

A probabilistic study of the set of stationary solutions to spatial kinetic-type equations

Sebastian Mentemeier and Glib Verovkin*

January 10, 2025

Abstract

In this paper we study multivariate kinetic-type equations in a general setup, which includes in particular the spatially homogeneous Boltzmann equation with Maxwellian molecules, both with elastic and inelastic collisions. Using a representation of the collision operator derived in [5, 13], we prove the existence and uniqueness of time-dependent solutions with the help of continuous-time branching random walks, under assumptions as weak as possible. Our main objective is a characterisation of the set of stationary solutions, e.g. equilibrium solutions for inelastic kinetic-type equations, which we describe as mixtures of multidimensional stable laws.

Keywords: Branching processes, Kinetic-type equation, central limit theorems, Inelastic Boltzmann Equation, Multidimensional Stable Laws, Multivariate smoothing equation, Multiplicative martingales

MSC 2020 Subject Classification: Primary: 60J85, Secondary: 60F05, 82C40

1 Introduction

1.1 Kinetic-type equations

In this article, we study kinetic-type equations that originate from the study of the time-dependent distribution of particle velocities in a spatially homogeneous, dilute ideal gas. Particles are assumed to interact only via binary collisions and to move independently before and after the collision has taken place (*Boltzmann's Stosszahlansatz*). There is an enormous body of literature devoted to the study of these equations, see [26] for a survey

*Universität Hildesheim, Institut für Mathematik und Angewandte Informatik, Hildesheim 31141, Germany. E-Mail: mentemeier@uni-hildesheim.de; verovkin@uni-hildesheim.de
The authors were partially supported by DFG grant ME 4473/1-1.

and [12] for a textbook introduction. If $f(v, t)$ denotes the density of particles with velocity $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$ at time $t \geq 0$, the spatial homogeneous Boltzmann equation reads

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} f &= Q(f, f) \\ f(\cdot, 0) &= f_0. \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where Q is the so-called *collision operator*, describing the changes in the velocity distribution due to the collision of two random particles. This equation should be understood in a formal way. In general, one does not assume that the distribution of particle velocities is absolutely continuous.

The form of the collision operator Q depends on the type of the interaction between particles. The case of *Maxwellian molecules*, which interact with a repulsive force that decays like r^{-5} has received a lot of attention, for it is mathematically tractable and yet provides good predictions (see [26, Chapter 1.1.] for a detailed discussion).

In the setting of Maxwellian molecules, it makes sense to consider the Boltzmann equation in Fourier space, for there is an explicit expression for the ‘‘Fourier version’’ \widehat{Q} of Q . In particular, \widehat{Q} splits into a *collisional gain operator* \widehat{Q}_+ and a loss operator, which in this case is just the identity map. If ϕ_t denotes the Fourier transform of the particle velocity distribution $f(\cdot, t)$ at time t , then Eq. (1.1) becomes

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \phi_t = \widehat{Q}_+(\phi_t, \phi_t) - \phi_t, \quad \phi_0 = \phi_{f_0}. \tag{1.2}$$

Under the *cut-off assumption* that excludes the effect of grazing collisions (which would lead to a singularity in the collision kernel associated to \widehat{Q}_+), Bassetti, Ladelli and Matthes in [5], following Dolera and Regazzini [13], have derived a probabilistic representation of \widehat{Q}_+ , which is as follows. Denote by $SO(d)$ the special orthogonal group in dimension d , write \top for transpose and denote by e_i , $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ the standard orthonormal basis of \mathbb{R}^3 . Let ϕ be the Fourier transform of a probability measure on \mathbb{R}^3 , then for all $r \geq 0$ and $o \in SO(3)$,

$$\widehat{Q}_+(\phi, \phi)(roe_3) = \mathbb{E} \left[\phi \left(roR_1O_1e_3 \right) \phi \left(roR_2O_2e_3 \right) \right], \tag{1.3}$$

where R_1, R_2 are nonnegative random variables and O_1, O_2 are random rotations in $SO(3)$ having suitable probability distributions, see [5, Section 3] for details.

In this paper, we are going to study the initial value problem associated to Eq. (1.2) and the operator (1.3) under assumptions as mild as possible. We are going to provide a representation of time-dependent solutions in terms of a continuous-time multitype branching process (see Theorem 3.1). In our main result, Theorem 3.4, we determine the set of solutions to the associated stationary equation

$$\phi = \widehat{Q}_+(\phi, \phi), \tag{1.4}$$

the solutions of which govern the long-term behavior of the time-dependent solutions. We consider both the elastic case (conservation of energy) as well as the inelastic case (loss of energy).

1.2 Setup and assumptions

We are going to study both time-dependent and stationary solutions to Eq. (1.2) and (1.4) respectively, assuming that r, R_1, R_2 take nonnegative values and that o, O_1, O_2 belong to the group of orthogonal 3×3 matrices $\mathbb{O}(3)$. In this section we present our assumptions imposed on the operator (1.3) and the laws of R_1, R_2, O_1, O_2 , which comfortably cover the case of the (inelastic) Boltzmann equation with Maxwellian molecules, as proved in [5, Section 3].

Considering the function $m : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ defined by

$$m(\gamma) := \mathbb{E}[R_1^\gamma + R_2^\gamma],$$

our first assumption is

$$m(\alpha) = 1 \quad \text{for some } \alpha \in (0, 2] \tag{A1}$$

The physical interpretation is as follows: $\alpha = 2$ corresponds to the conservation of kinetic energy, while $0 < \alpha < 2$ means dissipation of energy, see e.g. [24, Section 4]. One can interpret R_1, R_2 as the proportions of kinetic energy given to each one of two colliding particles. In this application it then follows $R_1 \leq 1$ and $R_2 \leq 1$ a.s., with $\mathbb{P}(R_1 = 1 \text{ or } R_2 = 1) < 1$. Hence, the existence of $\alpha > 0$ as in (A1) is always guaranteed – observe that the function m is convex and hence continuous and differentiable on the interior of its domain. Also our second assumption,

$$m'(\alpha) \in (-\infty, 0) \tag{A2}$$

for the α from (A1), is always satisfied in the setting of kinetic equations.

In order to make the definition of \widehat{Q}_+ in (1.3) independent of a particular choice of o , we need to assume that

$$(oR_1O_1e_3, oR_2O_2e_3) \stackrel{d}{=} (uR_1O_1e_3, uR_2O_2e_3) \tag{A3}$$

for any $o, u \in \mathbb{O}(3)$, such that $oe_3 = ue_3$. Here and below, $\stackrel{d}{=}$ denotes equality in distribution. Assumption (A3) may look restrictive at a first glance, but it is required for \widehat{Q}_+ to be well defined and it is satisfied in the main applications from statistical mechanics, see e.g. [5, Section 3]. A trivial example, where (A3) is satisfied, is when both O_1, O_2 act on the plane, spanned by $\{e_1, e_2\}$, i.e are of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} \star & \star & 0 \\ \star & \star & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In this case, moreover, the equality in (A3) holds almost surely. Note that, except for (A3), we allow for any dependence structure within and between the tuples (R_1, O_1) and (R_2, O_2) .

When studying stationary solutions satisfying Eq. (1.4), we assume that ϕ is the characteristic function of a random vector X with the property

$$\mathbb{P}(\|X\| > t) \leq Ct^{-\alpha} \quad \text{for all } t > 0 \quad (\text{A4})$$

for some constant C . This assumption is much weaker than assuming that $\|X\|$ is in the normal domain of attraction of an α -stable law, which would entail that $\mathbb{P}(\|X\| > t)$ is of precise order $t^{-\alpha}$, see [16, § 35].

1.3 Adhoc statement of the main result

To not repeat ourselves, we will introduce all necessary notation and objects in Section 2 before stating the main result in full detail in Section 3. However, for the reader's convenience, we formulate an adhoc version of the classification result for stationary solutions in the most simple, yet instructive case, when α in (A1) is in $(0, 1)$.

Denote by $\mathbb{O}(3)$ the multiplicative group of orthogonal 3×3 matrices, by $\mathbb{R}_>$ (\mathbb{R}_\geq) the multiplicative group of positive (the set of nonnegative) real numbers, and denote by $\mathbb{M} := \mathbb{R}_> \times \mathbb{O}(3)$ the group of similarity matrices, *i.e.*, products of an orthogonal matrix and a dilation. Equipping each set with the corresponding Borel σ -field, we obtain measurable spaces. We denote by \mathbb{S} the smallest closed subgroup of \mathbb{M} that contains $\{(R_1, O_1), (R_2, O_2)\}$ with probability 1.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume (A1)-(A4) with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. There exists a nonnegative random variable W_∞ with mean one such that a characteristic function ϕ is a solution to (1.4) if and only if*

$$\phi(roe_3) = \mathbb{E}[e^{-W_\infty K(r,o)}]$$

for a function $K : \mathbb{R}_\geq \times \mathbb{O}(3) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ satisfying $K(r, o) = s^{-\alpha} K(rs, ou)$ for all $(s, u) \in \mathbb{S}$ and $K(0, o) = 0$ for any $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$.

1.4 Related works

The probabilistic form of the Boltzmann equation that is used in our work is based on [5], whereas the original idea behind it has been first introduced in [13]. In [13] time-dependent solutions to the spatially homogeneous Boltzmann equation have been considered assuming existence of the fourth moment of the initial condition f_0 . The authors derived a uniform upper bound on the total variation distance between the solution and the limiting Maxwellian distribution. An explicit form of the stationary solution has also been established, given by a weak limit of its time-dependent counterpart.

In [5, Theorem 2.3] the set of stationary solutions in the domain of normal attraction of an α -stable law was studied, assuming in addition the existence of a density. These two assumptions will in particular be removed in our main result, Theorem 3.4. We also refer the reader to a list of further references given in that paper, see [5, Section 1.2].

Starting from the seminal work of Kac [20], various probabilistic interpretations of solutions have been investigated, we mention here in particular [11, 15, 4, 3]. In our work, we will introduce for the multivariate setting a representation of solutions with the help of continuous-time branching random walks, based on the univariate techniques developed recently in [7, 9, 8].

To study stationary equations, we pursue strategies that have been developed for the study of fixed points of *smoothing equations*, see e.g. [1, 2, 23]. We may refer to \widehat{Q}_+ as nonlinear smoothing operator because of the following relation. A random vector X is said to satisfy a (linear) multivariate smoothing equation with matricial weights, if

$$X \stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{j=1}^N T_j X_j, \quad (1.5)$$

where X_1, X_2, \dots are i.i.d. copies of X , that are independent of the (conditionally given) weights $T_1, \dots, T_N \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$; here the number N of weights may also be random. Then the characteristic function ϕ of X satisfies the equation

$$\phi(\xi) = \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{j=1}^N \phi(T_j^\top \xi) \right] \quad (1.6)$$

for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Despite the formal similarity of equations (1.6) and (1.3), the action of \widehat{Q}_+ does not allow for a representation as a weighted sum of random variables as in (1.5), due to the noncommutativity of matrix products: o and O_1, O_2 do not commute.

The set of solutions to (1.5) in the case where $T_j \in \mathbb{M}$, has been determined in [23]. It is instructive to compare it with our result.

Structure of the paper

We proceed by introducing necessary notation and objects from the realm of branching processes in Section 2. With this at hand, we are ready to formulate our results in full detail in Section 3. Proofs for the existence and uniqueness of time-dependent solutions are given in Section 4; the study of stationary solutions is conducted in Section 5. In Section A.1 we investigate the structure of stationary solutions in more detail.

2 Branching processes and martingales

A probabilistic representation (using branching processes) of time-dependent solutions to Eq. (1.2) was given in [4], where the authors used a discrete-time model based on Wild series to derive a time-dependent solution. In [7, 8] it was observed that this construction can be simplified by using a continuous-time branching random walk. We will follow their construction to obtain a representation of both time-dependent and stationary solutions as functionals of a certain branching process.

2.1 A weighted branching process

Let $\mathbf{T} = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \{1, 2\}^n$ be an infinite binary tree with the root \emptyset . For a node $v = v_1 \dots v_n \in \mathbf{T}$, where $v_i \in \{1, 2\}$ for any $i = 1, \dots, n$, we say that v is in the n -th generation and write $|v| = n$. For any $k = 0, \dots, n-1$ the ancestor of v in the k -th generation is denoted by $v|_k := v_1 \dots v_k$. For any $j \in \{1, 2\}$ the j -th descendant of v in the $(n+1)$ -th generation is $vj := v_1 \dots v_n j$.

Let E be an exponential random variable with unit mean, independent of (R_1, O_1, R_2, O_2) . Assign to each node $v \in \mathbf{T}$ an i.i.d. copy $(E(v), R_1(v), O_1(v), R_2(v), O_2(v))$ of the tuple (E, R_1, O_1, R_2, O_2) . We call the family $\mathbf{B} := (E(v), R_j(v), O_j(v) : j \in \{1, 2\})_{v \in \mathbf{T}}$ the weighted branching process associated to the tuple $(E, R_j, O_j : j \in \{1, 2\})$, rooted at \emptyset . We denote by $F := (F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ the natural filtration for \mathbf{B} , associated to generations, namely

$$F_n := \sigma((E(v), L(v), U(v)), |v| \leq n) \quad (2.1)$$

for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

For any $w \in \mathbf{T}$ we consider the shifted weighted branching process rooted at w , defined by

$$[\mathbf{B}]_w := (E(wv), R_j(wv), O_j(wv) : j \in \{1, 2\})_{v \in \mathbf{T}}.$$

Notice, that \mathbf{B} and $[\mathbf{B}]_w$ have the same law. For any function of the weighted branching process $\zeta = \zeta(\mathbf{B})$ we can define a function $[\zeta]_w$ as $\zeta([\mathbf{B}]_w)$.

