

The relationship between extinction of a branching process and moments of the offspring distribution

Sterling Sawaya and Steffen Klaere

April 10, 2022

Abstract

A standard approach for comparing biological strategies is to examine the mean and variance in reproductive success. These values ultimately rely on measures of the first few moments of the offspring distribution. Here we discuss an alternative, comparing strategies by their probability of extinction. We focus on the interplay between extinction and the moments of the offspring distribution. The probability of extinction decreases with increasing odd moments and increases with increasing even moments, a property which is intuitively clear. There is no closed form solution to calculate the probability of extinction in general, and numerical methods are often used to infer its value. Alternatively, one can use analytical approaches to generate bounds on the extinction probability. We examine these bounds, focusing on the theory of s -convex ordering of random variables, a method primarily used in the field of actuarial sciences. This method utilizes the first few moments of the offspring distribution to generate “worst case” and “best case” distributions, which can then be used to find bounds on the probability of extinction. We discuss how this approach can provide insight into the evolutionary process.

1 Extinction of a branching process

Survival is ultimately tied to population growth; life avoids extinction by replicating. Populations with rapid growth will often avoid extinction. However, a population may have a high expected growth rate but nevertheless goes extinct with near certainty (Lewontin and Cohen, 1969). For example, populations with large variation in reproductive success can sometimes have a high probability of extinction, even if they have a high expected growth (Tuljapurkar and Orzack, 1980).

Similarly, investors and gamblers can avoid Gambler’s Ruin through growth of capital. However, a gambler cannot simply apply the strategy with the highest expected growth rate, because this may run a high risk of ruin. For example, investors can use the Kelly ratio (Kelly, 1956) to maximize expected geometric growth of their capital but strict adherence

to this ratio can be risky, and playing a more conservative strategy is often recommended (MacLean et al., 2010).

To estimate the probability of Gambler’s Ruin, one can use approximations based on moments (Ethier and Khoshnevisan, 2002; Canjar, 2007; Hürlimann, 2005). Here we apply these approaches to branching processes. The mathematics of Gambler’s Ruin is very similar to that of extinction in a branching process (Courtois et al., 2006). Both statistical models involve a random variable (payoff/offspring number), resulting in a random walk (change in capital/change in population size), and an absorbing state (ruin/extinction). Moreover, both processes are assumed to be Markovian, and finding the probability of ruin/extinction involves solving for the root of a convex function.

To investigate biological extinction, we use a Galton-Watson branching process, in which, at each discrete time interval, each individual generates i discrete offspring with probability p_i , and zero offspring with p_0 . Without loss of generality we assume that an individual produces its offspring and then dies, i.e. each individual in a population is restricted to a single generation. The offspring number is a random variable, which we denote by X . Let n be the maximum value of X , and thus X takes values in the state space $\mathcal{D}_n = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

The random variable X is easily understood in biological sense, it is simply the number of offspring produced by an individual. The state space of this random variable, \mathcal{D}_n , and its moments are strictly positive. This naturally leads to the use of s -convex extremal random variables to obtain bounds on the probability of extinction (Denuit and Lefevre, 1997; Denuit et al., 1999b; Hürlimann, 2005). Here we discuss how the moments of the offspring distribution are related to the probability of extinction. We show how the first few moments of X can be used to generate extremal random variables representing “best case” and “worst case” scenarios.

2 Extinction in the Galton-Watson branching process

At any given time t , the size of a population (Z_t) is the number of individuals in the branching process. We set $Z_0 \equiv 1$ unless otherwise specified. The probability of extinction of a branching process is $q \equiv \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} P(Z_t = 0 | Z_0 = 1)$.

The recursive formula for finding q can be found through a first step analysis (Kimmel and Axelrod, 2002). The probability that the lineage of a single individual expires is then the probability that it dies without offspring (p_0) plus the probability that it produces a single offspring whose lineage dies out (p_1q) plus the probability that it produces two offspring whose joint lineages die out (p_2q^2), and so on.

This leads to the formal definition of the probability generating function:

$$f(q) = \mathbb{E}[q^X] = p_0 + p_1q + p_2q^2 + p_3q^3 \dots p_nq^n = \sum_{k=0}^n p_k q^k. \quad (1)$$

The probability of extinction of a branching process starting with a single individual is the smallest root of the equation $f(q) = q$ for $q \in [0, 1]$.

