

**Analogue of Classical Limit Theorems for the Supercritical Galton–Watson Process with Immigration**

C. C. HEYDE AND E. SENETA  
*Australian National University  
 Canberra, Australia*

Communicated by Richard Bellman

ABSTRACT

In [6] it was shown that under standard conditions  $X_n/m^n \rightarrow V > 0$  with probability one, where  $\{X_n\}$  is a Galton–Watson process with immigration, and offspring mean  $m > 1$ . The authors obtain convergence-rate results under additional conditions for this asymptotic behavior in the form of analogues of the central limit theorem and the law of the iterated logarithm, and similar results for the estimator  $X_{n+r}/X_n$ , which for fixed  $r \geq 1$  approaches  $m^r$  with probability one.

INTRODUCTION

The classical central limit theorem and the law of the iterated logarithm may be regarded as convergence-rate results for the strong law of large numbers. Recently, one of the authors has adopted this interpretation with regard to the well-known relation  $Z_n/m^n \xrightarrow{a.s.} W$  for the ordinary Galton–Watson process  $\{Z_n\}$  with offspring mean  $m > 1$ , and proved analogous convergence-rate theorems for this strong convergence result [1, 2].

A similar strong convergence result is known for the supercritical Galton–Watson process with immigration  $\{X_n\}$ ; this has been derived simply in an earlier article in this journal [6], to which we refer the reader for a detailed description, and whose notation and assumptions we adopt. (The result may also be eventually deduced from a general limit theorem on an ordinary decomposable multitype Galton–Watson process, namely, Theorem 2.1 of Kesten and Stigum [4].) Thus, our basic assumptions are that the process is initiated by a single ancestor; and that the offspring and immigration distributions  $\{f_j\}$ ,  $\{b_j\}$ , generated respectively by the probability generating functions (pgf’s)  $F(s)$ ,  $B(s)$ ,  $s \in [0, 1]$  satisfy:

$$1 < F'(1-) \equiv m < \infty; f_j \neq 1, j \geq 0; 0 < \lambda \equiv B'(1-) < \infty.$$

*Mathematical Biosciences* 11 (1971), 249–259

Copyright © 1971 by American Elsevier Publishing Company, Inc.

The theorem of [6] then implies that if  $\sum j(\log j)f_j < \infty$ ,  $\{X_n/m^n\}$  converges almost surely to a proper random variable  $V$  with finite mean  $EV$ , and such that  $P(V = 0) = 0$ . One of the aims of this article is to indicate that for the process with immigration also analogous convergence-rate results hold, under further conditions, to be introduced as required.

We note also that the foregoing convergence result implies that for any fixed integer  $r \geq 1$ ,  $X_{n+r}/X_n \rightarrow m^r$  with probability one. It will be seen from the representation (2), which follows, that this may be regarded as an analogue of the strong law of large numbers for the estimator  $X_{n+r}/X_n$  of  $m^r$ . We give a parallel set of convergence-rate results for this relationship also, which may have some statistical utility.

The overall treatment is relatively brief, because much of the approach may be taken over directly from that for the ordinary supercritical Galton–Watson case; in fact, the present situation is intrinsically simpler in that  $X_n \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \infty$ , a property not shared in general by the ordinary process. Indeed, the main difficulty is to obtain for the present process an analogue of the Berry–Esseen bound on the deviation from normality, which is needed to prove the analogue of the iterated logarithm law. This is done via Lemma 3.1, which may be of some independent interest, and two further lemmas.

DESCRIPTION OF THE RESULTS

The keys to the limit results are representations for  $X_n - m^n V$  and  $X_{n+r} - m^r X_n$  as sums of independent random variables.

In the first case, we have

$$X_n - m^n V = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \left( X_n - m^n \frac{X_{n+r}}{m^{n+r}} \right) \text{ a.s.} \tag{1}$$

