will construct a suitable homeomorphism $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$. Choose any $s > 0$; since $g(1/2, s, x) \uparrow$ in $s$ and

\begin{align*}
\lim_{t \to \infty} P^x\{R_t \leq \gamma(1/2, t + s)\} &= g(1/2, s, x) \quad \text{and} \\
\lim_{t \to \infty} P^x\{R_t \leq \gamma(1/2, t)\} &= g(1/2, 0, x),
\end{align*}

it follows that $\gamma(1/2, t) < \gamma(1/2, t + s)$ for all sufficiently large $t$. Furthermore, by (3.9), $\gamma(1/2, t) \to \infty$, as $t \to \infty$. For $n = 1, 2, \ldots$ define $t_n = \min\{k/2^n : k \geq 0 \text{ and } \gamma(1/2, j/2^n) < \gamma(1/2, (j + 1)/2^n) \forall j \geq k\}$ and note that $t_1 \leq t_2 \leq t_3 \leq \ldots$. Now define

\[ f(\gamma(1/2, j/2^n)) = j/2^n \quad \forall \ j/2^n \geq t_n; \]
There is an increasing homeomorphism of $R$ onto $R$.

If $\tilde{X}_j(t) = f(X_j(t))$ for $1 \leq j \leq N(t) = \tilde{N}(t)$ then clearly $\tilde{R}_t = f(R_t)$. Consequently, for any $j, k$ such that $(j + k) / 2^n \geq t_n$,

$$P^x\{\tilde{R}_{j/2^n} \leq j/2^n + k/2^n\} = P^x\{R_{j/2^n} \leq \gamma(1/2, (j + k)/2^n)\}.$$  

It therefore follows from (3.3) and the continuity of $g(1/2, y, x)$ in $y$ that as $t \to \infty$ through any of the discrete sets $D_n = \{k/2^n : k \in Z\}$,

$$P^x\{\tilde{R}_t \leq t + y\} \to g(1/2, y, x).$$

The result (3.11) now follows from Lemma 3.1 (applied to the rescaled branching diffusion process $(\tilde{X}_j(t))$).  

4. A Family of Martingales and a Coupling Argument

For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $s \in R$, and $t \geq 0$ define

$$Y_{\alpha, s}(t) = \prod_{j=1}^{N(t)} g(\alpha, s + t, X_j(t)).$$  

(4.1)

Recall (cf. (3.7) and Prop. 3.5) that $g(\alpha, s, x)$ is increasing in $\alpha$ and monotone in $s$; consequently, for each $t \geq 0$, so is $Y_{\alpha, s}(t)$.

**PROPOSITION 4.1**: $Y_{\alpha, s}(t)$ is a martingale relative to any admissible filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$, under any $P^x$, $x \in R$.

**PROOF**: This follows from (3.4) by the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 2.2.  

We now examine more closely the martingales $Y_{\alpha, s}(t)$ defined by (4.1) and their limits. Recall that $\gamma(\alpha, t)$ is the $\alpha^{th}$ quantile of $R_t$ under $P^0$. By the Markov property, if $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is any admissible filtration for the branching diffusion process $(X_j(t))$, then

$$P^x\{R_{t-s} \leq \gamma(\alpha, t) | \mathcal{F}_s\} = \prod_{j=1}^{N(r)} P^{X_j(r)}\{R_{t-s-r} \leq \gamma(\alpha, t)\}$$

$$= \prod_{j=1}^{N(r)} u(t-s-r, X_j(r), \gamma(\alpha, t))$$
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for $t - s \geq r$. Letting $t \to \infty$ and appealing to Th. 3.2, we obtain

$$
\lim_{t \to \infty} \lim_{r \to \infty} P^z\{R_{t-s} \leq \gamma(\alpha, t)|\mathcal{F}_r\} = \prod_{j=1}^{N(r)} g(\alpha, s + r, X_j(r)) = Y_{\alpha, s}(r).
$$

Since $Y_{\alpha, s}(r)$ is a bounded martingale, it has a limit as $r \to \infty$; thus, we may define

$$
(4.2) \quad Y_{\alpha, s} = \lim_{r \to \infty} Y_{\alpha, s}(r) = \lim_{r \to \infty} \lim_{t \to \infty} P^z\{R_{t-s} \leq \gamma(\alpha, t)|\mathcal{F}_r\}.
$$

Observe that $Y_{\alpha, s}(r)$ and $Y_{\alpha, s}$ do not depend on the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_r)_{r \geq 0}$. Furthermore, with $P^z$-probability one, $Y_{\alpha, s}$ is nondecreasing in $\alpha$ and monotone in $s$ in the same direction as is $g(\alpha, s, x)$, because for each $r$ the same properties obtain for $Y_{\alpha, s}(r)$. Also, since $Y_{\alpha, s}(r)$ is a bounded martingale under any $P^z$,

$$
(4.3) \quad E^z Y_{\alpha, s} = E^z Y_{\alpha, s}(0) = g(\alpha, s, x).
$$

Since $g(\alpha, s, x)$ is continuous and monotone, there is a version of the process $Y_{\alpha, s}$ which is right-continuous in $s$.

**PROPOSITION 4.2:** For any $\alpha$, $\alpha_* \in (0, 1)$ and $s_*, x \in \mathbb{R}$, either

$$
Y_{\alpha, s} \geq Y_{\alpha_*, s+s_*} \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R} \text{ with } P^z\text{-probability one, or} \quad (4.4)
$$

$$
Y_{\alpha, s} \leq Y_{\alpha_*, s+s_*} \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R} \text{ with } P^z\text{-probability one.} \quad (4.5)
$$

**PROOF:** By (3.7), either $g(\alpha, s + r, x) \geq g(\alpha_*, s + s_* + r, x) \forall x, r \in \mathbb{R}$ or $g(\alpha, s + r, x) < g(\alpha_*, s + s_* + r, x) \forall x, r \in \mathbb{R}$. By (4.1), $Y_{\alpha, s}(r) \geq Y_{\alpha_*, s + s_*}(r) \forall r > 0$ in the first case and $Y_{\alpha, s}(r) < Y_{\alpha_*, s + s_*}(r) \forall r > 0$ in the second case. \hfill \Box

The next result is similar, but requires a more sophisticated argument; it does not seem to follow from the comparison methods of sec. 2.

**PROPOSITION 4.3:** For any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $s_*, x \in \mathbb{R}$ and positive integers $k_1$, $k_2$, with $P^z$-probability one, one of the following holds:

$$
Y_{\alpha, s}^{k_1} \geq Y_{\alpha_*, s+s_*}^{k_2} \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}; \quad \text{or} \quad (4.6)
$$

$$
Y_{\alpha, s}^{k_1} \leq Y_{\alpha_*, s+s_*}^{k_2} \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (4.7)
$$
REMARK: According to Proposition 4.3, it may be random whether (4.6) holds or (4.7) holds. However, it will follow from results in sec. 5 that either (4.6) holds a.s. \( (P^\varepsilon) \) or (4.7) holds a.s. \( (P^\varepsilon) \).

PROOF: Since \( Y_{\alpha,s} \) is a monotone right-continuous function of \( s \) a.s. \( (P^\varepsilon) \), it suffices to prove that for any \( s_1, s_2, x \in \mathbb{R} \) and any \( \varepsilon > 0 \),

\[
(4.8) \quad P^\varepsilon\{Y_{\alpha, s_1}^{k_1} > Y_{\alpha, s_1 + s_*}^{k_2} + \varepsilon \text{ and } Y_{\alpha, s_2}^{k_1} < Y_{\alpha, s_2 + s_* - \varepsilon}\} = 0.
\]

We will use a coupling argument, which will involve the use of auxiliary branching diffusion processes \( (\tilde{X}_j^i(t)) \), \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, k_1 \), and \( (\hat{X}_j^i(t)) \), \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, k_2 \). Let \( (\tilde{\mathcal{F}})_{t \geq 0} \) be the filtration generated by the processes \( (\tilde{X}_j^i(t)) \), \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, k_1 \) and by the original process \( (X_j(t)) \). Let \( (\hat{\mathcal{F}})_{t \geq 0} \) be the filtration generated by the processes \( (\hat{X}_j^i(t)) \), \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, k_2 \). The processes will be constructed in such a way that \( (\tilde{\mathcal{F}})_{t \geq 0} \) is an admissible filtration for its generating processes, and likewise for \( (\hat{\mathcal{F}})_{t \geq 0} \). Random variables defined in terms of \( (\tilde{X}_j^i(t)) \) will be denoted by a superscript \( i \) and a \( \sim \), e.g., \( \tilde{N}^i(t) = \text{number of particles in } (\tilde{X}_j^i(t)) \text{ at time } t \), \( \tilde{R}^i_t = \max(\tilde{X}_1^i(t), \ldots, \tilde{X}_{\tilde{N}^i(t)}^i(t)) \), etc.; similarly for \( (\hat{X}_j^i(t)) \).