If the population starts with more than one individual, $Z_0 = N$ with $N > 1$, and the generating functions for each individual are independent, then

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} P(Z_t = 0 | Z_0 = N) = q^N$$

Therefore, we solve for the case $Z_0 = 1$ with the understanding that q can then be used to find extinction probabilities for any starting population size.

The solution $q = 1$ is always a root of (1) and is not necessarily the least positive root. In some cases, the probability of extinction is trivially obvious. For instance, if $p_0 = 0$, i.e. an individual always produces at least one offspring, then $q = 0$. Furthermore, cases where $\mathbb{E}[X] \leq 1$ always yield $q = 1$ (Kimmel and Axelrod, 2002).

Inferring the probability of extinction analytically for branching processes with $p_0 > 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[X] > 1$ can be difficult because (1) has n complex-valued roots according to the fundamental law of algebra. In the following we point out how (1) can be seen in terms of moments of the offspring distribution, and discuss how this approach can be used to estimate q .

3 Moments of the branching process

Let $m_k \equiv \mathbb{E}[X^k]$ denote the k th moment of the branching process generator X . The first moment, m_1 , is equivalent to the average offspring number. Higher moments can be used to obtain other summary statistics of the distribution, such as the variance $\sigma^2 = m_2 - m_1^2$.

The Laplace transform of (1) can be used to (recursively) express extinction in terms of the moments of the branching process

$$\begin{aligned} f(q) &= \mathbb{E}[q^X] = \mathbb{E}[e^{X \log q}] \\ &= 1 + m_1 \log q + m_2 \frac{(\log q)^2}{2} + m_3 \frac{(\log q)^3}{6} + \dots \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} m_k \frac{(\log q)^k}{k!} \end{aligned}$$

where $m_0 = 1$. Note that $m_k > 0$ for all $k \geq 0$. Furthermore, with $q \in (0, 1)$ we clearly have $\log q < 0$. Therefore, even moments increase the probability of extinction while odd moments decrease it. Additionally, if $q \in (e^{-1}, 1)$ then $\log q \in (-1, 0)$ and the series converges with $\log q$. Thus, approximations, $f^*(q)$, which take the form

$$f^*(q) = \sum_{k=0}^{s-1} m_k \frac{(\log q)^k}{k!} + o((\log q)^s) \quad (2)$$

for an $s \geq 3$ are only accurate when q is large and the moments are small. As $q \downarrow 0$, the series requires more and more terms to be accurate. Therefore, when q is small the first few moments are not necessarily informative about extinction.

4 Estimating extinction

Gambling literature investigates an alternative equation to (1) (Ethier and Khoshnevisan, 2002; Canjar, 2007). Here, one divides by q on both sides of (1), and a simple rearrangement results in:

$$0 = \mathbb{E} [q^{X-1}] - 1$$

We introduce new notation to simplify. Define the modified random variable $\widehat{X} = X - 1$ and its moments $\widehat{m}_k = \mathbb{E} [\widehat{X}^k]$. This variable represents the change in population size between generations, equivalent to the return on a gamble (total win or loss).

$$Z_{t+1} = Z_t + \sum_{j=1}^{Z_t} \widehat{X}_j$$

This is also the approach used in Feller (1968) in which \widehat{X} represents a random walk, the generating function is defined as $f(q) = \mathbb{E} [q^{\widehat{X}}]$, and the probability of extinction is a root of $f(q) = 1$. Using the Laplace transform of the new equation we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \mathbb{E} [q^{\widehat{X}}] - 1 = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \widehat{m}_k \frac{(\log q)^k}{k!} - 1 \\ 0 &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \widehat{m}_k \frac{(\log q)^k}{k!} \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

If q is assumed to be near 1, then approximations can be made with (2). For example, if two moments are known:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \widehat{m}_1 \log q + \widehat{m}_2 \frac{(\log q)^2}{2} + o((\log q)^3) \\ q &\approx \exp \left(\frac{2\widehat{m}_1}{\widehat{m}_2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

If higher moments are known, or can be estimated (e.g. González et al., 2008) the extinction estimate can be improved by including more terms. However, adding only the first three moments results in a cubic that has no real root on $q \in (0, 1)$ if $\widehat{m}_1 \widehat{m}_3 \geq 3(\widehat{m}_2)^2/8$ (Ethier and Khoshnevisan, 2002). Alternatively, truncating after an even moment always provides an equation with a real root on $q \in (0, 1)$, but as previously noted, these approximations are only meaningful if q is reasonably large.

