

## **Branching Processes with Negative Offspring Distributions**

Ioana Dumitriu<sup>1</sup>, Joel Spencer<sup>2</sup>, and Catherine Yan<sup>3\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139  
USA  
dumitriu@math.mit.edu

<sup>2</sup>Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University, New York, NY 10012, USA  
spencer@cims.nyu.edu

<sup>3</sup>Department of Mathematics, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843, USA  
cyan@math.tamu.edu

Received January 3, 2003

*AMS Subject Classification:* 05A16, 05D40, 60J80

**Abstract.** A branching process is a mathematical description of the growth of a population for which the individual produces offsprings according to stochastic laws. Branching processes can be modeled by one-dimensional random walks with non-negative integral step-sizes. In this paper we consider the random walk with a similar algebraic setting but the step-size distribution is allowed to take negative values. We gave the exact formula for the limit probability under which the random walk continues forever. Asymptotic results are also presented.

*Keywords:* branching processes, negative offsprings

### **1. Introduction**

A branching process is a mathematical description of the growth of a population for which the individual produces offsprings according to stochastic laws. A typical process is of the following form. Considering a population of individuals developing from a single progenitor — the initial individual. The initial individual produces a random number of offsprings, each of them in turn produces a random number of offsprings; and so the process continues as long as there are live individuals in the population. An interesting question is to find the probability that the population survives, (or, extincts).

The branching process was proposed by Galton [5], and the probability of extinction was first obtained by Watson [17] by considering the probability generating function for the number of children in the  $n$ th generation. This mathematical model was known as

---

\* Research supported by NSF grants DMS-0070574 and a Sloan fellowship. Part of the research was done during the author's visit to Institute for Advanced Study.

the Galton-Watson branching process, and had been studied thoroughly in literature, for example, [2, 6, 7, 10]. Some interesting details on the early history of branching processes can be found in [9].

Another model for the branching processes was based on the interpretation of the random walk  $S_n - n$  and the branching processes in terms of queuing theory, which is due to Kendall [8]. Here  $S_n = Z_1 + Z_2 + \dots + Z_n$ , where  $Z_i$ 's are independent random variables with the identical distribution as the offsprings. In this model, the random family of a branching process is represented by a queue with a single server, with the service time for each customer being a unit period. The queue starts with one customer, corresponding to the initial individual in the branching process. Each individual in the random family represents a different customer, who arrives and waits for service in the queue. A customer  $j$  arrives during the service period of  $i$  if  $j$  is a child of  $i$ . Let  $Y_t$  be the number of customers in the queue at the end of the  $t$ -th service period. Then  $Y_0 = 1$ , and

$$Y_i = Y_{i-1} + Z_i - 1 \quad (i \geq 1),$$

where  $Z_i$  are independent random variables with the offspring distribution. Note that the total progeny is represented by the length of the first busy period of the server, i.e., smallest  $t$  such that  $Y_t = 0$ . The process continues forever iff  $Y_i > 0$  for all  $i$ .

By the above correspondence, the probabilities of extinction given by the Galton-Watson model and the random walk model are identical. Let  $Z$  be the offspring distribution. A basic fact about branching processes states that when  $E[Z] = c < 1$ , with probability 1 the process dies out; but when  $E[Z] = c > 1$ , there is a positive probability  $\alpha$  that the process will continue forever [4]. Let  $f(x)$  be the probability generating function for  $Z$ . In the case  $c > 1$ ,  $\alpha$  can be computed as  $1 - s$  where  $s$ , the probability of extinction, is the unique solution of  $s = f(s)$  in the interval  $[0, 1)$ . In particular, if the offspring distribution is Poisson with mean  $1 + \varepsilon$ , then the probability of survival is asymptotically  $2\varepsilon$  (c.f., [15]). An important condition in solving such probability in Galton-Watson branching processes is that the possible values of the offspring distribution  $Z$  are non-negative integers.