We may assume without loss of generality that \( s_* < 0 \).

STEP 1: The auxiliary processes \( (\tilde{X}_j^i(t)) \) and \( (\hat{X}_j^i(t)) \) will coincide with the original process \( (X_j(t)) \) up to a certain time. Specifically, for a certain \( r_* < \infty \),

\[
(4.9) \quad \tilde{N}^i(t) = N(t) \text{ and } \tilde{X}_j^i(t) = X_j(t) \quad \forall t \leq r_*, \quad j = 1, \ldots, N(t);
\]

\[
(4.10) \quad \hat{N}^i(t) = N(t) \text{ and } \hat{X}_j^i(t) = X_j(t) \quad \forall t \leq r_* - s_*, \quad j = 1, \ldots, N(t).
\]

Fix \( \delta > 0 \) (small); \( r_* < \infty \) should be chosen so that

\[
P^\varepsilon\{\sup_{r \geq r_*} |Y_{\alpha,s} - Y_{\alpha,s}(r)| \geq \varepsilon/4(k_1 + k_2)\} < \delta
\]

for \( s = s_1, s_2, s_1 + s_* , s_2 + s_* \). It follows from (4.2) that such an \( r_* \) exists. Now each of the processes \( (\tilde{X}_j^i(t)) \) and \( (\hat{X}_j^i(t)) \) has the same law as \( (X_j(t)) \), so the preceding inequality is valid also for \( \tilde{Y}_j^i_{\alpha,s}(r) \) and \( \hat{Y}_j^i_{\alpha,s}(r) \). But \( Y_{\alpha,s}(r) = \tilde{Y}_j^i_{\alpha,s}(r) = \hat{Y}_j^i_{\alpha,s}(r) \), since all the processes coincide up to time \( r_* \); consequently,

\[
P^\varepsilon\{|Y_{\alpha,s} - \tilde{Y}_j^i_{\alpha,s}| \geq \varepsilon/2(k_1 + k_2)\} < 2\delta, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k_1, \quad \text{and}
\]

\[
P^\varepsilon\{|Y_{\alpha,s} - \hat{Y}_j^i_{\alpha,s}| \geq \varepsilon/2(k_1 + k_2)\} < 2\delta, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k_2,
\]
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for \( s = s_1, s_2, s_1 + s_*, s_2 + s_* \). Since all of the random variables \( Y_{\alpha, \varepsilon}, \tilde{Y}_{\alpha, \varepsilon}^i, \hat{Y}_{\alpha, \varepsilon}^i \) take values in \([0,1]\), it follows that for \( s = s_1, s_2, s_1 + s_*, s_2 + s_* \),

\[
P^x\{\prod_{i=1}^{k_1} \tilde{Y}_{\alpha, \varepsilon}^i - Y_{\alpha, \varepsilon}^{k_1} \geq \varepsilon / 2\} < 2k_1 \delta \quad \text{and} \quad P^x\{\prod_{i=1}^{k_2} \hat{Y}_{\alpha, \varepsilon}^i - Y_{\alpha, \varepsilon}^{k_2} \geq \varepsilon / 2\} < 2k_2 \delta.
\]

The auxiliary processes will be constructed in such a way that

\[
(4.1) \quad P^x\{\prod_{i=1}^{k_1} \tilde{Y}_{\alpha, s_1}^i > \prod_{i=1}^{k_2} \hat{Y}_{\alpha, s_1 + s_*}^i \quad \text{and} \quad \prod_{i=1}^{k_1} \hat{Y}_{\alpha, s_2}^i < \prod_{i=1}^{k_2} \tilde{Y}_{\alpha, s_2 + s_*}^i \} = 0;
\]

this will therefore imply that

\[
P^x\{Y_{\alpha, s_1}^{k_1} > Y_{\alpha, s_1 + s_*}^{k_2} + \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad Y_{\alpha, s_2}^{k_1} < Y_{\alpha, s_2 + s_*}^{k_2} - \varepsilon\} < 4(k_1 + k_2) \delta.
\]

Since \( \delta > 0 \) is arbitrary, (4.8) will then follow.

STEP 2: The processes \( (\tilde{\tilde{X}}_j^i(t)) \), \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, k_1 \) are constructed as follows. Run the original branching diffusion process \( (X_j(t)) \) up to time \( t = r_* \); by (4.9), this determines the evolution of each \( (\tilde{\tilde{X}}_j^i(t)) \) up to \( t = r_* \). At time \( t = r_* \), each of the processes \( (X_j(t)) \) and \( (\tilde{\tilde{X}}_j^i(t)) \), \( i = 1, \ldots, k_1 \) has a single particle at each of the locations \( X_1(r_*), X_2(r_*), \ldots, X_{N(r_*)} (r_*) \). Conditional on \( \tilde{F}_r \), let each of these \( (1 + k_1)N(r_*) \) particles begin its own branching diffusion process forwards in time, independent of all the others; the paths of these particles and their progeny constitute the futures (after time \( r_* \)) of the processes \( (X_j(t)), \tilde{\tilde{X}}_j^1(t), \ldots, \tilde{\tilde{X}}_j^{k_1}(t) \). Note that conditional on \( \tilde{F}_r \), these processes are mutually independent and have the same law.

Let all of the particles in the processes \( (\tilde{\tilde{X}}_j^i(t)) \), \( i = 1, \ldots, k_1 \), be colored "white", and let each white particle be shadowed in spacetime by a "red" particle \(-s_* \) time units in the past. Thus, for each path \( \tilde{\tilde{X}}_j^i(t) \) of a white particle, \( t \geq \tilde{t}^i_j \geq r_* \), define

\[
\overline{X}_j^i(t) = \tilde{X}_j^i(t + s_*), t \geq \tilde{t}^i_j - s_*,
\]

and let each \( \overline{X}_j^i(t) \) be the path of a red particle. (Here, \( \tilde{t}^i_j \) is of course the birth time of the white particle following path \( \tilde{\tilde{X}}_j^i(t) \).) Observe that if a white particle fissions at time \( t \) then
the corresponding red particle fissions at time $t - s_*$, and the offspring red is the shadow particle of the offspring white. Conditional on $\tilde{F}_r$, the processes $(\tilde{X}_j^i(t))$ are independent branching diffusion processes, each initiated by particles at $(r_* - s_*, X_1(r_*), \ldots, (r_* - s_*, X_{N(r_*)}(r_*))$ in spacetime.

STEP 3: The construction of the processes $(\tilde{X}_j^i(t))$, $i = 1, \ldots, k_2$ will involve the paths of the red particles. The evolution of $(\tilde{X}_j^i(t))$ for $t \leq r_* - s_*$ is determined by (4.10). At time $t = r_* - s_*$ each of the processes $(\tilde{X}_j^i(t))$ has a particle at each of the positions $X_1(r_* - s_*)$, $\ldots$, $X_{N(r_* - s_*)}(r_* - s_*)$; let all of these particles and their offspring be colored "blue". At time $t = r_* - s_*$ there are also red particles at positions $X_1(r_*)$, $\ldots$, $X_{N(r_*)}(r_*)$, each of which will initiate a branching diffusion process of red particles.

Conditional on $\tilde{F}_{r_* - s_*}$, let each of the blue particles begin its own branching diffusion process, independent of all the other blue and red particles. However, whenever a free (uncoupled) blue particle meets a free red particle the two particles are coupled, and thereafter both particles follow the path of the red (including fissions — whenever the red particle fissions, so does the blue, and the offspring red and blue are coupled). The paths of the blue particles for $t \geq r_* - s_*$ constitute the processes $(\tilde{X}_j^i(t))$, $i = 1, \ldots, k_2$. Observe that conditional on $\tilde{F}_{r_* - s_*}$ the processes $(\tilde{X}_j^i(t))$, $i = 1, \ldots, k_2$ are mutually independent, but are not independent of the processes $(\tilde{X}_j^i(t))$, $i = 1, \ldots, k_1$.

For $t \geq r_* - s_*$, let $\mathcal{F}_t^* = \tilde{F}_{t - s_*} \vee \tilde{F}_t$. Observe that, for $t \geq r_* - s_*$, $(\mathcal{F}_t^*)_{t \geq r_* - s_*}$ is an admissible filtration for both the red processes $(\tilde{X}_j^i(t))$ and for the blue processes $(\tilde{X}_j^i(t))$.

