

Mixed state branching evolution for cell division models

Shukai Chen,¹ Lina Ji² and Jie Xiong³

School of Mathematics and Statistics, Fujian Normal University

Fuzhou 350007, People's Republic of China.

Faculty of Computational Mathematics and Cybernetics, Shenzhen MSU-BIT University

Shenzhen 518172, People's Republic of China.

Department of Mathematics and National Center for Applied Mathematics (Shenzhen)

Southern University of Science and Technology, Shenzhen 518055, China.

E-mail: skchen@mail.bnu.edu.cn, jiln@smbu.edu.cn and xiongj@sustech.edu.cn

Abstract

We prove a scaling limit theorem for two-type Galton-Watson branching processes with interaction. The limit theorem gives rise to a class of mixed state branching processes with interaction using to simulate the evolution for cell division affected by parasites. Such process can also be obtained by the pathwise unique solution to a stochastic equation system. Moreover, we present sufficient conditions for extinction with probability one and the exponential ergodicity in the total variation distance of such process.

Keywords and phrases: mixed state branching process; stochastic integral equation; interaction.

1 Introduction

Let $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. We consider a continuous time model in $D = [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{N}$ for cells and parasites, where the behavior of cell division is infected by parasites. Informally, the quantity of parasites $\{X_t : t \geq 0\}$ in a cell evolves as a continuous state branching process. The cells divide in continuous time at a rate $h(x, y)$ which may depend on the quantity of parasites x and cells y . This framework is general enough to be applied for the modelling of other structured populations, for instance, grass-rabbit models in [8].

Many studies have been conducted on branching within branching processes to study such population dynamics in continuous time. In [19], the evolution of parasites is modelled by a birth-death process, while the cells split according to a Yule process. [2] allows the quantity of parasites in a cell following a Feller diffusion. A continuous state branching process with jumps is considered to model the quantity of parasites in a cell in [18]. In particular, [19, 2, 18] describe cell populations in a tree structure, in this way, the population of cells at some time may be represented by a random point measure and associated martingale problems can be established by choosing test functions appropriately. Instead of [19, 2, 18], in this paper we ignore the tree structure and mainly focus on a parasite-cell model from a macro point of view. More precisely,

¹Supported by National Key R&D Program of China (No. 2022YFA1006000) and China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (No. 2022M720735).

²Supported by Guangdong Basic and Applied Basic Research Foundation (No. 2022A1515110986), Guangdong Young Innovative Talents Project (No. 2022KQNCX105) and NSFC grant (No. 12271029).

³Supported by National Key R&D Program of China grant (No. 2022YFA1006102) and NSFC grant (No. 11831010).

we use a stochastic equation system to describe the sample path of such models,

$$\begin{aligned} X_t &= X_0 - b \int_0^t X_s ds + \int_0^t \sqrt{2cX_s} dB_s + \int_0^t \int_0^{X_{s-}} \int_0^\infty \xi \tilde{M}(ds, du, d\xi), \\ Y_t &= Y_0 + \int_0^t \int_0^{Y_{s-}} \int_0^{h(X_{s-}, Y_{s-})} \int_{\mathbb{N}} (\xi - 1) N(ds, du, dr, d\xi), \end{aligned}$$

where $b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c \geq 0$ are constants, $(B_t : t \geq 0)$ is a standard Brownian motion, $h(\cdot, \cdot) \in C(\mathbb{R}_+^2)^+$, where $C(\mathbb{R}_+^2)^+$ is the collection of continuous positive functions defined on \mathbb{R}_+^2 . Let $(\xi \wedge \xi^2) m(d\xi)$ be a finite measure on $(0, \infty)$ and $(p_\xi : \xi \in \mathbb{N})$ be an offspring distribution satisfying $\sum_\xi \xi p_\xi < \infty$. Without losing generality, we assume $p_1 = 0$. The above $M(ds, du, d\xi)$ is a Poisson random measure on $(0, \infty)^3$ with intensity $dsdum(d\xi)$, and $\tilde{M}(ds, du, d\xi) = M(ds, du, d\xi) - dsdum(d\xi)$. The above N is a Poisson random measure on $(0, \infty)^3 \times \mathbb{N}$ with intensity $dsdudrn(d\xi)$, where $n(d\xi) = p_\xi \sharp(d\xi)$ with $\sharp(\cdot) = \sum_j \delta_j(\cdot)$ being the counting measure on \mathbb{N} . Those three random elements are independent of each other. Apparently, $\{X_t : t \geq 0\}$ is indeed a continuous-state branching process (CB-process), see [5, 6]. In particular, when $h(\cdot, \cdot) \equiv r > 0$, the model reduces to $\{(X_t, Y_t^r) : t \geq 0\}$, where $\{Y_t^r : t \geq 0\}$ is a standard continuous time Markov branching process with branching rate $r > 0$ and offspring $(p_\xi, \xi \in \mathbb{N})$. In this case, the system can be seen as a particular case of mixed state branching processes, which has been studied in [4].

For simplicity, we introduce another Poisson random measure and write it again by N on $[0, \infty)^3 \times \mathbb{N}^{-1}$, $\mathbb{N}^{-1} = \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1\}$ with characteristic measure $n(d\xi) = p'_\xi \sharp(d\xi)$, $p'_\xi = p_{\xi+1}$. Then we can rewrite the system by

$$X_t = X_0 - b \int_0^t X_s ds + \int_0^t \sqrt{2cX_s} dB_s + \int_0^t \int_0^{X_{s-}} \int_0^\infty \xi \tilde{M}(ds, du, d\xi), \quad (1.1)$$

$$Y_t = Y_0 + \int_0^t \int_0^{Y_{s-}} \int_0^{h(X_{s-}, Y_{s-})} \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1}} \xi N(ds, du, dr, d\xi). \quad (1.2)$$

In the rest of the paper, we use the stochastic equation system (1.1)–(1.2) to describe the parasite-cell model. In the literature on the theory of branching processes, the rescaling (in time or state) approach plays a valuable role in establishing the connection among those branching processes, see [9], [11, 12], [17], [4] and [15] and the references therein. To the best of our knowledge, limited work has been done in branching processes with interactions. This leads to the first purpose of this paper, and the establishment of strong uniqueness of solution to (1.1)–(1.2). For a sequence of two-type Galton–Watson processes with interactions $\{(x_k(n), y_k(n)) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}_{k \geq 1}$, we prove that $\{(x_k(\lfloor \gamma_k t \rfloor)/k, y_k(\lfloor \gamma_k t \rfloor)) : t \geq 0\}$ converges in distribution to the solution to (1.1)–(1.2) as $k \rightarrow \infty$ under suitable conditions. The pathwise uniqueness of solution to (1.1)–(1.2) is also given.

In addition, the second purpose of this paper is to study several long time behaviors of such process and we mainly obtain the extinction behavior and exponential ergodicity in total variation distance. The result of extinction behavior is inspired by [10]. Furthermore, ergodicity is the foundation for a wide class of limit theorems and long-time behavior for Markov processes. Due to the nonlinearity of function h , the semigroup transition of (X, Y) is not explicit. We obtain the ergodic property by a coupling approach, which has been proved to be effective in the study of ergodicity of nonlinear case, see [3], [16] and the references therein.

We now introduce some notation. Let $e_\lambda(z) = e^{-\langle \lambda, z \rangle}$ for any $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ and $z = (x, y) \in D$, where $\langle \lambda, z \rangle = \lambda_1 x + \lambda_2 y$. We use $C_b(D)$ to denote the set of all bounded functions $(x, y) \mapsto f(x, y)$ on D with $x \mapsto f(x, \cdot)$ continuous. Let $C_b^2(D)$ be the subset of $C_b(D)$ with continuous bounded derivatives up to 2nd order on x . Let $C_0^2(D)$ be the subset of $C_b^2(D)$ vanishing at infinity, and $C_c^2(D)$ be the subset of $C_0^2(D)$ with compact support. Define $C_b(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$ to be the collection of all bounded continuous functions on \mathbb{R}_+^2 , which is a subset of $C_b(D)$. Let $C_b^{2,1}(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$ be

the subset of $C_b(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$ with continuous bounded derivatives up to 2nd order on x and continuous bounded derivatives up to first order on y . Then we have $C_b^{2,1}(\mathbb{R}_+^2) \subset C_b^2(D)$. Let $\mathbb{D}([0, \infty), D)$ denote the space of càdlàg paths from $[0, \infty)$ to D furnished with the Skorokhod topology.

This paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we show that the existence by a scaling limit of a sequence of two-type Galton-Watson processes with interaction and pathwise uniqueness of solution to (1.1)–(1.2) hold. The extinction behavior is studied in Section 3. In Section 4, an exponential ergodic property is proved under some conditions.