In this paper we consider a random walk with a similar algebraic setting as the ones corresponding to branching processes. However, the step-size distribution can take negative values. Explicitly, let  $Z$  be a probability distribution with non-negative integral values, and  $E[Z] = 1 - \varepsilon$ , where  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ . Define a random walk  $\mathbf{Y} = Y_0, Y_1, \dots$  by the following formula

$$\begin{cases} Y_0 = 1, \\ Y_i = Y_{i-1} + 1 - Z_i, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where  $Z_1, Z_2, \dots$  are independent random variables each with distribution  $Z$ . In particular, we consider the case where  $Z$  is distributed according to the Poisson law with mean  $1 - \varepsilon$ , denoted by  $Po(1 - \varepsilon)$ . Let  $T$  be the least  $t$  for which  $Y_t \leq 0$ . If no such  $t$  exists, we say that  $T = +\infty$ . Since the expected step-size  $E[1 - Z] = \varepsilon > 0$ , with probability approaching 1,  $Y_n > 0$  when  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . We will compute the probability that  $Y_n > 0$  for all  $n$ , or equivalently,  $\Pr[T = +\infty]$ , in which case we say the random walk  $\mathbf{Y}$  *escapes*. We also consider the asymptotics of  $\Pr[T > N]$ . Note that this problem is essentially different from the one defined by branching processes, since the values of

the step-size random variable  $1 - Z$  are mostly negative. Traditional methods (e.g., [4]) for Galton-Watson branching processes based on the existence of a functional equation for probability generating function are not easily applied.

In this paper we find the exact value of the escaping probability for the random walk  $\mathbf{Y}$ . We present two proofs. The first is a pure probabilistic one, based on the linearity of expectations. The second is more analytic, using a theorem of Otter and Dwass in branching processes, which is equivalent to the Lagrange inversion formula for formal power series. The second proof applies to more general offspring distributions  $Z$ , provided that both the expected value and variance of  $Z$  exist. It is also used to obtain asymptotics of  $\Pr[T > N]$ . With suitable assumptions on  $Z$ , we prove that  $\Pr[T = \infty | T > N]$  is asymptotically 1 if  $N \gg \varepsilon^{-2}$ , when  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ . We also give a formula that generalizes the Otter-Dwass theorem, and use it to prove that if  $Z = Po(1 - \varepsilon)$ , then  $N \gg \varepsilon^{-2}$  is both necessary and sufficient for  $\Pr[T = \infty | T > N] \sim 1$ .

Generalizations of the Galton-Watson branching processes have been studied in statistical literatures, for example, by Quine and Szczotka [12–14]. It is showed that some standard branching process results hold in more general settings, e.g., the offspring random variables are permitted to take negative integer values, and are not necessarily i.i.d. The statistical work concentrated on the stochastic process  $\{X_n, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ , where  $X_n$  represents the size of the  $n$ -th generation in a branching process. Our model is different from theirs. Firstly, we use a different scale. We consider the limit behavior of the random walk as the time evolves, which corresponds to the evolution of the size of a queueing system. There is no natural correspondence of *generation* in a queueing system. Secondly, we assume that the step-size random variables are i.i.d. with the distribution  $1 - Z$ , where  $Z$  is non-negative. These assumptions enable us to get exact solutions instead of general description. Thirdly, we take a different approach. Our proofs are more elementary, which combine the basic probability theory and combinatorial methods, and lead to applications in enumeration.

## 2. The Escaping Probability

**Theorem 2.1.** *Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$ . For the random walk  $\mathbf{Y}$  defined by the formula (1.1) with  $Z = Po(1 - \varepsilon)$ , the escaping probability  $\Pr[T = +\infty]$  is  $e^{1-\varepsilon}\varepsilon$ .*

### 2.1. The Probabilistic Proof

Let  $p_i = \Pr[Z = i]$  for  $i \geq 0$ . Considering a new random walk  $\mathbf{Y}'$  defined by the same recurrence as (1.1) except that the beginning position is zero, i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} Y'_0 = 0, \\ Y'_i = Y'_{i-1} + 1 - Z_i, \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where  $Z_1, Z_2, \dots$  are independent random variables with the same distribution  $Z$ . Let  $T'$  be the least  $t > 0$  for which  $Y'_t \leq 0$ . If no such  $t$  exists, we say that  $T' = +\infty$ . Denote by  $s'$  the escaping probability  $\Pr[T' = +\infty]$  of  $\mathbf{Y}'$ . It is clear that if  $s$  is the escaping probability of the original random walk  $\mathbf{Y}$ , then  $s' = p_0 s$  and hence  $s = s'/p_0$ .



