

A moment approach to the law of large numbers for supercritical branching Markov processes

Christopher B. C. Dean*

János Engländer†

Emma Horton*

Abstract

We offer a new proof of the classical law of large numbers for a general class of branching Markov processes based on the asymptotic behaviour of the moments developed in [10, 11]. Moreover, we show that the law of the limiting random variable, that is the almost sure limit of the classical additive martingale, is completely determined by its moments.

Keywords: Branching Markov process, moments, law of large numbers.

MSC 2020: 60J80, 60J68, 60F05.

1 Introduction

Understanding the asymptotic behaviour of moments has been a central topic of interest in the study of branching processes [10, 7, 18, 4, 1, 5]. Moment asymptotics provide a powerful tool for analysing these processes, often revealing information about genealogical structure [9, 13], scaling limits [8], and long-term dynamics [14, 16, 21]. The focus of this article is to show that moment asymptotics can be used to obtain a classical law of large numbers (LLN) for a general class of branching Markov processes. Moreover, we show that the limiting random variable is completely determined by its moments.

Similar to moment asymptotics, LLNs have been well studied for branching particle systems, [6, 15, 20] with the proofs often utilising spine decompositions and martingale convergence techniques. In this paper, we present an alternative approach that exploits the moment asymptotics developed in [10].

Before we introduce the class of processes which we will work with, let us introduce some general notation. Throughout, we let E be a Polish space and $\dagger \notin E$ a cemetery (absorbing) point. We let $B(E)$ denote the space of real-valued bounded functions, $B^+(E)$ denote the space of non-negative real bounded functions and $B_1(E)$, (resp. $B_1^+(E)$) denote those functions in $B(E)$, (resp. $B^+(E)$) that are bounded by unity. We extend the definition of $f \in B(E)$ to $E \cup \{\dagger\}$ by setting $f(\dagger) = 0$.

We let $M(E)$ denote the space of atomic measure with non-negative integer total mass on E . For a measure μ and a function $f \in B(E)$, we write

$$\mu[f] := \int_E f(x) \mu(dx).$$

In the event that μ has a density with respect to Lebesgue measure, say ν , we slightly abuse notation and write $\nu[f] = \int_E f(x) \nu(x) dx$.

*Department of Statistics, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, UK. Email: {Christopher.B.C.Dean}, {Emma.Horton}@warwick.ac.uk

†Department of Mathematics, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309, USA. Email: janos.englander@colorado.edu

1.1 Branching Markov processes

We consider a measure-valued stochastic process $X = (X_t, t \geq 0)$ given by

$$X_t := \sum_{i=1}^{N_t} \delta_{x_i(t)}, \quad t \geq 0,$$

whose atoms $\{x_i(t) : i = 1, \dots, N_t\}$ evolve in $E \cup \{\dagger\}$ according to the following dynamics. From an initial position $x \in E$, particles evolve independently in E according to a Markov process ξ with semigroup $(\mathbf{P}_t)_{t \geq 0}$. When at $y \in E$, particles branch at rate $\gamma(y)$, where $\gamma \in B^+(E)$, at which point the particle gives birth according to the point process $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{P}_y)$, where

$$\mathcal{Z} = \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{x_i}.$$

We will also often use the notation \mathcal{E}_y for the expectation associated to \mathcal{P}_y . We also let \mathbb{P}_μ denote the law of X when initiated from $\mu \in M(E)$ and we write \mathbb{E}_μ for the associated expectation operator.

The process X is uniquely characterised via the non-linear semigroup

$$e^{-\mathbf{v}_t[f](x)} := \mathbb{E}_{\delta_x}[e^{-X_t[f]}], \quad f \in B^+(E), t \geq 0, x \in E,$$

which satisfies the evolution equation

$$e^{-\mathbf{v}_t[f](x)} = \mathbf{P}_t[e^{-f}](x) + \int_0^t \mathbf{P}_s[\mathbf{G}[e^{-\mathbf{v}_{t-s}[f]}]](x) ds.$$

Here

$$\mathbf{G}[f](x) := \gamma(x) \mathcal{E}_x \left[\prod_{i=1}^N f(x_i) - f(x) \right],$$

is the (non-linear) branching mechanism. We refer to X as a (\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{G}) -branching Markov process (BMP).