For each node $v \in \mathbf{T}$ we define recursively the quantities

$$L(\emptyset) := 1, \quad L(vj) := L(v)R_j(v) \quad (2.2)$$

and

$$U(\emptyset) := \text{Id}, \quad U(vj) := U(v)O_j(v), \quad (2.3)$$

with $\text{Id} \in \mathbb{O}(3)$ denoting the identity matrix. Therefore, for any $v = v_1 \dots v_n$ we have

$$L(v) := R_{v_1}(\emptyset) \dots R_{v_n}(v|_{n-1}) \quad (2.4)$$

and

$$U(v) := O_{v_1}(\emptyset) \dots O_{v_n}(v|_{n-1}). \quad (2.5)$$

Observe that, by [22, Lemma 7.2], assumption (A1) implies

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{|v|=n} L(v) = 0 \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (2.6)$$

Recall that \mathbb{S} denotes the smallest closed subgroup of \mathbf{M} that contains $\{(R_1, O_1), (R_2, O_2)\}$ with probability 1. Hence $\{(L(v), U(v)) : v \in \mathbf{T}\} \subset \mathbb{S}$ with probability 1 as well. In the same way, let \mathbb{G} and \mathbb{U} be the smallest closed subgroups of $\mathbb{R}_{>}$ and $\mathbb{O}(3)$, such that $\mathbb{P}(\{L(v) : v \in \mathbf{T}\} \in \mathbb{G}) = 1$ and $\mathbb{P}(\{U(v) : v \in \mathbf{T}\} \in \mathbb{U}) = 1$, respectively. Note, that in general $\mathbb{G} \times \mathbb{U} \neq \mathbb{S}$.

2.2 Branching random walk

In what follows we will consider nodes in \mathbf{T} as particles of a multiplicative continuous-time branching random walk on the group $\mathbf{M} = \mathbb{R}_{>} \times \mathbb{O}(3)$. For any such $v \in \mathbf{T}$ the component $E(v)$ will be interpreted as the lifetime of a particle v , whereas the tuple $(L(v), U(v))$ will describe the position of v in space $\mathbb{R}_{\geq} \times \mathbb{O}(3)$. However, before we are able to introduce the formal definition of the branching random walk, certain technical steps should be done first.

For each $v \in \mathbf{T}$ we define the following two random variables

$$B(v) := \sum_{k=1}^{|v|-1} E(v|_k) \quad \text{and} \quad D(v) := B(v) + E(v). \quad (2.7)$$

denoting the birth time and the death time of particle v , respectively, with the convention $B(\emptyset) = 0$. Further, we define for any $t \geq 0$ the following two random subsets of \mathbf{T} :

$$\mathbf{T}_t := \{v \in \mathbf{T} : B(v) \leq t\} \quad (2.8)$$

and

$$\partial \mathbf{T}_t := \{v \in \mathbf{T} : B(v) \leq t < D(v)\}. \quad (2.9)$$

The first set contains all particles which have been born up to time t , whereas the second one contains particles that are alive at time t . We denote by $\mathcal{F} := (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ the filtration generated by particles in the set \mathbf{T}_t ,

$$\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma(E(v), L(v), U(v) : v \in \mathbf{T}_t). \quad (2.10)$$

It can easily be checked, that

$$\mathcal{F}_0 = F_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{F}_t = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_n.$$

We will denote the above limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_n =: F_\infty$, which can informally be perceived as the total information conveyed by the process \mathbf{B} .

A continuous-time multiplicative branching random walk in \mathbf{M} is then given by the point process $\mathcal{Z} = (\mathcal{Z}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq}}$, defined by

$$\int f(y, u) d\mathcal{Z}_t(y, u) := \sum_{v \in \partial \mathbf{T}_t} f(L(v), U(v)) \quad (2.11)$$

for all $t \geq 0$ and nonnegative measurable functions f on \mathbf{M} . Its dynamics can be described as follows. An initial particle is located in $(1, \text{Id})$. After an exponential time with unit mean it dies and gives birth to two new particles, which are distributed on \mathbf{M} according to the point process $\sum_{j=1}^2 \delta_{(R_j, O_j)}$. The two descendants reproduce in exactly the same way as their ancestor, independently from the latter and also from each other.

As in formula (2.11), throughout our work we will omit the lower index under the integral sign whenever the integration area is the entire domain of an underlying measure.

Since $(\mathcal{Z}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq}}$ is, by construction, a function of a weighted branching process \mathbf{B} , a shifted continuous-time branching random walk $([\mathcal{Z}_t]_w)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq}}$ is well-defined for any $w \in \mathbf{T}$:

$$[\mathcal{Z}_t]_w := \sum_{v \in [\partial \mathbf{T}_t]_w} \delta_{(L(wv), U(wv))}, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where $[\partial \mathbf{T}_t]_w = \{v \in \mathbf{T} : B(wv) \leq t < D(wv)\}$.

By sorting all particles alive at time $t + h$ according to their ancestors alive at time t , we derive the following branching property for \mathcal{Z} , which will be given without proof.

Lemma 2.1. *For all $t, h \geq 0$ and all measurable sets $A \in \mathbb{R}_{>}$, $B \in \mathbb{O}(3)$ it holds*

$$\mathcal{Z}_{t+h}(A, B) \stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{w \in \partial \mathbf{T}_t} [\mathcal{Z}_h]_w \left(L(w)^{-1} A, U(w)^{-1} B \right). \quad (2.12)$$

2.3 Associated random walks

In this section, we define two associated random walks, one in continuous time and one in discrete time, by means of many-to-one formulae.

Lemma 2.2. *Consider $\gamma \geq 0$ with $m(\gamma) < \infty$. Let $(L_n^{(\gamma)}, U_n^{(\gamma)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be a multiplicative random walk on \mathbf{M} starting in $(L_0^{(\gamma)}, U_0^{(\gamma)}) := (1, \text{Id})$ and increment law ρ defined by*

$$\rho(A \times B) := \frac{1}{m(\gamma)} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j=1}^2 R_j^\gamma \mathbf{1}_A(R_j) \mathbf{1}_B(O_j) \right]$$

for all measurable $A \subset \mathbb{R}_{>}$, $B \subset \mathbb{O}(3)$. Then, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and any nonnegative measurable function h the following identity holds:

$$\mathbb{E} [h(L_1^{(\gamma)}, \dots, L_n^{(\gamma)}, U_1^{(\gamma)}, \dots, U_n^{(\gamma)})]$$

$$= \frac{1}{m(\gamma)^n} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{|v|=n} L(v)^\gamma h \left((L(v|_k))_k, (U(v|_k))_k; k = 1, \dots, n \right) \right] \quad (2.13)$$

Many-to-one results are standard tools in the theory of branching processes. We refrain from giving details of the proof. A proof for a univariate version can be found e.g. in [25, Theorem 1.1].

We will be particularly interested in the case $\gamma = \alpha$ and, to simplify the notation, we will write $L_n := L_n^{(\alpha)}$ and $U_n := U_n^{(\alpha)}$, for any $n \geq 0$. We observe that \mathbb{S} is also the smallest closed semigroup containing $(L_n, U_n)_{n \geq 0}$ with probability 1, as well as \mathbb{U} and \mathbb{G} contain $(U_n)_{n \geq 0}$ and $(L_n)_{n \geq 0}$ with probability 1, respectively. We finish this section by quoting the following Choquet-Deny-type result, which proves to be useful for studying solutions to the stationary equation.

Lemma 2.3. *Let ρ be a probability law on \mathbb{M} and let \mathbb{S} be the smallest closed subgroup of \mathbb{M} , generated by ρ . Suppose $\xi : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is measurable and bounded. Then, if*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\xi(sL_1, uU_1) \right] = \xi(s, u) \quad (2.14)$$

holds for any $(s, u) \in \mathbb{S}$, where the expectation is taken w.r.t. to ρ , then ξ is constant ρ -a.e.

Source. A Choquet-Deny-type result for the similarity group $\mathbb{M} = \mathbb{R}_{>} \times \mathbb{O}(3)$ is a consequence of [17, Theorem 3]. We refer the reader to [23, Lemma 5.1] for a version with notation adopted to the present context, mutatis mutandis: In the quoted lemma, new information enters from the left, while we consider multiplication from the right. \square

2.4 Additive martingales

For any $\gamma \geq 0$ such that $m(\gamma) < \infty$ we can define the *additive martingale* $W^{(\gamma)} := (W_n^{(\gamma)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ by

$$W_n^{(\gamma)} := m(\gamma)^{-n} \sum_{|v|=n} L(v)^\gamma \quad (2.15)$$

With the help of Lemma 2.2 one can easily check, that $W^{(\gamma)}$ is a nonnegative F -martingale with mean one. Hence, by Doob's martingale convergence theorem, we may define $W_\infty^{(\gamma)} := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} W_n^{(\gamma)}$ as its almost sure limit. It is well-known, that the limit $W_\infty^{(\gamma)}$ is nondegenerate (which is equivalent to the convergence of $W^{(\gamma)}$ in mean) if and only if

$$\mathbb{E} \left[W_1^{(\gamma)} \log^+ W_1^{(\gamma)} \right] < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad m(\gamma) \log m(\gamma) > \gamma m'(\gamma), \quad (2.16)$$

see [6].

The convergence conditions (2.16) together with $m(\gamma) < \infty$ are satisfied for all $\gamma \leq \alpha$ due to our assumptions (A1) and (A2), using that m is convex and continuous, hence decreasing on $[0, \alpha]$. Note, that in case $\gamma > \alpha$, condition $m(\gamma) < \infty$, as well as the second part of (2.16) in general may not hold, and thus we need to assume these two extra conditions to obtain the convergence in mean of $\mathcal{W}^{(\gamma)}$.

Throughout our work we will frequently deal with $W := W^{(\alpha)}$ for α given by assumption (A1), which for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is given by

$$W_n = \sum_{|v|=n} L(v)^\alpha, \quad (2.17)$$

and its a.s. limit W_∞ which is nondegenerate with $\mathbb{E}W_\infty = 1$. It further holds that

$$W_\infty = \sum_{|v|=n} L(v)^\alpha [W_\infty]_v \quad (2.18)$$

almost surely, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$; see Lemma 5.8 below for the proof of a similar result.

3 Main results

In this section we state our main results, the proofs of which will be given in subsequent sections. Equip the space of bounded continuous complex-valued functions on \mathbb{R}^3 , $\mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C})$ with the supremum norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ and consider $E := \{f \in \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{C}) : \|f\|_\infty = 1\}$.

3.1 Time-dependent solutions

The general form of the time-dependent solution is given in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *Assume (A3). For any $\phi_0 \in E$, there is a unique function $\phi : [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ solving equation (1.2) with initial value ϕ_0 ; with the property that for each $t \in [0, \infty)$, $\phi_t := \phi(t, \cdot) \in E$ and the mapping $t \mapsto \phi_t$ is continuous on $[0, \infty)$ and differentiable on $(0, \infty)$. It is given by*

$$\phi_t(roe_3) = \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{v \in \partial \mathbf{T}_t} \phi_0(roL(v)U(v)e_3) \right] \quad (3.1)$$

for any $(r, o) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq} \times \mathbb{O}(3)$ and all $t \geq 0$.

Remark 3.2. If ϕ_0 is the characteristic function of a random vector, we are unable to show in general, that the function $\phi_t : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, defined by (3.1), is a characteristic function of a three-dimensional random vector for $t > 0$, due to nonlinearity of underlying collisional

operator \widehat{Q}_+ . However we can show that ϕ_t can be viewed as the restriction of a characteristic function of a suitable random matrix. This implies in particular the continuity of ϕ_t , defined by formula (3.1).

The relation is as follows. Suppose that ϕ_0 is the characteristic function of some vector $X = (X_1, X_2, X_3)^\top$ and define a random matrix \widetilde{X} as

$$\widetilde{X} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & X_1 \\ 0 & 0 & X_2 \\ 0 & 0 & X_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Denote by $\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ a space of 3×3 matrices with real entries. Let $\psi_0 : \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be the characteristic function of \widetilde{X} , which by definition can be written as

$$\psi_0(a) = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i \mathbf{tr}(a^\top \widetilde{X})} \right]$$

for any $a \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$. Here $\mathbf{tr}(\cdot)$ denotes the trace of a matrix. Observe, that for any $r \geq 0$ and $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$ we have

$$\phi_0(roe_3) = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i \langle roe_3, X \rangle} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i \mathbf{tr}(ro^\top \widetilde{X})} \right] = \psi_0(ro).$$

Applying this identity in formula (3.1), using cyclic property and linearity of the trace, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_t(roe_3) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{v \in \partial \mathbf{T}_t} \phi_0(roL(v)U(v)e_3) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{v \in \partial \mathbf{T}_t} \psi_0(roL(v)U(v)) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ i \sum_{v \in \partial \mathbf{T}_t} \mathbf{tr}(rL(v)U(v)^\top o^\top \widetilde{X}(v)) \right\} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ i \sum_{v \in \partial \mathbf{T}_t} \mathbf{tr}(ro^\top L(v) \widetilde{X}(v)U(v)^\top) \right\} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ i \mathbf{tr}(ro^\top \sum_{v \in \partial \mathbf{T}_t} \widetilde{X}(v)(L(v)U(v)^\top) \right\} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $\widetilde{X}(v)$ are independent copies of \widetilde{X} . The last term in the above formula can be viewed as the characteristic function of the random matrix $\sum_{v \in \partial \mathbf{T}_t} \widetilde{X}(v)(L(v)U(v)^\top)$, evaluated at the point ro .