The benefit of this approach is that finding the root of (3) does not involve dividing $\log q$ by q , as would be required for (2). This produces a simple approximation for the probability of extinction based on two moments. However, improved bounds are possible using our original variable X and its moments (Hürlimann, 2005).

5 s -Convex orderings of random variables

The benefits of using X instead of \widehat{X} is that it conveniently allows for s -convex ordering (Denuit and Lefevre, 1997; Hürlimann, 2005). Define the *moment space* for all random variables with state set \mathcal{D}_n and fixed first $s - 1$ moments m_1, \dots, m_{s-1} by

$$\mathfrak{B}_{s,n}^{\vec{m}} \equiv \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{D}_n, m_1, m_2, \dots, m_{s-1})$$

As previously mentioned, the state space of the random variable X is bound by zero and its maximum, n , and therefore contains only positive elements. Further, we are only interested in cases where the mean is greater than 1 so that extinction is not certain. This provides a moment space with well behaved properties. The study of the moment problem (e.g., Karlin and McGregor, 1957; Prékopa, 1990) yields an important relationship between consecutive moments on $\mathfrak{B}_{s,n}^{\vec{m}}$ conditional on $m_1 > 1$

$$(m_i)^{\frac{i+1}{i}} \leq m_{i+1} \leq nm_i \quad (4)$$

This relationship becomes useful when examining extremal distributions using s -convexity.

For two random variables X and Y with state set \mathcal{D}_n , we say that if X is smaller than Y in the s -convex sense ($X \leq_{s-cx}^{\mathcal{D}_n} Y$) then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(X^k) &= \mathbb{E}(Y^k) \quad \text{for } k = 1, 2, \dots, s - 1 \\ \mathbb{E}(X^k) &\leq \mathbb{E}(Y^k) \quad \text{for } k \geq s \end{aligned}$$

Minimum and maximum extrema distributions on $\mathfrak{B}_{s,n}^{\vec{m}}$ can be found for any distribution on \mathcal{D}_n , with fixed first moments m_1, m_2, \dots, m_s (Denuit and Lefevre, 1997). The random variables for these distributions are denoted $X_{\min}^{(s)}$ and $X_{\max}^{(s)}$ such that

$$X_{\min}^{(s)} \leq_{s-cx}^{\mathcal{D}_n} X \leq_{s-cx}^{\mathcal{D}_n} X_{\max}^{(s)} \quad \text{for all } X \in \mathcal{D}_n$$

See Denuit and Lefevre (1997), Denuit et al. (1999b) and Hürlimann (2005) for detailed definitions of s -convexity. Following the results from these papers, we define the extremal min/max random variables given the first few moments. We begin on $\mathfrak{B}_{2,n}^{\vec{m}}$ with the maximal random variable, $X_{\max}^{(2)}$, defined as:

$$X_{\max}^{(2)} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{with } p_0 = 1 - \frac{m_1}{n} \\ n & \text{with } p_n = \frac{m_1}{n} \end{cases}$$

For $X_{\max}^{(2)}$ we observe $m_{i+1} = nm_i$, so by (4) this can clearly be seen as the maximum extrema. Intuitively, this is the “long shot” distribution on \mathcal{D}_n , a worst case scenario. Because the values and respective probabilities of $X_{\max}^{(2)}$ are known, q can be solved explicitly using (1). This provides an upper limit on extinction because the generating function for the extremal random variable will be greater than or equal to the generating function for all other random variables with the same m_1 and n , on $q \in [0, 1]$.

$\mathfrak{B}_{2,n}^{\vec{m}}$ is a very general moment space, as the first moment does not provide much information about the distribution. Therefore, $X_{\max}^{(2)}$ is not likely to be a tight upper bound when n is large or unknown. However, if m_1 is near n , then the distribution can be fairly well approximated by $X_{\max}^{(2)}$.

Unlike $X_{\max}^{(2)}$, $X_{\min}^{(2)}$ does not provide a useful bound on the probability of extinction. $X_{\min}^{(2)}$ is defined as:

$$X_{\min}^{(2)} = \begin{cases} \alpha & \text{with } p_\alpha = \alpha + 1 - m_1 \\ \alpha + 1 & \text{with } p_{\alpha+1} = m_1 - \alpha \end{cases}$$

where α is the integer on \mathcal{D}_n such that

$$\alpha < m_1 \leq \alpha + 1$$

This extremal random variable represents a ‘‘best case’’ scenario. However, since $m_1 > 1$, α must be larger than zero and this branching process has no chance of death (i.e. $p_0 = 0$) and consequently no chance of extinction ($q = 0$). Therefore $X_{\min}^{(2)}$ does not provide a useful bound on the probability of extinction as the bound $q \geq 0$ is obvious.