If  $\tilde{T} < \infty$ , then  $T' < \infty$ . Conversely, we claim that if  $T' < \infty$ , then with probability one  $\tilde{T} < \infty$ . To prove the claim, first note that  $T' < \infty$  but  $\tilde{T} = \infty$  implies that there exists  $N > 0$  such that for all  $n \geq N$ ,  $Y'_n < 0$ . Let  $A_n$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  be the event that  $Y'_n < 0$ .  $Y'_n$  has the distribution  $n - S_n$  where  $S_n$  is distributed according to the Poisson law with mean  $n(1 - \varepsilon)$ . For the Poisson distribution, we have the following large deviation result (e.g., see [1, Appendix A.15]),

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $P$  have Poisson distribution with mean  $\mu$ . For  $\delta > 0$ , we have*

$$\Pr[P \leq \mu(1 - \delta)] \leq e^{-\delta^2 \mu / 2},$$

$$\Pr[P \geq \mu(1 + \delta)] \leq [c_\delta]^\mu,$$

where  $c_\delta = e^\delta(1 + \delta)^{-(1+\delta)} < 1$  is a constant depending only on  $\delta$ .

Using the lemma,  $\Pr[A_n] = \Pr[Y'_n < 0] = \Pr[S_n > n] \leq (c_\delta)^{n(1-\varepsilon)}$  where  $\delta = \varepsilon/(1 - \varepsilon)$ , and  $c_\delta$  is a constant in  $(0, 1)$ . It follows that  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Pr[A_n]$  converges. By Borel-Cantelli Lemma, with probability one  $Y'_n < 0$  is true only for finitely many  $n$ . This proves the claim. Therefore  $\Pr[\tilde{T} < \infty] = \Pr[T' < \infty] = q'$  and  $\Pr[W = k] = q'^k s'$ .

It follows that  $\Pr[W \geq k] = q'^k$ . Hence

$$E[W] = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Pr[W \geq k] = \frac{q'}{1 - q'} = \frac{1 - s'}{s'}.$$

On the other hand, by the linearity of the expectation,

$$E[W] = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} E[W_n] = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Pr[Y'_n = 0].$$

Again, note that  $Y'_n = n - S_n$ , where  $S_n$  has the Poisson distribution with mean  $n(1 - \varepsilon)$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} E[W] &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Pr[S_n = n] = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-(1-\varepsilon)n} (n - n\varepsilon)^n}{n!} \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{n^n}{n!} \left( (1 - \varepsilon) e^{-(1-\varepsilon)} \right)^n = t e^{-t} R'(t e^{-t}), \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

where  $t = 1 - \varepsilon$  and  $R(x) = \langle x e^{-x} \rangle^{-1}$  is the inverse function of  $y = x e^{-x}$ . (See, e.g., [16, Chap. 5.3].)

Let  $y = t e^{-t}$ . From  $R(t e^{-t}) = t$ , differentiating with respect to  $t$ , we have

$$R'(y)(e^{-t} - t e^{-t}) = 1,$$

that is,

$$R'(y) = \frac{e^t}{1 - t}.$$

Substituting into (2.2), we have

$$\frac{1 - s'}{s'} = E[W] = \frac{t}{1 - t} = \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{\varepsilon}.$$

Therefore  $s' = \varepsilon$  and  $s = \varepsilon/p_0 = e^{1-\varepsilon}\varepsilon$ . ■

*Remark.* Theorem 2.1 asserts that the escaping probability  $s'$  is  $\varepsilon$  for the random walk  $\mathbf{Y}'$ . Such a clean answer deserves an easy explanation. The following is an intuitive one:

In the infinite random walk  $\mathbf{Y}'$ , for any  $i > 0$ , let  $W_i$  be the number of  $t$  such that  $Y'_t = i$ . For a fixed  $i$ , almost surely the random walk will hit the line  $y = i$ , i.e.,  $\Pr[W_i \geq 1] = 1$ . For any  $k > 1$ , similar to the argument in the preceding proof, we have  $\Pr[W_i = k] = q^{k-1}s'$ , and  $\Pr[W_i \geq k] = q^{k-1}$ . Therefore  $E[W_i] = 1 + q + q^2 + \dots = 1/s'$ , consequently  $E[W_1 + W_2 + \dots + W_{N\varepsilon}] = N\varepsilon/s'$ .

On the other hand,

$$E[W_1 + W_2 + \dots + W_{N\varepsilon}] = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \Pr[1 \leq Y'_j \leq N\varepsilon],$$

where  $Y'_j$  has distribution  $j - S_j$ ,  $S_j = Z_1 + Z_2 + \dots + Z_j \sim Po(j(1 - \varepsilon))$ .