This relation will be further investigated in the appendix, see Section A.1.

3.2 Stationary solutions

In order to identify possible equilibrium states for elastic and inelastic spatial kinetic equations, in this section we discuss the solutions to the stationary equation (1.4).

The solutions will be described in terms of W_∞ and two auxiliary random functions $V : \mathbb{O}(3) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\geq$ and $Y : \mathbb{O}(3) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that are functions of the weighted branching process and satisfy the following linear stochastic equations.

$$V(o) = \sum_{|v|=n} L(v)^2 [V]_v(oU(v)), \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (3.2)$$

and

$$Y(o) = \sum_{|v|=n} L(v) [Y]_v(oU(v)), \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad (3.3)$$

respectively.

Remark 3.3. While the general set of solutions to equations (3.2) and (3.3) may depend on the structure of \mathbb{U} , we have good knowledge about the particular case of rotationally invariant solutions, *i.e.*, when $V(o) \equiv V$ and $Y(o) \equiv Y$. Observing that $L(v)$ are nonnegative, we may employ the results of [2], in particular Theorem 4.12, from which it follows that $V = 0$ a.s. unless $\alpha = 2$, while $Y = 0$ a.s. unless $\alpha = 1$. Under an extra assumption, which is satisfied if $m(\alpha + \epsilon) < \infty$ for some $\epsilon > 0$, it is proved in [2, Theorem 4.13], that in the case $\alpha = 2$, $V = cW_\infty$ a.s. for some $c > 0$, and $Y = cW_\infty$ a.s. for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$ in the case $\alpha = 1$.

One more definition is needed before we can state our result. We say that a function $K : \mathbb{R}_\geq \times \mathbb{O}(3) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is (\mathbb{S}, γ) -invariant, if for all $(r, o) \in \mathbb{R}_\geq \times \mathbb{O}(3)$ it holds that

$$K(r, o) = s^{-\gamma} K(rs, ou)$$

for all $(s, u) \in \mathbb{S}$.

Theorem 3.4. *Let ϕ be the characteristic function of a random vector in \mathbb{R}^3 and assume that (A1) – (A4) hold with $\alpha \in (0, 2] \setminus \{1\}$. If $\alpha = 2$, assume in addition that $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{G} \times \mathbb{U}$.*

Then ϕ is a stationary solution to (1.4) if and only if ϕ admits the representation

$$\phi(roe_3) = \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} r^2 V(o) + irY(o) - W_\infty K(r, o) \right\} \right] \quad \text{for all } r \in \mathbb{R}_\geq, o \in \mathbb{O}(3), \quad (3.4)$$

where W_∞ is the limit of Biggins' martingale (see (2.17)), V and Y are random mappings which solve equations (3.2) and (3.3) respectively, and K is an (\mathbb{S}, α) -invariant function. If $\alpha < 1$, then $Y = 0$ a.s. and $V = 0$ a.s. as long as $\alpha < 2$. Further, $K = 0$ for $\alpha = 2$.

In [5, Theorem 2.3], stationary solutions of (1.4) in the class of characteristic functions of probability measures in the normal domain of attraction of some full α -stable distribution on \mathbb{R}^3 were studied, assuming in addition the existence of a density for \mathbb{U} (c.f. assumption (H3) in [5]) and that the measures are centered for $\alpha > 1$. With our result, we can remove these restrictions: We do not require a density assumption, we do not require the measures to be centered, and, in particular, we can determine all solutions (not necessarily in the domain of attraction of some α -stable law) that satisfy the weak tail assumption (A4). Of course, this assumption is satisfied by measures in the α -stable domain of attraction, but also by any probability measure that has a finite moment of order α .

The structure of the set of solutions is consistent with previous studies on linear fix-point equations, *i.e.* (1.5): If we restrict our attention to rotationally invariant solutions, then the equation (1.4) evaluated for the radial part, can be written in the form (1.5), with random vectors $X \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and nonnegative scalar weights T_j . The set of solutions is then described by [2, Theorem 2.1].

Remark 3.5. Previous work on fixed points of smoothing equations [23] indicates that the case $\alpha = 1$ will require stronger assumptions (finite support for ρ or the existence of a density); this is why we refer in this case to [5], where for $\alpha = 1$ the existence and uniqueness of solutions in the domain of attraction of a Cauchy distribution was shown under a density assumption.

Remark 3.6. The precise additional condition required for the case $\alpha = 2$ reads

$$\text{There exists } u \in \mathbb{U} \text{ and } s \in \mathbb{G}, s \neq 1, \text{ such that } (1, u) \in \mathbb{S} \text{ and } (s, u) \in \mathbb{S}. \quad (\text{A5})$$

It will be employed in the final part of the proof of Theorem 3.4 in Section 5.4.

4 Proofs for the time-dependent case

Proof of the Theorem 3.1. The proof is organized as follows. In Step 1 for ϕ_t , defined by (3.1), we derive the representation in terms of a branching random walk \mathcal{Z} , and, using branching property (2.12), investigate the relation between ϕ_{t+h} and ϕ_t for any $t, h \geq 0$. In Step 2 we show, that the mapping $t \mapsto \phi_t(\cdot)$ is continuous. After that we proceed to calculate its derivative w.r.t. to t and explicitly show, that ϕ_t is indeed the time-dependent solution to (1.2). This will be accomplished in Step 3.

Step 1: In view of (2.11), we may rewrite the right side of (3.1) in terms of \mathcal{Z} as follows:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{v \in \partial \mathbf{T}_t} \phi_0(roL(v)U(v)e_3) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \log \prod_{v \in \partial \mathbf{T}_t} \phi_0(roL(v)U(v)e_3) \right]$$

$$= \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \sum_{v \in \partial \mathbf{T}_t} \log \phi_0(roL(v)U(v)e_3) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \int_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq} \times \mathbb{O}(3)} \log \phi_0(royue_3) d\mathcal{Z}_t(y, u) \right].$$

From this, we may in particular infer (using dominated convergence) that $\phi_t \in E$ for all $t \geq 0$.

Now fix any $t, h \geq 0$. Using the branching property (2.12), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{t+h}(roe_3) &= \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \int \log \phi_0(royue_3) d\mathcal{Z}_{t+h}(y, u) \middle| \mathcal{F}_h \right] \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \int \log \phi_0(royue_3) d \sum_{v \in \partial \mathbf{T}_h} [\mathcal{Z}_t]_v(y/L(v), (U(v))^{-1}u) \middle| \mathcal{F}_h \right] \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \int \sum_{v \in \partial \mathbf{T}_h} \log \phi_0(roL(v)yU(v)ue_3) d[\mathcal{Z}_t]_v(y, u) \middle| \mathcal{F}_h \right] \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{v \in \partial \mathbf{T}_h} \exp \int \log \phi_0(roL(v)U(v)yue_3) d[\mathcal{Z}_t]_v(y, u) \middle| \mathcal{F}_h \right] \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{v \in \partial \mathbf{T}_h} \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \int \log \phi_0(roL(v)U(v)yue_3) d[\mathcal{Z}_t]_v(y, u) \right] \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{v \in \partial \mathbf{T}_h} \phi_t(roL(v)U(v)e_3) \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

Step 2: We now show, that the mapping $t \mapsto \phi_t(\cdot)$ is continuous. Since $|\phi_0(\xi)| \leq 1$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^3$, for any $t \geq 0$ and $roe_3 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ we have

$$|\phi_t(roe_3)| \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{v \in \partial \mathbf{T}_t} |\phi_0(roL(v)U(v)e_3)| \right] \leq 1. \tag{4.2}$$

For any t, s such that $0 \leq t < s$, the number of splits for each particle in \mathcal{Z}_t during time $[t, s]$ has the Poisson distribution with parameter $s - t$. Since particles in \mathcal{Z}_t reproduce independently, using (4.2), for any $roe_3 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_t(roe_3) - \phi_s(roe_3)| &\leq 2\mathbb{P}\{\text{there is at least one split in } (\mathcal{Z}_t)_{t \geq 0} \text{ during time } [t, s]\} \\ &= 2\mathbb{E}[1 - (e^{-(s-t)})^{|\partial \mathbf{T}_t|}] \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

as $s \rightarrow t$, since $|\partial \mathbf{T}_t|$, e.g. the number of alive particles at moment t , is finite almost surely for any $t \geq 0$. Since roe_3 was arbitrary, we conclude that $\|\phi_t - \phi_s\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$ as $s \rightarrow t$.

Step 3: Having established the continuity of $t \mapsto \phi_t(\cdot)$, we now calculate its derivative. To do that, we first take a closer look on the relation (4.1). Consider the amount of splits

in branching random walk \mathcal{Z} on the interval $[0, h]$. Since at moment zero there is only one living particle and its lifetime is exponentially distributed, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\{\text{there are no splits during } [0, h]\} &= e^{-h} \\ \mathbb{P}\{\text{there is one split during } [0, h]\} &= h \\ \mathbb{P}\{\text{there are more than one splits during } [0, h]\} &= 1 - e^{-h} - h.\end{aligned}$$

Conditioning on each of these three events, we may rewrite the formula (4.1) as

$$\phi_{t+h}(roe_3) = \phi_t(roe_3)e^{-h} + \widehat{Q}_+(\phi_t, \phi_t)(roe_3)h + \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{v \in \partial \mathbf{T}_h} \phi_t(roL(v)U(v)e_3)(1 - e^{-h} - h)\right].$$

We now have all the ingredients to calculate the derivative of $t \mapsto \phi_t(roe_3)$, at any fixed $roe_3 \in \mathbb{R}^3$:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\phi_t(roe_3) &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{\phi_{t+h}(roe_3) - \phi_t(roe_3)}{h} \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{\phi_t(roe_3)(e^{-h} - 1) + \widehat{Q}_+(\phi_t, \phi_t)(roe_3)h + \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{v \in \partial \mathbf{T}_h} \phi_t(roL(v)U(v)e_3)\right](1 - e^{-h} - h)}{h} \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{(e^{-h} - 1)}{h} \phi_t(roe_3) + \widehat{Q}_+(\phi_t, \phi_t)(roe_3) + \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1 - e^{-h} - h}{h} \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{v \in \partial \mathbf{T}_h} \phi_t(roL(v)U(v)e_3)\right] \\ &= -\phi_t(roe_3) + \widehat{Q}_+(\phi_t, \phi_t)(roe_3).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, ϕ_t solves the equation (1.2). Its uniqueness follows from the Picard-Lindelöf theorem, see e.g. [5, Proposition 2.2]. \square

5 Proofs for the stationary case

The proof of Theorem 3.4 is much more involved and requires a couple of intermediary steps. The proof of the theorem will be given at the end of this section and relies on Lemmas 5.9, 5.12, 5.14, 5.15 and 5.16. As in previous works on branching fixed point equations (see [23] and references therein), we begin with introducing a multiplicative martingale, which will be studied in the first part of this section.

5.1 Multiplicative martingales and random Lévy-Khintchine exponents

It will be stipulated throughout this section that ϕ is a characteristic function of an \mathbb{R}^3 -valued random variable satisfying (1.4); and that assumptions (A1) – (A4) are in force.

For $r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq}$ and $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$ we define a stochastic process $M = (M_n(r, o))_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ as

$$M_n(r, o) := \prod_{|v|=n} \phi(roL(v)U(v)e_3). \quad (5.1)$$

We suppress the dependence of M on ϕ in this notation. Since ϕ satisfies (1.4), for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[M_{n+1}(r, o) | F_n \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{|v|=n+1} \phi(roL(v)U(v)e_3) | F_n \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{|v|=n} \prod_{j=1,2} \phi(roL(v)U(v)R_j(v)O_j(v)e_3) | F_n \right] \\ &= \prod_{|v|=n} \mathbb{E} \left[\phi(roL(v)U(v)e_3) | F_n \right] = M_n(r, o). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for each fixed $r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq}$, $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$

$$M_n(r, o) = \prod_{|v|=n} \phi(roL(v)U(v)e_3)$$

is a bounded L^1 -martingale. Thus its a.s. limit, which we denote by $M_\infty(r, o)$, satisfies

$$\phi(roe_3) = \mathbb{E}[M_\infty(r, o)]. \quad (5.2)$$

The above identity (5.2) is the main reason to study the martingale M , for it will allow us to determine the structure of ϕ . The basis of our analysis will be the following Proposition 5.1 stating that almost surely, for each fixed $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$, $r \mapsto M_\infty(r, o)$ is the one-dimensional characteristic function of an infinitely divisible random variable. This technique goes back to [10, Theorem 1]. Note, that for this claim we will extend the definition of M in (5.1) for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$. Observe that, in contrast e.g. to [23, Lemma 3.1], the particular structure of \widehat{Q}_+ does not allow us to obtain that M_∞ is a three-dimensional characteristic function. Instead we obtain, that along each fixed direction oe_3 it is a one-dimensional characteristic function of an infinitely divisible law. Note, that there is in general no Cramér-Wold device for infinite divisibility, see e.g. the counterexample given in [14].