This bound and all other bounds examined here can be found using discrete Chebyshev systems (Denuit and Lefevre, 1997). However, extremal bounds are perhaps more intuitive for continuous random variables, to which the discrete cases can be seen as similar (Shaked and Shanthikumar, 2007; Hürlimann, 2005; Denuit et al., 1999b). For example, $X_{\min}^{(2)}$ in the continuous case has only one possible value, m_1 with $p_{m_1} = 1$. By (4) this is clearly an extrema because $(m_i)^{(i+1)/i} = m_{i+1} = (m_1)^{i+1}$. In comparison, the discrete case (5) has similar properties.

The following notation helps extending these calculations to higher order systems (Denuit et al., 1999a). Let $w, x, y, z \in \mathcal{D}_n$, and set $m_0 = 1$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} m_{j,z} &:= z \cdot m_{j-1} - m_j, & j = 1, 2, \dots; \\ m_{j,z,y} &:= y \cdot m_{j-1,z} - m_{j,z}, & j = 2, 3, \dots; \\ m_{j,z,y,x} &:= x \cdot m_{j-1,z,y} - m_{j,z,y}, & j = 3, 4, \dots; \\ m_{j,z,y,x,w} &:= w \cdot m_{j-1,z,y,x} - m_{j,z,y,x}, & j = 4, 5, \dots \end{aligned}$$

If the first two moments are known, then a tighter upper bound can be found. On $\mathfrak{B}_{3,n}^{\vec{m}}$ the minimal distribution in the 3-convex sense is given by:

$$X_{\min}^{(3)} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{with } p_0 = 1 - p_\alpha - p_{\alpha+1} \\ \alpha & \text{with } p_\alpha = \frac{m_{2,\alpha+1}}{\alpha} \\ \alpha + 1 & \text{with } p_{\alpha+1} = \frac{-m_{2,\alpha}}{\alpha + 1} \end{cases}$$

where

$$\alpha < \frac{m_2}{m_1} \leq \alpha + 1.$$

This bound is already known in the branching process literature (Daley and Narayan, 1980). Similar to $X_{\max}^{(2)}$, the extremal random variable $X_{\min}^{(3)}$ represents a worst case scenario, this time using two moments. The root of the equation

$$f(q) = q = p_0 + p_\alpha q^\alpha + p_{\alpha+1} q^{\alpha+1} \quad (5)$$

provides an upper bound to the probability of extinction due to the s -convexity of $\mathfrak{B}_{3,n}^{\bar{m}}$, i.e. (5) has greater values at any $q \in [0, 1)$ than the probability generating functions of any other random variable in $\mathfrak{B}_{3,n}^{\bar{m}}$.

In contrast to $X_{\max}^{(2)}$, the minimum extrema yields the upper limit for the probability of extinction in $\mathfrak{B}_{3,n}^{\bar{m}}$. The alternation between minimum and maximum for the worst case scenarios is due to the convexity of (1). Again, this extrema is perhaps more intuitive in the continuous sense, in which

$$X_{\min, \text{cont.}}^{(3)} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{with } p_0 = 1 - p_{m_2/m_1} \\ \frac{m_2}{m_1} & \text{with } p_{m_2/m_1} = \frac{(m_1)^2}{m_2} \end{cases}$$

In this case, successive moments simply grow by m_2/m_1 , i.e. $m_{i+1} = m_i(m_2/m_1)$, providing a clear minimum on $\mathfrak{B}_{3,n}^{\bar{m}}$. And, as was the case for the minimum on $\mathfrak{B}_{2,n}^{\bar{m}}$, the discrete minimum extrema on $\mathfrak{B}_{3,n}^{\bar{m}}$ has similar properties to the continuous minimum extrema.

For both $\mathfrak{B}_{2,n}^{\bar{m}}$ and $\mathfrak{B}_{3,n}^{\bar{m}}$ the discrete cases are simply discretization of the continuous case. However, this is not necessarily the case for higher moment spaces (Courtois et al., 2006). While the continuous cases provide more intuitive extrema, derivation of the discrete case for higher moments is not as simple as deriving the continuous case and discretizing.