1.2 Assumptions and main result

One object that is central to understanding the asymptotic behaviour of branching Markov processes, X , is its linear expectation semigroup,

$$\psi_t[f](x) := \mathbb{E}_{\delta_x}[X_t[f]], \quad t \geq 0, x \in E, f \in B(E). \quad (1.1)$$

Indeed, it is common that the semigroup ψ exhibits the following Perron Frobenius-type behaviour.

(H1) There exists $\lambda > 0$, a bounded function $\varphi \in B(E)$ and a probability measure with density $\tilde{\varphi}$ on E , such that, $\tilde{\varphi}[\varphi] = 1$,

$$\psi_t[\varphi](x) = e^{\lambda t} \varphi(x), \quad \tilde{\varphi}[\psi_t[f]] = \tilde{\varphi}[f],$$

and

$$\sup_{x \in E, f \in B_1(E)} |e^{-\lambda t} \varphi(x)^{-1} \psi_t[f](x) - \tilde{\varphi}[f]| \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

Here λ describes the leading order growth rate of the number of particles in the system and, in particular, assumes that the system is *supercritical*; $\tilde{\varphi}$ describes the stationary behaviour of the particles in the system; φ can be thought of as an importance function that indicates how favourable each $x \in E$ is for survival of the process when initiated from x .

We also introduce an assumption on the moments of the offspring distribution that will not be used in our main result but is necessary in order to present existing results.

(H2k) Fix $k \geq 1$. We assume that

$$\sup_{x \in E} \mathcal{E}_x[\mathcal{Z}[1]^k] < \infty.$$

This above assumption, along with the assumption on the branching rate, ensures that the k -th moment of the process is bounded, uniformly in x . Moreover, defining $\psi_t^{(k)}[f](x) := \mathbb{E}_{\delta_x}[X_t[f]^k]$, $t \geq 0$, $f \in B(E)$ and $x \in E$, the following result was obtained in [10, 11].

Theorem. [10, 11, Theorem 2] Fix $k \geq 2$ and assume that (H1) and (H2k) hold. For $\ell \leq k$ and $t \geq 0$, define

$$\Delta_t^{(\ell)} = \sup_{x \in E, f \in B_1^+(E)} \left| e^{-\ell \lambda t} \psi_t^{(\ell)}[f](x) - \ell! (\tilde{\varphi}[f])^\ell \varphi(x) L_\ell(x) \right|, \quad (1.2)$$

where, $L_1(x) = 1$ and we define iteratively for $k \geq 2$,

$$L_k(x) = \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda k s} \varphi(x)^{-1} \psi_s \left[\gamma \mathcal{E} \left[\sum_{[k_1, \dots, k_N]_k^2} \prod_{j=1}^N \varphi(x_j) L_{k_j}(x_j) \right] \right] (x) ds,$$

with $[k_1, \dots, k_N]_k^2$ denoting the set of all non-negative N -tuples (k_1, \dots, k_N) such that $\sum_{i=1}^N k_i = k$ and at least two of the k_i are strictly positive. Then, for all $\ell \leq k$

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \Delta_t^{(\ell)} < \infty \text{ and } \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Delta_t^{(\ell)} = 0. \quad (1.3)$$

Results of this kind have been extensively used in the subsequent study of non-local branching processes including to establish the classical Yaglom limit in the critical case [14, 16], characterise their genealogical structure [1, 9] and understand their scaling limits [8]. Our main result shows how they can be used to offer an alternative proof for well-known law of large numbers. Moreover, our proof enables one to characterise the limiting random variable in terms of its moments.