For the following considerations denote

$$\mathbf{L} := (L(v), U(v) : j \in \{1, 2\})_{v \in \mathbf{T}}. \quad (5.3)$$

The Doob martingale convergence theorem yields that for each fixed pair (r, o) , there is a set $N_{r,o} \subset (\mathbb{R}_{\geq} \times \mathbb{O}(3))^{\mathbf{T}}$ with $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{L} \in N_{r,o}^c) = 1$ such that for all $\mathbf{l} = (l(v), u(v) : j \in \{1, 2\})_{v \in \mathbf{T}} \in N_{r,o}^c$ we have the convergence

$$M_n(r, o, \mathbf{l}) = \prod_{|v|=n} \phi(rol(v)u(v)e_3) \rightarrow M_\infty(r, o, \mathbf{l}). \quad (5.4)$$

Our aim is to obtain a *global* null set N , such that we have simultaneous convergence for all (r, o) whenever $\mathbf{l} \in N^c$. Namely, we are going to prove the following result.

Proposition 5.1. *Assume (A1) – (A4). There is a set N with $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{L} \in N) = 0$, such that for all $\mathbf{l} \in N^c$ it holds*

$$M_n(r, o, \mathbf{l}) \rightarrow M_\infty(r, o, \mathbf{l})$$

simultaneously for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$. The mapping $(r, o) \mapsto M_\infty(r, o, \mathbf{l})$ is continuous. Moreover, for each fixed $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$, the mapping $r \mapsto M_\infty(r, o, \mathbf{l})$ is the characteristic function of an infinitely divisible random variable.

The proof of the proposition will consist of several steps. As the first step, we want to show that for each fixed $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$, the convergence holds for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$, and the limit is a characteristic function.

We follow the approach by [10]. Fix $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$. If X is a random vector with characteristic function ϕ , then we may consider

$$r \mapsto \begin{cases} \phi(roe_3) & r \geq 0, \\ \phi(|r|(-o)e_3) & r < 0 \end{cases}$$

as the characteristic function of $\langle e_3, o^\top X \rangle$. The stationary equation

$$\phi(roe_3) = \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{|v|=1} \phi(rL(v)oU(v))e_3 \right] \quad (5.5)$$

then corresponds to the following distributional equation

$$\langle e_3, o^\top X \rangle \stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{|v|=1} L(v) \langle U(v)e_3, o^\top X(v) \rangle,$$

where $\stackrel{d}{=}$ means that both sides have the same law, and $X(v)$ are i.i.d. copies of X , which are also independent of $\{L(v), U(v) : |v| = 1\}$.

Lemma 5.2. *For each $u \in \mathbb{R}$, we have that $(G_n(u))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, defined by*

$$G_n(u) := \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{|v|=n} L(v) \langle U(v)e_3, o^\top X(v) \rangle \leq u \mid F_n \right),$$

is an F -martingale.

Proof. By definition, $G_n(u)$ is adapted to the filtration F , and integrable. Considering the martingale property, we use the tower property of conditional expectation and then (5.5):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left(G_{n+1}(u) \mid F_n\right) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{|w|=n} \sum_{|v|=1} L(w)[L(v)]_w \langle U(w)[U(v)]_w e_3, o^\top [X(v)]_w \rangle \leq u \mid F_n\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{|w|=n} L(w) \langle U(w) e_3, o^\top X(w) \rangle \leq u \mid F_n\right) = G_n(u) \quad \text{a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 5.3. *For each $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$, there is a null set N_o such that for all $\mathbf{l} \in N_o^c$, the sequence of mappings $r \mapsto M_n(r, o, \mathbf{l})$ converges to the characteristic function of an infinitely divisible random variable $Y^o(\mathbf{l})$. Hence, on N_o^c , there is a version of $M_\infty(r, o, \mathbf{l})$ such that $r \mapsto M_\infty(r, o, \mathbf{l})$ is the characteristic function of an infinitely divisible random variable.*

Proof. Since for each $u \in \mathbb{R}$, $G_n(u)$ is a martingale by the previous lemma that is moreover bounded (by 1), we obtain the existence of an a.s.-limit $G_\infty(u)$. Obviously, we also have the simultaneous convergence $G_n(u, \mathbf{l}) \rightarrow G_\infty(u, \mathbf{l})$ for all $u \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $\mathbf{l} \in N_o^c$, where N_o is set with the property $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{L} \in N_o^c) = 1$.

We now introduce the function $\tilde{G}(u, \mathbf{l}) := \inf_{s > u, s \in \mathbb{Q}} G_\infty(s, \mathbf{l})$. Since each $G_n(\cdot, \mathbf{l})$ is nondecreasing with $\lim_{u \rightarrow -\infty} G_n(u, \mathbf{l}) = 0$ and $\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} G_n(u, \mathbf{l}) = 1$, the same holds true for $\tilde{G}(\mathbf{l})$ as well. Further, $\tilde{G}(\mathbf{l})$ is right-continuous with left limits. At every $u \in \mathbb{Q}$ that is a continuity point of $\tilde{G}(\mathbf{l})$, it coincides with $G_\infty(\mathbf{l})$. We conclude that $\tilde{G}(\mathbf{l})$ is the distribution function of a random variable $Y(\mathbf{l})$, and $G_n(u, \mathbf{l}) \rightarrow \tilde{G}(u, \mathbf{l})$ at every continuity point of $\tilde{G}(\mathbf{l})$.

Moreover, as in [10, Section 4.1] we obtain that for each fixed \mathbf{l} , $u \mapsto G_n(u, \mathbf{l})$ is the distribution function of $Y_n^o := \sum_{|v|=n} l(v) \langle o(v) e_3, o^\top X(v) \rangle$, and $(Y_n^o)_{n \geq 1}$ can be considered as a sequence of row sums in a triangular array. By (2.6), it holds that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{|v|=n} \mathbf{l}(v) = 0$ for all $\mathbf{l} \in N_o^c$ (possibly after intersecting with another null set). Hence, for all $\mathbf{l} \in N_o^c$ $(Y_n^o(\mathbf{l}))_{n \geq 0}$ constitutes a sequence of row sums in a triangular null array, and we have just shown (in the above paragraph) that it converges in distribution to a random variable $Y^o(\mathbf{l})$. It follows that $Y^o(\mathbf{l})$ is infinitely divisible.

For each fixed $\mathbf{l} \in N_o^c$, $r \mapsto M_n(r, o, \mathbf{l})$ is the characteristic function of $Y_n^o(\mathbf{l})$, hence it converges by the above considerations to the characteristic function of $Y^o(\mathbf{l})$. □

As the next step, we consider simultaneous convergence over $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$. Fix a countable dense subset $D \subset \mathbb{O}(3)$ and consider the null set $N^c := \bigcap_{o \in D} N_o^c$. We will rely on an argument using the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem.

Lemma 5.4. For each fixed $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbf{l} \in N^c$, the set of continuous functions on $\mathbb{O}(3)$

$$F := \left\{ o \mapsto M_n(r, o, \mathbf{l}) : n \in \mathbb{N} \right\}$$

is equicontinuous and pointwise bounded.

Proof. Throughout the proof we assume that $r \in \mathbb{R}$ is fixed. Since M_n is a finite product of characteristic functions, we immediately obtain that each M_n is continuous and uniformly bounded by 1.

To prove the equicontinuity, we use the representation

$$M_n(r, o, \mathbf{l}) = \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ i \sum_{|v|=n} rl(v) \langle u(v) e_3, o^\top X(v) \rangle \right\} \right],$$

valid for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$, where the expectation is taken only with respect to the family $X(v)$ of i.i.d. copies of X . We start our estimations by using the inequalities $|e^{ix} - e^{iy}| \leq |1 - e^{i(y-x)}|$ and $|1 - e^{ix}| \leq 2(|x| \wedge 1)$.

$$\begin{aligned} |M_n(r, u, \mathbf{l}) - M_n(r, o, \mathbf{l})| &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left| 1 - \exp \left(i \sum_{|v|=n} rl(v) \langle u(v) e_3, (o^\top - u^\top) X(v) \rangle \right) \right| \right] \\ &\leq 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_{|v|=n} rl(v) \langle u(v) e_3, (o^\top - u^\top) X(v) \rangle \right| \wedge 1 \right] \end{aligned}$$

Using next the triangle inequality, the Cauchy-Schwarz-inequality and the property of the matrix norm, we can further bound

$$\begin{aligned} |M_n(r, u, \mathbf{l}) - M_n(r, o, \mathbf{l})| &\leq 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_{|v|=n} rl(v) \langle u(v) e_3, (o^\top - u^\top) X(v) \rangle \right| \wedge 1 \right] \\ &\leq 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{|v|=n} |r| l(v) \|X(v)\| \|o^\top - u^\top\| \right) \wedge 1 \right] \end{aligned}$$

Now we separate according to whether $\sum_{|v|=n} |r| l(v) \|X(v)\| > K$ or not, where K is to be chosen below. In the first case, we bound the expectation by the probability of the corresponding event, while for the second case we bound the sum by K . We obtain

$$|M_n(r, u, \mathbf{l}) - M_n(r, o, \mathbf{l})| \leq 2 \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{|v|=n} |r| l(v) \|X(v)\| > K \right) + 2K \|o - u\|,$$

where we have used as well that $\|u^\top - o^\top\| = \|(u - o)^\top\| = \|u - o\|$.

Now fix $\epsilon > 0$. By Lemma 5.5 below, for given $\epsilon > 0$, there is $K = K(|r|)$, such that

$$\sup_n \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{|v|=n} |r| l(v) \|X(v)\| > K \right) < \epsilon/4.$$

Set $\delta := \frac{\epsilon}{4K}$. Then for all $u, o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$ satisfying $\|u - o\| < \delta$ it holds

$$|M_n(r, u, \mathbf{l}) - M_n(r, o, \mathbf{l})| \leq 2\epsilon/4 + 2K\|u - o\| < \epsilon.$$

This proves the equicontinuity. \square

Lemma 5.5. *For each $\mathbf{l} \in N^c$, for any given $\epsilon > 0$ and any fixed $r > 0$, there is K such that*

$$\sup_n \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{|v|=n} r l(v) |X(v)| > K \right) < \epsilon/4.$$

Proof. We rely on assumption (A4). It suffices to obtain a bound for random vectors X with Pareto tails, *i.e.*, $P(\|X\| > t) \sim Ct^\alpha > 0$; since by assumption (A4), any other stationary solution of interest in the paper would be stochastically dominated by such a random variable. Here, $f(t) \sim g(t)$ denotes asymptotic equivalence, *i.e.*, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(t)}{g(t)} = 1$.

Let $r > 0$ be fixed. By [19, Lemma 3.3], for all sufficiently large $K > 0$

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{|v|=n} r l(v) \|X(v)\| > K \right) \sim \mathbb{P}(\|X\| > K) \left(\sum_{|v|=n} r^\alpha l(v)^\alpha \right)$$

For any $\mathbf{l} \in N^c$, we have the convergence $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{|v|=n} r^\alpha l(v)^\alpha = r^\alpha W_\infty(\mathbf{l})$, where $W_\infty(\mathbf{l})$ denotes a realization of W_∞ . In particular, $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{|v|=n} r^\alpha l(v)^\alpha < \infty$; hence there is a constant $C' = C'(\mathbf{l})$ such that

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{|v|=n} r^\alpha l(v)^\alpha \|X(v)\|^\alpha > K \right) \leq C' \mathbb{P}(\|X\|^\alpha > K).$$

The assertion follows by choosing K large enough. \square

Corollary 5.6. *For each compact set $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ and for $\mathbf{l} \in N^c$, the set of continuous functions on $A \times \mathbb{O}(3)$*

$$F := \left\{ r, o \mapsto M_n(r, o, \mathbf{l}) : n \in \mathbb{N} \right\}$$

is equicontinuous and pointwise bounded.

Proof. Since set A is compact, Lemma 5.4 immediately implies, that the family

$$\left\{ o \mapsto M_n(r, o, \mathbf{1}) : n \in \mathbb{N}, r \in A \right\}$$

is equicontinuous (in both variables r and n) and pointwise bounded. Since $\mathbb{O}(3)$ is also compact, one can check, that the family

$$\left\{ r \mapsto M_n(r, o, \mathbf{1}) : n \in \mathbb{N}, o \in \mathbb{O}(3) \right\}$$

is equicontinuous and pointwise bounded by using the same techniques, as in Lemma 5.4. We refrain from providing details.