Next, we examine the maximum extrema on $\mathfrak{B}_{3,n}^{\bar{m}}$:

$$X_{\max}^{(3)} = \begin{cases} \alpha & \text{with } p_\alpha = \frac{m_{2,n,\alpha+1}}{n - \alpha} \\ \alpha + 1 & \text{with } p_{\alpha+1} = \frac{-m_{2,n,\alpha}}{n - \alpha - 1} \\ n & \text{with } p_n = 1 - p_\alpha - p_{\alpha+1} \end{cases}$$

where

$$\alpha < \frac{nm_1 - m_2}{n - m_1} \leq \alpha + 1$$

Again, $X_{\max}^{(3)}$ can only provide non-trivial information about q if $p_0 > 0$. This occurs when $\alpha = 0$ **and** $p_\alpha > 0$, which is the case whenever $nm_1 - m_2 < n - m_1$. Note the strict inequality is required because if $nm_1 - m_2 = n - m_1$ then even though $\alpha = 0$ the bound provided is not useful because $p_\alpha = 0$. Although this requirement may appear restrictive, some classes of distributions have simple rules under which $X_{\max}^{(3)}$ is informative. For example, for binomial distributions, $B_{n,p}$, $X_{\max}^{(3)}$ will provide a non-zero lower bound if $1/n < p \leq 1/(n-1)$.

The use of three moments can improve bounds on the probability of extinction, but as with all of the maximal random variables, $X_{\max}^{(4)}$ requires the knowledge of the maximum, n . $X_{\max}^{(4)}$

is defined as:

$$X_{\max}^{(4)} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{with } p_0 = 1 - p_\alpha - p_{\alpha+1} - p_n \\ \alpha & \text{with } p_\alpha = \frac{m_{3,n,\alpha+1}}{\alpha(n-\alpha)} \\ \alpha + 1 & \text{with } p_{\alpha+1} = \frac{-m_{3,n,\alpha}}{(\alpha+1)(n-\alpha-1)} \\ n & \text{with } p_n = \frac{m_{3,\alpha,\alpha+1}}{n(n-\alpha)(n-\alpha-1)} \end{cases}$$

where

$$\alpha < \frac{m_2 n - m_3}{m_1 n - m_2} \leq \alpha + 1$$

While this is a potential improvement to the bound given by $X_{\min}^{(3)}$, the improvement is sometimes negligible. As $n \rightarrow \infty$, the difference between $X_{\max}^{(4)}$ and $X_{\min}^{(3)}$ vanishes because

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m_2 n - m_3}{m_1 n - m_2} = \frac{m_2}{m_1}$$

and because $p_n \rightarrow 0$, the generating function for $X_{\max}^{(4)}$ is identical to (5). So, like the first moment, the third moment is uninformative about extinction when n is unknown, unless assumptions are made about the distribution (see, e.g., Daley and Narayan, 1980; Ethier and Khoshnevisan, 2002).

The minimal extrema for $\mathfrak{B}_{4,n}^{\vec{m}}$, $X_{\min}^{(4)}$ is given by

$$X_{\min}^{(4)} = \begin{cases} \alpha, & \text{with } p_\alpha = \frac{m_{3,\beta,\beta+1,\alpha+1}}{(\beta-\alpha)(\beta+1-\alpha)} \\ \alpha + 1, & \text{with } p_{\alpha+1} = \frac{-m_{3,\beta,\beta+1,\alpha}}{(\beta-\alpha)(\beta-1-\alpha)} \\ \beta, & \text{with } p_\beta = \frac{m_{3,\alpha,\alpha+1,\beta+1}}{(\beta-\alpha)(\beta-1-\alpha)} \\ \beta + 1, & \text{with } p_{\beta+1} = \frac{-m_{3,\alpha,\alpha+1,\beta}}{(\beta-\alpha)(\beta+1-\alpha)} \end{cases}$$

where α and β are given by

$$\alpha < \frac{m_{3,\beta,\beta+1}}{m_{2,\beta,\beta+1}} \leq \alpha + 1, \quad \beta < \frac{m_{3,\alpha,\alpha+1}}{m_{2,\alpha,\alpha+1}} \leq \beta + 1.$$