Furthermore,

$$X_{n+r} = Z_r^{(1)} + \dots + Z_r^{(X_n)} + Y_{r,n} \tag{2}$$

where

$$Y_{r,n} = U_{n+r}^{(n+1)} + \dots + U_{n+r}^{(n+r)}.$$

Here  $Z_r^{(i)}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, X_n$  each have the distribution of  $Z_r$ , where  $\{Z_n\}$  is an ordinary Galton–Watson process generated by  $F(s)$ ; and  $U_{n+r}^{(i)}$  is the number of direct descendants in the  $(n+r)$ th generation from immigration at the  $i$ th. Further, the  $Z_r^{(i)}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, X_n$  and  $U_{n+r}^{(i)}$ ,  $i = n+1, \dots, n+r$  are all independent, and  $Y_{r,n}$  has the same distribution for each  $n$ . Moreover, it has been shown in [6] that, for fixed  $n$ ,  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} m^{-r} Y_{r,n} = I^{(n)}$  a.s. where  $I^{(n)}$  has the distribution of  $I = V - W$ . From (1) and (2)

$$\begin{aligned} X_n - m^n V &= \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \left[ \left(1 - \frac{Z_r^{(1)}}{m^r}\right) + \cdots + \left(1 - \frac{Z_r^{(X_n)}}{m^r}\right) - \frac{Y_{r,n}}{m^r} \right] \\ &= (1 - W^{(1)}) + \cdots + (1 - W^{(X_n)}) - I^{(n)} \\ &= T_1 + \cdots + T_{X_n} - I^{(n)} \quad \text{a.s.,} \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

(say) where the components on the right-hand side are all independent and are each distributed independently of  $X_n$ .

The representation for  $X_{n+r} - m^r X_n$  follows simply from (2):

$$X_{n+r} - m^r X_n = (Z_r^{(1)} - m^r) + \cdots + (Z_r^{(X_n)} - m^r) + Y_{r,n} \tag{4}$$

where again the components on the right-hand side are all independent, and are independent of  $X_n$ ; and  $Y_{r,n}$  has the same distribution for each  $n$ .

Making use of (3) and (4) together with an adaptation of the techniques of [2] and [3] yields the following results.

**THEOREM 1.** *Let  $\text{var } Z_1 = \sigma^2 < \infty$ . Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P((m^2 - m)^{1/2} \sigma^{-1} X_n^{-1/2} (m^n V - X_n) \leq x | X_n > 0) = \Phi(x)$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\sigma_r^{-1} X_n^{-1/2} (X_{n+r} - m^r X_n) \leq x | X_n > 0) = \Phi(x)$$

where  $\Phi(x)$  is the distribution function of  $N(0, 1)$  and

$$\sigma_r^2 = \text{var } Z_r = \sigma^2 m^r (m^r - 1) (m^2 - m)^{-1}.$$

**THEOREM 2.** *Let  $EZ_1^3 < \infty$ . Then there exists a  $\delta, 0 < \delta < 1$ , such that*

$$\sup_x |P((m^2 - m)^{1/2} \sigma^{-1} X_n^{-1/2} (m^n V - X_n) \leq x | X_n > 0) - \Phi(x)| = O(\delta^n)$$

and

$$\sup_x |P(\sigma_r^{-1} X_n^{-1/2} (X_{n+r} - m^r X_n) \leq x | X_n > 0) - \Phi(x)| = O(\delta^n)$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

(Explicit forms for the remainders may be found from Lemmas 2 and 3 of the next section.)

**THEOREM 3.** *Let  $EZ_1^3 < \infty$ . Then with probability one*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m^n V - X_n}{(2\sigma^2(m^2 - m)^{-1} X_n \log n)^{1/2}} = 1,$$

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m^n V - X_n}{(2\sigma^2(m^2 - m)^{-1} X_n \log n)^{1/2}} = -1,$$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{X_{n+r} - m^r X_n}{(2\sigma_r^2 X_n \log n)^{1/2}} = 1, \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{X_{n+r} - m^r X_n}{(2\sigma_r^2 X_n \log n)^{1/2}} = -1.$$

PROOFS

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Theorem 1 is very easily obtained from the representations (3) and (4). Since  $X_n \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we certainly have  $X_n^{-1/2}I^{(n)}$  and  $X_n^{-1/2}Y_{r,n}$  converging in probability to zero on  $\{X_n > 0\}$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Then, noting that  $X_n$  is independent of the summands in each case, an appeal to the classical central limit theorem yields the result, since from ordinary Galton–Watson theory the remaining (identically and independently distributed) summands have zero mean. ■

In order to prove Theorem 2 we need first to extend the lemma in Section 4 of [3] so that the troublesome components  $I^{(n)}$  and  $Y_{r,n}$  in the representations (3) and (4) can be accounted for.