Theorem 1.1. Assume that (H1) holds and further assume that

$$\sup_{x \in E} \mathcal{E}_x[2^N] < \infty. \quad (1.4)$$

Then, for any $x \in E$ and $f \in B^+(E)$, we have that

$$e^{-\lambda t} X_t[f] \xrightarrow{d} W_x \tilde{\varphi}[f], \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty,$$

under \mathbb{P}_{δ_x} , where W_x is the almost sure limit of $e^{-\lambda t} X_t[\varphi]$. Moreover, W_x^k is determined by its moments which satisfy, for each $k \geq 2$, $\mathbb{E}[W_x^k] = k! \varphi(x) L_k(x)$.

Remark 1.2. Note that this result implies that $e^{-\lambda t} X_t(dy) \rightarrow W_x \tilde{\varphi}(dy)$ in law, as $t \rightarrow \infty$, which follows from the fact that the theorem holds for all non-negative, bounded and continuous functions f .

We also obtain the following corollary by combining [10, 11, Theorem 5] with the above result.

Corollary 1.3. Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, for any $x \in E$ and $f \in B^+(E)$, we have

$$e^{-\lambda t} \int_0^t X_s[f] ds \xrightarrow{d} W_x \tilde{\varphi}[f], \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

The main contribution of Theorem 1.1 is the fact that the law of W_x can be completely characterised by its moments. This is notable since these moments have explicit form as stated in (1.2). Moreover, Theorem 1.1 can be generalised to hold under a weaker version of (H1) that assumes the leading eigenvalue is non-simple. In this setting, $\varphi, \tilde{\varphi}$ are replaced, respectively, by a collection of bounded eigenfunctions $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n \in B(E)$ and bounded functionals $\tilde{\varphi}_1, \dots, \tilde{\varphi}_n : B(E) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, such that

$$\sup_{x \in E, f \in B_1(E)} \left| e^{-\lambda t} \psi_t[f](x) - \sum_{i=1}^k \tilde{\varphi}_i[f] \varphi_i(x) \right| \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

Again, the moments of W_x are given explicitly (see [3]). Furthermore, this setting appears in many non-trivial cases (see [3] for examples).

We also briefly comment on the moment assumption (1.4). While this assumption is quite strong, it is satisfied in several natural examples including growth-fragmentation processes with binary splitting [2], neutron transport [15].

In the next section we discuss some preliminary results, including the so-called Stieltjes moment problem and some basic theory on the convergence of random measures. Then we present the proof of Theorem 1.1.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Moment convergence and the Stieltjes moment problem

Recall that in the “Stieltjes moment problem” one considers non-negative random variables, that is, probability measures on a half-line $[0, \infty)$. For the moments $s_k := E[X^k]$ to determine the distribution of X uniquely, it is sufficient that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} s_k^{-1/(2k)} = +\infty. \quad (2.1)$$

The condition in (2.1) is called the *Carleman condition*. Various existing results give simpler criteria that imply (2.1), usually involving bounds for s_k , or asymptotics as $k \rightarrow \infty$. See, for example, [19, 22]. In what follows we will show that there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$s_k \leq C^{2k-1} (k!)^2, \quad k \geq 1,$$

where in our case, $s_k = k! \sup_{x \in E} \varphi(x) L_k(x)$. This and Stirling’s approximation then imply that (2.1) holds.

Regarding the convergence of moments we recall the following result.

Theorem 2.1 (Theorem 8.6. in [12]). *Let X and X_1, X_2, \dots be random variables with finite moments of all orders, and suppose that $E|X_n|^k \rightarrow E|X|^k$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for $k \geq 1$. If the moments of X determine the distribution of X uniquely, then $X_n \rightarrow X$ in law as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

If one only knows that $s_k := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E|X_n|^k$ exists but not a priori that they correspond to a probability distribution, then it may seem that one needs to establish in addition that the laws of the X_n are tight. However, this comes for free, because by the Markov inequality, for tightness it is sufficient to check for instance, that

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} E(X_n^2) < \infty,$$

and this we already know as $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E|X_n|^2 = s_2$.

2.2 Random measures

Below, we give a short summary on the convergence of random measures – for a reference see [17].