Using Lemma 2.2, for  $\sqrt{N} < j < N - K\sqrt{N}$ , ( $K \gg 1$ ), we have

$$\Pr[Y'_j > N\varepsilon] = \Pr[S_j < j - N\varepsilon] \leq e^{-\frac{1}{2} \frac{\varepsilon^2(N-j)^2}{j(1-\varepsilon)}} \leq e^{-\frac{1}{2} \frac{\varepsilon^2}{(1-\varepsilon)} \frac{K^2}{(1-K/\sqrt{N})}},$$

$$\Pr[Y'_j \leq 0] = \Pr[S_j - j \geq 0] \leq (c_\varepsilon)^j,$$

where  $c_\varepsilon < 1$  is a constant. Taking  $K = N^{1/3}$ , we have

$$\sum_{j=\sqrt{N}}^{N-N^{5/6}} \Pr[1 \leq Y'_j \leq N\varepsilon] \sim N(1 + o(1)).$$

While for  $j > N + K\sqrt{N}$ ,  $K = N^{1/3}$ , we have

$$\Pr[1 \leq Y'_j \leq N\varepsilon] \leq \Pr[Y'_j \leq N\varepsilon] = \Pr[S_j - j(1 - \varepsilon) \geq (j - N)\varepsilon] \leq (c_\delta)^{j(1-\varepsilon)},$$

where  $\delta = \frac{\varepsilon}{(1-\varepsilon)} \frac{j-N}{j}$ . From Lemma 2.2,  $c_\delta$  is decreasing as  $\delta$  increases, and  $c_\delta \sim e^{-\delta^2/2}$  for  $\delta$  small. So

$$c_\delta \leq c_{\varepsilon/(1-\varepsilon)N^{-1/6}} \sim e^{-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2(1-\varepsilon)^2}N^{-1/3}}.$$

Thus  $\Pr[1 \leq Y'_j \leq N\varepsilon] \leq \left( e^{-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2(1-\varepsilon)}N^{-1/3}} \right)^j$  and

$$\sum_{j=N+N^{5/6}} \Pr[1 \leq Y'_j \leq N\varepsilon] = O\left( e^{-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2(1-\varepsilon)}N^{1/3}} \right) = o(1).$$

Therefore

$$E[W_1 + W_2 + \dots + W_{N\varepsilon}] = N(1 + o(1)) + O(N^{1/2}) + O(N^{5/6}) + o(1) = N(1 + o(1)).$$

Comparing the two expressions for  $E[W_1 + W_2 + \dots + W_{N\varepsilon}]$ , we have  $N\varepsilon/s' \sim N$  when  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . This implies that the escaping probability  $s'$  equals  $\varepsilon$ .

## 2.2. The Analytic Proof

We compute the probability  $\Pr[T > N]$  directly, using the Otter-Dwass theorem in the theory of branching processes. This proof applies to all integral distributions  $Z$ , provided that  $E(Z)$  and  $\text{var}(Z)$  exist.

In a branching process with offspring distribution  $Z$ , let  $\#F_k$  be the total progeny in the process with  $k$  individuals to start with. The following theorem presents a remarkable formula for the distribution of  $\#F_k$  restricted to positive integers. This formula was discovered by Otter [11] for  $k = 1$ , and extended to all  $k \geq 1$  by Dwass [3].

**Theorem 2.3 (Otter and Dwass).** *For all  $n, k = 1, 2, \dots$ , we have*

$$\Pr[\#F_k = n] = \frac{k}{n} \Pr[S_n = n - k], \quad (2.3)$$

where  $S_n = Z_1 + Z_2 + \dots + Z_n$ .

To prove Theorem 2.1, as in the first proof, we consider the random walk  $\mathbf{Y}'$  defined by

$$Y'_0 = 0, \quad Y'_i = Y'_{i-1} + 1 - Z_i,$$

where  $Z_i$  are independent with distribution  $Z$ ,  $E(Z) = 1 - \varepsilon > 0$ , and  $\text{var}(Z) = \sigma$ . Again let  $T'$  be the least  $t > 0$  such that  $Y'_t \leq 0$ .

**Lemma 2.4.** *For  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , we have*

$$\Pr[T' > n, Y'_n = k] = \frac{k}{n} \Pr[S_n = n - k].$$

*Proof.* For any walk  $\{Y'_0, Y'_1, Y'_2, \dots, Y'_n\}$  satisfying  $Y'_0 = 0, Y'_i > 0$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$  and  $Y'_n = k$ , define the *reversed* walk  $\mathbf{X} = \{X_0, X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  as follows:  $X_0 = k, X_i = Y'_{n-i}$ . Then  $X_i = Y'_{n-i} = Y'_{n-i-1} + 1 - Z_{n-i} = X_{i+1} + 1 - Z_{n-i}$ . That is,  $\mathbf{X}$  satisfies the recurrence  $X_0 = k, X_{i+1} = X_i + Z_i - 1$  where  $Z_i$  are independent random variables with the identical distribution  $Z$ . In other words,  $\{X_0, X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  is a random walk corresponding to the Galton-Watson branching process with the offspring distribution  $Z$  and  $k$  individuals at the zero generation. The conditions  $Y'_0 = 0, Y'_i > 0$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$  imply that  $X_i > 0$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ , and  $X_n = 0$ . So this corresponds to the case that the total progeny in the branching process is exactly  $n$ , which happens with probability  $\Pr[\#F_k = n]$ . Now the lemma follows immediately from Otter-Dwass theorem. ■