LEMMA 1. *Let  $\xi_i, i = 1, 2, \dots$ , be independent and identically distributed random variables with  $E\xi_1 = 0, \text{var } \xi_1 = \alpha^2$ , and  $E|\xi_1|^3 < \infty$ . Let  $\eta_n$ , with  $E|\eta_n| < \infty$ , be a random variable independent of  $\{\xi_i\}$  and with the same distribution for each  $n$ ; and  $N_n$  be a positive integer-valued random variable that is independent of the  $\{\xi_i\}$  and  $\eta_n$ . Then for any sequence  $\{\varepsilon_n\}$  of positive constants with  $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_x |P(\alpha^{-1}N_n^{-1/2}(\xi_1 + \dots + \xi_{N_n} + \eta_n) \leq x) - \Phi(x)| \\ \leq CE(N_n^{-1/2}) + \alpha^{-1}\varepsilon_n^{-1}E|\eta_n|E(N_n^{-1/2}) + \frac{\varepsilon_n}{2} \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = K\alpha^{-3}E|\xi_1|^3$ ,  $K$  being the universal constant in the Berry–Esseen bound.

*Proof.* Using the Berry–Esseen bound and since  $\eta_n$  is independent of  $\{\xi_i\}$ ,

$$-CE(N_n^{-1/2})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= -C \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^{-1/2}P(N_n = j) \\ &= -C \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^{-1/2} \left[ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dP(\alpha^{-1}j^{-1/2}\eta_n \leq y) \right] P(N_n = j) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left[ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \{P(\alpha^{-1}j^{-1/2}(\xi_1 + \dots + \xi_j) \leq x - y) - \Phi(x - y)\} \right. \\ &\qquad \qquad \qquad \left. dP(\alpha^{-1}j^{-1/2}\eta_n \leq y) \right] P(N_n = j) \\ &\leq CE(N_n^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

But,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left[ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \{P(\alpha^{-1}j^{-1/2}(\xi_1 + \dots + \xi_j) \leq x - y) - \Phi(x - y)\} \right. \\ \left. dP(\alpha^{-1}j^{-1/2}\eta_n \leq y) \right] P(N_n = j) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} [P(\alpha^{-1}j^{-1/2}(\xi_1 + \dots + \xi_j + \eta_n) \leq x) \\
 &\quad - P(\zeta + \alpha^{-1}j^{-1/2}\eta_n \leq x)]P(N_n = j) \\
 &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} [P(\alpha^{-1}j^{-1/2}(\xi_1 + \dots + \xi_j + \eta_n) \leq x | N_n = j) \\
 &\quad - P(\zeta + \alpha^{-1}j^{-1/2}\eta_n \leq x | N_n = j)]P(N_n = j) \\
 &= P(\alpha^{-1}N_n^{-1/2}(\xi_1 + \dots + \xi_{N_n} + \eta_n) \leq x) - P(\zeta + \alpha^{-1}N_n^{-1/2}\eta_n \leq x)
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $\zeta$  has an  $N(0, 1)$  distribution and is independent of  $\eta_n$ , so that

$$\sup_x |P(\alpha^{-1}N_n^{-1/2}(\xi_1 + \dots + \xi_{N_n} + \eta_n) \leq x) - P(\zeta + \alpha^{-1}N_n^{-1/2}\eta_n \leq x)| \leq CE(N_n^{-1/2}). \tag{5}$$

To this point, the argument is a straightforward generalization of the lemma of [3].

Now, for any  $\varepsilon_n > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 &P(\zeta + \alpha^{-1}N_n^{-1/2}\eta_n \leq x) \\
 &= P(\zeta + \alpha^{-1}N_n^{-1/2}\eta_n \leq x, \alpha^{-1}N_n^{-1/2}|\eta_n| \leq \varepsilon_n) \\
 &\quad + P(\zeta + \alpha^{-1}N_n^{-1/2}\eta_n \leq x, \alpha^{-1}N_n^{-1/2}|\eta_n| > \varepsilon_n) \\
 &\leq P(\zeta \leq x + \varepsilon_n) + P(\alpha^{-1}N_n^{-1/2}|\eta_n| > \varepsilon_n), \tag{6a}
 \end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$P(\zeta + \alpha^{-1}N_n^{-1/2}\eta_n > x) \leq P(\zeta > x - \varepsilon_n) + P(\alpha^{-1}N_n^{-1/2}|\eta_n| > \varepsilon_n),$$

or equivalently,

$$P(\zeta + \alpha^{-1}N_n^{-1/2}\eta_n \leq x) \geq P(\zeta \leq x - \varepsilon_n) - P(\alpha^{-1}N_n^{-1/2}|\eta_n| > \varepsilon_n). \tag{6b}$$