2 Existence and pathwise uniqueness of solution

The generator A of $\{(X_t, Y_t) : t \geq 0\}$ satisfying (1.1)–(1.2) is determined by

$$\begin{aligned} Af(z) = & x \left[-bf'_x + cf''_{xx} + \int_0^\infty \{f(x+\xi, y) - f(x, y) - \xi f'_x\} m(d\xi) \right] \\ & + \gamma(x, y) \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1}} \{f(x, y+\xi) - f(x, y)\} n(d\xi) \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

for $f \in C_b^2(D)$ and $z = (x, y) \in D$, where $\gamma(x, y) = h(x, y)y$. Then

$$Ae_\lambda(z) = e_\lambda(z) \left[x\phi_1(\lambda_1) + \gamma(x, y)\phi_2(\lambda_2) \right], \quad (2.4)$$

where

$$\phi_1(\lambda_1) = b\lambda_1 + c\lambda_1^2 + \int_0^\infty (e^{-\lambda_1\xi} - 1 + \lambda_1\xi) m(d\xi), \quad (2.5)$$

$$\phi_2(\lambda_2) = \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1}} (e^{-\lambda_2\xi} - 1) n(d\xi). \quad (2.6)$$

We first consider the case of $h \in C_b(\mathbb{R}_+^2)^+$. Given the initial value $(x(0), y(0)) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$, let $\{(x(n), y(n)) : n \geq 0\}$ be a two-dimensional process defined by

$$x(n) = \sum_{j=1}^{x(n-1)} \alpha_{n-1,j}, \quad y(n) = \sum_{j=1}^{y(n-1)} \beta_{n-1,j,\theta(x(n-1), y(n-1))}, \quad n \geq 1, \quad (2.7)$$

where $\{\alpha_{n,j} : n \geq 0, j \geq 1\}$ are integer-valued i.i.d. random variables with offspring distribution $(w(i) : i \in \mathbb{N})$. Given $x, y \in \mathbb{N}$, the above $\{\beta_{n,j,\theta(x,y)} : n \geq 0, j \geq 1\}$ are i.i.d. integer-valued random variables with offspring distribution $(v^{\theta(x,y)}(i) : i \in \mathbb{N})$ depending on function θ . Let g_1 and $g_2^{\theta(x,y)}$ be the generating functions of $(w(i) : i \in \mathbb{N})$ and $(v^{\theta(x,y)}(i) : i \in \mathbb{N})$, respectively. It is known that $\{(x(n), y(n)) : n \geq 0\}$ is a Markov process and we call it *two-type Galton-Watson process with interaction*. Suppose that there exists a sequence of two-type Galton-Watson processes with interaction $\{(x_k(n), y_k(n)) : n \geq 0\}_{k \geq 1}$ with parameters $(g_{k,1}, g_{k,2}^{\theta_k(x,y)})$. Let $\{\gamma_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ be a sequence of positive numbers with $\gamma_k \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. For $(x, y) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$, we introduce several functions on \mathbb{R}_+ as below:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Phi}_{k,1}(\lambda_1) &= k\gamma_k \log \left[1 - (k\gamma_k)^{-1} \Phi_{k,1}(\lambda_1) e^{\lambda_1/k} \right], \\ \Phi_{k,1}(\lambda_1) &= k\gamma_k \left[e^{-\lambda_1/k} - g_{k,1}(e^{-\lambda_1/k}) \right], \\ \bar{\Phi}_{k,2}^{\theta_k(x,y)}(\lambda_2) &= \gamma_k \log \left[1 - \gamma_k^{-1} \Phi_{k,2}^{\theta_k(x,y)}(\lambda_2) e^{\lambda_2} \right], \\ \Phi_{k,2}^{\theta_k(x,y)}(\lambda_2) &= \gamma_k \left[e^{-\lambda_2} - g_{k,2}^{\theta_k(x,y)}(e^{-\lambda_2}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $E_k = \{0, k^{-1}, 2k^{-1}, \dots\}$ for each $k \geq 1$. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we take $x_k := \lfloor kx \rfloor / k$. Then $x_k \in E_k$ and $|x_k - x| \leq 1/k$. Now we consider the following conditions:

Condition 2.1

- (2.1.1) *The sequence $\{\Phi_{k,1}(\lambda_1)\}_{k \geq 1}$ is uniformly Lipschitz in λ_1 on each bounded interval, and converges to a continuous function as $k \rightarrow \infty$;*
- (2.1.2) *$\gamma_k[1 - v_k^{\theta_k(kx_k, y)}(1)] \rightarrow h(x, y)$ uniformly in $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{N}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$;*
- (2.1.3) *$\frac{v_k^{\theta_k(kx_k, y)}(\xi)}{1 - v_k^{\theta_k(kx_k, y)}(1)} \rightarrow p_\xi$ for $\xi \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$ uniformly in $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{N}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.*
- (2.1.4) *The sequence $\{\Phi_{k,2}^{\theta_k(kx_k, y)}(\lambda_2)\}_{k \geq 1}$ is uniformly Lipschitz in λ_2 on each bounded interval, where the Lipschitz coefficient is independent from x, y .*

By [14, Proposition 2.5], under Condition (2.1.1), $\Phi_{k,1}(\lambda_1)$ converges to a function with representation (2.5) as $k \rightarrow \infty$, see also [11, 12]. Moreover, there exists a constant $K > 0$ such that

$$\sup_k \Phi'_{k,1}(0+) = \sup_k \gamma_k[g'_{k,1}(1-) - 1] \leq K. \quad (2.8)$$

Example 2.1 *Let $\{p_\xi : \xi = 0, 1, \dots\}$ be an offspring distribution with $p_1 = 0$. Let*

$$v_k^{\theta_k(kx_k, y)}(\xi) = p_\xi \gamma_k^{-1/2} \left(1 - e^{-\gamma_k^{-1/2} h(x_k, y)}\right)$$

for any $\xi \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$ and

$$v_k^{\theta_k(kx_k, y)}(1) = 1 - \gamma_k^{-1/2} \left(1 - e^{-\gamma_k^{-1/2} h(x_k, y)}\right).$$

Then we have

$$\Phi_{k,2}^{\theta_k(kx_k, y)}(\lambda_2) = \gamma_k^{1/2} \left(1 - e^{-\gamma_k^{-1/2} h(x_k, y)}\right) \left(e^{-\lambda_2} - g(e^{-\lambda_2})\right)$$

with $g(e^{-\lambda_2}) = \sum_{\xi=0}^{\infty} p_\xi e^{-\lambda_2 \xi}$. It is easy to check that the above satisfies Condition (2.1.2)–(2.1.4).

Proposition 2.2 *Under Conditions (2.1.2)–(2.1.3), $e^{\lambda_2} \Phi_{k,2}^{\theta_k(kx_k, y)}(\lambda_2)$ converges to $-h(x, y)\phi_2(\lambda_2)$ uniformly for $(x, y, \lambda_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}_+$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, where $h \in C_b(\mathbb{R}_+^2)^+$ and $\phi_2(\lambda_2)$ is given by (2.6).*

Proof. One can see that

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{\lambda_2} \Phi_{k,2}^{\theta_k(kx_k, y)}(\lambda_2) \\ &= \gamma_k \left[1 - e^{\lambda_2} g_{k,2}^{\theta_k(kx_k, y)}(e^{-\lambda_2})\right] \\ &= \gamma_k \left[1 - e^{\lambda_2} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda_2 j} v_k^{\theta_k(kx_k, y)}(j)\right] \\ &= \gamma_k \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (1 - e^{-\lambda_2(j-1)}) v_k^{\theta_k(kx_k, y)}(j) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \gamma_k \left[1 - v_k^{\theta_k(kx_k, y)}(1) \right] \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1} \setminus \{0\}} (1 - e^{-\lambda_2 \xi}) \rho_k^{\theta_k(kx_k, y)}(d\xi),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_k^{\theta_k(kx_k, y)}(d\xi) &= \frac{1}{1 - v_k^{\theta_k(kx_k, y)}(1)} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} v_k^{\theta_k(kx_k, y)}(j) \delta_{j-1}(d\xi) \\ &= \frac{v_k^{\theta_k(kx_k, y)}(\xi + 1)}{1 - v_k^{\theta_k(kx_k, y)}(1)} \sharp(d\xi) \end{aligned}$$

for $\xi \in \mathbb{N}_{-1} \setminus \{0\}$ with $\sharp(d\xi)$ being the counting measure on \mathbb{N}_{-1} . The result follows from Conditions (2.1.2)–(2.1.3). \square

Let $D_k := E_k \times \mathbb{N}$. Then D_k is a subset of D . We define a continuous-time stochastic process taking values on D_k as $\{(X_k(t), Y_k(t)) : t \geq 0\} := \{(x_k(\lfloor \gamma_k t \rfloor / k, y_k(\lfloor \gamma_k t \rfloor)) : t \geq 0\}$. Denote $Z_k(t) = (X_k(t), Y_k(t))$ to simplify the notation. For $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} e_\lambda(Z_k(t)) &= e_\lambda(Z_k(0)) + \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \gamma_k t \rfloor} \left[e_\lambda \left(Z_k \left(\frac{i}{\gamma_k} \right) \right) - e_\lambda \left(Z_k \left(\frac{i-1}{\gamma_k} \right) \right) \right] \\ &= e_\lambda(Z_k(0)) + \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \gamma_k t \rfloor} \gamma_k^{-1} A_k e_\lambda \left(Z_k \left(\frac{i-1}{\gamma_k} \right) \right) + M_{k,\lambda}(t) \\ &= e_\lambda(Z_k(0)) + \int_0^{\lfloor \gamma_k t \rfloor / \gamma_k} A_k e_\lambda(Z_k(s)) ds + M_{k,\lambda}(t), \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} M_{k,\lambda}(t) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \gamma_k t \rfloor} \left\{ \left[e_\lambda \left(Z_k \left(\frac{i}{\gamma_k} \right) \right) - e_\lambda \left(Z_k \left(\frac{i-1}{\gamma_k} \right) \right) \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \mathbb{E} \left[e_\lambda \left(Z_k \left(\frac{i}{\gamma_k} \right) \right) - e_\lambda \left(Z_k \left(\frac{i-1}{\gamma_k} \right) \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{\frac{i-1}{\gamma_k}} \right] \right\} \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

is a martingale and for $z = (x, y) \in D$,

$$A_k e_\lambda(z) = \gamma_k \left[(g_{k,1}(e^{-\lambda_1/k}))^{kx_k} \cdot (g_{k,2}^{\theta_k(kx_k, y)}(e^{-\lambda_2}))^y - e_\lambda(z) \right].$$

One can check that

$$A_k e_\lambda(z) = e_\lambda(z) \left[x \bar{\Phi}_{k,1}(\lambda_1) + y \bar{\Phi}_{k,2}^{\theta_k(kx_k, y)}(\lambda_2) \right] + o(1).$$

By the above, [14, Proposition 2.5] and Proposition 2.2, we have the following estimation.

Theorem 2.3 *Suppose that Condition 2.1 holds. Then for any $\lambda > 0$, we have*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{z \in D_k} |A_k e_\lambda(z) - A e_\lambda(z)| = 0,$$

where A is the generator defined by (2.3).