Now fix an arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$. By above arguments, there exist δ_1 and δ_2 , which depend only on ϵ , such that for all $r, s \in A$ and $o, u \in \mathbb{O}(3)$ satisfying $|r - s| < \delta_1$ and $\|o - u\| < \delta_2$, the relations

$$|M_n(r, o, \mathbf{1}) - M_n(s, o, \mathbf{1})| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad |M_n(s, o, \mathbf{1}) - M_n(s, u, \mathbf{1})| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \quad (5.6)$$

both hold. Let d be a metric on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{O}(3)$, defined as

$$d((r, o), (s, u)) := \max\{|r - s|, \|o - u\|\},$$

and notice, that for all $r, s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $o, u \in \mathbb{O}(3)$ the relations $|r - s| < \delta_1$ and $\|o - u\| < \delta_2$ imply the existence of $\delta := \max\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$, such that $d((r, o), (s, u)) < \delta$. In view of (5.6), by the merit of triangle inequality we obtain

$$|M_n(r, o, \mathbf{1}) - M_n(s, u, \mathbf{1})| < \epsilon,$$

which proves equicontinuity. Boundedness follows from the properties of M , discussed at the beginning of Lemma 5.4. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.1. Using Corollary 5.6, we may apply the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem to obtain for any fixed compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ the existence of a continuous function $(r, o) \mapsto g(r, o, \mathbf{1})$ that is the limit of a subsequence of functions in F . But we know, that the full sequence converges on the countable dense set $K \times D$, hence the full sequence converges to the continuous function $g(\cdot, \mathbf{1})$ w.r.t. to uniform convergence for continuous functions on $K \times \mathbb{O}(3)$. Taking a countable union of compact sets that covers \mathbb{R} we conclude that there is a null set N , such that for all $\mathbf{1} \in N^c$

$$M_n(r, o, \mathbf{1}) \rightarrow M_\infty(r, o, \mathbf{1})$$

simultaneously for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$, and the mapping $(r, o) \mapsto M_\infty(r, o, \mathbf{1})$ is continuous.

The remaining assertion of the proposition has already been proved in Lemma 5.3. \square

Remark 5.7. Throughout the paper a statement, that a given property holds almost surely, should be understood in the way, that this property holds on the set H^c , unless stated otherwise, where the set H^c is given as follows. Firstly, since most our results rely on M_∞ being a one-dimensional characteristic function, one naturally requires $N \subset H$. To comfortably cover all instances of the formulation in question, let $H^c \subset \mathbf{L}$ be defined for the rest of the paper as

$$H^c = N^c \cap O^c \cap P^c \quad (5.7)$$

where O^c denotes the set, on which (2.6) holds, and P^c is the set, on which the limit of an additive martingale W defined in (2.17) exists. All three components are of probability 1, hence $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{L} \in H^c) = 1$.

Lemma 5.8. *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds*

$$M_\infty(r, o) = \prod_{|v|=n} [M_\infty]_v(rL(v), oU(v)), \quad (5.8)$$

almost surely, simultaneously for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$.

Proof. Decomposing at generation n , we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} M_\infty(r, o) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{|v|=n+k} \phi(roL(v)U(v)e_3) \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{|v|=n} \prod_{|w|=k} \phi(roL(v)U(v)[L(w)]_v[U(w)]_v e_3) \\ &= \prod_{|v|=n} [M_\infty]_v(rL(v), oU(v)), \quad \text{a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

Note that the size of generation n is 2^n , in particular finite, hence we may exchange limit and product. Further, we may obtain the simultaneous convergence for all arguments from a dense subset of $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{O}(3)$. By Proposition 5.1 there is a set of measure 1 on which M_∞ as well as $([M_\infty]_v)_{|v|=n}$ are continuous functions, hence the identity holds for all r and o simultaneously. \square

We say that Ψ is a random Lévy-Khintchine exponent with F_∞ -measurable random Lévy-triplet (μ, Θ, ν) if

$$\Psi(r) = ir\mu - \frac{1}{2}r^2\Theta + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(e^{iry} - 1 - iry\mathbb{1}_{[0,1]}(|y|) \right) \nu(dy). \quad (5.9)$$

where μ and Θ are F_∞ -measurable random variables taking values in \mathbb{R} and $[0, \infty)$, respectively, and ν is an F_∞ -measurable random Lévy measure. Combining Proposition 5.1 and Lemma 5.8, we may now obtain equations for the components of the random Lévy-Khintchine exponent pertaining to $M_\infty(\cdot, o)$.

Proposition 5.9. For every fixed $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$, the mapping $r \mapsto M_\infty(r, o)$ admits the representation

$$M_\infty(\cdot, o) = e^{\Psi^o(\cdot)}, \quad (5.10)$$

where Ψ^o is a random Lévy-Khintchine exponent with F_∞ -measurable random Lévy-triplet (μ^o, Θ^o, ν^o) . The random variable Θ^o satisfies

$$\Theta^o = \sum_{|v|=n} L(v)^2 [\Theta]_v^{oU(v)}; \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (5.11)$$

while ν^o satisfies for any $B \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$

$$\nu^o(B) = \sum_{|v|=n} [\nu]_v^{oU(v)}(L(v)^{-1}B), \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (5.12)$$

Remark 5.10. By Proposition 5.9, using (5.2), we have that ϕ admits the representation

$$\phi(roe_3) = \mathbb{E}[e^{\Psi^o(r)}] \quad (5.13)$$

for any $r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq}$ and $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$.

Proof of Proposition 5.9. By Proposition 5.1, for all $\mathbf{l} \in N^c$, $r \mapsto M_\infty(r, o, \mathbf{l})$ is the characteristic function of an infinitely divisible law. Therefore, it admits the representation $M_\infty(r, o, \mathbf{l}) = \exp(\Psi^o(r, \mathbf{l}))$, for a (deterministic, \mathbf{l} -dependent) Lévy-Khintchine exponent

$$\Psi^o(r) = ir\mu^o - \frac{1}{2}r^2\Theta^o + \int \left(e^{iry} - 1 - iry\mathbf{1}_{[0,1]}(|y|) \right) \nu^o(dy). \quad (5.14)$$

Note, that $\Psi^o(r) = \log M_\infty(r, o)$ is a measurable function. By [21, Theorem 13.28], we have the vague convergence

$$\sum_{|v|=n} \mathbb{P} \left(l(v) \langle u(v)e_3, o^\top X(v) \rangle \in \cdot \right) \rightarrow \nu^o(\mathbf{l})(\cdot)$$

from which we may deduce the F_∞ -measurability of ν^o . The corresponding formulae for μ^o and Θ^o in [21, Theorem 13.28] involve the choice of a continuity point of ν^o ; which may be random at this stage. We therefore postpone the proof of measurability of μ^o and Θ^o to Lemmata 5.15 and 5.16, respectively. Note that in both cases the proofs will rely only on the measurability and properties of ν^o , and the results of Proposition 5.1.

By combining (5.8) and (5.10), we obtain

$$\Psi^o(r) = \sum_{|v|=n} [\Psi]_v^{oU(v)}(rL(v)), \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (5.15)$$

Expanding the right-hand side of (5.15) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi^o(r) &= ir\mu^o - \frac{1}{2}r^2\Theta^o + \int \left(e^{iry} - 1 - iry\mathbb{1}_{[0,1]}(y) \right) \nu^o(dy) \\
&= ir \sum_{|v|=n} L(v)[\mu]_v^{oU(v)} - \frac{1}{2}r^2 \sum_{|v|=n} L(v)^2[\Theta]_v^{oU(v)} \\
&\quad + \sum_{|v|=n} \int \left(e^{irL(v)y} - 1 - irL(v)y\mathbb{1}_{[0,1]}(y) \right) [\nu]_v^{oU(v)}(dy) \\
&= ir \sum_{|v|=n} L(v)[\mu]_v^{oU(v)} - \frac{1}{2}r^2 \sum_{|v|=n} L(v)^2[\Theta]_v^{oU(v)} \\
&\quad + \sum_{|v|=n} \int \left(e^{irL(v)y} - 1 - irL(v)y\mathbb{1}_{[0,1]}(L(v)y) \right) [\nu]_v^{oU(v)}(dy) \\
&\quad - \sum_{|v|=n} \int \left(irL(v)y\mathbb{1}_{[0,1]}(y) - irL(v)y\mathbb{1}_{[0,1]}(L(v)y) \right) [\nu]_v^{oU(v)}(dy),
\end{aligned}$$

where all equations hold almost surely. The last term in the above formula contributes to the random shift, thus, using uniqueness of the Lévy-triplet, we infer

$$\Theta^o = \sum_{|v|=n} L(v)^2[\Theta]_v^{oU(v)}, \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (5.16)$$

and

$$\int h(y)\nu^o(dy) = \sum_{|v|=n} \int h(L(v)y)[\nu]_v^{oU(v)}(dy), \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (5.17)$$

for all nonnegative measurable functions h on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. By taking $h(x) = \mathbb{1}_B(x)$ for any $B \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, we further obtain

$$\nu^o(B) = \sum_{|v|=n} [\nu]_v^{oU(v)}(L(v)^{-1}B), \quad \text{a.s.}$$

□

5.2 Determining the random Lévy measure

In the next major step we consider properties of the random Lévy-measure ν^o . An important role here is played by assumption (A4), under which the map $r \mapsto r^\alpha \nu^o((r, \infty))$ is bounded for any $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$, as will be proved in the next lemma.

Lemma 5.11. *There is a constant $C < \infty$ such that for all $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$ and $r > 0$,*

$$\nu^o\left(\left(\frac{1}{r}, \infty\right)\right) \leq Cr^\alpha W_\infty \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad \text{and} \quad \nu^o\left(\left(-\infty, -\frac{1}{r}\right)\right) \leq Cr^\alpha W_\infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Proof. We fix any $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$ and recall that $M_\infty(r, o)$ is the limit of characteristic functions of sums in a triangular array $\sum_{|v|=n} L(v)[X]_v^{oU(v)}$, in which all summands in any generation $\{|v| = n\}$ are independent and infinitesimal, and ν^o is the Lévy-measure in the characteristic exponent Ψ^o of $M_\infty(r, o)$. By Theorem 13.28, part (i) in [21] it follows that

$$\sum_{|v|=n} \mathbb{E} \left[f \left(L(v)[X]_v^{oU(v)} \right) \right] \rightarrow \int f(y) \nu^o(dy) \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (5.18)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for any continuous and compactly supported function f on $\overline{\mathbb{R}} \setminus \{0\}$. By choosing a smooth function $f \leq 1$ that dominates $\mathbb{1}_{(\frac{1}{r}, \infty]}$ and vanishes outside $(\frac{1}{2r}, \infty]$, we obtain

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbb{P} \left([X]_v^{oU(v)} > \frac{1}{2rL(v)} \right) \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbb{E} \left[f \left(L(v)[X]_v^{oU(v)} \right) \right] \geq \nu^o\left(\left(\frac{1}{r}, \infty\right)\right), \quad (5.19)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where all inequalities hold almost surely. Let us now take a look on the left side in (5.19). Direct calculations yield

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbb{P} \left([X]_v^{oU(v)} > \frac{1}{2rL(v)} \right) &\leq \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbb{P} \left(|[X]_v^{oU(v)}| > \frac{1}{2rL(v)} \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbb{P} \left(|\langle oU(v)e_3, [X]_v \rangle| > \frac{1}{2rL(v)} \right) \leq \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbb{P}(\|oU(v)e_3\| \|X\| > \frac{1}{2rL(v)}) \\ &= \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbb{P}(\|X\| > \frac{1}{2rL(v)}) \end{aligned} \quad (5.20)$$

By assumption (A4)

$$\sum_{|v|=n} \mathbb{P}(\|X\| > \frac{1}{2rL(v)}) \leq \sum_{|v|=n} 2^\alpha Cr^\alpha L(v)^\alpha. \quad (5.21)$$

By taking the limit in (5.21) as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and combining the obtained result with (5.19) and (5.20), we obtain

$$\nu^o\left(\left(\frac{1}{r}, \infty\right)\right) \leq 2^\alpha Cr^\alpha W_\infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

In the same way (observe that we have taken absolute values in (5.20) already), we obtain

$$\nu^o\left(\left(-\infty, -\frac{1}{r}\right)\right) \leq Cr^\alpha W_\infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

□

With the help of Lemma above, we are now able to establish an important invariance property of ν^o . Recall that \mathbb{S} denotes the smallest closed subgroup of \mathbb{M} that contains $\{(L(v), U(v))_{v \in \mathbb{V}}\}$ with probability 1. We say that a family $(\bar{\nu}^o)_{o \in \mathbb{O}(3)}$ of deterministic Lévy measures on \mathbb{R} is (\mathbb{S}, α) -invariant, if for all $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$ it holds that

$$\bar{\nu}^o(s^{-1}B) = s^\alpha \bar{\nu}^{ou^{-1}}(B) \quad (5.22)$$

for any $B \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and $(s, u) \in \mathbb{S}$. Equivalently,

$$\int f(sy) \bar{\nu}^o(dy) = s^\alpha \int f(y) \bar{\nu}^{ou^{-1}}(dy) \quad (5.23)$$

for every nonnegative measurable function f on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$.