*Proof of Theorem 2.1.* For the random walk  $\mathbf{Y}'$ ,  $T' > n$  means  $Y'_1 = 1$  (i.e.,  $Z_1 = 0$ ). Hence for the random walk  $\mathbf{Y}$ ,  $p_0 \Pr[T > n, Y_n = k] = \Pr[T' > n+1, Y'_{n+1} = k]$ , where  $p_0 = \Pr[Z = 0]$ . Therefore

$$\Pr[T > n, Y_n = k] = \frac{1}{p_0} \frac{k}{(n+1)} \Pr[S_{n+1} = n+1 - k], \quad (2.4)$$

and

$$\Pr[T > n] = \frac{1}{p_0} \frac{1}{(n+1)} \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} k \Pr[S_{n+1} = n+1 - k]. \quad (2.5)$$

We evaluate the sum in Equation (2.5).

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} k \Pr[S_{n+1} = n+1-k] \\
&= \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{k=0}^n (n+1-k) \Pr[S_{n+1} = k] \\
&= \frac{1}{n+1} (n+1) \Pr[S_{n+1} \leq n] - \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{k=0}^n k \Pr[S_{n+1} = k] \\
&= \Pr[S_{n+1} \leq n] - \frac{1}{n+1} \left( E[S_{n+1}] - \sum_{k>n} k \Pr[S_{n+1} = k] \right) \\
&= 1 - \Pr[S_{n+1} \geq n+1] - (1-\varepsilon) + \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{k>n} k \Pr[S_{n+1} = k] \\
&= \varepsilon - \Pr[S_{n+1} \geq n+1] + \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{k>n} k \Pr[S_{n+1} = k].
\end{aligned}$$

Note that  $E[S_{n+1}] = (n+1)(1-\varepsilon)$ , and  $\text{var}(S_{n+1}) = (n+1)\sigma$ . By Chebyshev's inequality,

$$\Pr[S_{n+1} \geq n+1] = \Pr[S_{n+1} - (n+1)(1-\varepsilon) \geq (n+1)\varepsilon] \leq \frac{\sigma}{(n+1)\varepsilon^2} = o(1),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{k>n} k \Pr[S_{n+1} = k] &= \Pr[S_{n+1} \geq n+1] + \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{k>n+1} \Pr[S_{n+1} \geq k] \\
&\leq \frac{\sigma}{(n+1)\varepsilon^2} + \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \frac{(n+1)\sigma}{((n+1)\varepsilon+t)^2} \\
&\sim \frac{\sigma}{(n+1)\varepsilon^2} + \sigma \int_1^{\infty} \frac{1}{((n+1)\varepsilon+t)^2} dt \\
&= O(n^{-1}) = o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\Pr(T = \infty) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(T > n) = \varepsilon/p_0.$$

For the case that  $Z$  is the Poisson distribution with mean  $1-\varepsilon$ ,  $p_0 = e^{-(1-\varepsilon)}$ , and hence  $\Pr[T = \infty] = e^{1-\varepsilon}\varepsilon$ .  $\blacksquare$

Let  $p_i = \Pr[Z = i]$ . In the random walk  $\mathbf{Y}$ , for  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , we have

$$\Pr[T > n, Y_n = k] = \sum_{(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)} \prod_{i=1}^n p_{z_i},$$

where  $(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)$  are non-negative integers so that  $Y_i > 0$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ , and  $Y_n = k$ . In terms of  $z_i$ , these conditions are equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} z_1 &\leq 1, \\ z_1 + z_2 &\leq 2, \\ &\dots \leq \dots \\ z_1 + z_2 + \dots + z_{n-1} &\leq n-1, \\ z_1 + z_2 + \dots + z_n &= n+1-k. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