Proposition 2.4 *Let $T > 0$ be a fixed constant and $\sup_k \mathbb{E}[X_k(0) + Y_k(0)] < \infty$. Then we have*

$$\sup_k \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E}[X_k(t) + Y_k(t)] < \infty.$$

Proof. By (2.8) one sees that $0 \leq g'_{k,1}(1-) \leq K/\gamma_k + 1$. Then for $t \in [\frac{i}{\gamma_k}, \frac{i+1}{\gamma_k})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[X_k(t)] &= k^{-1} \mathbb{E}[x_k(\lfloor \gamma_k t \rfloor)] \\ &= g'_{k,1}(1-) k^{-1} \mathbb{E}[x_k(\lfloor \gamma_k t \rfloor - 1)] \\ &\leq (K/\gamma_k + 1) k^{-1} \mathbb{E}[x_k(\lfloor \gamma_k t \rfloor - 1)].\end{aligned}$$

By induction, we have $\mathbb{E}[X_k(t)] \leq (K/\gamma_k + 1)^{\lfloor \gamma_k t \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[X_k(0)]$. Moreover, by Condition (2.1.4), we have

$$\sup_k \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_2} \Phi_{k,2}^{\theta_k(kx_k, y)}(\lambda_2) \Big|_{\lambda_2=0} \right| = \sup_k \gamma_k \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial z} g_{k,2}^{\theta_k(kx_k, y)}(z) \Big|_{z=1} - 1 \right| \leq K.$$

Similarly, for $t \in [\frac{i}{\gamma_k}, \frac{i+1}{\gamma_k})$, one sees that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[Y_k(t)] &= \mathbb{E}[y_k(\lfloor \gamma_k t \rfloor)] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{y_k(n-1)} \mathbb{E} \left[\beta_{n-1, k, \theta_k(x_k(n-1), y_k(n-1))} \Big| x_k(n-1), y_k(n-1) \right] \right] \Big|_{n=\lfloor \gamma_k t \rfloor} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[y_k(n-1) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial z} g_{k,2}^{\theta_k(kx_k(n-1), y_k(n-1))}(z) \Big|_{z=1} \right] \Big|_{n=\lfloor \gamma_k t \rfloor} \\ &\leq (1 + K/\gamma_k) \mathbb{E}[y_k(\lfloor \gamma_k t \rfloor - 1)].\end{aligned}$$

Then we get $\mathbb{E}[Y_k(t)] \leq (K/\gamma_k + 1)^{\lfloor \gamma_k t \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[Y_k(0)]$ by induction. The result follows. \square

Let $\{\tau_k : k \geq 1\}$ be a sequence of bounded stopping times, and $\{\delta_k : k \geq 1\}$ be a sequence of positive constants with $\delta_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. For a fixed constant $T > 0$, we assume that

$$0 \leq \tau_k \leq \tau_k + \delta_k \leq T.$$

Proposition 2.5 *Suppose that Condition 2.1 holds and $h \in C_b(\mathbb{R}_+^2)^+$. Then for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, we have*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[|e_\lambda(Z_k(\tau_k + \delta_k)) - e_\lambda(Z_k(\tau_k))|^2 \right] = 0.$$

Proof. For any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, by (2.9) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \left[|e_\lambda(Z_k(\tau_k + \delta_k)) - e_\lambda(Z_k(\tau_k))|^2 \right] &\leq |\mathbb{E} [e_{2\lambda}(Z_k(\tau_k + \delta_k)) - e_{2\lambda}(Z_k(\tau_k))]| \\ &\quad + |\mathbb{E} [2e_\lambda(Z_k(\tau_k)) [e_\lambda(Z_k(\tau_k + \delta_k)) - e_\lambda(Z_k(\tau_k))]]| \\ &\leq I_1 + I_2 + I_3,\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}I_1 &= \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\lfloor \gamma_k \tau_k \rfloor / \gamma_k}^{\lfloor \gamma_k (\tau_k + \delta_k) \rfloor / \gamma_k} A_k e_{2\lambda}(Z_k(s)) ds \right] \right|, \\ I_2 &= \left| \mathbb{E} \left[2e_\lambda(Z_k(\tau_k)) \int_{\lfloor \gamma_k \tau_k \rfloor / \gamma_k}^{\lfloor \gamma_k (\tau_k + \delta_k) \rfloor / \gamma_k} A_k e_\lambda(Z_k(s)) ds \right] \right|, \\ I_3 &= |\mathbb{E} [2e_\lambda(Z_k(\tau_k)) (M_{k,\lambda}(\tau_k + \delta_k) - M_{k,\lambda}(\tau_k))]|.\end{aligned}$$

Then by (2.4), Theorem 2.3 and Proposition 2.4, one can see that

$$I_1 \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\lfloor \gamma_k \tau_k \rfloor / \gamma_k}^{\lfloor \gamma_k (\tau_k + \delta_k) \rfloor / \gamma_k} |A_k e_{2\lambda}(Z_k(s)) - A e_{2\lambda}(Z_k(s))| ds \right]$$

$$+ \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\lfloor \gamma_k \tau_k \rfloor / \gamma_k}^{\lfloor \gamma_k (\tau_k + \delta_k) \rfloor / \gamma_k} |A e_{2\lambda}(Z_k(s))| ds \right] \leq K \delta_k.$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\lfloor \gamma_k \tau_k \rfloor / \gamma_k}^{\lfloor \gamma_k (\tau_k + \delta_k) \rfloor / \gamma_k} |A_k e_\lambda(Z_k(s))| ds \right] \\ &\leq 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\lfloor \gamma_k \tau_k \rfloor / \gamma_k}^{\lfloor \gamma_k (\tau_k + \delta_k) \rfloor / \gamma_k} |A_k e_\lambda(Z_k(s)) - A e_\lambda(Z_k(s))| ds \right] \\ &\quad + 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\lfloor \gamma_k \tau_k \rfloor / \gamma_k}^{\lfloor \gamma_k (\tau_k + \delta_k) \rfloor / \gamma_k} |A e_\lambda(Z_k(s))| ds \right] \leq K \delta_k. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by (2.10) and Doob's stopping theorem, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} [e_\lambda(Z_k(\tau_k)) (M_{k,\lambda}(\tau_k + \delta_k) - M_{k,\lambda}(\tau_k))] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} [e_\lambda(Z_k(\tau_k)) (M_{k,\lambda}(\tau_k + \delta_k) - M_{k,\lambda}(\tau_k)) | \mathcal{F}_{\lfloor \gamma_k \tau_k \rfloor}]] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [e_\lambda(Z_k(\tau_k)) [\mathbb{E} [M_{k,\lambda}(\tau_k + \delta_k) | \mathcal{F}_{\lfloor \gamma_k \tau_k \rfloor}] - M_{k,\lambda}(\tau_k)]] \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $I_3 = 0$. The result follows. \square

Corollary 2.6 *Suppose that Condition 2.1 holds and $h \in C_b(\mathbb{R}_+^2)^+$. Then for any $\lambda := (\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, we have*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} L_{\tau_k, \delta_k}^\lambda(Z_k) = 0,$$

$$\text{where } L_{\tau_k, \delta_k}^\lambda(Z_k) := \mathbb{E} \left[\left| e^{-\lambda_1 X_k(\tau_k + \delta_k)} - e^{-\lambda_1 X_k(\tau_k)} \right|^2 + \left| e^{-\lambda_2 Y_k(\tau_k + \delta_k)} - e^{-\lambda_2 Y_k(\tau_k)} \right|^2 \right].$$

Proof. The result follows by taking $\lambda = (\lambda_1, 0)$ and $\lambda = (0, \lambda_2)$ in Proposition 2.5. \square

Similar to the proof of [14, Theorem 3.6], we get the following result.

Proposition 2.7 *Suppose that Condition 2.1 holds and $h \in C_b(\mathbb{R}_+^2)^+$. Let $Z_k(0) = (X_k(0), Y_k(0))$ be the initial value satisfying $\sup_k \mathbb{E}[X_k(0) + Y_k(0)] < \infty$. Then the process $\{Z_k(t) : t \geq 0\}_{k \geq 1} = \{(X_k(t), Y_k(t)) : t \geq 0\}_{k \geq 1}$ is tight on $\mathbb{D}([0, \infty), D)$.*

Proof. By Aldous's criterion, it suffices to show that, for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} [\|Z_k(\tau_k + \delta_k) - Z_k(\tau_k)\| > \epsilon] = 0, \quad (2.11)$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is the L^2 norm on D . For any $a := (a_1, a_2), b := (b_1, b_2) \in D$ satisfying $\|a - b\| > \epsilon$, we have $|a_1 - b_1| \wedge |a_2 - b_2| > \epsilon/2$. Then for a fixed constant $M > 0$, by taking $0 \leq \|a\|, \|b\| \leq M$, one sees that

$$|e^{-\lambda_1 a_1} - e^{-\lambda_1 b_1}|^2 + |e^{-\lambda_2 a_2} - e^{-\lambda_2 b_2}|^2 \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} (\lambda_1 \wedge \lambda_2) \epsilon e^{-(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)M} \right)^2.$$

By Proposition 2.5, it is easy to see that

$$\mathbb{P} \{ \|Z_k(\tau_k + \sigma_k) - Z_k(\tau_k)\| > \epsilon; \|Z_k(\tau_k)\| \vee \|Z_k(\tau_k + \delta_k)\| \leq M \}$$

$$\leq \left(\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 \wedge \lambda_2) \epsilon e^{-(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)M} \right)^{-2} L_{\tau_k, \delta_k}^\lambda(Z_k) \rightarrow 0$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Further, by Proposition 2.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[\|Z_k(\tau_k + \sigma_k)\| \geq M] &\leq \mathbb{P}\left[X_k(\tau_k + \sigma_k) \geq \frac{M}{2}\right] + \mathbb{P}\left[Y_k(\tau_k + \sigma_k) \geq \frac{M}{2}\right] \\ &\leq 2 \frac{\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{E}[X_k(t) + Y_k(t)]}{M} \leq \frac{K}{M} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}[\|Z_k(\tau_k)\| \geq M] \leq \frac{K}{M}.$$

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[\|Z_k(\tau_k + \delta_k) - Z_k(\tau_k)\| > \epsilon] \\ \leq \mathbb{P}[\|Z_k(\tau_k + \sigma_k) - Z_k(\tau_k)\| > \epsilon; \|Z_k(\tau_k)\| \vee \|Z_k(\tau_k + \delta_k)\| \leq M] \\ + \mathbb{P}[\|Z_k(\tau_k + \sigma_k)\| \geq M] + \mathbb{P}[\|Z_k(\tau_k)\| \geq M] \end{aligned}$$

goes to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and $M \rightarrow \infty$, which implies (2.11). The result follows. \square