(i) Let \mathcal{X} be a Polish space (complete separable metric space), let $C_c(\mathcal{X})$ denote the space of continuous functions with compact support and let $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$ denote the space of finite measures on \mathcal{X} , equipped with the vague topology. This space is then metrizable with a metric ρ_{vag} and $(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}, \rho_{\text{vag}})$ is Polish too. Now consider X, X_0, X_1, X_2, \dots where X and X_i are $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -valued random elements (random measures). By definition, $X_n \rightarrow X$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in law means that for each bounded and continuous map

$$F : (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}, \rho_{\text{vag}}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, d),$$

one has $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}(F(X_n)) = \mathbf{E}(F(X))$. (Here d is the Euclidean metric.) Since $F_f(\nu) := \exp\{-\nu(f)\}$ with some $f \in C_c(\mathcal{X})$ is one such map, $X_n \rightarrow X$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in law implies that

$$\lim_n \mathcal{L}_{X_n}(f) := \lim_n \mathbf{E}[\exp\{-X_n(f)\}] = \mathbf{E}[\exp\{-X(f)\}] =: \mathcal{L}_X(f), \quad f \in C_c(\mathcal{X}). \quad (2.2)$$

It is well known though that (2.2) is not just necessary but also sufficient for concluding that $X_n \rightarrow X$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in law. (Here \mathcal{L}_X is the *Laplace functional* of X .)

(ii) Next, one can modify the above discussion by letting $C_b(\mathcal{X})$ denote the space of bounded continuous functions and considering $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}$ being equipped with the *weak* topology. Then this space is also metrizable with a metric ρ_{pro} (Prokhorov metric) and $(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}, \rho_{\text{pro}})$ is Polish too. In this case, $X_n \rightarrow X$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in law means that for each bounded and continuous map $F : (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{X}}, \rho_{\text{pro}}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, d)$, one has $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}(F(X_n)) = \mathbf{E}(F(X))$. Similarly to the case of vague topology, it is now clear that $X_n \rightarrow X$ in law implies that

$$\lim_n \mathcal{L}_{X_n}(f) = \mathcal{L}_X(f), \quad f \in C_b(\mathcal{X}), \quad (2.3)$$

and again, it is known that (2.3) is in fact not just a necessary but also a sufficient condition for the convergence in law.

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

The general strategy of the proof is to use the fact that convergence of moments is sufficient if the limit is determined uniquely by its moments, as discussed in Section 2.1. Now, note that for any $f \in B^+(E)$, we have that

$$e^{-\lambda t} X_t[f] = \tilde{\varphi}[f] e^{-\lambda t} X_t[\varphi] + e^{-\lambda t} X_t[f - \tilde{\varphi}[f]\varphi].$$

Since $\tilde{\varphi}[\varphi] = 1$, we have that $\tilde{\varphi}[f - \tilde{\varphi}[f]\varphi] = 0$ and thus the limit appearing in (1.2) is equal to 0 for any $k \geq 1$. In particular, taking $\ell = 2$, this implies the second term converges in L^2 to 0 as $t \rightarrow \infty$, hence it remains to show convergence of $e^{-\lambda t} X_t[\varphi]$. Since convergence of moments is already given in [10], it remains to check that the limit W_x is uniquely determined by its moments. As such, we will show that there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that

$$k! \sup_{x \in E} \varphi(x) L_k(x) \leq C^{2k-1} (k!)^2 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \sup_{x \in E} \varphi(x) L_k(x) \leq C^{2k-1} k!. \quad (3.1)$$

We prove this using induction.

The case $k = 1$ is immediate by taking $C = \|\varphi\| < \infty$. For $k \geq 2$, assume that, for each $1 \leq \ell < k$, (3.1)