Again, this bound is only useful if $p_0 > 0$. Unfortunately, there is no short form equation to identify which spaces $\mathfrak{B}_{4,n}^{\vec{m}}$ fit this requirement. However, one can easily determine if a given $\mathfrak{B}_{4,n}^{\vec{m}}$ has a useful $X_{\min}^{(4)}$. Assuming $\alpha = 0$, β is simply bound by

$$\hat{\beta} < \frac{m_3 - m_2}{m_2 - m_1} \leq \hat{\beta} + 1$$

And if $m_{3,\hat{\beta},\hat{\beta}+1} < m_{2,\hat{\beta},\hat{\beta}+1}$, then the bound is useful because the resulting $X_{\min}^{(4)}$ has $p_0 > 0$. Alternatively, if $m_{3,\hat{\beta},\hat{\beta}+1} \geq m_{2,\hat{\beta},\hat{\beta}+1}$ the the supports for $X_{\min}^{(4)}$ have $p_0 = 0$ and consequently $q = 0$.

If the first four moments are known, the extremal variable $X_{\min}^{(5)}$ can be obtained. Its distribution takes a simple form, but the equations used to find its values and relative probabilities are relatively large. From Hürlimann (2005), $X_{\min}^{(5)}$ is defined as:

$$X_{\min}^{(5)} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{with } p_0 = 1 - p_\alpha - p_{\alpha+1} - p_\beta - p_{\beta+1} \\ \alpha & \text{with } p_\alpha = \frac{m_{4,\beta,\beta+1,\alpha+1}}{\alpha(\beta-\alpha)(\beta+1-\alpha)} \\ \alpha+1 & \text{with } p_{\alpha+1} = \frac{-m_{4,\beta,\beta+1,\alpha}}{(\alpha+1)(\beta-\alpha)(\beta-1-\alpha)} \\ \beta & \text{with } p_\beta = \frac{m_{4,\alpha,\alpha+1,\beta+1}}{\beta(\beta-\alpha)(\beta-1-\alpha)} \\ \beta+1 & \text{with } p_{\beta+1} = \frac{-m_{4,\alpha,\alpha+1,\beta}}{(\beta+1)(\beta-\alpha)(\beta+1-\alpha)} \end{cases}$$

where

$$\alpha < \frac{m_{4,\beta,\beta+1}}{m_{3,\beta,\beta+1}} \leq \alpha + 1, \quad \beta < \frac{m_{4,\alpha,\alpha+1}}{m_{3,\alpha,\alpha+1}} \leq \beta + 1.$$

Courtois et al. (2006) proposed that there is no analytic form to directly obtain α and β for $X_{\min}^{(5)}$. They showed this by disproving the intuitive idea that the discrete support encloses the continuous support. Knowledge of the continuous support may nevertheless be useful here. We propose that using the continuous support as a starting point for the search of the discrete support is more appropriate than searching \mathcal{D}_n exhaustively. The supports for $X_{\min, \text{cont}}^{(5)}$ are $\{0, \alpha, \beta\}$ given by

$$\alpha = \frac{m_1 m_4 - m_2 m_3 - \sqrt{(m_1 m_4 - m_2 m_3)^2 - 4(m_1 m_3 - m_2^2)(m_2 m_4 - m_3^2)}}{2(m_1 m_3 - m_2^2)},$$

$$\beta = \frac{m_1 m_4 - m_2 m_3 + \sqrt{(m_1 m_4 - m_2 m_3)^2 - 4(m_1 m_3 - m_2^2)(m_2 m_4 - m_3^2)}}{2(m_1 m_3 - m_2^2)}$$

Hürlimann (2005) also presents a form for the upper extremal variable in $\mathfrak{B}_{5,n}^{\vec{m}}$. The process $X_{\max}^{(5)}$ is defined as:

$$X_{\max}^{(5)} = \begin{cases} \alpha, & \text{with } p_\alpha = \frac{m_{4,n,\beta,\beta+1,\alpha+1}}{(\beta-\alpha)(\beta+1-\alpha)(n-\alpha)} \\ \alpha+1, & \text{with } p_{\alpha+1} = \frac{-m_{4,n,\beta,\beta+1,\alpha}}{(\beta-\alpha)(\beta-\alpha-1)(n-\alpha-1)} \\ \beta, & \text{with } p_\beta = \frac{m_{4,n,\alpha,\alpha+1,\beta+1}}{(\beta-\alpha)(\beta-\alpha-1)(n-\beta)} \\ \beta+1, & \text{with } p_{\beta+1} = \frac{-m_{4,n,\alpha,\alpha+1,\beta}}{(\beta-\alpha)(\beta+1-\alpha)(n-\beta-1)} \\ n, & \text{with } p_n = 1 - p_\alpha - p_{\alpha+1} - p_\beta - p_{\beta+1} \end{cases}$$

where

$$\alpha < \frac{m_{4,n,\beta,\beta+1}}{m_{3,n,\beta,\beta+1}} \leq \alpha + 1, \quad \beta < \frac{m_{4,n,\alpha,\alpha+1}}{m_{3,n,\alpha,\alpha+1}} \leq \beta + 1.$$