STEP 4: Consider the aggregation of all white particles, i.e., the collection of all particles in the process $(\tilde{X}_j^1(t)), \ldots, (\tilde{X}_j^{k_1}(t))$. Let $R^W_\mathbf{t} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq k_1} \tilde{R}_t^i$ be the position of the rightmost white particle at time $t$. Conditional on $\tilde{F}_r$, the random variables $\tilde{R}_t^1, \ldots, \tilde{R}_t^{k_1}$ are independent; also, for each $i$,

$$\tilde{Y}^i_{\alpha, t} = \lim_{r \to \infty} \lim_{t \to \infty} P_{z, \gamma, t} \{ \tilde{R}_t^{i} \leq \gamma(\alpha, t) | \tilde{F}_r \},$$

by (4.2). It follows that

$$\prod_{i=1}^{k_1} \tilde{Y}^i_{\alpha, t} = \lim_{r \to \infty} \lim_{t \to \infty} P_{z, \gamma, t} \{ R^W_\mathbf{t} \leq \gamma(\alpha, t) | \tilde{F}_r \}.$$
Recall that each white particle is shadowed by a red particle \( -s_* \) time units in the past. Hence, if \( R^R_t \) is the position of the rightmost red particle at time \( t \) then \( R^R_{t-s_*} = R^W_t \), so

\[
\prod_{i=1}^{k_1} \tilde{Y}_{\alpha,s}^i = \lim_{r \to \infty} \lim_{t \to \infty} P^\alpha_r \{ R^R_{t-s_*} \leq \gamma(\alpha,t) | \hat{\xi}_r \} = \lim_{r \to \infty} \lim_{t \to \infty} P^\alpha_r \{ R^R_{t-s_*} \leq \gamma(\alpha,t) | \xi^* \}
\]

Similarly, if \( R^B_t = \max_{1 \leq i \leq k_2} \hat{R}^i_t \) is the position of the rightmost blue particle at time \( t \) then

\[
\prod_{i=1}^{k_2} \hat{Y}_{\alpha,s}^i = \lim_{r \to \infty} \lim_{t \to \infty} P^\alpha_r \{ R^B_{t-s_*} \leq \gamma(\alpha,t) | \hat{\xi}_r \} = \lim_{r \to \infty} \lim_{t \to \infty} P^\alpha_r \{ R^B_{t-s_*} \leq \gamma(\alpha,t) | \xi^* \}.
\]

Consider next the relationship between \( R^B_t \) and \( R^R_t \). If the rightmost particle at time \( t \) (among all particles, red or blue) is a free red then \( R^R_t > R^B_t \); if it is a free blue then \( R^B_t > R^R_t \); and if it is a coupled blue-red then \( R^B_t = R^R_t \). (NOTE: The \( P^\alpha \)-probability that two uncoupled particles are at the same location at time \( t > 0 \) is zero.) Call a set of free blue particles a **blue cluster** if no two have a free red between them, and call a set of free red particles a **red cluster** if no two have a free blue between them. If \( t_1 < t_2 \) and \( R^R_{t_1} > R^B_{t_1} \) but \( R^B_{t_2} < R^R_{t_2} \) then between times \( t_1 \) and \( t_2 \) the rightmost blue cluster disappears. (Recall that whenever a free red and a free blue meet they couple.) Similarly, if \( t_1 < t_2 \) and \( R^R_{t_1} > R^B_{t_1} \) but \( R^R_{t_2} < R^B_{t_2} \) then between times \( t_1 \) and \( t_2 \) the rightmost red cluster disappears. Now after time \( r_* - s_* \) no new red clusters or blue clusters arise, because a free red particle cannot cross a free blue particle without coupling. Since there are only finitely many red and blue clusters at time \( r_* - s_* \), it follows that only finitely many clusters can disappear after time \( r_* - s_* \); therefore,

\[
P^\alpha \{ R^B_t \leq R^R_t \text{ eventually or } R^B_t \geq R^R_t \text{ eventually} \} = 1.
\]

Define events \( F = \{ R^R_t \leq R^B_t \text{ eventually} \} \) and \( G = \{ R^B_t \leq R^R_t \text{ eventually} \} \). We will show that \( \forall s \in R, \)

\[
\prod_{i=1}^{k_1} \tilde{Y}_{\alpha,s}^i \geq \prod_{i=1}^{k_2} \hat{Y}_{\alpha,s}^i \text{ on } F \text{ a.s. } (P^\alpha) \text{ and}
\]

\[
\prod_{i=1}^{k_1} \tilde{Y}_{\alpha,s}^i \leq \prod_{i=1}^{k_2} \hat{Y}_{\alpha,s}^i \text{ on } G \text{ a.s. } (P^\alpha).
\]
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Since by the preceding paragraph $P^z(F \cup G) = 1$, this will imply (4.11) and therefore complete the proof of Prop. 4.2. Fix $s \in \mathbb{R}$, and define events

\[ H_t = \{ R_{t-s}^R \leq \gamma(\alpha, t) \} \text{ and} \]
\[ K_t = \{ R_{t-s}^B \leq \gamma(\alpha, t) \}; \]

clearly

\[ \lim_{t \to \infty} 1_F 1_{K_t \cap H_t^z} = 0 \text{ a.s. } (P^z) \text{ and} \]
\[ \lim_{t \to \infty} 1_G 1_{H_t \cap K_t^z} = 0 \text{ a.s. } (P^z). \]

By the martingale convergence theorem,

\[ \lim_{r \to \infty} P^z(F \mid \mathcal{F}_r^*) = 1_F \text{ a.s. } (P^z) \text{ and} \]
\[ \lim_{r \to \infty} P^z(G \mid \mathcal{F}_r^*) = 1_G \text{ a.s. } (P^z). \]

Choose $\delta > 0$ (small); then there exist $r_\delta < \infty$ and $t_\delta < \infty$ such that for all $r \geq r_\delta$ and $t \geq t_\delta$

\[ E^z(1_F - P^z(F \mid \mathcal{F}_r^*)) < \delta, \]
\[ E^z(1_F 1_{K_t \cap H_t^z}) < \delta, \]
\[ \Rightarrow E^z(P^z(F \mid \mathcal{F}_r^*) 1_{K_t \cap H_t^z}) < 2\delta, \]
\[ \Rightarrow E^z(P^z(F \mid \mathcal{F}_r^*) P^z(K_t \cap H_t^z \mid \mathcal{F}_r^*)) < 2\delta, \]
\[ \Rightarrow E^z(1_F P^z(K_t \cap H_t^z \mid \mathcal{F}_r^*)) < 2\delta, \]
\[ \Rightarrow P^z(F \cap \{ P^z(K_t \cap H_t^z \mid \mathcal{F}_r^*) > \sqrt{2\delta} \}) < \sqrt{2\delta}, \]
\[ \Rightarrow P^z(F \cap \{ P^z(K_t \mid \mathcal{F}_r^*) - P^z(H_t \mid \mathcal{F}_r^*) > \sqrt{2\delta} \}) < \sqrt{2\delta}. \]

Since $\delta > 0$ is arbitrary, it follows that

\[ 1_F \left( \lim_{r \to \infty} \lim_{t \to \infty} P^z(K_t \mid \mathcal{F}_r^*) \right) \leq 1_F \left( \lim_{r \to \infty} \lim_{t \to \infty} P^z(H_t \mid \mathcal{F}_r^*) \right) \text{ a.s. } (P^z). \]

By (4.12) and (4.13), this proves (4.14); (4.15) follows by a similar argument. \(\square\)

COROLLARY 4.4: For any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $s_*$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\beta \in (0, \infty)$, with $P^z$-probability one either

\[ Y_{\alpha, s} \geq Y_{\alpha, s+s_*}^\beta \quad \forall \ s \in \mathbb{R}, \text{ or} \]
\[ Y_{\alpha, s} \leq Y_{\alpha, s+s_*}^\beta \quad \forall \ s \in \mathbb{R}. \]
PROOF: For rational $\beta$ this follows immediately from Prop. 4.3. Any irrational $\beta$ is the limit of an increasing sequence of rationals. \hfill \Box

Let $(X_j(t))$ and $(\tilde{X}_j(t))$ be independent branching diffusion processes started from single particles at $x$ and $\tilde{x}$, respectively, under $P = P^{x,\tilde{x}}$. Let random variables defined in terms of $(\tilde{X}_j(t))$ be denoted by a $\sim$, e.g., $\tilde{N}(t) = \text{number of particles in } (\tilde{X}_j(t)) \text{ at time } t$.