When  $Z$  has the Poisson distribution with mean  $\mu$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[T > n, Y_n = k] &= \sum_{(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)} \prod_{i=1}^n e^{-\mu} \frac{\mu^{z_i}}{z_i!} = \sum_{(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)} e^{-\mu n} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\mu^{z_i}}{z_i!} \\ &= e^{-\mu n} \frac{\mu^{n+1-k}}{(n+1-k)!} \sum_{(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)} \binom{n+1-k}{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

where  $(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)$  satisfies the condition (2.6). By Equation (2.4),

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[T > n, Y_n = k] &= e^\mu \frac{k}{n+1} \Pr[S_{n+1} = n+1-k] \\ &= e^\mu \frac{k}{n+1} e^{-(n+1)\mu} \frac{((n+1)\mu)^{n+1-k}}{(n+1-k)!}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

Combining (2.7) and (2.8), we get

$$\sum_{(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)} \binom{n+1-k}{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n} = k(n+1)^{n-k}, \tag{2.9}$$

where  $(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)$  satisfies condition (2.6).

The sum in the left-hand side of Equation (2.9) has the following combinatorial interpretation. Put balls  $B_1, B_2, \dots, B_{n+1-k}$  into  $n$  different boxes. The sum counts the number of ways one can do it so that the number of balls in the first  $i$  boxes does not exceed  $i$ , for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . Hence, we have

**Corollary 2.5.** *Let  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . The number of ways to put  $n+1-k$  distinct balls into  $n$  distinct boxes, so that the number of balls in the first  $i$  boxes does not exceed  $i$ , for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , is  $k(n+1)^{n-k}$ .*

### 3. The Asymptotic Formula

In this section we consider the asymptotics of the escaping probability of  $\mathbf{Y}$  when  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ . Using the Otter-Dwass theorem and Lemma 2.4, we estimate the escaping

probability after a finite number of steps. More precisely, let  $Z^{(\varepsilon)}$  be a family of non-negative integral random variables such that as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ ,  $\Pr[Z^{(\varepsilon)} = 0] \rightarrow p_0 \in (0, 1)$ ,  $E[Z^{(\varepsilon)}] = 1 - c\varepsilon + o(\varepsilon)$  for some positive constant  $c$ . Further we assume a uniform bound  $M$  such that  $\text{var}(Z^{(\varepsilon)}) \leq M$  for all positive  $\varepsilon$  in some neighborhood of the origin. Under these conditions,

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let the random walk  $\mathbf{Y}^{(\varepsilon)}$  be defined by*

$$Y_0^{(\varepsilon)} = 1, \quad Y_i^{(\varepsilon)} = Y_{i-1}^{(\varepsilon)} + 1 - Z_i^{(\varepsilon)},$$

where  $Z_i^{(\varepsilon)}$  are independent random variables with identical distribution  $Z^{(\varepsilon)}$ . Set  $S_n^{(\varepsilon)} = Z_1^{(\varepsilon)} + Z_2^{(\varepsilon)} + \dots + Z_n^{(\varepsilon)}$ , and  $T^{(\varepsilon)}$  the least  $t$  such that  $Y_t^{(\varepsilon)} = 0$ . Then  $\Pr[T^{(\varepsilon)} > N] \sim c\varepsilon/p_0$  if  $N \gg \varepsilon^{-2}$ .

*Proof.* From the analytic proof of Theorem 2.1, we have

$$\Pr[Z^{(\varepsilon)} = 0] \Pr[T^{(\varepsilon)} > N] = 1 - E[Z^{(\varepsilon)}] + \frac{1}{N+1} \sum_{k>N+1} \Pr[S_{N+1}^{(\varepsilon)} \geq k].$$

Let  $K = N\varepsilon^2$ . If  $N \gg \varepsilon^{-2}$ , then  $K \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ . By Chebyshev's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N+1} \sum_{k>N+1} \Pr[S_{N+1}^{(\varepsilon)} \geq k] &\leq \frac{1}{N+1} \sum_{t \geq 1} \frac{(N+1)\text{var}(Z^{(\varepsilon)})}{((N+1)(1 - E[Z^{(\varepsilon)}]) + t)^2} \\ &\leq \frac{M}{N(1 - E[Z^{(\varepsilon)}])} = \frac{M\varepsilon}{K(c + o(1))} = o(\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\frac{\Pr[T^{(\varepsilon)} > N]}{\varepsilon} = \frac{c + o(1)}{p_0 + o(1)} \rightarrow \frac{c}{p_0}. \quad \blacksquare$$

*Remark.* A typical example is given by  $Z^{(\varepsilon)} = Po(1 - \varepsilon)$ , in which case  $\Pr[Z^{(\varepsilon)} = 0] = e^{-(1-\varepsilon)} \rightarrow e^{-1}$ ,  $E[Z^{(\varepsilon)}] = 1 - \varepsilon$ , and  $\text{var}(Z^{(\varepsilon)}) = 1 - \varepsilon \leq 1$  for  $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$ . Taking, for example,  $N = \varepsilon^{-2} \ln \ln \varepsilon^{-1}$  we have  $\Pr[T^{(\varepsilon)} > N] \sim e\varepsilon$ .