Lemma 5.12. *A family of random Lévy measures $(\nu^o)_{o \in \mathbb{O}(3)}$ satisfies (5.12) if and only if there is a family of deterministic (\mathbb{S}, α) -invariant Lévy measures $(\bar{\nu}^o)_{o \in \mathbb{O}(3)}$ such that*

$$\nu^o = W_\infty \bar{\nu}^o \quad (5.24)$$

almost surely for all $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$. There is a constant C such that for all $r > 0$ and $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$,

$$\bar{\nu}^o((\frac{1}{r}, \infty)) \leq Cr^\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\nu}^o((-\infty, -\frac{1}{r})) \leq Cr^\alpha.$$

Proof. The proof is organized as follows. In step 1 we prove the sufficiency by showing, that ν^o given by (5.24) satisfies (5.12). The general idea to prove the necessity, which is the more complicated part of the two, is to define a deterministic measure $\bar{\nu}^o := \mathbb{E}[\nu^o]$ and show, that it satisfies (5.24) and (5.22) on a set of intervals forming a countable generator of the Borel- σ -field on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. This will immediately imply, that both these properties hold for any subset of $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. In step 2 we introduce the countable generator S of Borel- σ -field on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and show, that the map $(r, o) \mapsto \mathbb{E}[r^{-\alpha} \nu^o((\frac{1}{r}, \infty))]$ is constant ρ -a.s., where ρ is defined in Lemma 2.2. In step 3 we define $\bar{\nu}^o$ and prove (5.24) and, consequently, (5.22). In step 4 we show, that $\bar{\nu}^o$ is a Lévy measure, thus finishing the proof.

Step 1: Suppose that $\nu^o = W_\infty \bar{\nu}^o$ for a family $(\bar{\nu}^o)_{o \in \mathbb{O}(3)}$ satisfying (5.22). For any $B \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, in view of (2.18), we then have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{|v|=n} [\nu]_v^{oU(v)}(L(v)^{-1}B) &= \sum_{|v|=n} [W_\infty \bar{\nu}]_v^{oU(v)}(L(v)^{-1}B) \\ &= \sum_{|v|=n} [W_\infty]_v \bar{\nu}^{oU(v)}(L(v)^{-1}B) = \sum_{|v|=n} [W_\infty]_v L(v)^\alpha \bar{\nu}^{oU(v)U(v)^{-1}}(B) \\ &= W_\infty \bar{\nu}^o(B) = \nu^o(B), \quad \text{a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

In the rest of the proof we prove the necessity.

Step 2: Assume that the family $(\nu^o)_{o \in \mathbb{O}(3)}$ satisfies the equation (5.12) for any measurable set $B \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. For any $x > 0$ denote by I_x and I_{-x} intervals $(\frac{1}{x}, \infty)$ and $(-\infty, -\frac{1}{x})$. Note, that the collection of sets $S := \{I_r : r \in \mathbb{Q}_>\} \cup \{I_{-r} : r \in \mathbb{Q}_<\}$ is a countable generator of the Borel- σ -field on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. For any $r > 0$ and $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$ we define the following functionals.

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_+(r, o) &:= r^{-\alpha} \nu^o(I_r), & \eta_+(r, o) &:= \mathbb{E}[\psi_+(r, o)], \\ \psi_-(r, o) &:= r^{-\alpha} \nu^o(I_{-r}), & \eta_-(r, o) &:= \mathbb{E}[\psi_-(r, o)].\end{aligned}\tag{5.25}$$

Observe, that the integrability of ψ_{\pm} is a consequence of Lemma 5.11. Using $\mathbb{E}W_{\infty} = 1$, it holds moreover that $\eta_{\pm}(r, o) \leq C$ for all $r > 0$, $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$ for the constant C from Lemma 5.11. By (5.12) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_+(r, o) &= r^{-\alpha} \sum_{|v|=n} [\nu]_v^{oU(v)} (L(v)^{-1} I_r) \\ &= r^{-\alpha} \sum_{|v|=n} [\nu]_v^{oU(v)} (I_{rL(v)}) = \sum_{|v|=n} L(v)^{\alpha} [\psi_+]_v(rL(v), oU(v)), \quad \text{a.s.}\end{aligned}$$

By taking the expectation and using the many-to-one identity, Lemma 2.2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_+(r, o) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{|v|=n} L(v)^{\alpha} [\psi_+]_v(rL(v), oU(v)) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{|v|=n} L(v)^{\alpha} \eta_+(rL(v), oU(v)) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\eta_+(rL_n, oU_n) \right],\end{aligned}\tag{5.26}$$

where $(L_n, U_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is the random walk on \mathbb{M} , introduced in Lemma 2.2. Defining for any fixed $(r, o) \in \mathbb{M}$ a function $F_{r,o} : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ as

$$F_{r,o}(s, u) := \eta_+(rs, ou),$$

the property (5.26) (applied at $r' = rs$, $o' = ou$) translates into

$$F_{r,o}(s, u) = \mathbb{E}[F_{r,o}(sL_n, uU_n)],$$

for any $(s, u) \in \mathbb{S}$. Thus, $F_{r,o}$ satisfies (2.14), moreover, it is bounded, since η_+ is bounded. Applying the Choquet-Deny Lemma 2.3 to $F_{r,o}$, we infer, that $F_{r,o}$ is constant ρ -a.s., where ρ is the increment distribution in the associated random walk $(L_n, U_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, introduced in the many-to-one lemma (Lemma 2.2). It follows that for any $r > 0$, $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$,

$$\eta_+(r, o) = \eta_+(rs, ou)\tag{5.27}$$

for ρ -almost every $(s, u) \in \mathbb{S}$.

Step 3: Let H^c be a set in $\mathbb{R}_{\geq} \times \mathbb{O}(3)$, such that $\rho(H^c) = \mathbb{P}((L_1, U_1) \in H^c) = 1$ and $\eta_+(r, o)$ is constant on H^c . Applying Lemma 2.3 to the function $\mathbb{1}_{H^c}(\cdot)$ gives us

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{|v|=n} L(v)^\alpha \mathbb{1}_{H^c}(L(v), U(v)) \right] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{H^c}(L_n, U_n)] = \rho(H^c) = 1,$$

hence, by assumption (A1),

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{|v|=n} L(v)^\alpha \mathbb{1}_{H^c}(L(v), U(v)) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{|v|=n} L(v)^\alpha \right].$$

The last equality implies

$$\mathbb{P}((L(v), U(v)) \in H^c \text{ for all } v : L(v) > 0) = 1, \quad (5.28)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By martingale convergence theorem, in view of (5.28) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_+(r, o) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\psi_+(r, o) | F_n \right] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{|v|=n} L(v)^\alpha [\psi_+]_v(rL(v), oU(v)) | F_n \right] \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{|v|=n} L(v)^\alpha \eta_+(rL(v), oU(v)) = W_\infty \eta_+(r, o), \quad \text{a.s.}, \end{aligned}$$

simultaneously for all (r, o) . Recalling the definition of ψ_+ in (5.25), we obtain

$$\nu^o(I_r) = W_\infty \eta_+(r, o) r^\alpha, \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (5.29)$$

We now define by

$$\bar{\nu}^o := \mathbb{E}[\nu^o] \quad (5.30)$$

a deterministic measure on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. By (5.29), we have

$$\bar{\nu}^o(I_r) = \mathbb{E}[\nu^o(I_r)] = \mathbb{E}[W_\infty \eta_+(r, o) r^\alpha] = \eta_+(r, o) r^\alpha,$$

which, again in view of (5.29), implies

$$\nu^o(I_r) = W_\infty \bar{\nu}^o(I_r), \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (5.31)$$

Further, for any $(s, u) \in \mathbb{S}$ it follows by (5.27), that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^o(s^{-1}I_r) &= \nu^o(I_{rs}) = W_\infty \eta_+(rs, o) r^\alpha s^\alpha = W_\infty \eta_+(rs, (ou^{-1})u) r^\alpha s^\alpha \\ &= s^\alpha W_\infty \eta_+(r, ou^{-1}) r^\alpha = s^\alpha \nu^{ou^{-1}}(I_r), \quad \text{a.s.} \end{aligned} \quad (5.32)$$

Formulae (5.31) and (5.32) imply, that relations (5.24) and (5.22), respectively, hold for all sets $(I_r)_{r \in \mathbb{Q}_>}$. Replacing ψ_+ and η_+ with ψ_- and η_- in the above proof, by same arguments both these properties hold for all sets $(I_r)_{r \in \mathbb{Q}_<}$, hence for all sets in S . Since S is a countable generator of the Borel- σ -field on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, we conclude, that (5.24) and (5.22) hold for all measurable sets in $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$.

Step 4: We now show, that $\bar{\nu}^o$ is a (deterministic) Lévy measure on \mathbb{R} , for any $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$. Since ν^o itself is a Lévy measure, by (5.24) we trivially have $\bar{\nu}^o(\{0\}) = 0$ and further observe, that

$$\infty > \int (x^2 \wedge 1) \nu^o(dx) = \int (x^2 \wedge 1) W_\infty \bar{\nu}^o(dx), \quad \text{a.s.}$$

W.l.o.g. assume, that the above relation holds on a set H^c , such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{L} \in H^c) = 1$. Since the set $\{W_\infty > 0\}$ carries positive probability, we can always find an $\mathbf{l} \in H^c \cap \{W_\infty > 0\}$, such that

$$\int (x^2 \wedge 1) W_\infty(\mathbf{l}) \bar{\nu}^o(dx) < \infty \tag{5.33}$$

holds. Dividing the last inequality by $W_\infty(\mathbf{l})$ completes the proof. \square

5.3 Determining the random Lévy-triplet

Lemma 5.12 is a powerful tool, which enables us to further study Lévy-triplet (μ^o, Θ^o, ν^o) . In the next lemma we derive the more convenient form for the integral in the characteristic exponent Ψ^o .

Given a family $(\bar{\nu}^o)_{o \in \mathbb{O}(3)}$ of (\mathbb{S}, α) -invariant Lévy measures, define

$$\begin{aligned} K_1(r, o) &:= \int (\cos(ry) - 1) \bar{\nu}^o(dy), \\ K_2(r, o) &:= \int \sin(ry) \bar{\nu}^o(dy), \\ \gamma(o) &:= - \int y \mathbb{1}_{[0,1]}(|y|) \bar{\nu}^o(dy). \end{aligned} \tag{5.34}$$

Further, denote by

$$\Gamma^o(x) := \int \left(e^{ixy} - 1 - ixy \mathbb{1}_{[0,1]}(y) \right) \nu^o(dy)$$

the Lévy integral that appears in the random Lévy-Khintchine exponent Ψ^o in formula (5.9).

Lemma 5.13. *With the notations (5.34), it holds for any $r \in \mathbb{R}_\geq$ and $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$ that*

$$\Gamma^o(r) = W_\infty K_1(r, o) + iW_\infty K_2(r, o) + irW_\infty \gamma(o). \tag{5.35}$$

The functions K_j , $j = 1, 2$ are (\mathbb{S}, α) -invariant.

Proof. Fix any $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$. For any $r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq}$ we have

$$I^o(r) = \int \left(\cos(ry) + i \sin(ry) - 1 - iry \mathbf{1}_{[0,1]}(y) \right) W_{\infty} \bar{\nu}^o(dy), \quad (5.36)$$

which, in view of notations in (5.34), yields (5.35). Further, by Proposition 5.12, in particular the invariance property (5.23), for any $(s, u) \in \mathbb{S}$ we have

$$K_2(s, o) = \int \sin(sy) \bar{\nu}^o(dy) = s^{\alpha} \int \sin(y) \bar{\nu}^{ou^{-1}}(dy) = s^{\alpha} K_2(1, ou^{-1})$$

and

$$K_1(s, o) = \int (\cos(sy) - 1) \bar{\nu}^o(dy) = s^{\alpha} \int (\cos(y) - 1) \bar{\nu}^{ou^{-1}}(dy) = s^{\alpha} K_1(1, ou^{-1}).$$

□

We proceed to show that, depending on the value of α , certain components in the random Lévy-triplet may vanish. We start with uniform boundedness of γ in case $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, from which we will infer that both μ^o and Θ^o vanish for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

Lemma 5.14. *Assume $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Then the function γ , defined in (5.34), is bounded uniformly in $\mathbb{O}(3)$.*

Proof. Observe that

$$|\gamma(o)| = \left| \int y \mathbf{1}_{[0,1]}(|y|) \bar{\nu}^o(dy) \right| \leq \left| \int_{(0,1]} y \bar{\nu}^o(dy) \right| + \left| \int_{[-1,0)} y \bar{\nu}^o(dy) \right|. \quad (5.37)$$

We will treat the two summands in the right-hand side of (5.37) separately. We use (5.22) and the fact, that $\bar{\nu}^o(I_s)$ is finite for any $s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq}$ and $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$, which is a direct consequence of Lemma 5.11. As a consequence of (A1), we may assume that there exists $s \neq 1$ and $u \in \mathbb{O}(3)$, such that $(s, u) \in \mathbb{S}$. By the group property of \mathbb{S} we may further assume that $s > 1$. Direct calculations, using (5.23), yield