PROPOSITION 4.5: For any $\alpha \in (0,1)$, $s_* \in \mathbb{R}$, and $x, \tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}$, with $P^{x,\tilde{x}}$-probability one either

\begin{align}
(4.18) \quad Y_{\alpha,s} &\geq \tilde{Y}_{\alpha,s+s_*} \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}, \text{ or} \\
(4.19) \quad Y_{\alpha,s} &\leq \tilde{Y}_{\alpha,s+s_*} \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}.
\end{align}

PROOF: This is virtually the same as that of Prop. 4.3. Define a third branching diffusion process $(\tilde{X}_j(t))$ as follows. Let $(\tilde{X}_j(t))$ coincide with $(\tilde{X}_j(t))$ up to time $r$. After time $r$, whenever a particle from $(\tilde{X}_j(t))$ meets a particle from $(X_j(t+s_*))$ the two particles are coupled and thereafter follow the path of the particle from $(X_j(t+s_*))$. As in the proof of Prop. 4.3, for any $s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{R}$

$$P^{x,\tilde{x}}\{Y_{\alpha,s_1} > \tilde{Y}_{\alpha,s_1+s_*} \text{ and } Y_{\alpha,s_2} < \tilde{Y}_{\alpha,s_2+s_*}\} = 0.$$ 

Furthermore, if $r$ is chosen sufficiently large then

$$P^{x,\tilde{x}}\{|\tilde{Y}_{\alpha,s+s_*} - \tilde{Y}_{\alpha,s+s_*}| \geq \varepsilon/2\} < \varepsilon, \ s = s_1, s_2.$$ 

Letting $\varepsilon \to 0$, one obtains the desired result. \hfill \Box

5. The Extreme Value Law

THEOREM 5.1: For each $\alpha \in (0,1)$, with $P^x$-probability one (for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$) the random functions $Y_{\alpha,s}$ must assume one of the following forms:

\begin{align}
(5.1) \quad Y_{\alpha,s} &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s > U_{\alpha} \\ 0 & \text{if } s < U_{\alpha} \end{cases} \\
(5.2) \quad Y_{\alpha,s} &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s < U_{\alpha} \\ 0 & \text{if } s > U_{\alpha} \end{cases}
\end{align}
or

\[ Y_{\alpha,s} = \exp\{-Z_{\alpha}e^{-C_{\alpha}s}\} \quad \forall \ s \in \mathbb{R}, \]

where \( C_{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R} \) is a constant independent of \( x \) and the random variables \( U_{\alpha} \) and \( Z_{\alpha} \) satisfy \(-\infty \leq U_{\alpha} \leq \infty \) and \( 0 \leq Z_{\alpha} \leq \infty \). For a given \( \alpha \), only one of the three types (5.1)–(5.3) may occur with positive \( P^x \)-probability (excluding the trivial overlaps where \( U_{\alpha} = \pm \infty \) and \( Z_{\alpha} = 0 \) or \( \infty \)). Moreover, with \( P^x \)-probability one all of the functions \( Y_{\alpha,s}, \ \alpha \in (0,1) \), are of the same type.

In sec. 7 below we give examples showing all three types (5.1)–(5.3) are possible. Note that types (5.1) and (5.2) may be regarded as limiting cases of (5.3) in which \( C_{\alpha} = \pm \infty \). On the event that the functions \( Y_{\alpha,s} \) are of type (5.1) or (5.2), the behavior of \( R_t \) is ultimately predictable — see Prop. 5.2 below.

PROOF: Recall that \( Y_{\alpha,s} \) is monotone in \( s \) and nondecreasing in \( \alpha \). Suppose that \( 0 < Y_{\alpha,s} < 1 \) and \( 0 < Y_{\alpha,s+s_1} < 1 \) for some \( s \in \mathbb{R}, \ s_1 > 0 \); then \( 0 < Y_{\alpha,s+r} < 1 \) for all \( r \in [0,s_1] \). By Cor. 4.4, for each \( r \in [0,s_1] \) there exists \( b(r) \in \mathbb{R} \) such that

\[ \log \frac{Y_{\alpha,s+r}}{Y_{\alpha,s}} = b(r) \quad \forall \ s \in \mathbb{R}; \]

a routine argument using the monotonicity in \( s \) of \( Y_{\alpha,s} \) now shows that (5.3) holds. This proves that with \( P^x \)-probability one, for each \( \alpha \) the function \( Y_{\alpha,s} \) must assume one of the forms (5.1)–(5.3).

Suppose that for some \( \alpha \) case (5.i) obtains \((i = 1, 2, \text{ or } 3)\) with \(-\infty < U_{\alpha} < \infty \) (if \( i = 1 \) or 2) and \( 0 < Z_{\alpha} < \infty \) (if \( i = 3 \)). Then by Prop. 4.2 the same case (5.i) must obtain for all \( \alpha \in (0,1) \) (although perhaps with \( U_{\alpha} = \pm \infty \) or \( Z_{\alpha} = 0 \) or \( \infty \)). Thus the probability space \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P^x)\) is partitioned into four disjoint events \( F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4 \); on \( F_i \) \((i = 1, 2, \text{ or } 3)\) all \( Y_{\alpha,s} \) are of type (5.i) with \(-\infty < U_{\alpha} < \infty \) or \( 0 < Z_{\alpha} < \infty \) for some \( \alpha \), and on \( F_4 \) all \( Y_{\alpha,s} \) are either identically 1 or identically 0.

Suppose now that for some \( \alpha = \alpha_\ast \) case (5.i) \((\text{with } i = 1 \text{ or } 2)\) holds and that \(-\infty < U_{\alpha_\ast} < \infty \) with positive \( P^x \)-probability. Then by Prop. 4.5 the same case (5.i) must hold with \( P^x \)-probability one for \( \alpha = \alpha_\ast \) (although \( U_{\alpha} \) may assume the values \( \pm \infty \) with positive probability). Similarly, if for some \( \alpha = \alpha_\ast \) case (5.3) holds and \( 0 < Z_{\alpha_\ast} < \infty \) with
positive $P^z$-probability, then by Prop. 4.5 case (5.3) must hold with $P^z$-probability one, for $\alpha = \alpha_*$ and $C_\alpha$ must be a constant r.v., the same for all initial points $\bar{z}$. \hfill \Box

Define $Q_t = \inf\{\alpha: R_t \leq \gamma(\alpha, t)\}$, i.e., $Q_t$ is the observed quantile of $R_t$ at time $t$. As in the proof of Th. 5.1, define $F_i$ ($i = 1, 2, \text{or } 3$) to be the event on which all $Y_{\alpha, s}$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, are of type $i$ and not all of another type $i'$; and define $F_4$ to be the event on which all $Y_{\alpha, s}$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, are identically zero or one.

**PROPOSITION 5.2**: There exists a random variable $Q$ such that $Q_t$ converges to $Q$ in probability on $F_1 \cup F_2 \cup F_4$, i.e., $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}$

\[
\lim_{t \to \infty} P^z\{|Q_t1_{F_1 \cup F_2 \cup F_4} - Q1_{F_1 \cup F_2 \cup F_4}| > \varepsilon\} = 0.
\]

**PROOF**: This is a routine consequence of (4.2) with $s = 0$, because on $F_1 \cup F_2 \cup F_4$, 

\[
Y_{\alpha, 0} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \alpha > Q \\ 0 & \text{if } \alpha < Q \end{cases}
\]

for a suitable $Q$ valued in $[0, 1]$. \hfill \Box

**PROPOSITION 5.3**: Assume $P^z(F_3) = 1$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Then

\[
g(\alpha, s, x) = E^z \exp\{-Z_\alpha e^{-C_\alpha s}\}.
\]

For any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ the constant $C_\alpha = 0$ iff $g(\alpha, s, 0)$ is constant in $s$; $C_\alpha > 0$ iff $g(\alpha, s, 0)$ is increasing in $s$; and $C_\alpha < 0$ iff $g(\alpha, s, 0)$ is decreasing in $s$. For any $\alpha < \alpha'$, if $P^z\{0 < Z_\alpha < \infty \text{ and } 0 < Z_{\alpha'} < \infty\} > 0$ then $C_\alpha = C_{\alpha''} \forall \alpha'' \in [\alpha, \alpha']$. If for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $P^z\{0 < Z_\alpha < \infty\} = 1$ then $C_\alpha = C$ is the same $\forall \alpha \in (0, 1)$. Finally, if $C_\alpha \neq 0$ then

\[
P^z\{Z_\alpha = 0\} = \begin{cases} \lim_{s \to \infty} g(\alpha, s, x) & \text{if } C_\alpha < 0; \\ \lim_{s \to \infty} g(\alpha, s, x) & \text{if } C_\alpha > 0; \end{cases}
\]

\[
P^z\{Z_\alpha = \infty\} = \begin{cases} \lim_{s \to \infty} (1 - g(\alpha, s, x)) & \text{if } C_\alpha > 0, \\ \lim_{s \to \infty} (1 - g(\alpha, s, x)) & \text{if } C_\alpha < 0. \end{cases}
\]

**PROOF**: Since $Y_{\alpha, s}$ is the limit as $r \to \infty$ of a bounded martingale $Y_{\alpha, s}(r)$ with $Y_{\alpha, s}(0) = g(\alpha, s, x)$, (5.5) follows directly from (5.3), and (5.6)–(5.7) are immediate consequences of
(5.5). The necessary and sufficient conditions for $C_{\alpha} = 0$, $C_{\alpha} < 0$, and $C_{\alpha} > 0$ also follow immediately from (5.5).