Lemma 2.8 *For any $f \in C_b^2(D)$, there exists a sequence of functions $f^{m,n} \in C_0^2(D)$ such that $f^{m,n} \rightarrow f$, $f_1^{m,n} \rightarrow f_1$ and $f_{11}^{m,n} \rightarrow f_{11}$ uniformly on any bounded subset of D as $m, n \rightarrow \infty$, where $f_1^{m,n} := \frac{\partial f^{m,n}(x,y)}{\partial x}$, $f_1 := \frac{\partial f(x,y)}{\partial x}$, $f_{11}^{m,n} := \frac{\partial^2 f^{m,n}(x,y)}{\partial x^2}$ and $f_{11} := \frac{\partial^2 f(x,y)}{\partial x^2}$.*

Proof. For any nonnegative function $f \in C_b^2(D)$, we define

$$f^{m,n}(x, y) = \begin{cases} f(x, y), & (x, y) \in [0, m] \times [0, n] \cap D, \\ f(x, y) \left[1 - 2 \int_m^x \rho(2(z - m) - 1) dz\right], & (x, y) \in [m, m+1] \times [0, n] \cap D; \\ 0, & \text{others,} \end{cases}$$

where ρ is the mollifier defined by

$$\rho(x) = \Lambda \exp\{-1/(1 - x^2)\} 1_{\{|x| < 1\}}$$

with Λ being the constant such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho(x) dx = 1$. It is easy to see that $f^{m,n} \in C_0^2(D)$. Notice that, for $(x, y) \in [m, m+1] \times [0, n] \cap D$,

$$f_1^{m,n}(x, y) = f_1(x, y) - \frac{d}{dx} \left[2f(x, y) \int_m^x \rho(2(z - m) - 1) dz \right]$$

and

$$f_{11}^{m,n}(x, y) = f_{11}(x, y) - \frac{d^2}{dx^2} \left[2f(x, y) \int_m^x \rho(2(z - m) - 1) dz \right].$$

Let D^b be a fixed bounded subset of D . Then we have

$$\sup_{(x,y) \in D^b} [|f^{m,n}(x, y) - f(x, y)| + |f_1^{m,n}(x, y) - f_1(x, y)| + |f_{11}^{m,n}(x, y) - f_{11}(x, y)|] \rightarrow 0$$

as $m, n \rightarrow \infty$. The result follows. \square

Now we are ready to give the existence of the solution to (1.1)–(1.2) for the case of $h \in C_b(D)^+$.

Theorem 2.9 Suppose that Condition 2.1 holds and $h \in C_b(\mathbb{R}_+^2)^+$. Let $Z_k(0)$ converge in distribution to Z_0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$ with $\sup_k \mathbb{E}[X_k(0) + Y_k(0)] < \infty$. Then $\{Z_k(t) : t \geq 0\}_{k \geq 1}$ converges in distribution on $\mathbb{D}(0, \infty), D)$ to $\{Z_t : t \geq 0\}$, which is a solution to (1.1)–(1.2).

Proof. Let $P^{(k)}$ be the distributions of Z_k on $\mathbb{D}([0, \infty), D)$. By Proposition 2.7, the sequence of processes $\{Z_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ is relatively compact. Then there are a probability measure Q and a subsequence $P^{(k_i)}$ on $\mathbb{D}([0, \infty), D)$ such that $Q = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} P^{(k_i)}$. By Skorokhod representative theorem, there exists a probability space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$ on which are defined càdlàg processes $\{\tilde{Z}_t : t \geq 0\}$ and $\{\tilde{Z}_{k_i}(t) : t \geq 0\}$ such that the distribution of \tilde{Z} and \tilde{Z}_{k_i} on $\mathbb{D}([0, \infty), D)$ are Q and $P^{(k_i)}$, respectively, and $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{Z}_{k_i} = \tilde{Z}$, $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ -almost surely.

Now it suffices to show that $(\tilde{Z}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ satisfies the following martingale problem: for any $f \in C_b^2(D)$, we have

$$f(\tilde{Z}_t) = f(\tilde{Z}_0) + \int_0^t Af(\tilde{Z}_s)ds + \text{local mart.} \quad (2.12)$$

Let $f(z) = e_\lambda(z)$ for any $z \in D$. By (2.9), we get

$$e_\lambda(\tilde{Z}_{k_i}(t)) = e_\lambda(\tilde{Z}_{k_i}(0)) + \int_0^{\lfloor \gamma_{k_i} t \rfloor / \gamma_{k_i}} A_{k_i} e_\lambda(\tilde{Z}_{k_i}(s)) ds + M_{k_i, \lambda}(t).$$

One sees that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{\lfloor \gamma_{k_i} t \rfloor / \gamma_{k_i}} \left| A_{k_i} e_\lambda(\tilde{Z}_{k_i}(s)) - A e_\lambda(\tilde{Z}_s) \right| ds \\ & \leq \int_0^{\lfloor \gamma_{k_i} t \rfloor / \gamma_{k_i}} \left| A_{k_i} e_\lambda(\tilde{Z}_{k_i}(s)) - A e_\lambda(\tilde{Z}_{k_i}(s)) \right| ds \\ & \quad + \int_0^{\lfloor \gamma_{k_i} t \rfloor / \gamma_{k_i}} \left| A e_\lambda(\tilde{Z}_{k_i}(s)) - A e_\lambda(\tilde{Z}_s) \right| ds =: I_{k_i}^1 + I_{k_i}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then $I_{k_i}^1 \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ by Theorem 2.3. On the other hand, let $C_X := \{t > 0 : \tilde{P}(\tilde{Z}_{t-} = \tilde{Z}_t) = 1\}$. Then the set $\mathbb{R}_+ \setminus C_X$ is at most countable. Then we have $I_{k_i}^2 \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. Consequently, the process $(\tilde{Z}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ satisfies the martingale problem (2.12) when $f(z) = e_\lambda(z)$.

Let $f \in C_0^2(D)$ be fixed, and E_0 be the linear hull of $\{e_\lambda(z) : \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2\}$. By Stone-Weierstrass Theorem and (2.3), there exists a sequence of functions $f_n \in E_0$ such that $Af_n(z) \rightarrow Af(z)$ uniformly on each bounded subset of D as $n \rightarrow \infty$. As a linear span of $\{e_\lambda(z)\}$, we have

$$f_n(\tilde{Z}_t) = f_n(\tilde{Z}_0) + \int_0^t Af_n(\tilde{Z}_s)ds + \text{local mart.} \quad (2.13)$$

Let $\tilde{\tau}_N := \inf\{t > 0 : \tilde{X}_t \geq N \text{ or } \tilde{Y}_t \geq N\}$. Then $\tilde{\tau}_N \rightarrow \infty$ almost surely as $N \rightarrow \infty$ by Proposition 2.4 and Fatou's lemma. Replacing t with $t \wedge \tilde{\tau}_N$, and taking limits as $n \rightarrow \infty$ on both sides of (2.13), we then have

$$f(\tilde{Z}_{t \wedge \tilde{\tau}_N}) = f(\tilde{Z}_0) + \int_0^t Af(\tilde{Z}_{s \wedge \tilde{\tau}_N-})ds + \text{mart.} \quad (2.14)$$

Next, for the general function $f \in C_b^2(D)$, by Lemma 2.8, there exists a sequence functions $f^{m,n} \in C_0^2(D)$ such that $Af^{m,n}(z) \rightarrow Af(z)$ uniformly on each bounded subset of D as $m, n \rightarrow \infty$. Similar to the above, (2.14) holds for any $f \in C_b^2(D)$. Letting $N \rightarrow \infty$, one can see that $(\tilde{Z}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ satisfies the martingale problem (2.12), which implies that $(\tilde{Z}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a weak solution to (1.1)–(1.2). The result follows. \square

Theorem 2.10 Assume that $h \in C_b(\mathbb{R}_+^2)^+$. For any given initial value $(X_0, Y_0) \in D$, the pathwise uniqueness holds for (1.1)–(1.2) on D .

Proof. By [5, Theorems 5.1 and 5.2] and [7, Corollary 5.2], there is a unique positive strong solution to (1.1). Moreover, it was shown in [5, 7] that the solution $\{X_t : t \geq 0\}$ is a CB-process. The pathwise uniqueness of solution to Y can also be constructed by path stitching method. Here we prove it by Yamada-Watanabe method since we will get comparison theorem by the same method.

Let $\{(X_t, Y_t^1) : t \geq 0\}$ and $\{(X_t, Y_t^2) : t \geq 0\}$ be two solutions to (1.1)–(1.2) with the same initial value (X_0, Y_0) . It is easy to see that the processes have bounded first moments since $h \in C_b(D)^+$. We define $\tau_k^1 = \inf\{t \geq 0 : Y_t^1 \geq k\}$, $\tau_k^2 = \inf\{t \geq 0 : Y_t^2 \geq k\}$ and $\tau_k = \tau_k^1 \wedge \tau_k^2$. Then $\tau_k \rightarrow \infty$ almost surely as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Let $Z_t = Y_t^1 - Y_t^2$. One can check that

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{t \wedge \tau_k} &= \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_k} \int_0^{Y_{s-}^1} \int_0^{h(X_{s-}, Y_{s-}^1)} \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1}} \xi N(ds, du, dr, d\xi) \\
&\quad - \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_k} \int_0^{Y_{s-}^2} \int_0^{h(X_{s-}, Y_{s-}^2)} \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1}} \xi N(ds, du, dr, d\xi) \\
&= \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_k} \int_{Y_{s-}^2}^{Y_{s-}^1} \int_0^{h(X_{s-}, Y_{s-}^1)} \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1}} \xi 1_{\{Z_{s-} > 0\}} N(ds, du, dr, d\xi) \\
&\quad + \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_k} \int_0^{Y_{s-}^2} \int_{h(X_{s-}, Y_{s-}^2)}^{h(X_{s-}, Y_{s-}^1)} \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1}} \xi 1_{\{Z_{s-} > 0\}} N(ds, du, dr, d\xi) \\
&\quad - \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_k} \int_{Y_{s-}^1}^{Y_{s-}^2} \int_0^{h(X_{s-}, Y_{s-}^2)} \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1}} \xi 1_{\{Z_{s-} < 0\}} N(ds, du, dr, d\xi) \\
&\quad - \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_k} \int_0^{Y_{s-}^1} \int_{h(X_{s-}, Y_{s-}^2)}^{h(X_{s-}, Y_{s-}^1)} \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1}} \xi 1_{\{Z_{s-} < 0\}} N(ds, du, dr, d\xi). \tag{2.15}
\end{aligned}$$