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{(0,1]} y \bar{\nu}^o(dy) \right| &\leq \sum_{n \geq 0} \left| \int \mathbf{1}_{(s^{-n-1}, s^{-n}]}(y) y \bar{\nu}^o(dy) \right| = \sum_{n \geq 0} \left| \int \mathbf{1}_{(s^{-1}, 1]}(s^n y) s^{-n} (s^n y) \bar{\nu}^o(dy) \right| \\ &= \sum_{n \geq 0} \left| s^{n\alpha} \int_{(\frac{1}{s}, 1]} s^{-n} y \bar{\nu}^{o(u)^{-n}}(dy) \right| = \sum_{n \geq 0} s^{n(\alpha-1)} \left| \int_{(\frac{1}{s}, 1]} y \bar{\nu}^{o(u)^{-n}}(dy) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{n \geq 0} s^{n(\alpha-1)} \left| \int_{(\frac{1}{s}, 1]} \bar{\nu}^{o(u)^{-n}}(dy) \right| \leq \sum_{n \geq 0} s^{n(\alpha-1)} |\bar{\nu}^{o(u)^{-n}}((\frac{1}{s}, \infty))| \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \sum_{n \geq 0} (s^{\alpha-1})^n C s^\alpha =: \tilde{C} < \infty, \quad (5.38)$$

where we have used Lemma 5.12 in the penultimate line. The constant \tilde{C} is finite due to $s > 1$ and $\alpha < 1$. The second summand in (5.37) is treated analogously. \square

We proceed by proving the uniform boundedness of μ^o in case $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

Lemma 5.15. *The random shift μ^o in the Lévy-triplet is an F_∞ -measurable function. If $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, then*

$$\sup_{o \in \mathbb{O}(3)} |\mu^o| < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Proof. Choose any $h \in (0, 1)$, such that $\bar{\nu}^o(\{|x| = h\}) = 0$ and hence, by Lemma 5.12, $\nu^o(\{|x| = h\}) = 0$ almost surely. By part (iii) in Theorem 13.28 in [21], we have

$$\sum_{|v|=n} \mathbb{E} \left[L(v)[X]_v^{oU(v)}; |L(v)[X]_v^{oU(v)}| \leq h \right] \rightarrow b^o(h) \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad (5.39)$$

where $b^o(h)$ is defined as

$$b^o(h) := \mu^o - \int_{h < |x| \leq 1} x \nu^o(dx). \quad (5.40)$$

Both equations together yield in particular the measurability of first $b^o(h)$ and hence of μ^o . By an appeal to Proposition 5.1, it further holds that the family $\{\mu_o : o \in \mathbb{O}(3)\}$ is well defined simultaneously outside the set N of measure zero.

Concerning the boundedness for $\alpha < 1$, it follows from (5.39), that

$$\left| \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbb{E} \left[L(v)[X]_v^{oU(v)}; |L(v)[X]_v^{oU(v)}| \leq h \right] \right| \rightarrow |b^o(h)| \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (5.41)$$

For the left side of (5.41), we write

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbb{E} \left[L(v)[X]_v^{oU(v)}; |L(v)[X]_v^{oU(v)}| \leq h \right] \right| \leq \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbb{E} \left[|L(v)[X]_v^{oU(v)}| \mathbf{1}_{[0,h]}(|L(v)[X]_v^{oU(v)}|) \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{|v|=n} \int_0^h \mathbb{P} \left(|L(v)[X]_v^{oU(v)}| > x \right) dx = \sum_{|v|=n} \int_0^h \mathbb{P} \left(|\langle oU(v)e_3, X \rangle| > \frac{x}{L(v)} \right) dx \\ & \leq \sum_{|v|=n} \int_0^h \mathbb{P} \left(\|oU(v)e_3\| \|X\| > \frac{x}{L(v)} \right) dx \leq \sum_{|v|=n} \int_0^h \mathbb{P} \left(\|X\| > \frac{x}{L(v)} \right) dx \\ & \leq \sum_{|v|=n} \int_0^h C L(v)^\alpha x^{-\alpha} dx = \left(\sum_{|v|=n} L(v)^\alpha \right) C \frac{h^{1-\alpha}}{1-\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds by assumption (A4). Sending $n \rightarrow \infty$, in view of (2.18), we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbb{E} \left[L(v)[X]_v^{oU(v)}; |L(v)[X]_v^{oU(v)}| \leq h \right] \right| \leq W_\infty C \frac{h^{1-\alpha}}{1-\alpha} \quad \text{a.s.},$$

which, combined with (5.41), yields

$$|b^\circ(h)| \leq W_\infty C \frac{h^{1-\alpha}}{1-\alpha} \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (5.42)$$

for any $h > 0$. For the integral in (5.40) we have

$$\left| \int_{h < |x| \leq 1} x \nu^\circ(dx) \right| \leq |W_\infty \gamma(o)| \leq W_\infty \tilde{C} \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad (5.43)$$

by Lemma 5.13. Combining (5.42) and (5.43), we obtain

$$|\mu^\circ| \leq |b^\circ(h)| + \left| \int_{h < |x| \leq 1} x \nu^\circ(dx) \right| \leq |W_\infty \gamma(o)| \leq W_\infty C \frac{h^{1-\alpha}}{1-\alpha} + W_\infty \tilde{C} \quad \text{a.s..}$$

Since both constants do not depend on o and are finite, this implies the uniform boundedness of μ° almost surely in $\mathbb{O}(3)$. \square

We now prove the uniform boundedness of Θ° for both $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\alpha \in (1, 2)$.

Lemma 5.16. *The random variance Θ° is an F_∞ -measurable function. For $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 2)$, it holds*

$$\sup_{o \in \mathbb{O}(3)} |\Theta^\circ| < \infty \quad \text{a.s..}$$

Proof. As in the previous lemma, we choose $h > 0$, such that $\bar{\nu}^\circ(\{|x| = h\}) = 0$ and hence, by Lemma 5.12, $\nu^\circ(\{|x| = h\}) = 0$ a.s. By part (ii) in Theorem 13.28 in [21],

$$\sum_{|v|=n} \mathbb{V} \left[L(v)[X]_v^{oU(v)}; |L(v)[X]_v^{oU(v)}| \leq h \right] \rightarrow a^\circ(h) \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad (5.44)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $a^\circ(h)$ is defined as

$$a^\circ(h) := \Theta^\circ + \int_{h < |x| \leq 1} x^2 \nu^\circ(dx). \quad (5.45)$$

This proves in particular the F_∞ -measurability of Θ° .

By Lemma 5.12, the integral in (5.45) is bounded by $Ch^{-\alpha}$ uniformly in $\mathbb{O}(3)$. Boundedness of Θ^o will hence be deduced from boundedness of $a^o(h)$. Therefore, we want to bound the left hand side of (5.44) from above. Obviously, we can bound variances by the second moment. Hence we consider

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbb{E} \left[(L(v)[X]_v^{oU(v)} \mathbb{1}_{[0,h]}(|L(v)[X]_v^{oU(v)}|))^2 \right] \\
& \leq \sum_{|v|=n} \int_0^{h^2} \mathbb{P} \left((L(v)[X]_v^{oU(v)})^2 > x \right) dx \\
& \leq \sum_{|v|=n} \int_0^{h^2} \mathbb{P} \left(([X]_v^{oU(v)})^2 > \frac{x}{L(v)^2} \right) dx = \sum_{|v|=n} \int_0^{h^2} \mathbb{P} \left(|[X]_v^{oU(v)}| > \frac{\sqrt{x}}{L(v)} \right) dx \\
& = \sum_{|v|=n} \int_0^{h^2} \mathbb{P} \left(|\langle oU(v)e_3, X \rangle| > \frac{\sqrt{x}}{L(v)} \right) dx \leq \sum_{|v|=n} \int_0^{h^2} \mathbb{P} \left(\|X\| > \frac{\sqrt{x}}{L(v)} \right) dx \\
& \leq \sum_{|v|=n} \int_0^{h^2} CL(v)^\alpha x^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} dx = \left(\sum_{|v|=n} L(v)^\alpha \right) C \frac{h^{2-\alpha}}{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds by assumption (A4). Sending $n \rightarrow \infty$, in view of (2.18), we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbb{E} \left[(L(v)[X]_v^{oU(v)} \mathbb{1}_{[0,h]}(|L(v)[X]_v^{oU(v)}|))^2 \right] \leq W_\infty C \frac{h^{2-\alpha}}{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}},$$

which yields

$$a^o(h) \leq W_\infty C \frac{h^{1-\alpha}}{1-\alpha}. \tag{5.46}$$

Together with (5.45), this immediately implies that Θ^o is almost surely uniformly bounded in $\mathbb{O}(3)$. \square

5.4 Proof of Theorem 3.4

We now have all ingredients to prove Theorem 3.4. We start by proving the converse inclusion, that is, every solution is of the form (3.4).

A short proof for the direct inclusion follows immediately afterwards.

Proof of the converse inclusion in Theorem 3.4. Let ϕ be the characteristic function of a random vector on \mathbb{R}^3 that is a solution to (1.4). Recall that we consider $\alpha > 0$ with $\alpha \neq 1$. By Remark 5.10, we have for any $r \in \mathbb{R}_\geq$ and $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$

$$\phi(roe_3) = \mathbb{E}[e^{\Psi^o(r)}].$$

By Lemma 5.13, we have

$$\Psi^o(r) = ir\mu^o - \frac{1}{2}r^2\Theta^o + W_\infty K_1(r, o) + iW_\infty K_2(r, o) + irW_\infty\gamma(o). \quad (5.47)$$

Using the invariance formulae obtained, for any $(s, u) \in \mathbb{S}$ we have

$$\Psi^o(rs) = irs\mu^o - \frac{1}{2}r^2s^2\Theta^o + s^\alpha W_\infty K_1(r, ou^{-1}) + is^\alpha W_\infty K_2(r, ou^{-1}) + irsW_\infty\gamma(o). \quad (5.48)$$

The proof is organized as follows. We first prove the representation (3.4) by using the branching relation (5.15) satisfied by Ψ^o and separating the components of Ψ^o to obtain equations for Y , V and K , to be defined below as well. Then we turn to the separate components and prove that they vanish if α takes values in specified ranges.

Step 1. In this step, we are going to prove for any $\alpha \neq 1$ the representation (3.4) and show, that K vanishes a.s. for $\alpha = 2$.

By (5.15) we have for any $r > 0$, $s \in \mathbb{G}$ and $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$ that

$$\Psi^o(rs) = \sum_{|v|=n} [\Psi]_v^{oU(v)}(rsL(v)), \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (5.49)$$

Fix any $s \in \mathbb{G}$, such that $(s, u) \in \mathbb{S}$ for some $u \in \mathbb{U}$. Expanding the right-hand side in the above formula, using (5.47) and (5.48) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{|v|=n} [\Psi]_v^{oU(v)}(rsL(v)) &= \sum_{|v|=n} \left(irs[\mu]_v^{oU(v)} - \frac{1}{2}r^2s^2L(v)^2[\Theta]_v^{oU(v)} + [W_\infty]_v K_1(rsL(v), oU(v)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + i[W_\infty]_v K_2(rsL(v), oU(v)) + i[W_\infty]_v rsL(v)\gamma(oU(v)) \right) \\ &= \sum_{|v|=n} \left(irs[\mu]_v^{oU(v)} - \frac{1}{2}r^2s^2L(v)^2[\Theta]_v^{oU(v)} + [W_\infty]_v L(v)^\alpha s^\alpha K_1(r, ou^{-1}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + i[W_\infty]_v L(v)^\alpha s^\alpha K_2(r, ou^{-1}) + i[W_\infty]_v rsL(v)\gamma(oU(v)) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.50)$$

In the last line, we have used the (\mathbb{S}, α) -invariance of K_1 and K_2 , to take $L(v)^\alpha$ outside. At the same time, this removes $U(v)$. Let us define

$$Y(o) := \mu^o + W_\infty\gamma(o) \quad \text{and} \quad V(o) := \Theta^o. \quad (5.51)$$

Using these definitions in (5.48) and (5.50), we can rewrite the identity (5.49) as

$$irsY(o) - \frac{1}{2}r^2s^2V(o) + s^\alpha W_\infty K_1(r, ou^{-1}) + is^\alpha W_\infty K_2(r, ou^{-1})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= irs \sum_{|v|=n} L(v)[Y]_v(oU(v)) - \frac{1}{2}r^2s^2 \sum_{|v|=n} L(v)^2[V]_v(oU(v)) \\
&\quad + s^\alpha \left(K_1(r, ou^{-1}) + iK_2(r, ou^{-1}) \right) \sum_{|v|=n} [W_\infty]_v L(v)^\alpha \quad \text{a.s.}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.52}$$

Regarding only the imaginary part in (5.52), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&rsY(o) + W_\infty s^\alpha K_2(r, ou^{-1}) \\
&= \sum_{|v|=n} (rsL(v)[Y]_v(oU(v)) + s^\alpha [W_\infty]_v L(v)^\alpha K_2(r, ou^{-1})) \quad \text{a.s.}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.53}$$

This identity holds for any $(s, u) \in \mathbb{S}$. Upon dividing by $s \neq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&rY(o) + W_\infty s^{\alpha-1} K_2(r, ou^{-1}) \\
&= \sum_{|v|=n} (rL(v)[Y]_v(oU(v)) + s^{\alpha-1} [W_\infty]_v L(v)^\alpha K_2(r, ou^{-1})) \quad \text{a.s.}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.54}$$

By (A1) and since \mathbb{S} is a group, there is $(s, u) \in \mathbb{S}$ with $s > 1$. If $\alpha < 1$, we consider the limit of (5.54) for $s^n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$; for $\alpha > 1$ we consider the limit of (5.54) for $s^{-n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We obtain that

$$Y(o) = \sum_{|v|=n} L(v)[Y]_v(oU(v)), \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{5.55}$$

i.e., identity (3.3). Next, regarding only the real part in (5.52), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{1}{2}r^2s^2V(o) - s^\alpha W_\infty K_1(r, ou^{-1}) \\
&= -\frac{1}{2}r^2s^2 \sum_{|v|=n} L(v)^2[V]_v(oU(v)) - s^\alpha K_1(r, ou^{-1}) \sum_{|v|=n} [W_\infty]_v L(v)^\alpha \quad \text{a.s.}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.56}$$

For $\alpha < 2$ dividing (5.56) by s^2 and considering a sequence $s^n \rightarrow \infty$ immediately gives us

$$V(o) = \sum_{|v|=n} L(v)^2[V]_v(oU(v)), \quad \text{a.s.} \tag{5.57}$$

i.e., the identity (3.2).