Suppose that $P^z\{0 < Z_\alpha < \infty \text{ and } 0 < Z_{\alpha'} < \infty\} > 0$; then with positive $P^z$-probability
\[
Y_{\alpha,s} = \exp\{-Z_\alpha e^{-C_{\alpha}s}\} \forall s, 0 < Z_\alpha < \infty,
\]
\[
Y_{\alpha',s} = \exp\{-Z_{\alpha'} e^{-C_{\alpha'}s}\} \forall s, 0 < Z_{\alpha'} < \infty, \text{ and}
\]
\[
Y_{\alpha'',s} = \exp\{-Z_{\alpha''} e^{-C_{\alpha''}s}\} \forall s, 0 < Z_{\alpha''} < \infty
\]
(that $0 < Z_{\alpha''} < \infty$ when $0 < Z_\alpha, Z_{\alpha'} < \infty$ follows from the monotonicity in $\alpha$ of $Y_{\alpha,s}$).

By Prop. 4.2, $C_{\alpha} = C_{\alpha'} = C_{\alpha''}$.

Finally, suppose $P^z\{0 < Z_\alpha < \infty\} = 1$. Then for any $\alpha' \neq \alpha$, either $P^z\{0 < Z_{\alpha'} < \infty\} = 0$, in which case the choice of $C_{\alpha'}$ is irrelevant, or $P^z\{0 < Z_\alpha, Z_{\alpha'} < \infty\} > 0$, in which case $C_{\alpha} = C_{\alpha'}$.

Define
\[
G^+(\alpha, x) = \lim_{s \to \infty} g(\alpha, s, x),
\]
\[
G^-(\alpha, x) = \lim_{s \to -\infty} g(\alpha, s, x).
\]

Let $T = \inf\{t \geq 0: N(t) \geq 2\}$ and for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ let $\tau_x = \inf\{t \geq T: \text{ some } X_f(t) = x\}$.

PROPOSITION 5.4: Suppose that either (5.10) or (5.11) holds:

(5.10) \hspace{1cm} G^+(\alpha, x) = 1 \text{ and } G^-(\alpha, x) = 0 \quad \forall \alpha, x.

(5.11) \hspace{1cm} G^+(\alpha, x) = 0 \text{ and } G^-(\alpha, x) = 1 \quad \forall \alpha, x.

Then for some $i = 1, 2, \text{ or } 3$,

(5.12) \hspace{1cm} P^z(F_i) = 1 \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}.

If $P^z(F_1) = 1$ or $P^z(F_2) = 1$ then $-\infty < U_\alpha < \infty \text{ a.s.}(P^z)$. If $P^z(F_3) = 1$ then $C_{\alpha} = C$ is independent of $\alpha, C \neq 0$, and $0 < Z_\alpha < \infty \text{ a.s.}(P^z)$.

If for some $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $P^z\{\tau_x < \infty\} = 1$, then (5.10) holds.
NOTE: If $X_1(t)$ is recurrent and $\beta(x) > 0$ somewhere then $P^x \{ \tau_\alpha < \infty \} = 1 \quad \forall \ x \in \mathbb{R}$.

PROOF: Recall from (4.3) that $g(\alpha, s, x) = E_s Y_{\alpha, s}$. Consequently, if either (5.10) or (5.11) holds then for each $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and each $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$P^x \{ Y_{\alpha, s} = 0 \ \forall \ s \in \mathbb{R} \text{ or } Y_{\alpha, s} = 1 \ \forall \ s \in \mathbb{R} \} = 0.$$  

Thus, $Y_{\alpha, s}$ must be of the form (5.1) or (5.2) with $-\infty < U_{\alpha, s} < \infty$ or of the form (5.3) with $0 < Z_{\alpha, s} < \infty$ and $C_{\alpha, s} \neq 0$. But now Prop. 4.5 implies that $P^x(F_1) = 1 \ \forall \ x$ or $P^x(F_2) = 1 \ \forall \ x$. If $P^x(F_3) = 1$ then $C_{\alpha, s} = C$ is independent of $\alpha$, by Prop. 5.3. \( \square \)

Note that $G^+(\alpha, x)$ and $G^-(\alpha, x)$ are continuous functions of $x$, by (3.8). Also, $\forall \ \alpha, \ \forall \ x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\prod_{j=1}^{N(t)} G^+(\alpha, X_j(t))$$

and $\prod_{j=1}^{N(t)} G^-(\alpha, X_j(t))$ are martingales relative to any admissible filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)$, under any $P^x$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, by Prop. 4.1 and the dominated convergence theorem for conditional expectations. Thus, $\forall \ \alpha$ the functions $G^+(\alpha, x)$ and $G^-(\alpha, x)$ are martingale functions of $x$, so if $G^+(\alpha, x) < 1$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}$ then $G^+(\alpha, x) < 1 \ \forall \ x \in \mathbb{R}$, by Lemma 2.6.

Assume now that $P^x \{ \tau_\alpha < \infty \} = 1$ for some $x$. The martingale property implies that

$$G^\pm(\alpha, x) = E^x \prod_{j=1}^{N(\tau_\alpha)} G^\pm(\alpha, X_j(\tau_\alpha)),$$

so by the result of the previous paragraph, if $G^+(\alpha, x) < 1$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}$ then $G^+(\alpha, x) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, and similarly for $G^-$. For each $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $g(\alpha, 0, 0) = \alpha$, so by Prop. 3.5 the function $g(\alpha, s, x)$ is either strictly increasing or strictly decreasing in $s$. Furthermore, it follows from $g(\alpha, 0, x) = E^x(Y_{\alpha, 0}(\tau_\alpha))$ and

$$Y_{\alpha, 0}(\tau_\alpha) = g(\alpha, \tau_\alpha, x) \prod_{X_j(\tau_\alpha) \neq x} g(\alpha, \tau_\alpha, X_j(\tau_\alpha))$$

that $g(\alpha, s, x)$ is increasing rather than decreasing in $s$. Consequently (5.10) must hold. \( \square \)

6. Travelling Waves

For certain branching diffusion processes the distribution of $R_t - \gamma(1/2, t)$ has a weak limit as $t \to \infty$ (cf. Th. 3.6). In this section we shall investigate some of the consequences of our previous results for such processes. We assume throughout this section that

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} P^0 \{ R_t \leq \gamma(1/2, t) + y \} = w_0(y) \quad \forall \ y \in \mathbb{R}$$

(6.1)
where $w_0(y)$ is a proper, continuous c.d.f. (thus $w_0(y) \to 1$ as $y \to \infty$ and $w_0(y) \to 0$ as $y \to -\infty$). Let $\gamma(\alpha) = \inf\{y; w_0(y) \geq \alpha\}$ be the $\alpha$th quantile of $w_0(y)$. Note that $\gamma$ is continuous at $\alpha$ iff $w_0$ is strictly increasing at $\gamma(\alpha)$ (i.e., $\forall \varepsilon > 0, w_0(\gamma(\alpha) + \varepsilon) - w_0(\gamma(\alpha)) > 0$ and $w_0(\gamma(\alpha)) - w_0(\gamma(\alpha) - \varepsilon) > 0$).

**Lemma 6.1:** Assume (6.1). Then for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $s, x \in \mathbb{R}$,

\begin{equation}
\lim_{t \to \infty} P^x \{R_{t-s} \leq \gamma(1/2, t) + \gamma(\alpha)\} = g(\alpha, s, x).
\end{equation}

**Proof:** By Th. 3.2, for every $\alpha' \in (0, 1)$

\begin{equation}
\lim_{t \to \infty} P^x \{R_{t-s} \leq \gamma(\alpha', t)\} = g(\alpha', s, x),
\end{equation}

and by Prop. 3.3, $g(\alpha', s, x)$ is continuous in $\alpha'$. Consequently, to prove (6.2) it suffices to show that $\forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists t_\varepsilon$ such that for $t \geq t_\varepsilon$

$$
\gamma(\alpha - \varepsilon, t) \leq \gamma(1/2, t) + \gamma(\alpha) \leq \gamma(\alpha + \varepsilon, t).
$$

But this follows from (6.1) and (6.3) with $s = x = 0$ and $\alpha' = \alpha + \varepsilon$, since $g(\alpha', 0, 0) = \alpha'$ and $w_0(\gamma(\alpha)) = \alpha$. \hfill \Box

**Proposition 6.2:** Assume (6.1). Then there exists a constant $v \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\forall \alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$,

\begin{equation}
\lim_{t \to \infty} (\gamma(\alpha, t) - \gamma(\alpha, t - s)) = vs \quad \text{and}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\lim_{t \to \infty} \gamma(\alpha, t)/t = v.
\end{equation}

Moreover, $v = 0$ iff $g(\alpha, s, x)$ is constant in $s$ for all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$. If $v \neq 0$ then

\begin{equation}
\lim_{t \to \infty} (\gamma(1/2, t) - \gamma(\alpha, t)) = -\gamma(\alpha) \quad \forall \alpha \in (0, 1),
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
w_0(y) = g(1/2, y/v, 0) \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}, \text{ and}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
g(\alpha, s, 0) = g(1/2, s + \gamma(\alpha)/v, 0) \quad \forall \alpha \in (0, 1), s \in \mathbb{R};
\end{equation}
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thus \( w_0 \) is strictly increasing and \( \gamma \) is continuous.