Again, $X_{\max}^{(5)}$ is only informative if $p_0 = 0$. As was the case for $X_{\min}^{(4)}$, one can determine if a set of moments will have a useful $X_{\max}^{(5)}$ by assuming $\alpha = 0$ and solving for $\hat{\beta}$ with

$$\hat{\beta} < \frac{m_{4,n,0,1}}{m_{3,n,0,1}} \leq \hat{\beta} + 1$$

And then if the resulting $\hat{\beta}$ in the inequality $m_{4,n,\hat{\beta},\hat{\beta}+1} < m_{4,n,\hat{\beta},\hat{\beta}+1}$ holds, the bound for $X_{\max}^{(5)}$ is informative.

6 Examples

Here we discuss some example distributions, graph their generating functions, and also graph generating functions for the extremal distributions. The plot of the probability generating function, $f(q)$, on $q \in (0, 1)$ is a useful way to visualize how the moments are related to extinction. The probability generating function takes the value p_0 at $q = 0$. At small q , $f(q)$ has a slope of approximately p_1 . In this part of the function, when q is small, there is little relationship between $f(q)$ and moments. The moments are closely related to $f(q)$ at the other end of our domain of interest, when q is near 1. For example $f'(1) = m_1$. Higher moments begin to influence the function as q moves away from 1.

The probability of extinction of a process is found at the intersect between its probability generating function $f(q)$ and the diagonal q . Thus, processes with a high probability of extinction will cross the diagonal near $q = 1$, in the domain of q in which the probability generating function is closely related to its first few moments.




Figure 1: Probability generating functions, $f(q)$, for a Binomial and a truncated Geometric distribution. Both distributions have a mean of 2. The offspring distribution is shown above each graph of the respective probability generating functions. The probability generating functions for the extremal distributions are also plotted.

Plotting the probability generating functions for the extremal distributions helps demonstrate why they act as bounds on extinction. In these examples, we compare two distributions with an identical first moment and maximum ($m_1 = 2$, $n = 20$) for a binomial distribution and a truncated geometric distribution (Figure 1). Because they share an identical first moment and maximum, $X_{\max}^{(2)}$ is the same for both distributions. Clearly, $X_{\max}^{(2)}$ does not provide a good bound. Comparatively, the use of four moment provides relatively tight bounds for both cases.

The lower bounds are useful in both cases, but only when three or four moments are known. The lower bound using only one moment was not included because the function is trivial and uninformative about extinction. The lower bound based on two moments is included in both plots, but only provides the trivial lower bound $q > 0$ in these cases.

7 Discussion

The work here is intended to highlight the relationship between the moments of the offspring distribution with the probability of extinction. The extinction equation can be defined in terms of moments, but the first few moments are only closely related to extinction when q is reasonably large. But, no matter the value of q , there exists an interesting relationship with even and odd moments: high even moments favor extinction, high odd moments favor survival. This relationship between even and odd moments is also seen in the stochastic price equation, where relative growth rates increase with increasing odd moments, and decrease with increasing even moments (Rice, 2008).

Approximations and bounds on extinction can be made if the first few moments are known. Strict upper bounds can be found by examining s -convex extremal random variables. Using an even number of moments provides the most useful upper bounds because these bounds do not rely on the maximum value of the offspring distribution. If an odd number of moments are known, s -convex approximations can provide improved upper bounds over the use of an even number of moments. However, these bounds require knowledge of the maximum and provide limited improvements over upper bounds using an even number of moments in situations where the maximum is large. Lower bounds on extinction can also be found by examining s -convex extremal random variables, but these bounds are only informative in certain cases.