For each integer $n \geq 0$ define $a_n = \exp\{-n(n+1)/2\}$. Then $a_n \rightarrow 0$ decreasingly as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\int_{a_n}^{a_{n-1}} z^{-1} dz = n, n \geq 1$. Let $x \rightarrow g_n(x)$ be a positive continuous function supported by (a_n, a_{n-1}) so that $\int_{a_n}^{a_{n-1}} g_n(x) dx = 1$ and $g_n(x) \leq 2(nx)^{-1}$ for every $x > 0$. For $n \geq 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$ let

$$\phi_n(z) = \int_0^{|z|} dy \int_0^y g_n(x) dx.$$

Then $\phi_n(z) \rightarrow |z|$ increasingly as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, we have $|\phi_n'(z)| \leq 1$. For $z, \zeta \in \mathbb{R}$, it is easy to see that $|\phi_n(z + \zeta) - \phi_n(z)| \leq |\zeta|$. By Itô's formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_n(Z_{t \wedge \tau_k}) &= \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_k} \int_{Y_{s-}^2}^{Y_{s-}^1} \int_0^{h(X_{s-}, Y_{s-}^1)} \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1}} [\phi_n(Z_{s-} + \xi) - \phi_n(Z_{s-})] 1_{\{Z_{s-} > 0\}} N(ds, du, dr, d\xi) \\
&\quad + \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_k} \int_0^{Y_{s-}^2} \int_{h(X_{s-}, Y_{s-}^2)}^{h(X_{s-}, Y_{s-}^1)} \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1}} [\phi_n(Z_{s-} + \xi) - \phi_n(Z_{s-})] 1_{\{Z_{s-} > 0\}} N(ds, du, dr, d\xi) \\
&\quad + \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_k} \int_{Y_{s-}^1}^{Y_{s-}^2} \int_0^{h(X_{s-}, Y_{s-}^2)} \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1}} [\phi_n(Z_{s-} - \xi) - \phi_n(Z_{s-})] 1_{\{Z_{s-} < 0\}} N(ds, du, dr, d\xi) \\
&\quad + \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_k} \int_0^{Y_{s-}^1} \int_{h(X_{s-}, Y_{s-}^2)}^{h(X_{s-}, Y_{s-}^1)} \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1}} [\phi_n(Z_{s-} - \xi) - \phi_n(Z_{s-})] 1_{\{Z_{s-} < 0\}} N(ds, du, dr, d\xi) \\
&= \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_k} Z_{s-} h(X_{s-}, Y_{s-}^1) \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1}} [\phi_n(Z_{s-} + \xi) - \phi_n(Z_{s-})] 1_{\{Z_{s-} > 0\}} n(d\xi) \\
&\quad + \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_k} Y_{s-}^2 [h(X_{s-}, Y_{s-}^1) - h(X_{s-}, Y_{s-}^2)] \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1}} [\phi_n(Z_{s-} + \xi) - \phi_n(Z_{s-})] 1_{\{Z_{s-} > 0\}} n(d\xi)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_k} Z_{s-} h(X_{s-}, Y_{s-}^2) \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1}} [\phi_n(Z_{s-} - \xi) - \phi_n(Z_{s-})] 1_{\{Z_{s-} < 0\}} n(d\xi) \\
& - \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_k} Y_{s-}^2 [h(X_{s-}, Y_{s-}^1) - h(X_{s-}, Y_{s-}^2)] \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1}} [\phi_n(Z_{s-} - \xi) - \phi_n(Z_{s-})] 1_{\{Z_{s-} < 0\}} n(d\xi) \\
& + mart.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

Recall that $h \in C_b(\mathbb{R}_+^2)^+$. Then $h \in C_b(D)^+$. For any constant $k > 0$, one sees that there exists a constant $K_k > 0$ depending on k such that

$$|h(x, y_1) - h(x, y_2)| \leq K_k |y_1 - y_2| \tag{2.17}$$

for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and any $y_1, y_2 \in [0, K] \cap \mathbb{N}$. Taking expectations on both sides of (2.16), we then have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\phi_n(Z_{t \wedge \tau_k})] & \leq K_k^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{t \wedge \tau_k} |Z_{s-}| ds \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1}} |\xi| n(d\xi) \right] \\
& \leq K_k^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{t \wedge \tau_k} |Z_{s-}| ds \right].
\end{aligned}$$

where K_k^1, K_k^2 are positive constants depending on k . Taking $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\mathbb{E}[|Z_{t \wedge \tau_k}|] = 0$ by Gronwall's inequality, and so $\mathbb{P}(Y_t^1 = Y_t^2) = 1$ for all $t \geq 0$ by letting $k \rightarrow \infty$. Then $\mathbb{P}(Y_t^1 = Y_t^2 \text{ for all } t \geq 0) = 1$ by the right continuity of the processes. \square

Theorem 2.11 *Suppose that $h \in C(\mathbb{R}_+^2)^+$. Then there exists a unique strong solution to (1.1)–(1.2).*

Proof. Let $h_m(x, y) := h(x \wedge m, y \wedge m)$. Then h_m is bounded for any $m \geq 1$ and $h_m \rightarrow h$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. By Theorems 2.9 and 2.10, there exists a unique strong solution $\{(X_t^m, Y_t^m) : t \geq 0\}$ to the following stochastic integral equation system:

$$\begin{cases} X_t = X_0 - b \int_0^t X_s ds + \int_0^t \sqrt{2cX_s} dB_s + \int_0^t \int_0^{X_{s-}} \int_0^\infty \xi \tilde{M}(ds, du, d\xi), \\ Y_t = Y_0 + \int_0^t \int_0^{Y_{s-}} \int_0^{h_m(X_{s-}, Y_{s-})} \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1}} \xi N(ds, du, dr, d\xi). \end{cases} \tag{2.18}$$

In fact, $\{X_t^m : t \geq 0\}$ is the unique strong solution to (1.1) independent with m , which is written as $\{X_t : t \geq 0\}$ in the following. Let $\tau_m^X := \inf\{t > 0 : X_t \geq m\}$, $\tau_m^Y := \inf\{t > 0 : Y_t^m \geq m\}$ and $\tau_m = \tau_m^X \wedge \tau_m^Y$. Then $0 \leq X_t < m$ and $0 \leq Y_t^m < m$ for $0 \leq t < \tau_m$, and (X_t, Y_t^m) satisfies (1.1)–(1.2) for $0 \leq t < \tau_m$. Let

$$Y_{\tau_m}^m = Y_{\tau_m-}^m + \int_{\{\tau_m\}} \int_0^{Y_{\tau_m-}^m} \int_0^{h_n(X_{\tau_m-}, Y_{\tau_m-}^m)} \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1}} \xi N(ds, du, dr, d\xi).$$

For $n \geq m \geq 1$ there exists a unique strong solution $(X_t, \tilde{Y}_t)_{t \geq \tau_m}$ to (1.1) and

$$Y_t = Y_{\tau_m}^m + \int_{\tau_m}^t \int_0^{Y_{s-}} \int_{\tau_m}^{h_n(X_{s-}, Y_{s-})} \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1}} \xi N(ds, du, dr, d\xi).$$

Let $Y_t' = Y_t^m$ for $0 \leq t < \tau_m$ and $Y_t' = \tilde{Y}_t$ for $t \geq \tau_m$. Then it is a solution to (2.18) by changing m to n . By the strong uniqueness we get $(X_t, Y_t')_{t \geq 0} = (X_t, Y_t^n)_{t \geq 0}$ almost surely. In particular, we infer $Y_t^n = Y_t^m < m$ for $0 \leq t < \tau_m$. Consequently, the sequence $\{\tau_m\}$ is non-decreasing. On the other hand, by (2.18) it is easy to check that $\mathbb{E}[X_{t \wedge \tau_m^X}] \leq \mathbb{E}[X_0] e^{Kt}$, where K is a constant independent with m . Then we have $\tau_m^X \rightarrow \infty$ almost surely as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Let $\tau = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \tau_m = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \tau_m^Y$. Let $Y_t = Y_t^m$ for all $0 \leq t < \tau_m$ and $m \geq 1$. It is easily seen that $(X_t, Y_t)_{t \in [0, \tau]}$ is a unique strong solution to (1.1)–(1.2) up to τ . For $t \geq \tau$, let $(X_t, Y_t) = (X_t, \infty)$. The result follows. \square

Theorem 2.12 Assume $h \in C(\mathbb{R}_+^2)^+$. The comparison property of (1.1)–(1.2) holds.

Proof. Suppose that $(X_t^1, Y_t^1)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(X_t^2, Y_t^2)_{t \geq 0}$ are two positive solutions to (1.1)–(1.2) with $\mathbb{P}(X_0^1 \leq X_0^2, Y_0^1 \leq Y_0^2) = 1$. By [14, Theorem 8.4] We have $\mathbb{P}(X_t^1 \leq X_t^2 \text{ for all } t \geq 0) = 1$. For $n \geq 0$ let ϕ_n be the function defined as in the proof of Theorem 2.10. Let $\psi_n(z) = \phi_n(z \vee 0)$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $\psi_n(z) \rightarrow z_+ := z \vee 0$ increasingly as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We define $\kappa_k^1 = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t^1 + Y_t^1 \geq k\}$, $\kappa_k^2 = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t^2 + Y_t^2 \geq k\}$ and $\kappa_k = \kappa_k^1 \wedge \kappa_k^2$. Let $\kappa := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_k$. Then $Y_t^1 = Y_t^2 = \infty$ almost surely for any $t \geq \kappa$. Let $Z_t = Y_t^1 - Y_t^2$ for $t \in [0, \kappa)$. Similar to the proof of Theorem 2.10, we get $\mathbb{E}[(Z_{t \wedge \kappa_k})_+] = 0$ for every $t \geq 0$ by Gronwall's inequality. Then by taking $k \rightarrow \infty$ and using Fatou's lemma we see that $\mathbb{E}[(Z_t)_+] = 0$ for every $t \in [0, \kappa)$, then $\mathbb{P}(Y_t^1 \leq Y_t^2 \text{ for all } t \geq 0) = 1$ by the right continuity of the processes. \square

3 Foster-Lyapunov criteria for extinction

In this section, we mainly discuss the extinction behavior of (X, Y) under $b \geq 0$. Define $\tau_0 = \inf\{t > 0 : X_t = 0 \text{ and } Y_t = 0\}$. Moreover, we separately define the extinction time of X, Y as $\tau_0^X := \inf\{t > 0 : X_t = 0\}$ and $\tau_0^Y := \inf\{t > 0 : Y_t = 0\}$. Then we have $\tau_0 = \tau_0^X \vee \tau_0^Y$. For the extinction behavior of the process X , we introduce the so called Grey's condition:

Condition 3.1 There is some constant $\theta > 0$ so that $\phi_1(z) > 0$ for $z \geq \theta$ and $\int_\theta^\infty \phi_1^{-1}(z) dz < \infty$, where ϕ_1 is given by (2.5).