**PROOF:** Recall (Prop. 3.5) that \( \forall \alpha \in (0,1) \) the function \( g(\alpha, s, x) \) is strictly increasing, strictly decreasing, or constant in \( s \), and that the same case obtains \( \forall x \in \mathbb{R} \). Suppose that for some \( \alpha' \in (0,1) \), \( g(\alpha', s, 0) \) is not constant in \( s \); choose \( \alpha'' \neq \alpha' \) such that \( g(\alpha', s, 0) = \alpha'' \) for some \( s \) (recall that \( g(\alpha', 0, 0) = \alpha' \)). Since \( \gamma(\alpha) \) has at most countably many discontinuities and \( g(\alpha, s, x) \) is continuous and monotone in \( s \), \( \alpha'' \) may be chosen so that \( \gamma(\alpha) \) is continuous at \( \alpha = \alpha'' \), and thus \( w_0 \) is strictly increasing at \( \gamma(\alpha'') \).

It follows from (6.1)–(6.2) that if \( \gamma \) is continuous at \( \alpha \) then \( (\gamma(1/2, t) - \gamma(\alpha, t)) \to -\gamma(\alpha) \) as \( t \to \infty \). But by Lemma 6.1

\[
\lim_{t \to \infty} P^0 \{ R_{t-s} \leq \gamma(1/2, t) + \gamma(\alpha') \} = g(\alpha', s, 0) = \alpha'',
\]
\[
\lim_{t \to \infty} P^0 \{ R_{t-s} \leq \gamma(1/2, t-s) + \gamma(\alpha'') \} = g(\alpha'', 0, 0) = \alpha'',
\]

so

\[
\lim_{t \to \infty} (\gamma(1/2, t) - \gamma(1/2, t-s)) = \gamma(\alpha'') - \gamma(\alpha') \neq 0.
\]

(NOTE: \( \gamma(\alpha') \neq \gamma(\alpha'') \) because \( \alpha' \neq \alpha'' \) and \( w_0 \) is continuous.) Now (6.4) follows for each \( \alpha \) such that \( \gamma(\alpha) \) is continuous at \( \alpha \), since \( (\gamma(1/2, t) - \gamma(\alpha, t)) \to -\gamma(\alpha) \); but \( \gamma(\alpha) \) has at most countably many discontinuities and \( \gamma(\alpha,t) \) is monotone in \( s \), so (6.4) must hold \( \forall \alpha \in (0,1) \). The relation (6.5) follows from (6.4) by a routine but tedious argument which we shall omit.

We have shown that if \( g(\alpha, s, 0) \) is not constant in \( s \) for some \( \alpha \) then (6.4) holds with \( v \neq 0 \). It follows, by (6.1)–(6.2), that

\[
w_0(y) = \lim_{t \to \infty} P^0 \{ R_t \leq \gamma(1/2, t) + y \}
= \lim_{t \to \infty} P^0 \{ R_t \leq \gamma(1/2, t + y/v) + o(1) \}
= g(1/2, y/v, 0)
\]

provided \( w_0 \) is strictly increasing at \( y \). But by the continuity and monotonicity in \( y \) of \( w_0 \) and in \( s \) of \( g(\alpha, s, 0) \), it follows that (6.7) holds \( \forall y \in \mathbb{R} \). Similarly, by (6.1), (6.2), (6.4),

\[
g(\alpha, s, 0) = \lim_{t \to \infty} P^0 \{ R_{t-s} \leq \gamma(1/2, t) + \gamma(\alpha) \}
= \lim_{t \to \infty} P^0 \{ R_{t-s} \leq \gamma(1/2, t + \gamma(\alpha)/v) + o(1) \}
= g(1/2, s + \gamma(\alpha)/v, 0),
\]
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proving (6.8). Now if (6.7) holds then by Prop. 3.5, \(w_0(y)\) is strictly increasing, so by (6.1)–(6.2), (6.6) must hold \(\forall \alpha \in (0,1)\).

Finally, suppose that for all \(\alpha \in (0,1)\), \(g(\alpha,s,0)\) is constant in \(s\). Choose \(\alpha'\) so that \(\gamma(\alpha)\) is continuous at \(\alpha = \alpha'\); then by (6.2),

\[
\lim_{t \to \infty} P^0 \{ R_{t-s} \leq \gamma(1/2,t) + \gamma(\alpha') \} = g(\alpha', 0, 0) = \alpha',
\]
\[
\lim_{t \to \infty} P^0 \{ R_{t-s} \leq \gamma(1/2,0) + \gamma(\alpha') \} = g(\alpha', 0, 0) = \alpha'.
\]

Since \(w_0\) is strictly increasing at \(\gamma(\alpha')\), it follows that \((\gamma(1/2,t) - \gamma(1/2,t-s)) \to 0\) as \(t \to \infty\). Routine arguments based on (6.1) now show that \((\gamma(\alpha,t) - \gamma(\alpha,t-s)) \to 0\) as \(t \to \infty\) \(\forall \alpha \in (0,1)\), and (6.5) follows from (6.4). \(\square\)

Recall (sec. 5) that \(F_4\) is the event that each of the functions \(Y_{\alpha,s}, \alpha \in (0,1)\), is either identically 1 or identically 0 in \(s\), and that \(F_i, i = 1, 2, 3\), is the event that (5.i) holds \(\forall \alpha\) but not all of the \(Y_{\alpha,s}\) are identically 1 or identically 0.

**PROPOSITION 6.3:** Assume (6.1). If \(v = 0\) in (6.4) then \(P^x(F_3 \cup F_4) = 1 \forall x \in \mathbb{R}\), and \(C_{\alpha} = 0 \forall \alpha \in (0,1)\). If \(v \neq 0\) then either (5.10) or (5.11) holds, and therefore (5.12) also holds. If \(v > 0\) then \(P^x(F_2) = 0 \forall x\), and if \(v < 0\) then \(P^x(F_1) = 0 \forall x\). If \(P^x(F_1) = 1\) or \(P^x(F_2) = 1\) and \(v \neq 0\) then \(-\infty < U_{1/2} < \infty\) a.s. \((P^x)\) and

\[
U_{\alpha} = U_{1/2} + \gamma(\alpha)/v \text{ a.s. } (P^x)
\]

\(\forall \alpha \in (0,1)\) and \(x \in \mathbb{R}\). If \(P^x(F_2) = 1\) and \(v \neq 0\) then \(C_{\alpha} = C\) is independent of \(\alpha, C > 0\) if \(v > 0, C < 0\) if \(v < 0\), \(0 < Z_{1/2} < \infty\) a.s. \((P^x)\), and

\[
Z_{\alpha} = Z_{1/2} e^{-C \gamma(\alpha)/v} \text{ a.s. } (P^x)
\]

\(\forall \alpha \in (0,1)\) and \(x \in \mathbb{R}\).

**PROOF:** Suppose first that \(v = 0\). Then by Prop. 6.2, \(g(\alpha,s,x)\) is constant in \(s\) for all \(\alpha, x\). But \(g(\alpha,s,x) = E^x Y_{\alpha,s}\), by (4.3), and \(\forall \alpha\) the function \(Y_{\alpha,s}\) is either nondecreasing in \(s\) a.s. \((P^x)\) or nonincreasing in \(s\) a.s. \((P^x)\), by Th. 5.1. Consequently, \(Y_{\alpha,s}\) is constant in \(s\) a.s. \((P^x)\), so \(P^x(F_3 \cup F_4) = 1\).

Now suppose that \(v \neq 0\). Since \(w_0(y)\) is a proper c.d.f., (6.7)–(6.8) imply that \(g(\alpha,s,0) \to 0\) and \(1\) as \(s \to \pm \infty\) or \(\mp \infty\). Thus, either

\[
G^+(\alpha,0) = 1 \text{ and } G^-(\alpha,0) = 0 \quad \forall \alpha \in (0,1) \text{ or }
\]
\[
G^+(\alpha,0) = 0 \text{ and } G^-(\alpha,0) = 1 \quad \forall \alpha \in (0,1).
\]
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Recall from the proof of Prop. 5.4 that $\forall \alpha$, $G^+(\alpha, x)$ and $G^-(\alpha, x)$ are martingale functions of $x$; therefore, by Lemma 2.6, either (5.10) or (5.11) holds. Prop. 5.4 implies that (5.12) also holds, and in addition implies that $-\infty < U_\alpha < \infty$ a.s. $(P^x)$ if $P^x(F_i) = 1$ for $i = 1$ or 2, and that $C_\alpha = C$ is independent of $\alpha$, that $C \neq 0$, and that $0 < Z_\alpha < \infty$ a.s. $(P^x)$ if $P^x(F_3) = 1$. If $v > 0$ then (6.7)–(6.8) imply that $g(\alpha, s, 0)$ is increasing in $s$, so $P^x(F_2) = 0$, by (4.3) and (5.12); similarly, if $v < 0$ then $P^x(F_1) = 0$. If $v > 0$ and $P^x(F_3) = 1$ then by (4.3), $C > 0$; if $v < 0$ and $P^x(F_3) = 1$ then $C < 0$.