Also, it is readily checked that

$$\sup_x |P(\zeta \leq x - \varepsilon_n) - P(\zeta \leq x)| < \frac{\varepsilon_n}{2} \tag{7a}$$

from, for example, the mean value theorem, whence

$$\sup_x |P(\zeta \leq x) - P(\zeta \leq x + \varepsilon_n)| < \frac{\varepsilon_n}{2}. \tag{7b}$$

Using the double inequality for  $P(\zeta + \alpha^{-1}N_n^{-1/2}\eta_n \leq x)$  provided by (6a) and (6b) in conjunction with (7a) and (7b)

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\sup_x |P(\zeta + \alpha^{-1}N_n^{-1/2}\eta_n \leq x) - \Phi(x)| \\
 &\leq P(\alpha^{-1}N_n^{-1/2}|\eta_n| > \varepsilon_n) + \frac{\varepsilon_n}{2} \\
 &\leq \alpha^{-1}\varepsilon_n^{-1}E(N_n^{-1/2}|\eta_n|) + \frac{\varepsilon_n}{2}
 \end{aligned}$$

by Markov's inequality;

$$= \alpha^{-1} \varepsilon_n^{-1} E(N_n^{-1/2}) E|\eta_n| + \frac{\varepsilon_n}{2} \tag{8}$$

by the independence of  $\eta_n$  and  $N_n$ . The result of the lemma then follows from (5) and (8). ■

LEMMA 2. *Let  $EZ_1^3 < \infty$ . Then for any sequence  $\{\varepsilon_n\}$  of positive constants such that  $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_x |P((m^2 - m)^{1/2} \sigma^{-1} X_n^{-1/2} (m^n V - X_n) \leq x | X_n > 0) - \Phi(x)| \\ \leq K \sigma^{-3} (m^2 - m)^{3/2} E|W - 1|^3 E(X_n^{-1/2} | X_n > 0) \\ + \sigma^{-1} (m^2 - m)^{1/2} \varepsilon_n^{-1} E(I) E(X_n^{-1/2} | X_n > 0) + \frac{\varepsilon_n}{2} \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_x |P(\sigma_r^{-1} X_n^{-1/2} (X_{n+r} - m^r X_n) \leq x | X_n > 0) - \Phi(x)| \\ \leq K \sigma_r^{-3} E|Z_r - m^r|^3 E(X_n^{-1/2} | X_n > 0) \\ + \sigma_r^{-1} \varepsilon_n^{-1} E(Y_{r,1}) E(X_n^{-1/2} | X_n > 0) + \frac{\varepsilon_n}{2} \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where  $K (< 0.82)$  is the universal constant in the Berry–Esseen bound.

*Proof.* The inequalities (9) and (10) follow respectively from the representations (3) and (4), and application of Lemma 1, having noted that all expectations occurring on the right-hand sides of (9) and (10) are finite on account of the totality of conditions being assumed to be satisfied. ■

LEMMA 3. *Let  $\gamma$  be any positive number satisfying*

$$1 > \gamma^2 > \max(B(q), m^{-1}).$$

*Then*

$$E(X_n^{-1} | X_n > 0) = O(\gamma^n) \tag{11}$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . (An explicit, of somewhat inconvenient, form for the right-hand side may be deduced from the body of the proof.)

*Proof.* Let us denote by  $P_n(x)$  the pgf of  $X_n$ , and write

$$P_n(x) = F_n(x) \tilde{P}_n(x),$$

$x \in [0, 1]$ , where from [6],  $\tilde{P}_n(x) \equiv \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} B\{F_j(x)\}$ ,  $n \geq 1$ , denotes the pgf of the contribution to  $X_n$  resulting from immigration since generation 1. It is easily checked that

$$D_n \equiv E[X_n^{-1} | X_n > 0] = \int_0^1 \frac{P_n(x) - P_n(0)}{x\{1 - P_n(0)\}} dx,$$

so that we proceed to the estimation of the right-hand integral. We assume initially that  $q > 0$ , where  $q$  is the unique root in  $[0, 1)$  of the equation  $F(x) = x$ , and decompose the integral into components.