holds. Note that,

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi(x)L_k(x) &\leq \sup_{x \in E} \mathcal{E}_x \left[\sum_{[k_1, \dots, k_N]_k^2} \prod_{j: k_j > 0} \varphi(x_j)L_{k_j}(x_j) \right] \int_0^\infty e^{-k\lambda s} \psi_s[\gamma](x) ds \\
&\leq C_1 \sup_{x \in E} \mathcal{E}_x \left[\sum_{[k_1, \dots, k_N]_k^2} \prod_{j: k_j > 0} \varphi(x_j)L_{k_j}(x_j) \right] \\
&\leq C_1 C^{2k-2} k! \sup_{x \in E} \mathcal{E}_x \left[\sum_{[k_1, \dots, k_N]_k^2} \binom{k}{k_1, \dots, k_N}^{-1} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where, since $\lambda > 0$, the second inequality is due to (H1), and the final inequality is due to the inductive hypothesis and that at least two of the k_j are strictly positive. Importantly, C_1 does not depend on k . To complete the proof, we use the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{k \geq 1} \sum_{[k_1, \dots, k_N]_k} \binom{k}{k_1, \dots, k_N}^{-1} \leq C 2^N, \quad N \geq 1.$$

This, along with (1.4), then implies that

$$\sup_{k \geq 2} \sup_{x \in E} \mathcal{E}_x \left[\sum_{[k_1, \dots, k_N]_k^2} \binom{k}{k_1, \dots, k_N}^{-1} \right] \leq C_2, \quad (3.2)$$

which yields (3.1) with $C \geq C_1 C_2$.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. For $N, k \geq 1$, define $[k_1, \dots, k_N]_{k,1}$ to denote the set of N -tuples (k_1, \dots, k_N) such that $\sum_{j=1}^N k_j = k$ and all the k_j are greater than or equal to 1. We first claim that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{N \geq 1} \sup_{k \geq 1} \sum_{[k_1, \dots, k_N]_{k,1}} \binom{k}{k_1, \dots, k_N}^{-1} \leq C. \quad (3.3)$$

Let $[k_1, \dots, k_N]_{k,1}^3$ denote the subset of $[k_1, \dots, k_N]_{k,1}$ such that at least 3 of the k_j are greater than 1. Then,

$$\sup_{N \geq 1} \sup_{k \geq 1} \sum_{[k_1, \dots, k_N]_{k,1}^3} \binom{k}{k_1, \dots, k_N}^{-1} \leq \sup_{N \geq 1} \sup_{k \geq 1} \sum_{[k_1, \dots, k_N]_{k,1}^3} \frac{2^2(k-N-1)!}{k!} \leq 4, \quad (3.4)$$

where we have obtained the first inequality by maximising the summands by taking all but three of the $k_i = 1$, and two of the remaining three $k_i = 2$, and the second inequality by noting that the number of summands is bounded by $k!/(k-N-1)!$. Next note that for all $k \geq 2$, $|[k_1, \dots, k_N]_{k,1} \setminus [k_1, \dots, k_N]_{k,1}^3| \leq 3kN^2$, since at most 2 of the k_i may differ from 1 and fixing one forces the choice of the other. Therefore, by a similar argument to (3.4), there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{N \geq 1} \sup_{k \geq 1} \sum_{[k_1, \dots, k_N]_{k,1} \setminus [k_1, \dots, k_N]_{k,1}^3} \binom{k}{k_1, \dots, k_N}^{-1} \leq \sup_{N \geq 1} \sup_{k \geq 1} \sum_{[k_1, \dots, k_N]_{k,1} \setminus [k_1, \dots, k_N]_{k,1}^3} \frac{(k-N+1)!}{k!} \leq C,$$

where in the final inequality we have used that the sum only has a non-zero number of summands when $k \geq N$, and that the summand is $o(k^{-1}N^{-2})$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly in $k \geq N$. This and (3.4) give

(3.3). Now, consider the partition of $[k_1, \dots, k_N]_k$ into the sets $[k_1, \dots, k_N]_{k,A}$, $A \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\}$, where $[k_1, \dots, k_N]_{k,A}$ consists of elements that satisfy $k_i = 0$ for $i \in A$ and $k_i > 0$ for $i \notin A$. Using this partition and (3.3), we conclude the proof with the following bound

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{k \geq 2} \sum_{[k_1, \dots, k_N]_k} \binom{k}{k_1, \dots, k_N}^{-1} &= \sup_{k \geq 2} \sum_{A \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\}} \sum_{[k_1, \dots, k_N]_{k,A}} \binom{k}{k_1, \dots, k_N}^{-1} \\ &= \sum_{\alpha=0}^N \binom{N}{\alpha} \sup_{k \geq 2} \sum_{[k_1, \dots, k_{N-\alpha}]_{k,1}} \binom{k}{k_1, \dots, k_{N-\alpha}}^{-1} \\ &\leq C \sum_{\alpha=0}^N \binom{N}{\alpha} \leq 2^N, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second equality we use that the summand only depends on A through $|A|$. \square

Acknowledgements

EH and CBCD acknowledge the support of EPSRC grant MaThRad EP/W026899/2.