If $v \neq 0$ then by Prop. 6.2, $w_0(y)$ is strictly increasing and $\gamma(\alpha)$ is continuous. Recall (4.2) that

$$Y_{\alpha, s} = \lim_{r \to \infty} \lim_{t \to \infty} P^x\{R_{t-s} \leq \gamma(\alpha, t) | \mathcal{F}_r\};$$

by (6.4) and (6.6)

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} P^x\{R_{t-s} \leq \gamma(\alpha, t) | \mathcal{F}_r\} = \lim_{t \to \infty} P^x\{R_{t-s} \leq \gamma(1/2, t) + \gamma(\alpha) | \mathcal{F}_r\} = \lim_{t \to \infty} P^x\{R_{t-s} \leq \gamma(1/2, t + \gamma(\alpha)/v) | \mathcal{F}_r\}$$

so $Y_{\alpha, s} = Y_{1/2, s + \gamma(\alpha)/v}$ a.s. $(P^x)$. The relations (6.9)–(6.10) follow directly. □

PROPOSITION 6.4: Assume (6.1); define $w_x(y) = g(w_0(y), 0, x)$. Then $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, w_x(y)$ is a proper, continuous c.d.f. and

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} P^x\{R_t \leq \gamma(1/2, t) + y\} = w_x(y).$$

PROOF: Lemma 6.1 with $s = 0$ implies (6.11) for $y = \gamma(\alpha), \alpha \in (0, 1)$. Since $g$ and $w_0$ are continuous it follows that (6.11) holds $\forall y \in \mathbb{R}$, and that $w_x(y)$ is jointly continuous in $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$. It remains to prove that $w_x(y)$ is a proper c.d.f., i.e., that $w_x(y) \to 0$ as $y \to -\infty$ and $w_x(y) \to 1$ as $y \to \infty$.

Suppose first that $g(\alpha, s, x)$ is constant in $s$ for all $\alpha, x$ (cf. Prop. 3.5). Then by Prop. 4.1, for each $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $g(\alpha, 0, x)$ is a martingale function (of $x$). Define

$$H^+(x) = \lim_{y \to \infty} w_x(y) = \lim_{\alpha \to 1} g(\alpha, 0, x), \text{ and}$$

$$H^-(x) = \lim_{y \to -\infty} w_x(y) = \lim_{\alpha \to 0} g(\alpha, 0, x);$$

then $H^+$ and $H^-$ are martingale functions. Since $g(\alpha, 0, 0) \equiv \alpha, H^+(0) = 1$ and $H^-(0) = 0$, so by Lemma 2.6, $H^+(x) = 1$ and $H^-(x) = 0 \forall x \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus $w_x$ is a proper c.d.f. $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$.
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Suppose now that for some \( \alpha, g(\alpha, s, x) \) is not constant in \( s \). Consider the functions 
\[ G^\pm(1/2, x) \] defined by (5.8)–(5.9); by Cor. 6.3, these are identically one/zero, so by (5.8)–(5.9)
\[
\lim_{s \to \infty} g(1/2, s, x) = 1 \text{ or } 0 \quad \forall \ x \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } \\
\lim_{s \to -\infty} g(1/2, s, x) = 0 \text{ or } 1 \quad \forall \ x \in \mathbb{R}.
\]
Now (6.11) and Cor. 3.4 imply that
\[
w_x(y) = g(w_0(y), 0, x) \\
= g(g(1/2, y/v, 0), 0, x) \\
= g(1/2, y/v, x),
\]
so it follows that \( w_x(y) \to 1 \) as \( y \to \infty \) and \( w_x(y) \to 0 \) as \( y \to -\infty \).

When (6.1) holds it is often fairly easy to ascertain which of the cases (5.1)–(5.3) holds in Th. 5.1. We shall state a simple sufficient condition for (5.3). Assume for simplicity that the underlying diffusion \( X_1(t) \) satisfies a stochastic differential equation
\[
dX_1(t) = \alpha(X_1(t))dt + \sigma(X_1(t))dW(t)
\]
where \( dW(t) \) is white noise and the local drift and diffusion coefficients \( \alpha(x) \) and \( \sigma(x) \) are continuous.

PROPOSITION 6.5: Assume (6.1). If \( v > 0, |\alpha(x)| \) is bounded as \( x \to \infty \), and \( 1/\sigma(x) \) is bounded as \( x \to \infty \), then \( P^x(F_3) = 1 \). If \( v < 0, |\alpha(x)| \) is bounded as \( x \to -\infty \), and \( 1/\sigma(x) \) is bounded as \( x \to -\infty \), then \( P^x(F_3) = 1 \). In either case \( 0 < Z_\alpha < 0 \) a.s. (\( P^x \)) and
\[
w_x(y) = \mathbb{E}^x \exp\{-Z_{1/2}e^{-Cy/v}\}
\]

PROOF: If \( v \neq 0 \) then by Cor. 6.3, \( P^x(F_i) = 1 \) \( \forall \ x \in \mathbb{R} \), for some \( i = 1, 2, \) or 3. Suppose that \( P^x(F_i) = 1 \) for \( i = 1 \) or \( 2 \); then by Prop. 5.2 the observed quantile \( Q_t \) converges in probability to a random variable \( Q \). We will show that if \( v \neq 0 \) and the functions \( \alpha(x) \), \( \sigma(x) \) satisfy the hypotheses stated then this cannot occur. This will prove that \( P^x(F_3) = 1 \).

Suppose that \( v < 0 \) and that \( |\alpha(x)|, 1/\sigma(x) \) are bounded as \( x \to -\infty \) (the other case is similar). Then \( R_t \to -\infty \) in \( P^0 \)-probability, by (6.5). Take \( t_* \) so large that
\( P^0\{|Q_t - Q| > \varepsilon\} < \varepsilon \) for all \( t \geq t_* \), where \( \varepsilon > 0 \) is small. Then at time \( t_* \), \( R_{t_*} \) is near \( \gamma(Q, t_*) \) with \( P^0 \) probability \( \geq 1 - \varepsilon \). But if \( |\alpha(x)| \) and \( 1/\sigma(x) \) are bounded as \( x \to -\infty \) then there is a good chance \( \delta \gg \varepsilon \) that the lead particle will wander out to beyond \( \gamma(Q + \delta, t_* + 1) \) at time \( t_* + 1 \), in view of (6.1). But this contradicts the statement \( P^0\{|Q_t - Q| > \varepsilon\} < \varepsilon \forall t \geq t_* \).

Thus, if \( v \neq 0 \) then \( P^0(F_3) = 1 \). But by Prop. 6.3 if \( v \neq 0 \) then (5.12) holds, so it follows that \( P^e(F_3) = 1 \ \forall \ x \in \mathbb{R} \). Since either (5.10) or (5.11) holds, \( 0 < Z_\alpha < \infty \) a.s. \( (P^e) \), \( C_\alpha = C \) is independent of \( \alpha \), and \( C \neq 0 \) (see Prop. 6.3). Finally,

\[
w_x(y) = g(1/2, -y/v, x) = E^e \exp\{-Z_{1/2}e^{-C_y/v}\}
\]

by Prop. 5.3 and (6.12), proving (6.13). \( \square \)

7. Examples

In this section we discuss briefly some particular examples which illustrate various facets of the theory developed in the previous sections. In each example we will specify the branching diffusion process by identifying (i) the branching rate function \( \beta(x) \), and (ii) the diffusion law, which in most cases is determined by the local drift coefficient \( \alpha(x) \) and the local diffusion coefficient \( \sigma(x) \). We always use \( p_1(x) \equiv 1 \).

EXAMPLE 7.1: \( \alpha(x) \equiv \mu; \sigma(x) \equiv 1; \beta(x) \equiv 1 \).