$$D_n = \int_0^q \frac{P_n(x) - P_n(0)}{x\{1 - P_n(0)\}} dx + \int_q^1 \frac{P_n(x) - P_n(0)}{x\{1 - P_n(0)\}} dx$$

$$= D_n(1) + D_n(2), \text{ say.}$$

To estimate the first integral we note that

$$D_n(1) = \{1 - P_n(0)\}^{-1} \int_0^q \left( \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} P(X_n = j)x^{j-1} \right) dx$$

$$= \{1 - P_n(0)\}^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^{-1}P(X_n = j)q^j$$

$$\leq \{1 - P_n(0)\}^{-1}P_n(q)$$

$$= \{1 - P_n(0)\}^{-1}q(B(q))^n$$

$$\leq C_1(B(q))^n \tag{12}$$

(since  $P_n(0) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ), where  $C_1$  is a positive constant.

To estimate  $D_n(2)$  we first note that

$$D_n(2) \leq C_2(1 - q)^{-1} \int_q^1 P_n(x) dx$$

where  $C_2$  is a constant. If we now make the change of variable  $x = q + (1 - q)y$ , we get

$$D_n(2) \leq C_2 \int_0^1 P_n(q + (1 - q)y) dy$$

$$\leq C_2 \int_0^1 \tilde{P}_n(q + (1 - q)y) dy.$$

Now, for  $j \geq 0$

$$B\{F_j(q + (1 - q)y)\} = B^*\{F_j^*(y)\}$$

where

$$B^*(y) = B(q + (1 - q)y) \quad \text{and} \quad F_j^*(y) = \frac{F_j(q + (1 - q)y) - q}{1 - q},$$

$F_j^*(y)$  being easily seen to be the  $j$ th functional iterate of  $F_1^*(y)$ , which is a pgf with mean  $m$ , and  $F_1^*(0) = 0$ . Thus, for  $n \geq 1$

$$\tilde{P}_n(q + (1 - q)y) \equiv \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} B^*\{F_j^*(y)\} = P_n^*(y),$$

say, where  $P_n^*(y)$  may itself be construed as the pgf of the  $n$ th generation of a *supercritical* Galton–Watson process with immigration, with offspring pgf  $F_1^*(y)$  and immigration pgf  $B^*(y)$ , and no initial ancestor. Thus

$$P_n^*(y) = P_k^*(y)P_{n-k}^*(F_k^*(y)) \tag{13}$$

for any integer  $k, 1 \leq k \leq n$ .

Let us note at this stage, for further use, that for any fixed  $y_0 \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$P_k^*(y_0) \leq \{B^*(y_0)\}^k \tag{14}$$

since in the present situation  $F_1^*(y_0) < y_0$ . Also, if we let  $H_n(y), y \in [0, 1]$ , denote the inverse function of  $F_n^*(y), y \in [0, 1]$ , then it is easily checked that  $H_n(y)$  is the  $n$ th functional iterate of  $H_1(y)$ , and that  $H_n(y_0) \uparrow 1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . In fact, since by the mean value theorem

$$1 - H_n(y_0) = H_1'(\xi_n)\{1 - H_{n-1}(y_0)\}$$

where  $H_{n-1}(y_0) < \xi_n < 1$ , and since  $H_1'(y) \downarrow m^{-1}$  as  $y \uparrow 1$ , it follows that for any fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$  satisfying  $m^{-1} + \varepsilon < 1$ , there exists a fixed  $r_0 \equiv r_0(y_0, \varepsilon)$  such that

$$1 - H_n(y_0) \leq (m^{-1} + \varepsilon)^n \{(m^{-1} + \varepsilon)^{-r_0}(1 - H_{r_0}(y_0))\}$$

for  $n \geq r_0$ .

Then

$$\begin{aligned} D_n(2) &\leq C_2 \int_0^1 P_n^*(y) dy \tag{15} \\ &= C_2 \left\{ \int_0^{H_k(y_0)} P_n^*(y) dy + \int_{H_k(y_0)}^1 P_n^*(y) dy \right\} \\ &\leq C_2 \{H_k(y_0)P_k^*(H_k(y_0))P_{n-k}^*(y_0) + 1 - H_k(y_0)\} \end{aligned}$$

providing  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , by dominating by the maximum value of the integrand in each case, and in the first part using (13);

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq C_2 \{P_{n-k}^*(y_0) + 1 - H_k(y_0)\} \\ &\leq C_2 \{(B^*(y_0))^{n-k} + 1 - H_k(y_0)\} \end{aligned}$$

on account of (14).