As an extension to the Otter-Dwass theorem, we have the following formula for the random walk  $\mathbf{Y}$ .

**Theorem 3.2.** *In the random walk  $\mathbf{Y}$  with any offspring distribution  $Z$ ,*

$$\Pr[T = n, Y_n = 0] = \frac{1}{n} \Pr[S_n = n + 1].$$

*Proof.* Note that

$$\Pr[T = n, Y_n = 0] = \sum_{(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)} \prod_{i=1}^n p_{z_i},$$

where  $z_i$  are non-negative integers such that  $Y_i \geq 1$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ , and  $Y_n = 0$ . Equivalently,  $z_i$  satisfies the condition

$$\begin{aligned} z_1 &\leq 1 \\ z_1 + z_2 &\leq 2, \\ &\dots \leq \dots \\ z_1 + z_2 + \dots + z_{n-1} &\leq n-1, \\ z_1 + z_2 + \dots + z_n &= n+1. \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Also note

$$\Pr[S_n = n+1] = \sum_{(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)} \prod_{i=1}^n p_{z_i},$$

where  $z_i$  are non-negative integers with  $z_1 + \dots + z_n = n+1$ . Hence it is sufficient to show that for any sequence of non-negative integers  $\alpha = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$  with  $a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_n = n+1$ , there is exactly one cyclic shift  $\alpha_i = (a_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n, a_1, \dots, a_{i-1})$  satisfying condition (3.1). The proof is contained in the following two claims.

*Claim 1.* For any sequence  $\alpha$ , there is at most one cyclic shift of  $\alpha$  satisfying condition (3.1).

Prove by contradiction. Assume both  $\alpha = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$  and  $\alpha_i = (a_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n, a_1, \dots, a_{i-1})$  satisfy condition (3.1), where  $i$  is an index between 2 and  $n$ . Then  $a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_{i-1} \leq i-1$ , and  $a_i + \dots + a_n \leq n-i$ . Hence  $a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_n \leq n$ , contradicting the fact that  $a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_n = n+1$ . Note that Claim 1 also implies that all the conjugates of  $\alpha$  are distinct.

*Claim 2.* For any sequence  $\alpha = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$  of non-negative integers, there exists a cyclic shift  $\alpha_i$  satisfying condition (3.1).

Let  $x_i = i - (a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_i)$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ . If all  $x_i \geq 0$ , then  $\alpha$  satisfies condition (3.1). Otherwise, let  $x = \min\{x_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ . Then  $x < 0$ . Find the smallest index  $i$  such that  $x_i = x$ . We prove that the cyclic shift  $\alpha_{i+1} = (a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n, a_1, \dots, a_i)$  satisfies (3.1). Denote  $\alpha_{i+1}$  by  $(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)$ .

1. For  $1 \leq k \leq n-1-i$ ,  $b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_k = a_{i+1} + a_{i+2} + \dots + a_{k+i}$ . Since

$$\begin{aligned} (k+i) - (a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_{k+i}) &= x_{k+i} \geq x_i = i - (a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_i), \\ b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_k &\leq k. \end{aligned}$$

2. For  $k = n-i$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_k &= a_{i+1} + a_{i+2} + \dots + a_n = (n+1) - (a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_i) \\ &= n+1 - (i-x) \leq n-i, \end{aligned}$$

as  $x < 0$ .

3. For  $n - i < k < n$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} b_1 + b_2 + \cdots + b_k &= a_{i+1} + \cdots + a_n + a_1 + \cdots + a_{k-(n-i)} \\ &= n + 1 - (i - x) + a_1 + \cdots + a_{k-(n-i)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $k - (n - i) - (a_1 + \cdots + a_{k-(n-i)}) \geq x + 1$ , we have

$$b_1 + b_2 + \cdots + b_k \leq n + 1 - i + x + k - (n - i) - (x + 1) = k.$$

This finishes the proof. ■

Using Theorem 3.2, we have the following result for  $Z = Po(1 - \varepsilon)$ .