For \( \mu = 0 \) this process is branching Brownian motion. It is known [5] that when \( \mu = 0 \), (6.1) obtains and that \( \gamma(1/2, t) \sim \sqrt{2} t \) as \( t \to \infty \). For arbitrary \( \mu \), (6.1) must also obtain, with \( \gamma(1/2, t) \sim (\sqrt{2} + \mu)t \); thus the velocity \( v \) of the travelling wave is positive, negative, or zero depending on whether \( \mu \) is greater, less, or equal to \(-\sqrt{2} \). By Prop. 6.2, the function \( g(\alpha, s, x) \) is constant in \( s \) iff \( \mu = -\sqrt{2} \); by (6.7), \( g(\alpha, s, x) \) is strictly increasing in \( s \) if \( \mu < -\sqrt{2} \) and strictly decreasing if \( \mu > -\sqrt{2} \). Prop. 6.5 implies that \( P^e(F_3 \cup F_4) = 1 \), i.e., case (5.3) of Th. 5.1 obtains a.s., and (6.10) implies that \( C < 0 \) if \( \mu > -\sqrt{2} \) and \( C > 0 \) if \( \mu < -\sqrt{2} \). Also, if \( \mu \neq -\sqrt{2} \) then \( 0 < Z_\alpha < \infty \) a.s.

Now consider the case \( \mu = -\sqrt{2} \), for which \( v = 0 \). The law of \( (X_j(t)) \) under \( P^e \) is the same as that of \( (X_j(t) + x) \) under \( P^0 \), since \( \alpha(x), \sigma(x), \) and \( \beta(x) \) are all constant in \( x \). Consequently \( P^e(R_t \leq y) = P^0(R_t \leq y - x) \), and (6.1)–(6.2), (6.4) imply that
\[ g(\alpha, s, x) = g(\alpha, 0, x) = w_0(\gamma(\alpha) - x), \] so

\[ Y_{\alpha, \delta} = \lim_{t \to \infty} \prod_{j=1}^{N(t)} w_0(\gamma(\alpha) - X_j(t)). \]

By the arguments of [2], sec. 2, we have \( 0 < Y_{\alpha, \delta} < 1 \) a.s. \((P^\delta)\). Therefore, in the representation (5.1), \( C = 0 \) and \( 0 < Z_\alpha < \infty \) a.s. \((P^\delta)\).

EXAMPLE 7.2: \( \alpha(x) = -x, \sigma(x) \equiv 1, \beta(x) \equiv 1. \)

In this example the underlying diffusion \( X_1(t) \) is the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. This diffusion is positive recurrent, with stationary probability density \((2\pi)^{-1/2} e^{-x^2/2}\); hence by Prop. 5.4 the function \( g(\alpha, s, x) \) is not constant in \( s \). If the initial point of the first particle is chosen at random from the stationary distribution then at any time \( t \) the expected number of particles in \( dx \) is \( e^{t^2/2} e^{-x^2} dx \); consequently

\[ \lim_{t \to \infty} P\{R_t > \sqrt{t} \log t\} = 0. \]

Thus, (6.5) does not hold with \( v \neq 0 \). Since \( g(\alpha, s, x) \) is not constant in \( s \), Prop. 6.2 implies that (6.1) does not hold. In fact it is not difficult to show that \( \forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \forall \epsilon > 0, \)

\[ P^\delta\{|R_t - \sqrt{t}| > \epsilon\} \longrightarrow 0; \]

thus, (6.1) holds but with a discontinuous limiting c.d.f. \( w_0(\cdot) \). An argument like that of [3] seems to show that \( \sqrt{t}(R_t - \sqrt{t}) \) converges in distribution to a non-trivial limit.

EXAMPLE 7.3: \( \alpha(x) = -x/|x|, \sigma(x) \equiv 1, \beta(x) \equiv 1. \)

In this example the underlying diffusion \( X_1(t) \) is positive recurrent, with stationary probability density \( \frac{1}{2} e^{-|x|} \). The distribution of \( R_t \) behaves differently in this example than in Ex. 7.2 because of the different tail behavior of the stationary distribution. Here (6.1) holds and the velocity of the wave is \( v = 1 \). This may be proved by an adaptation of the methods of [3]. By Prop. 6.5, \( P^\delta(F_3) = 1 \forall x \). Note that the wave velocity is different than that in Ex. 7.1 with \( \alpha(x) \equiv -1 \), even though the two processes behave the same way on \( (0, \infty) \).

EXAMPLE 7.4: \( \alpha(x) = 2x/|x|, \sigma(x) \equiv 1, \beta(x) \equiv 1. \)
Here the underlying diffusion $X_1(t)$ is transient, with either $X_1(t) \to \infty$ or $X_1(t) \to -\infty$ a.s. ($P^x$). Under any $P^x$, there is positive probability that eventually there are no particles to the right of the origin, because to the left of the origin particles behaves as in Ex. 7.1 with $\mu = -2$. But there is also positive $P^x$-probability that $R_t/t \to 2 + \sqrt{2}$, because to the right of the origin particles behave as in Ex. 7.1 with $\mu = +2$. Using the results concerning the distribution of $R_t$ in Ex. 7.1 with $\mu = \pm 2$ it is not difficult to show that here

$$P^x\{R_t \leq \gamma(\alpha_+, t) + y\} \to w^+_x(y) \text{ and}$$

$$P^x\{R_t \leq \gamma(\alpha_-, t) + y\} \to w^-_x(y),$$

where

$$\lim_{y \to \infty} w^+_x(y) = 1, \lim_{y \to -\infty} w^+_x(y) = \alpha_x,$$

$$\lim_{y \to \infty} w^-_x(y) = \alpha_x, \lim_{y \to -\infty} w^-_x(y) = 0,$$

$$\alpha_- < \alpha_0 < \alpha_+, \text{ and}$$

$$\alpha_x = P^x\{\text{no particles to the right of } 0 \text{ as } t \to \infty\}.$$

Furthermore, $\gamma(\alpha_+, t)/t \to 2 + \sqrt{2}$ and $\gamma(\alpha_-, t)/t \to -2 + \sqrt{2}$ as $t \to \infty$. Thus in this example the distribution of $R_t$ splits into two distinct travelling waves, one travelling at velocity $2 + \sqrt{2}$, the other at $-2 + \sqrt{2}$. Each of the two waves is a defective c.d.f., and each is continuous.

Now consider the function $g(\alpha, s, x)$; it satisfies

$$g(w^+_0(y), s, 0) = w^+_0(y + s(2 + \sqrt{2})) \quad \forall y, s \in \mathbb{R},$$

$$g(w^-_0(y), s, 0) = w^-_0(y + s(-2 + \sqrt{2})) \quad \forall y, s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Consequently, $g(\alpha, s, x)$ is strictly increasing in $s$ for $\alpha > \alpha_0$, strictly decreasing in $s$ for $\alpha < \alpha_0$, and (by continuity) constant in $s$ for $\alpha = \alpha_0$. (See Prop. 3.5 — this shows that the same case need not obtain for all $\alpha$.)

Since $|\alpha(x)|$ and $1/\sigma(x)$ are bounded as $x \to \pm\infty$, an argument similar to that in the proof of Prop. 6.5 shows that the observed quantile $Q_t$ cannot stabilize as $t \to \infty$; thus, by Prop. 5.2, $P^x(F_3) = 1 \forall x \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $A = \{\text{no particles to the right of 0 eventually}\}.$
Then by (4.2) and (5.3), for $\alpha > \alpha_0$

$$1\{Z_\alpha = 0\} = 1_A \text{ a.s. } (P^z),$$

$$1\{Z_\alpha = 0\} = 0 \text{ a.s. } (P^z),$$

but for $\alpha < \alpha_0$

$$1\{Z_\alpha = 0\} = 0 \text{ a.s. } (P^z),$$

$$1\{Z_\alpha = \infty\} = 1 - 1_A \text{ a.s. } (P^z);$$

moreover, $C_\alpha = C_- < 0$ for $\alpha < \alpha_0$, $C_{\alpha_0} = 0$, and $C_\alpha = C_+ > 0$ for $\alpha > \alpha_0$. This shows that the constants $C_\alpha$ in (5.3) need not always be equal, or even of the same sign.

EXAMPLE 7.5: $\alpha(x) \equiv 1; \sigma(x) = \min(1,e^{1-x}); \beta(x) \equiv 0$.

In this example there are no fissions, only a single particle executing a diffusion $R_t$ with coefficients $\alpha(x), \sigma(x)$. Furthermore, $R_t - t$ is a martingale whose quadratic variation $V = \int_0^\infty \sigma^2(R_t)dt$ is finite a.s. $(P^z)$. Consequently $R_t - t \to U$ a.s. $(P^z)$ for a suitable random variable $U$. Under $P^0$, the random variable $U$ has a nonatomic distribution, because under $P^0$, $U = -T + U'$ where $T, U'$ are independent and $T = \inf\{t: R_t = 1\}$, which is known to have a density. Thus (6.1) holds, with $w_0(y)$ being a translate of the c.d.f. of $U$ under $P^0$. The velocity $v$ of the wave is 1.

Clearly, as $t \to \infty$ the position $R_t$ of the particle becomes predictable, and thus $P^z(F_1) = 1$. This shows that (5.1) is possible.
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