If we now choose  $k = [n/2]$  and choose  $n$  so large that  $[n/2] \geq r_0$ ,

$$\leq C_2 \{(B^*(y_0))^{n/2} + \rho(\varepsilon, y_0)(m^{-1} + \varepsilon)^{n/2}\} \tag{16}$$

where  $\rho > 0$  does not depend on  $n$ .

Since initially both  $y_0$  and  $\varepsilon$  could have been chosen as close to zero as desired and  $B^*(y_0) = B(q + (1 - q)y_0)$ , the assertion of the lemma follows from (12) and (16).



It remains only to estimate  $D_n \equiv D_n(2)$  when  $q = 0$ . We have then that  $P_n(x) = F_n(x)\tilde{P}_n(x) = F_n(x)P_n^*(x)$ , with  $P_n(0) = F_n(0) = 0, F_n(x) < x$ . Thus

$$D_n = \int_0^1 \frac{P_n(x)}{x} dx \tag{17}$$

$$\leq \int_0^1 P_n^*(x) dx$$

whence we may proceed as before from (15). ■

NOTES. (a) The technique for estimating the rate of geometric convergence was suggested by a method of A. V. Nagaev [5] in a similar situation in connection with the ordinary supercritical Galton–Watson process. (There appear to be some imprecise steps in his development.)

(b) The rate of convergence in (17) may also be estimated with the aid of the estimate in [3] for a similar ordinary supercritical Galton–Watson process.

(c) Other choices of  $k$ , for example,  $k = [\delta n]$ , for a  $\delta$  fixed in  $(0, 1)$ , would give similar results. The optimal choice of such  $k$ , giving optimal geometric rate at least within the context of the present proof, would appear to depend on the absolute sizes of the two values  $B(q), 1/m$ .

PROOF OF THEOREM 2. We first note that, by a standard moment inequality,

$$E(X_n^{-1/2} | X_n > 0) \leq E(X_n^{-1} | X_n > 0)^{1/2}.$$

The assertions of the theorem then follow from Lemmas 2 and 3 by putting  $\varepsilon_n = \gamma^{n/4}$ , in which case  $\delta = \gamma^{1/4}$ . ■

PROOF OF THEOREM 3. This follows exactly the pattern of that of [2]. There are two main points of difference for which some modification is required:

(i) that  $\sum_{n=1}^\infty P(A_{n+1} | X_n, \dots, X_1) = \infty$  a.s. when

$$A_n = \{X_n - mX_{n-1} > (1 - \delta)\sigma(2X_{n-1} \log(n - 1))^{1/2}\}$$

for any  $\delta, 0 < \delta < 1$ ;

(ii) that for any integer  $r > 1, \{X_{rn}\}, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , also describes a supercritical Galton–Watson process with immigration; and we shall confine ourselves to establishing the validity of these points.

(i) Using (4) we have, if  $X_n > 0$ ,

$$P(A_{n+1} | X_n, \dots, X_1) = P((Z_1^{(1)} - m) + \dots + (Z_1^{(X_n)} - m) + Y > (1 - \delta)\sigma(2X_n \log n)^{1/2} | X_n)$$

where  $Y$  has the immigration distribution, and the  $Z_1^{(i)}$  are independent

and identically distributed, each with the distribution of  $Z_1$ , and are independent of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  and  $Y$ ; and if  $X_n = 0$

$$P(A_{n+1}|X_n, \dots, X_1) = P(Y > 0).$$

In the former case

$$\begin{aligned} P((Z_1^{(1)} - m) + \dots + (Z_1^{(X_n)} - m) + Y > (1 - \delta)\sigma(2X_n \log n)^{1/2}|X_n) \\ \geq P((Z_1^{(1)} - m) + \dots + (Z_1^{(X_n)} - m) > (1 - \delta)\sigma(2X_n \log n)^{1/2}|X_n) \end{aligned}$$

since  $Y \geq 0$

$$\geq 1 - \Phi((1 - \delta)(2 \log n)^{1/2}) - CX_n^{-1/2}$$

using the Berry–Esseen bound. Now, with probability one,  $X_n > 0$  for  $n$  sufficiently large, since  $X_n \rightarrow \infty$  a.s. Hence the last inequality may be used to show divergence with probability one of  $\sum_1^\infty P(A_{n+1}|X_n, \dots, X_1)$  as in [2].