**Theorem 3.3.** *In the random walk  $\mathbf{Y}$  with  $Z = Po(1 - \varepsilon)$ ,*

$$\Pr[T > N] \sim e\varepsilon \quad \text{iff} \quad N \gg \varepsilon^{-2}.$$

Or equivalently,

$$\Pr[T = \infty | T > N] \sim 1 \quad \text{iff} \quad N \gg \varepsilon^{-2}.$$

*Proof.* The sufficient part is proved in Theorem 3.1. For the necessary part, we need to show

$$\text{If } \sum_{i=N}^{\infty} \Pr[T = i] = o(\varepsilon), \quad \text{then } N \gg \varepsilon^{-2},$$

where the summation does not contain the term  $\Pr[T = +\infty]$ . We show this by finding a lower bounds for  $\sum_{i=N}^{\infty} \Pr[T = i]$ . Note that when  $Z = Po(1 - \varepsilon)$ ,  $S_N$  has the distribution  $Po(N(1 - \varepsilon))$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[T = N] &\geq \Pr[T = N, Y_N = 0] = \frac{1}{N} \Pr[S_N = N + 1] \\ &= \frac{e^{-tN} t^{N+1} N^N}{(N+1)!} \sim \frac{t}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{(te^\varepsilon)^N}{(N+1)^{3/2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $t = 1 - \varepsilon$ . Note that  $te^\varepsilon \sim 1 - \varepsilon^{-2}/2$ . So if  $N = C\varepsilon^{-2}$  for a constant  $C$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=N}^{\infty} \Pr[T = i] &\geq \frac{t}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sum_{i=N}^{\infty} \frac{(te^\varepsilon)^i}{(i+1)^{3/2}} \\ &\geq \frac{t}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sum_{i=N}^{2N} \frac{(te^\varepsilon)^i}{(i+1)^{3/2}} \\ &\geq \frac{t}{\sqrt{2\pi}} (te^\varepsilon)^{2N} \sum_{i=N}^{2N} (i+1)^{-3/2} \\ &\sim \frac{2t}{\sqrt{2\pi C}} e^{-C} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right) \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

That is, if  $N = C\varepsilon^{-2}$ , then

$$\sum_{i=N}^{\infty} \Pr[T = i] > C_1 \cdot \varepsilon,$$

for a constant  $C_1 > 0$ . This proves that for  $\sum_{i=N}^{\infty} \Pr(T = i) = o(\varepsilon)$ , it is necessary that  $N \gg \varepsilon^{-2}$ . ■

## References

1. N. Alon and J. Spencer, *The Probabilistic Method*, 2nd Edition, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2000.
2. K.B. Athreya and P. Ney, *Branching Processes*, Springer-Verlag, 1972.
3. M. Dwass, The total progeny in a branching process, *J. Appl. Probab.* **6** (1969) 682–686.
4. W. Feller, *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 3rd Edition, 1970.
5. F. Galton, Problem 4001, *Educational Times* **1** April (1873) p. 17.
6. T.E. Harris, *The Theory of Branching Processes*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1963.
7. P. Jagers, *Branching Processes with Biological Applications*, Wiley, 1975.
8. D.G. Kendall, Some problems in the theory of queue, *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B* **13** (1951) 151–185.
9. D.G. Kendall, Branching processes since 1873, *J. London Math. Soc.* **41** (1966) 385–406.
10. C.J. Mode, *Multitype Branching Processes, Theory and Applications*, American Elsevier, New York, 1971.
11. R. Otter, The multiplicative process, *Ann. Math. Statist.* **20** (1949) 206–224.
12. M.P. Quine and W. Szczotka, Generalizations of the Bienayme-Galton-Watson branching process via its representation as an embedded random walk, *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **4** (4) (1994) 1206–1222.
13. M.P. Quine and W. Szczotka, Asymptotic normality of processes with a branching structure, *Comm. Statist. Stochastic Models* **14** (4) (1998) 833–848.
14. M.P. Quine and W. Szczotka, Existence and positivity of the limit in processes with a branching structure, *J. Appl. Probab.* **36** (1) (1999) 132–138.
15. J. Spencer and C.H. Yan, An enumeration problem and branching processes, preprint.
16. R. Stanley, *Enumerative Combinatorics*, Vol. 2, Cambridge University Press, 1999.
17. H.W. Watson, Solution to problem 4001, *Educational Times* **1** August (1873) 115–116.
18. C.H. Yan, On the enumeration of generalized parking functions, *Congr. Numer.* **147** (2000) 201–209.