References

- [1] Mathilde André, Félix Foutel-Rodier, and Emmanuel Schertzer. Moments of density-dependent branching processes and their genealogy. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.05231](#), 2025.
- [2] Jean Bertoin. Markovian growth-fragmentation processes. 2017.
- [3] Christopher B. C. Dean and Emma Horton. Moment fluctuations for branching markov processes. [arXiv](#), 2025.
- [4] Christopher B. C. Dean and Emma Horton. More on the asymptotic behaviour of moments of branching markov processes. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.19268](#), 2025.
- [5] S.D. Durham. Limit theorems for a general critical branching process. [Journal of Applied Probability](#), 8(1):1–16, 1971.
- [6] János Engländer, Simon C. Harris, and Andreas E. Kyprianou. Strong law of large numbers for branching diffusions. [Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques](#), 46(1):279–298, 2010.
- [7] J. Fleischman. Limiting distributions for branching random fields. [Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.](#), 239:353–389, 1978.
- [8] Félix Foutel-Rodier. A moment approach for the convergence of spatial branching processes to the continuum random tree. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.16035](#), 2024.
- [9] Félix Foutel-Rodier and Emmanuel Schertzer. Convergence of genealogies through spinal decomposition with an application to population genetics. [Probability Theory and Related Fields](#), 187(3):697–751, 2023.
- [10] I. Gonzalez, E. Horton, and A. E. Kyprianou. Asymptotic moments of spatial branching processes. [Probability Theory and Related Fields](#), 184(3-4):805–858, 2022.
- [11] Isaac Gonzalez, Emma Horton, and Andreas E Kyprianou. Erratum to: Asymptotic moments of spatial branching processes. 2022.

- [12] Allan Gut. Probability: a graduate course. Springer Texts in Statistics. Springer, New York, 2005.
- [13] Simon C Harris, Emma Horton, Andreas E Kyprianou, and Ellen Powell. Many-to-few for non-local branching markov process. Electronic Journal of Probability, 29:1–26, 2024.
- [14] Simon C Harris, Emma Horton, Andreas E Kyprianou, and Minmin Wang. Yaglom limit for critical nonlocal branching markov processes. The Annals of Probability, 50(6):2373–2408, 2022.
- [15] E. Horton and A. E. Kyprianou. Stochastic neutron transport and non-local branching Markov processes. Probability and its Applications. Birkhäuser, 2023.
- [16] Emma Horton, Andreas E Kyprianou, Pedro Martín-Chávez, Ellen Powell, and Victor Rivero. Stability of (sub) critical non-local spatial branching processes with and without immigration. arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.05472, 2024.
- [17] Olav Kallenberg. Random measures, theory and applications, volume 77 of Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling. Springer, Cham, 2017.
- [18] A. Klenke. Multiple scale analysis of clusters in spatial branching models. Ann. Probab., 25(4):1670–1711, 1997.
- [19] G. D. Lin. Recent developments on the moment problem. J. Statist. Dist. Appl., 4(5):1–17, 2017.
- [20] Aline Marguet. A law of large numbers for branching markov processes by the ergodicity of ancestral lineages. ESAIM: Probability and Statistics, 23:638–661, 2019.
- [21] Y. X. Ren, R. Song, and R. Zhang. Central limit theorems for supercritical branching markov processes. Journal of Functional Analysis, 266(3):1716–1756, 2014.
- [22] Konrad Schmüdgen. The moment problem, volume 277 of Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer, Cham, 2017.