Since $b \geq 0$, under Condition 3.1, one can see that $\mathbb{P}_x(\tau_0^X < \infty) = 1$ for all $x > 0$; see, e.g., [14, Corollary 3.8]. In the following, we present a Foster-Lyapunov criteria-type result for the process (X, Y) . For $z_1 = (x_1, y_1), z_2 = (x_2, y_2) \in D$, we say $z_1 \succeq z_2$ if $x_1 \geq x_2$ and $y_1 \geq y_2$. Let $\tilde{z} := (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \succeq z_0$ and $(X_t, Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be the mixed state branching process satisfying (1.1)–(1.2) with initial value z_0 . We define stopping time $\sigma_{\tilde{z}} = \inf\{t > 0 : X_t \geq \tilde{x} \text{ or } Y_t \geq \tilde{y}\}$. It is easy to see that $X_{t \wedge \sigma_{\tilde{z}}} \leq \tilde{x}$ and $Y_{t \wedge \sigma_{\tilde{z}}} \leq \tilde{y}$.

Theorem 3.2 Let $\{(X_t, Y_t) : t \geq 0\}$ be the mixed state branching process satisfying (1.1)–(1.2) with initial value $z_0 = (x_0, y_0) \in D$. Suppose that $\phi_1(\lambda_1) > 0$ and $\phi_2(\lambda_2) > 0$ for any $\lambda := (\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in (0, \infty)^2$. Then we have $\mathbb{P}_{z_0}\{\tau_0 < \infty\} = 1$.

Proof. It suffices to prove the case of $z_0 \in D \setminus (0, 0)$. The proof is inspired by [10, Lemma 4.1]. By Itô's formula, we have

$$e_\lambda(Z_{t \wedge \tau_0 \wedge \sigma_{\tilde{z}}}) = e_\lambda(z_0) + \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_0 \wedge \sigma_{\tilde{z}}} Ae_\lambda(Z_{s-}) ds + \text{mart.} \quad (3.19)$$

Taking expectations on both sides, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{z_0}[e_\lambda(Z_{t \wedge \tau_0 \wedge \sigma_{\tilde{z}}})] = e_\lambda(z_0) + \int_0^t \mathbb{E}_{z_0}[Ae_\lambda(Z_{s-}) 1_{\{s < \tau_0 \wedge \sigma_{\tilde{z}}\}}] ds,$$

which implies that

$$d(\mathbb{E}_{z_0}[e_\lambda(Z_{t \wedge \tau_0 \wedge \sigma_{\tilde{z}}})]) = \mathbb{E}_{z_0}[Ae_\lambda(Z_{t-}) 1_{\{t < \tau_0 \wedge \sigma_{\tilde{z}}\}}] dt.$$

Recall that $\phi_1(\lambda_1) > 0$ and $\phi_2(\lambda_2) > 0$ for all $\lambda \in (0, \infty)^2$. Then for all $\tilde{z} = (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \in D$ with $\tilde{z} \succeq z_0$ and $\lambda \in (0, \infty)^2$, there exists a constant $d_{z_0, \tilde{z}, \lambda} > 0$ such that for all $z = (x, y) \in D$ with $z_0 \preceq z \preceq \tilde{z}$,

$$x\phi_1(\lambda_1) + h(x, y)y\phi_2(\lambda_2) \geq d_{z_0, \tilde{z}, \lambda}. \quad (3.20)$$

Then by integration by parts,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^\infty e^{-d_{z_0, \tilde{z}, \lambda} t} \mathbb{E}_{z_0} [A e_\lambda(Z_t) 1_{\{t < \tau_0 \wedge \sigma_{\tilde{z}}\}}] dt \\
&= \int_0^\infty e^{-d_{z_0, \tilde{z}, \lambda} t} d(\mathbb{E}_{z_0} [e_\lambda(Z_{t \wedge \tau_0 \wedge \sigma_{\tilde{z}}})]) \\
&= d_{z_0, \tilde{z}, \lambda} \int_0^\infty e^{-d_{z_0, \tilde{z}, \lambda} t} \mathbb{E}_{z_0} [e_\lambda(Z_{t \wedge \tau_0 \wedge \sigma_{\tilde{z}}})] dt - e_\lambda(z_0).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by (2.4) and (3.20) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^\infty e^{-d_{z_0, \tilde{z}, \lambda} t} \mathbb{E}_{z_0} [A e_\lambda(Z_t) 1_{\{t < \tau_0 \wedge \sigma_{\tilde{z}}\}}] dt \\
&\geq d_{z_0, \tilde{z}, \lambda} \int_0^\infty e^{-d_{z_0, \tilde{z}, \lambda} t} \mathbb{E}_{z_0} [e_\lambda(Z_t) 1_{\{t < \tau_0 \wedge \sigma_{\tilde{z}}\}}] dt.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
e_\lambda(z_0) &\leq d_{z_0, \tilde{z}, \lambda} \int_0^\infty e^{-d_{z_0, \tilde{z}, \lambda} t} \mathbb{E}_{z_0} [e_\lambda(Z_{\tau_0 \wedge \sigma_{\tilde{z}}}) 1_{\{t \geq \tau_0 \wedge \sigma_{\tilde{z}}\}}] dt \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}_{z_0} \{\tau_0 \leq \sigma_{\tilde{z}}\} + \sup_{z \succeq \tilde{z}} [e^{-\lambda_1 x} + e^{-\lambda_2 y}] \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}_{z_0} \{\tau_0 < \infty\} + \sup_{z \succeq \tilde{z}} [e^{-\lambda_1 x} + e^{-\lambda_2 y}].
\end{aligned}$$

Taking $\tilde{x}, \tilde{y} \rightarrow \infty$, we get $\mathbb{P}_{z_0} \{\tau_0 < \infty\} \geq e_\lambda(z_0)$, which holds for any $\lambda \in (0, \infty)^2$. The result follows by letting $\lambda \rightarrow (0, 0)$. \square

Remark 3.3 The processes $\{X_t : t \geq 0\}$ and $\{Y_t : t \geq 0\}$ are independent as $h > 0$ being a constant. In this case, one can check that $\mathbb{P}(\tau_0^X < \infty) = 1$ when $\phi_1(\lambda_1) > 0$ for any $\lambda_1 > 0$, and $\mathbb{P}(\tau_0^Y < \infty) = 1$ if $\phi_2(\lambda_2) > 0$ for any $\lambda_2 > 0$.

Corollary 3.4 Assume that $b \geq 0$, $R_1 := \int_{\mathbb{N}-1} \xi n(d\xi) < 0$ and Condition 3.1 holds. Then we have $\mathbb{P}_{z_0} \{\tau_0 < \infty\} = 1$.

Proof. By Condition 3.1 and $b \geq 0$, one sees that $\phi_1(\lambda_1) > 0$ for any $\lambda_1 > 0$. Moreover, by the inequality $1 - e^{-\lambda_2 \xi} \leq \lambda_2 \xi$, we have $\phi_2(\lambda_2) \geq -R_1 \lambda_2 > 0$. The result follows by Theorem 3.2. \square

4 Exponential ergodicity in the Wasserstein distance

Recalling that the generator of $\{(X_t, Y_t) : t \geq 0\}$ is given by (2.3) for any $f \in C_b^{2,1}(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$. Let $\mathcal{D}(A)$ denote the linear space consisting of functions $f \in C_b^{2,1}(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$ such that the two integrals on the right-hand side of (2.3) are convergent and define continuous functions on D .

To study the coupling and ergodicity of the process $\{(X_t, Y_t) : t \geq 0\}$, we begin with the construction of a new coupling operator for its generator A . Denote by \tilde{A} the infinitesimal generator of the Markov coupling process $\{(X_t, Y_t, \tilde{X}_t, \tilde{Y}_t) : t \geq 0\}$. Then the operator \tilde{A} satisfies the following marginal property, i.e., for any $f, g \in \mathcal{D}(A)$,

$$\tilde{A}F(x, y, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) = Af(x, y) + Ag(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}),$$

where $F(x, y, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) = f(x, y) + g(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})$ for $(x, y), (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \in D$. We call \tilde{A} a coupling operator of A . In order to construct the associated coupling generator, we use the synchronous coupling to the jump system corresponding to Y ; see, e.g., [3]. Namely,

$$(y, \tilde{y}) \rightarrow \begin{cases} (y + \xi, \tilde{y} + \xi), & [\gamma(x, y) \wedge \gamma(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})]n(d\xi), \\ (y + \xi, \tilde{y}), & [\gamma(x, y) - \gamma(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})]^+n(d\xi), \\ (y, \tilde{y} + \xi), & [\gamma(x, y) - \gamma(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})]^-n(d\xi). \end{cases}$$