(ii) Consideration of the structure of the process reveals that indeed  $\{X_{nr}\}$ ,  $n \geq 0$ , may be considered as a branching process with immigration, the offspring distribution being  $F_r(x)$  and the immigration distribution  $\prod_{i=0}^{r-1} B\{F_i(x)\}$ . This last may also be easily confirmed from the fact that  $X_{nr}$  has the pgf  $P_{nr}(x)$  and from the fundamental recursion for the Galton–Watson process with immigration  $\{X_n\}$

$$P_{nr}(x) = B(x)P_{nr-1}(F(x))$$

whence, iterating back,

$$P_{nr}(x) = B(x)B(F(x)) \cdots B(F_{r-1}(x))P_{(n-1)r}(F_r(x)). \blacksquare$$

SUPPLEMENTARY REMARKS

The results given above have been proved under conditions that are convenient, but frequently more restrictive than necessary, and we now briefly note how these can be relaxed.

Reference to [7] in conjunction with [6] reveals that Theorem 1 remains valid if the condition  $0 < \lambda < \infty$  on the immigration distribution is replaced by the milder assumption that  $\sum_{j=1}^\infty b_j \log j < \infty$  with  $b_0 < 1$ .

In Theorems 2 and 3 the condition  $EZ_1^3 < \infty$  may be replaced by the weaker one that  $EZ_1^{2+\kappa} < \infty$  where  $0 < \kappa \leq 1$ , through the application of generalized forms of Berry–Esseen bounds. In passing we also note the Lemma 3 remains valid without any auxiliary moment conditions at all (even  $m = \infty$  is permissible). Finally, it may be possible to relax the condition  $0 < \lambda < \infty$ , which with the other conditions implies  $EI < \infty$  and  $EY_{r,1} < \infty$  in (9) and (10), and replace  $EI$  and  $EY_{r,1}$  by something correspondingly weaker. The reader wishing to pursue this interaction

may begin by consulting Lemma 2.2 of [9] in conjunction with the representation (9) of [6].

Finally, we note that it is not difficult to verify the validity of the second part of Theorem 1 even when  $m = 1$ , where  $\sigma_r^2 = \text{var } Z_r = r\sigma^2$ , since  $P(X_n = k | X_n > 0) \rightarrow 0, k = 1, 2, \dots$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  (see [8]).

*Note added in proof:* Subsequent research by C. C. Heyde and J. R. Leslie has revealed that versions of Theorems 2 and 3 hold subject to only the condition  $EZ_1^2 < \infty$  (to appear in *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc.*).

#### REFERENCES

- 1 C. C. Heyde, Some central limit analogues for supercritical Galton–Watson processes *J. Appl. Prob.* (to appear in 1971).
- 2 C. C. Heyde, Some almost sure convergence theorems for branching processes (submitted for publication).
- 3 C. C. Heyde and B. M. Brown, An invariance principle and some convergence rate results for branching processes (submitted for publication).
- 4 H. Kesten and B. P. Stigum, Limit theorems for decomposable multidimensional Galton–Watson processes. *J. Math. Anal. Applic.* **17**(1967), 309–338.
- 5 A. V. Nagaev, On the estimation of the mean number of direct descendants of a particle in a branching random process, *Teor. Veroyat. Primenen.* **12**(1967), 363–369 (in Russian).
- 6 E. Seneta, A note on the supercritical Galton–Watson process with immigration, *Math. Biosci.*, **6**(1970), 305–312.
- 7 E. Seneta, On the supercritical Galton–Watson process with immigration, *Math. Biosci.*, **7**(1970), 9–14.
- 8 E. Seneta, An explicit-limit theorem for the critical Galton–Watson process with immigration, *J. Roy. Statist. Soc.* **32**(1970), 149–152.
- 9 W. L. Smith, Remarks on renewal theory when quality of renewals varies, *Inst. Statist. Mimeo Ser.* **548**(1967) (Univ. of North Carolina).