This relationship between moments and the probability of extinction can provide insights into the evolutionary process. Evolution cannot simply favor high expected rates of growth because strategies with a high first moment can also have a high probability of extinction. Evolution also does not simply always favor strategies with high expected growth and low variance. Rather, strategies with large odd moments, and relatively small even moments are favored for survival. The first moment has the strongest influence on survival, and the influence decreases for each successive moment. The relative importance of higher moments depends on the distribution, and in some cases, higher moments should not be ignored.

References

- M.R. Canjar. Gambler's ruin revisited: The effects of skew and large jack-pots. In S.N. Ethier and W.R. Eadington, editors, *Optimal Play: Mathematical Studies of Games and Gambling*, pages 439–469. Institute for the Study of Gambling and Commercial Gaming, University of Nevada, Reno, 2007.
- Cindy Courtois, Michel Denuit, and Sebastien Van Bellegem. Discrete s -convex extremal distributions: Theory and applications. *Applied Mathematics Letters*, 19(12):1367 – 1377, 2006. ISSN 0893-9659. doi: 10.1016/j.aml.2006.02.006. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S089396590600053X>.
- D.J. Daley and P. Narayan. Series expansions of probability generating functions and bounds for the extinction probability of a branching process. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 17: 939, 1980.

- Michael Denuit and Claude Lefevre. Some new classes of stochastic order relations among arithmetic random variables, with applications in actuarial sciences. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 20(3):197 – 213, 1997. ISSN 0167-6687. doi: 10.1016/S0167-6687(97)00010-3. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167668797000103>.
- Michael Denuit, Etienne de Vylder, and Claude Lefevre. Extremal generators and extremal distributions for the continuous s -convex stochastic orderings. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 24:201–217, 1999a.
- Michel Denuit, Claude Lefevre, and Mhamed Mesfioui. On s -convex stochastic extrema for arithmetic risks. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 25(2):143 – 155, 1999b. ISSN 0167-6687. doi: 10.1016/S0167-6687(99)00030-X. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S016766879900030X>.
- S. N. Ethier and Davar Khoshnevisan. Bounds on gambler’s ruin probabilities in terms of moments. *Methodology and Computing in Applied Probability*, 4:55–68, 2002. ISSN 1387-5841. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1015705430513>. 10.1023/A:1015705430513.
- William Feller. *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications, Vol. 1, 3rd Edition*. Wiley, 3rd edition, January 1968. ISBN 0471257087.
- M. González, J. Martín, R. Martínez, and M. Mota. Non-parametric bayesian estimation for multitype branching processes through simulation-based methods. *Comput. Stat. Data Anal.*, 52(3):1281–1291, January 2008. ISSN 0167-9473. doi: 10.1016/j.csda.2007.06.008. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.csda.2007.06.008>.
- Werner Hürlimann. Improved analytical bounds for gambler’s ruin probabilities. *Methodology and Computing in Applied Probability*, 7:79–95, 2005. ISSN 1387-5841. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11009-005-6656-4>. 10.1007/s11009-005-6656-4.
- Samuel Karlin and J. L. McGregor. The differential equations of birth-and-death-processes, and the stieltjes moment problem. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 85(2):489–546, 1957. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1992942>.
- J. Kelly. A new interpretation of information rate. *Bell Sys. Tech. Journal*, 35:917–926, 1956.
- Marek Kimmel and David E. Axelrod. *Branching Processes in Biology*. Springer, May 2002. ISBN 038795340X. URL <http://www.worldcat.org/isbn/038795340X>.
- R. C. Lewontin and D. Cohen. On population growth in a randomly varying environment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 62(4):1056–1060, 1969. URL <http://www.pnas.org/content/62/4/1056.abstract>.
- L.C. MacLean, E.O. Thorp, and Ziemba W.T. Good and bad properties of the Kelly criterion. In *The Kelly Capital Growth Investment Criterion: Theory and Practice*, pages 563–574. World Scientific Publishing, Singapore, 2010.

- András Prékopa. The discrete moment problem and linear programming. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 27:235–254, 1990.
- S. H. Rice. A stochastic version of the Price equation reveals the interplay of deterministic and stochastic processes in evolution. *BMC Evol. Biol.*, 8:262, 2008.
- Moshe Shaked and J. George Shanthikumar. *Stochastic Orders*. Springer, 2007.
- S.D. Tuljapurkar and Steven Hecht Orzack. Population dynamics in variable environments i. long-run growth rates and extinction. *Theoretical Population Biology*, 18(3): 314 – 342, 1980. ISSN 0040-5809. doi: 10.1016/0040-5809(80)90057-X. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/004058098090057X>.