For the first component process X , we use the coupling by reflection of the local part but apply the synchronous coupling of the non-local part. More precisely, for any $(x, y), (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \in D$ with $x \geq \tilde{x} \geq 0$, let us consider the operator \tilde{A} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{A}F(x, y, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) &= -bx F'_{x\infty} - b\tilde{x} F'_{\tilde{x}} + cx F''_{xx} + c\tilde{x} F''_{\tilde{x}\tilde{x}} - 2c\sqrt{x\tilde{x}} F''_{x\tilde{x}} \\ &\quad + \tilde{x} \int_0^\infty [F(x + \xi, y, \tilde{x} + \xi, \tilde{y}) - F(x, y, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) - \xi(F'_x + F'_{\tilde{x}})] m(d\xi) \\ &\quad + (x - \tilde{x}) \int_0^\infty [F(x + \xi, y, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) - F(x, y, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) - \xi F'_x] m(d\xi) \\ &\quad + [\gamma(x, y) \wedge \gamma(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})] \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1}} [F(x, y + \xi, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y} + \xi) - F(x, y, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y})] n(d\xi) \\ &\quad + [\gamma(x, y) - \gamma(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})]^+ \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1}} [F(x, y + \xi, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) - F(x, y, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y})] n(d\xi) \\ &\quad + [\gamma(x, y) - \gamma(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})]^- \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1}} [F(x, y, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y} + \xi) - F(x, y, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y})] n(d\xi) \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

for $F \in \mathcal{D}(\tilde{A})$, where $\mathcal{D}(\tilde{A})$ denote the linear space consisting of the functions F such that the integrals in (4.21) are convergent and define continuous functions on D . Similarly, we can define the case that $0 \leq x < \tilde{x}$. In the sequel, it suffices to consider $x \geq \tilde{x} \geq 0$ due to the comparison theorem w.r.t. general CB processes; see, e.g., [14, Theorem 8.4]. It is not hard to see that \tilde{A} is indeed a coupling generator of A defined by (2.3).

Theorem 4.1 *There exists a coupling process $\{((X_t, Y_t), (\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{Y}_t)) : t \geq 0\}$ whose generator \tilde{A} is defined by (4.21).*

Proof. Consider the following SDE:

$$\begin{cases} X_t = X_0 - b \int_0^t X_s ds + \int_0^t \sqrt{2cX_s} dB_s + \int_0^t \int_0^{X_{s-}} \int_0^\infty \xi \tilde{M}(ds, du, d\xi), \\ Y_t = Y_0 + \int_0^t \int_0^{Y_{s-}} \int_0^{h(X_{s-}, Y_{s-})} \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1}} \xi N(ds, du, dr, d\xi), \\ \tilde{X}_t = \tilde{X}_0 - b \int_0^t \tilde{X}_s ds + \int_0^t \sqrt{2c\tilde{X}_s} dB_s^* + \int_0^t \int_0^{\tilde{X}_{s-}} \int_0^\infty \xi \tilde{M}(ds, du, d\xi), \\ \tilde{Y}_t = \tilde{Y}_0 + \int_0^t \int_0^{\tilde{Y}_{s-}} \int_0^{h(\tilde{Y}_{s-}, \tilde{Y}_{s-})} \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1}} \xi N(ds, du, dr, d\xi), \end{cases} \quad (4.22)$$

where

$$B_t^* = \begin{cases} -B_t, & t \leq T, \\ -2B_T + B_t, & t > T, \end{cases}$$

$T = \inf\{t > 0 : X_t = \tilde{X}_t\}$. Clearly, $(B_t^*)_{t \geq 0}$ is still a standard Brownian motion. By the results in Section 2, we can determine the unique strong solution $\{((X_t, Y_t), (\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{Y}_t)) : t \geq 0\}$ to (4.22).

On the other hand, we can apply the Itô formula to the SDE (4.22) to see that the infinitesimal generator of the process $\{((X_t, Y_t), (\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{Y}_t)) : t \geq 0\}$ is indeed the coupling generator defined by (4.21). \square

By $\mathcal{P}(D)$ we denote the space of all Borel probability measures over D . Given $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(D)$, a coupling H of (μ, ν) is a Borel probability measure on $D \times D$ which has marginals μ and ν , respectively. We write $\mathcal{H}(\mu, \nu)$ for the collection of all such couplings. Let d be a metric on D such that (D, d) is a complete separable metric space and define

$$\mathcal{P}_d(D) = \left\{ \rho \in \mathcal{P}(D) : \int_D d((x, y), (0, 0)) \rho(dx, dy) < \infty \right\}.$$

The *Wasserstein distance* on $\mathcal{P}_d(D)$ is defined by

$$W_d(\mu, \nu) = \inf \left\{ \int_{D \times D} d((x, y), (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})) H(dx, dy, d\tilde{x}, d\tilde{y}) : H \in \mathcal{H}(\mu, \nu) \right\}.$$

Moreover, it can be shown that this infimum is attained; see, e.g., [20, Theorem 6.16]. More precisely, there exists $H \in \mathcal{H}(\mu, \nu)$ such that

$$W_d(\mu, \nu) = \int_{D \times D} d((x, y), (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})) H(dx, dy, d\tilde{x}, d\tilde{y}).$$

In the remainder of the article, we will use the following particular example.

Take $d((x, y), (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})) = \mathbf{1}_{\{(x, y) \neq (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})\}}$, then $\mathcal{P}_d(D) = \mathcal{P}(D)$ and

$$W_d(\mu, \nu) = \|\mu - \nu\|_{TV} := \sup\{|\mu(A) - \nu(A)| : A : \text{Borel set}\}.$$

We write $d = d_{TV}$ and $W_{d_{TV}}$ is the *total variation distance*.

Definition 4.2 *We say the mixed state branching process with interaction (X, Y) or its transition semigroup $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is exponential ergodic in the total variation distance with rate $\lambda_0 > 0$ if it possesses a unique stationary distribution μ and there is a nonnegative function $\nu \mapsto C(\nu)$ on $\mathcal{P}(D)$ such that*

$$W_{d_{TV}}(\nu P_t, \mu) \leq C(\nu) e^{-\lambda_0 t}, \quad t \geq 0, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(D). \quad (4.23)$$

By standard arguments, (4.23) follows if there exists a constant $C_0 > 0$ such that

$$W_{d_{TV}}(P_t((x, y), \cdot), P_t((\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}), \cdot)) \leq C_0 e^{-\lambda_0 t} d_{TV}((x, y), (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})), \quad t \geq 0. \quad (4.24)$$

Fixed some positive constant $l_0 > 0$. Let define a proper function f on $D \times D$ such that

$$f(x, y, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) = \left[1 + \varphi_{l_0}(|x - \tilde{x}|) + \psi_{l_0}(|y - \tilde{y}|) \right] \mathbf{1}_{\{(x, y) \neq (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})\}}, \quad (4.25)$$

where

$$\varphi_{l_0}(r) := c_0(r \wedge l_0) + (r \wedge l_0)^{\theta_1}, \quad \psi_{l_0}(r) := r \wedge l_0, \quad r \geq 0$$

with $c_0 > 0, \theta_1 \in (0, 1)$, the exact values of above constants will be determined later. It is easy to see that

$$1 \leq f(x, y, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \leq 1 + \phi(l_0) + \psi(l_0), \quad (x, y) \neq (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}). \quad (4.26)$$

Clearly, the function f controls the distance d_{TV} in the sense that there are constants $\lambda_2 \geq \lambda_1 > 0$ such that for $(x, y), (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \in D$,

$$\lambda_1 f(x, y, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \leq d_{TV}((x, y), (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})) \leq \lambda_2 f(x, y, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}). \quad (4.27)$$

Condition 4.3 One of the following two assumptions holds:

(4.3.1) $c > 0$.

(4.3.2) There exist $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ and $C_* > 0$ such that $\int_0^r z^2 m(dz) \geq C_* r^{2-\alpha}$ for $r \in (0, 1]$.

Condition 4.4 There exists $k_2 > 0$ such that for all $|y - \tilde{y}| \in [0, l_0]$,

$$[\gamma(x, y) - \gamma(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})]^+ \mathbf{1}_{\{y - \tilde{y} < 0\}} + [\gamma(x, y) - \gamma(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})]^- \mathbf{1}_{\{y - \tilde{y} \geq 0\}} \leq k_2 |x - \tilde{x}|. \quad (4.28)$$

Condition 4.5 $b > 0$ and $R_1 = \int_{\mathbb{N}-1} \xi n(d\xi) \in (-\infty, 0)$.

Remark 4.6 (4.3.2) in Condition 4.3 means that the driving Lévy-jump process has a α -stable process as a component, where $\alpha \in (1, 2)$. Note that either (4.3.1) or (4.3.2) in Condition 4.3 implies the so called Grey's Condition in Condition 3.1. And it somehow keeps consistent with the results in [13]; see also [14].

Condition 4.4 holds when $h(x, y) \equiv r$ for some fixed positive constant r . In this case, $(\{Y_t^r : t \geq 0\})$ is a standard continuous time branching process with branching rate $r > 0$ and offspring $(p_\xi, \xi \in \mathbb{N})$.

$R_1 < 0$ of Condition 4.5 actually means that the associated first moment of offspring of each individual strictly less than 1, i.e. $\sum_j j p_j < 1$, which is so called the subcritical case; see, e.g. [1, pp.112]. Under Conditions 4.3 and 4.5, the process $\{Z_t : t \geq 0\}$ extincts in finite time by Corollary 3.4.

Theorem 4.7 Suppose that Conditions 4.3–4.5 are satisfied. Then there are constants $\lambda_0 > 0$ and $C_0 > 0$ such that (4.24) holds.

Proof. Step 1. Assume that (4.3.2) in Condition 4.3 is satisfied. We shall first give some estimates of $\tilde{A}\varphi_{l_0}(x - \tilde{x})$ and $\tilde{A}\psi_{l_0}(|y - \tilde{y}|)$.

$$\tilde{A}\varphi_{l_0}(x - \tilde{x}) \leq -bc_0(x - \tilde{x}) + (x - \tilde{x}) \int_0^\infty [\varphi_{l_0}(x - \tilde{x} + \xi) - \varphi_{l_0}(x - \tilde{x}) - \xi \varphi'_{l_0}(x - \tilde{x})] m(d\xi). \quad (4.29)$$

By Taylor's formula and $b > 0$, $\tilde{A}\varphi_{l_0}(x - \tilde{x}) \leq 0$ for all $x \geq \tilde{x} \geq 0$. In particular, when $x - \tilde{x} \in [0, l_0]$, set $\delta_0 = \min\{\frac{1}{l_0}, \frac{2}{2-\theta_1}\}$ and $\theta_1 = \frac{\alpha-1}{2} \in (0, 1)$. By using Taylor's formula again and some elementary calculations,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{A}\varphi_{l_0}(x - \tilde{x}) &\leq -bc_0(x - \tilde{x}) + (x - \tilde{x}) \int_0^\infty [\varphi(x - \tilde{x} + \xi) - \varphi(x - \tilde{x}) - \xi \varphi'(x - \tilde{x})] m(d\xi) \\ &\leq -bc_0(x - \tilde{x}) + (x - \tilde{x}) \int_0^{\delta_0(x - \tilde{x})} \left[\frac{\xi^2}{2} \varphi''(x - \tilde{x}) + \frac{\xi^3}{6} \varphi'''(x - \tilde{x}) \right] m(d\xi) \\ &= -bc_0(x - \tilde{x}) + \frac{x - \tilde{x}}{2} \varphi''(x - \tilde{x}) \left[1 + \frac{\delta_0(x - \tilde{x})}{3} \frac{\varphi'''(x - \tilde{x})}{\varphi''(x - \tilde{x})} \right] \int_0^{\delta_0(x - \tilde{x})} \xi^2 m(d\xi) \\ &\leq -bc_0(x - \tilde{x}) + \frac{(x - \tilde{x})^{\theta_1-1} \theta_1 (\theta_1 - 1)}{6} \int_0^{\delta_0(x - \tilde{x})} \xi^2 m(d\xi) \\ &\leq -bc_0(x - \tilde{x}) - \frac{C_* \theta_1 (1 - \theta_1) \delta_0^{2-\alpha}}{6} (x - \tilde{x})^{-\theta_1}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.30)$$

where the third inequality due to the fact that

$$1 + \frac{\delta_0(x - \tilde{x})}{3} \frac{\varphi'''(x - \tilde{x})}{\varphi''(x - \tilde{x})} \geq \frac{1}{3}$$

and the last inequality follows from Condition 4.3. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{A}\psi_{l_0}(|y - \tilde{y}|) &= [\gamma(x, y) - \gamma(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})]^+ \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1}} \left[\psi_{l_0}(|y - \tilde{y} + \xi|) - \psi_{l_0}(|y - \tilde{y}|) \right] n(d\xi) \\
&\quad + [\gamma(x, y) - \gamma(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})]^- \int_{\mathbb{N}^{-1}} \left[\psi_{l_0}(|y - \tilde{y} - \xi|) - \psi_{l_0}(|y - \tilde{y}|) \right] n(d\xi) \\
&\leq \mathbf{1}_{\{|y - \tilde{y}| \leq l_0\}} \psi'(|y - \tilde{y}|) R_1 \left\{ [\gamma(x, y) - \gamma(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})]^+ \mathbf{1}_{\{y - \tilde{y} > 0\}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + [\gamma(x, y) - \gamma(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})]^- \mathbf{1}_{\{y - \tilde{y} < 0\}} \right\} \\
&\quad + \mathbf{1}_{\{|y - \tilde{y}| \leq l_0\}} R_2 \left\{ [\gamma(x, y) - \gamma(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})]^+ \mathbf{1}_{\{y - \tilde{y} < 0\}} + [\gamma(x, y) - \gamma(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})]^- \mathbf{1}_{\{y - \tilde{y} > 0\}} \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where $R_2 = 2\psi(l_0)$. Clearly, when $|y - \tilde{y}| > l_0$, $\tilde{A}\psi_{l_0}(|y - \tilde{y}|) \leq 0$. And when $|y - \tilde{y}| \in [0, l_0]$, we use Condition 4.4 and Condition 4.5 to see that

$$\tilde{A}\psi_{l_0}(|y - \tilde{y}|) \leq R_2 k_2 (x - \tilde{x}). \quad (4.31)$$

Case 1: $x - \tilde{x}, |y - \tilde{y}| \in [0, l_0]$. In view of (4.30) and (4.31), if we take $c_0 \geq \frac{R_2 k_2}{b}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{A}(\varphi_{l_0}(x - \tilde{x}) + \psi_{l_0}(|y - \tilde{y}|)) &\leq -\frac{C_* \theta_1 (1 - \theta_1) \delta_0^{2-\alpha}}{6} (x - \tilde{x})^{-\theta_1} \\
&\leq -\frac{C_* \theta_1 (1 - \theta_1) \delta_0^{2-\alpha}}{6} l_0^{-\theta_1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Case 2: $x - \tilde{x} > l_0, |y - \tilde{y}| \in [0, l_0]$. In view of (4.29) and (4.31) and $c_0 = \frac{2R_2 k_2}{b}$,

$$\tilde{A}(\varphi_{l_0}(x - \tilde{x}) + \psi_{l_0}(|y - \tilde{y}|)) \leq -R_2 k_2 (x - \tilde{x}) < -R_2 k_2 l_0.$$

Case 3: $x - \tilde{x} \in [0, l_0], |y - \tilde{y}| > l_0$. By (4.30) it is not hard to show that

$$\tilde{A}(\varphi_{l_0}(x - \tilde{x}) + \psi_{l_0}(|y - \tilde{y}|)) \leq -\frac{C_* \theta_1 (1 - \theta_1) \delta_0^{2-\alpha}}{6} l_0^{-\theta_1}.$$

Case 4: $x - \tilde{x} > l_0, |y - \tilde{y}| > l_0$. Similarly,

$$\tilde{A}(\varphi_{l_0}(x - \tilde{x}) + \psi_{l_0}(|y - \tilde{y}|)) \leq -bc_0(x - \tilde{x}) \leq -bc_0 l_0.$$

Step 2. Assume that (4.3.1) in Condition 4.3 is satisfied. By using Taylor's formula again for jump-part integral, one can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{A}\phi_{l_0}(x - \tilde{x}) &\leq -bc_0(x - \tilde{x}) - c\theta_1(1 - \theta_1)(x - \tilde{x})^{\theta_1-2}(\sqrt{x} + \sqrt{\tilde{x}})^2 \\
&\leq -bc_0(x - \tilde{x}) - c\theta_1(1 - \theta_1)(x - \tilde{x})^{\theta_1-1}
\end{aligned} \quad (4.32)$$

by the fact that $(\sqrt{x} + \sqrt{\tilde{x}})^2 \geq (x - \tilde{x})$. One can see (4.32) is similar to (4.30) since $\theta_1 < 1$. We omit the details.

In conclusion, by choosing $c_0 = \frac{2R_2 k_2}{b}$ and $\theta_1 = \frac{\alpha-1}{2}$ if (4.3.2) holds and $\theta_1 \in (0, 1)$ is arbitrary if (4.3.1) holds, for any $(x, y), (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \in D$ with $(x, y) \neq (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})$, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\tilde{A}f(x, y, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \leq -Cf(x, y, \tilde{x}, \tilde{y})$$

by noticing (4.26). Following similar arguments in step 2 of the proof for [16, Theorem 3.1] and (4.27), we obtain the desired result. \square

References

- [1] Athreya, K.B. and Ney, P.E. (1972): *Branching Processes*. New York, Heidelberg, Berlin.
- [2] Bansaye, V. and Tran V.C. (2011): Branching Feller diffusion for cell division with parasite infection. *ALEA, Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat.* **8**: 95–127.
- [3] Chen, M. (2004): *From Markov Chains to Non-Equilibrium Particle Systems*, Second edition, World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., River Edge, NJ.
- [4] Chen, S. and Li, Z. (2021): Continuous time mixed state branching processes and stochastic equations. *Acta Math. Sci. (Engl. Ed.)* **41(5)**: 1445–1473.
- [5] Dawson, D.A. and Li, Z. (2006): Skew convolution semigroups and affine Markov processes. *Ann. Probab.* **34**: 1103–1142.
- [6] Dawson, D.A. and Li, Z. (2012): Stochastic equations, flows and measure-valued processes. *Ann. Probab.* **40**: 813–857.
- [7] Fu, Z. and Li, Z. (2010): Stochastic equations of non-negative processes with jumps. *Stoch. Process. Appl.* **120**: 306–330.
- [8] Ji, L. and Xiong, J. (2022): Superprocesses for the population of rabbits on grassland. *Proc. Steklov Inst. Math.* **316(1)**: 195–208.
- [9] Kawazu, K. and Watanabe, S. (1971): Branching processes with immigration and related limit theorems. *Theory Probab. Appl.* **16**: 36–54.
- [10] Li, P., Yang, X. and Zhou, X. (2019): A general continuous-state nonlinear branching process. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **29(4)**: 2523–2555.
- [11] Li, Z. (2006): A limit theorem for discrete Galton-Watson branching processes with immigration. *J. Appl. Probab.* **43**: 289–295.
- [12] Li, Z. (2011): *Measure-Valued Branching Markov Processes*. Probab. and Its Appl. Springer.
- [13] Li, Z. and Ma, C. (2015): Asymptotic properties of estimators in a Cox-Ingersoll-Ross model. *Stoch. Process. Appl.* **125**: 3196–3233.
- [14] Li, Z. (2020): *Continuous-State Branching Processes with Immigration*. In: Jiao, Y. (eds) From Probability to Finance. Mathematical Lectures from Peking University. Springer, Singapore.
- [15] Liu, J. (2022+): Scaling Limits of Controlled Branching Processes. Available at arxiv: 2204.06796.
- [16] Luo, D. and Wang, J. (2019): Refined basic couplings and Wasserstein-type distances for SDEs with Lévy noises. *Stoc. Process. Appl.* **129**: 3129–3173.
- [17] Ma, C. (2009): A limit theorem of two-type Galton-Watson branching processes with immigration. *Stat. Prob. Lett.* **79**: 1710–1716.
- [18] Marguet, A. and Smadi, C. (2020+): Parasite infection in a cell population with deaths. Available at arxiv: 2010.16070v1.
- [19] Osorio, L. and Winter, A. (2020+): Two level branching model for virus population under cell division. Available at arxiv: 2004.14352.
- [20] Villani, C. (2009): *Optimal Transport, Old and New*. Springer, Berlin.