For $\alpha = 2$ we will now prove, that ν^o and hence K_1 vanishes a.s., which in view of (5.56) implies (5.57) as well in this case. Recall, that for $\alpha = 2$ by assumption (A5) there is $s \neq 1$ and $u \in \mathbb{O}(3)$ such that both $(1, u)$ and (s, u) are in \mathbb{S} . By group property of \mathbb{S} , we may

again assume, that $s > 1$. Using the (\mathbb{S}, α) -invariance of $\bar{\nu}^o = \mathbb{E}\nu^o$, proved in Lemma 5.12, we have, since $(s, u) \in \mathbb{S}$,

$$\bar{\nu}^o(sB) = s^{-\alpha} \bar{\nu}^{ou^{-1}}(B) = s^{-2} \bar{\nu}^{ou^{-1}}(B)$$

and also, since $(1, u) \in \mathbb{S}$,

$$\bar{\nu}^o(B) = \bar{\nu}^{ou^{-1}}(B),$$

hence, by combining and iterating the above identities,

$$\bar{\nu}^o(s^n B) = s^{-2n} \bar{\nu}^o(B) \tag{5.58}$$

for any $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$, $B \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. From Lemma 5.12 we know, that $\bar{\nu}^o$ is a Lévy measure, hence

$$\int (x^2 \wedge 1) \bar{\nu}^o(dx) < \infty.$$

By direct calculations, using (5.58), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \infty &> \int (x^2 \wedge 1) \bar{\nu}^o(dx) \geq \int_{(0, \infty)} (x^2 \wedge 1) \bar{\nu}^o(dx) = \int_{(0, 1]} x^2 \bar{\nu}^o(dx) + \bar{\nu}^o((1, \infty)) \\ &= \sum_{n \geq 0} \int_{(s^{-n-1}, s^{-n}]} x^2 \bar{\nu}^o(dx) + \bar{\nu}^o((1, \infty)) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \int_{(\frac{1}{s}, 1]} s^{-2n} x^2 \bar{\nu}^o(s^{-n} dx) + \bar{\nu}^o((1, \infty)) \\ &= \sum_{n \geq 0} s^{n(2-2)} \int_{(\frac{1}{s}, 1]} x^2 \bar{\nu}^o(dx) + \bar{\nu}^o((1, \infty)) \geq \sum_{n \geq 0} s^{-2} \bar{\nu}^o((\frac{1}{s}, 1]) + \bar{\nu}^o((1, \infty)) \\ &= \infty s^{-2} \bar{\nu}^o((\frac{1}{s}, 1]) + \bar{\nu}^o((1, \infty)). \end{aligned}$$

To avoid pending contradiction, it follows necessarily, that

$$\bar{\nu}^o((\frac{1}{s}, 1]) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\nu}^o((1, \infty)) < \infty.$$

Note that we have required (5.58) and thereby the assumption (A5) to compare the Lévy measure of $(s^{-n-1}, s^{-n}]$ to that of $(s^{-1}, 1]$ without changing the index o . Observe further, that

$$\bar{\nu}^o((0, 1]) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \bar{\nu}^o((\frac{1}{s^{n+1}}, \frac{1}{s^n}]) = \sum_{n \geq 0} s^{2n} \bar{\nu}^o((\frac{1}{s}, 1]) = 0,$$

since each summand in the last sum is equal to 0. Finally, by another appeal to (5.58), we have that

$$\bar{\nu}^o((0, s^n]) = \bar{\nu}^o(s^n(0, 1]) = s^{-2n} \bar{\nu}^o((0, 1]) = 0$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, $\bar{\nu}^o((0, \infty)) = 0$. Using analogous arguments, it follows that $\bar{\nu}^o((-\infty, 0)) = 0$. Hence ν^o and consequently K_1 vanishes a.s., and we have (5.57) also for the case $\alpha = 2$.

Finally, we define

$$K(r, o) := -K_1(r, o) - iK_2(r, o) = \int (1 - e^{iry}) \bar{\nu}^o(dy) \quad (5.59)$$

and note that K inherits the property of (\mathbb{S}, α) -invariance from K_1 and K_2 .

Combining (5.59), (5.51) and (5.47) we conclude, that

$$\phi(roe_3) = \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ -W_\infty K(r, o) - \frac{1}{2} r^2 V(o) + irY(o) \right\} \right], \quad (5.60)$$

with Y and V satisfying the a.s. equations (3.3) and (3.2), respectively.

We finish this step with a remark, that K vanishes a.s. in case $\alpha = 2$, since ν^o does so, as has been proven above.

Step 2. As the next step, we prove that V vanishes for $\alpha < 2$. Recall that, by Lemma 5.16, $V(\cdot) = \Theta^{(\cdot)}$ is almost surely bounded by $\tilde{C}W_\infty$ for some $\tilde{C} > 0$, uniformly in $\mathbb{O}(3)$. Since Θ^o is F_∞ -measurable and integrable (since W_∞ is integrable), we have

$$V(o) = \Theta^o = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\Theta^o \mid F_n] \quad \text{a.s.}$$

and we may use the identity (5.57) to compute

$$\begin{aligned} V(o) = \Theta^o &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\Theta^o \mid F_n] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{|v|=n} L(v)^2 [\Theta]_v^{oU(v)} \mid F_n \right] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{|v|=n} L(v)^2 \mathbb{E} \left[[\Theta]_v^{oU(v)} \right] \\ &\leq \tilde{C} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{|v|=n} L(v)^2 \leq \tilde{C} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sup_{|v|=n} (L(v)^{2-\alpha}) \sum_{|v|=n} L(v)^\alpha \right) \\ &= \tilde{C}W_\infty \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{|v|=n} (L(v)^{2-\alpha}) = \tilde{C}W_\infty \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{|v|=n} (L(v)^{2-\alpha}) = 0, \quad \text{a.s.}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.61)$$

where the last equality holds by relation (2.6) for both $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\alpha \in (1, 2)$. Since Θ^o is non-negative by definition, this implies, that $V(o) = 0$ almost surely.

Step 3. In this step, we prove that Y vanishes almost surely in the case $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. As a consequence of Lemma 5.15 and Lemma 5.13, $|Y(o)| = |\mu^o + W_\infty \gamma(o)|$ is almost surely uniformly bounded in $\mathbb{O}(3)$ by $\hat{C}W_\infty$ with some constant $\hat{C} > 0$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |Y(o)| &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\mathbb{E}[Y(o) \mid F_n]| \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_{|v|=n} L(v) [Y]_v^{oU(v)} \mid F_n \right| \right] \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{|v|=n} L(v) \mathbb{E} \left[|[Y]_v^{oU(v)}| \right] \leq \hat{C} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sup_{|v|=n} (L(v)^{1-\alpha}) \sum_{|v|=n} L(v)^\alpha \right) = 0 \quad \text{a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

Arguing as in the previous step, it follows, that $Y(o) = 0$ almost surely whenever $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, which completes the proof. \square

Proof of the direct inclusion in Theorem 3.4. Throughout the proof, let $r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq}$ and $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$ be arbitrarily fixed. We rely on properties (3.2) and (3.3) of V and Y , as well as the disintegration property (2.18) of W_{∞} and the fact that K is (\mathbb{S}, α) -invariant. Observe, that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(roe_3) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2}r^2V(o) + irY(o) - W_{\infty}K(r, o) \right\} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \sum_{|v|=1} \left(-\frac{1}{2}r^2L(v)^2[V]_v(oU(v)) + irL(v)[Y]_v(oU(v)) - L(v)^{\alpha}[W_{\infty}]_vK(r, o) \right) \right\} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{|v|=1} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2}(rL(v))^2[V]_v(oU(v)) + irL(v)[Y]_v(oU(v)) - [W_{\infty}]_vK(rL(v), oU(v)) \right\} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By conditioning the last term in the above formula on F_1 , we immediately obtain, that it is equal to

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{|v|=1} \phi(rL(v)oU(v)e_3) \right],$$

which proves the claim. \square

A Appendix

A.1 Geometry of Ψ^o

In this section we investigate consequences of the embedding of random vectors with characteristic functions satisfying (1.4) into the set of random 3×3 -matrices. As we have seen already in Remark 3.2, this embedding allows us to interpret ϕ_t as the restriction of a characteristic function of 3×3 -matrices; thereby giving a direct proof of continuity properties.

In the following, we want to make use of this embedding to obtain an interpretation of how the measures $\nu^o(\mathbf{l})$, $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$, depend on o , by identifying them as marginals of a unique Lévy measure for 3×3 matrices (or vectors in \mathbb{R}^9). Unfortunately, we will obtain this identification only when fixing a realisation \mathbf{l} of \mathbf{L} , see Remark A.2 below for details. Further, for simplicity, we restrict our presentation to the case $\alpha < 1$ in which drift and covariance term vanish.

Let $\mathbf{l} \in H^c$, where H^c is defined in Remark 5.7. Thus the statement of Proposition 5.1 is true for \mathbf{l} and the limit $W_{\infty}(\mathbf{l})$ of the additive martingale defined in (2.17) is strictly positive. Let ϕ be a characteristic function of some random \mathbb{R}^3 -vector $X = (X_1, X_2, X_3)^{\top}$ satisfying (1.4). Let ϕ be a characteristic function of some random \mathbb{R}^3 -vector $X = (X_1, X_2, X_3)^{\top}$

satisfying (1.4). Now let \tilde{X} be a random 3×3 -matrix, defined as

$$\tilde{X} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & X_1 \\ 0 & 0 & X_2 \\ 0 & 0 & X_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Similarly to Remark 3.2, we observe that

$$\phi(roe_3) = \phi_X(roe_3) = \mathbb{E}[e^{r\langle e_3, o^\top X \rangle}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{\mathbf{tr}((ro)^\top \tilde{X})}] =: \psi_{\tilde{X}}(ro)$$

for any $r \geq 0$, where $\psi_{\tilde{X}}$ denotes the characteristic function of \tilde{X} . Let $\mathbf{vec}(\tilde{X})$ be a vectorization of \tilde{X} , *i.e.* the random vector $(0, \dots, 0, X_1, X_2, X_3)^\top$ in \mathbb{R}^9 , and note that $\mathbf{tr}(o^\top \tilde{X}) = \langle \mathbf{vec}(o), \mathbf{vec}(\tilde{X}) \rangle$. Therefore, we may write

$$\phi_X(roe_3) \equiv \psi_{\tilde{X}}(ro) \equiv \zeta_{\mathbf{vec}(\tilde{X})}(r\mathbf{vec}(o)), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where we use the notation $\zeta_{\mathbf{vec}(\tilde{X})}$ for the characteristic function of $\mathbf{vec}(\tilde{X})$.

In the remaining part of this section we reserve notations ϕ, ψ and ζ for characteristic functions of a random \mathbb{R}^3 -vector, $\mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ -matrix and \mathbb{R}^9 -vector, respectively.

Recalling the definition of M and using linearity and cyclic property of traces, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $r \geq 0$ we infer from (A.1), that

$$\begin{aligned} M_n(r, o, \mathbf{1}) &= \prod_{|v|=n} \phi(rol(v)u(v)e_3) = \prod_{|v|=n} \psi(rl(v)ou(v)) \\ &= \prod_{|v|=n} \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ ir l(v) \mathbf{tr}((ou(v))^\top \tilde{X}(v)) \right\} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \sum_{|v|=n} ir \mathbf{tr} \left(l(v) (ou(v))^\top \tilde{X}(v) \right) \right\} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ i \mathbf{tr} \left((ro)^\top \sum_{|v|=n} l(v) \tilde{X}(v) u(v)^\top \right) \right\} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ i \langle r\mathbf{vec}(o), \mathbf{vec} \left(\sum_{|v|=n} l(v) \tilde{X}(v) u(v)^\top \right) \rangle \right\} \right] =: \zeta_{Y_n(\mathbf{1})}(r\mathbf{vec}(o)), \quad (\text{A.2}) \end{aligned}$$

where, as usual, $(\tilde{X}(v))_v$ denote independent copies of \tilde{X} . From (A.2) we infer, that $M_n(r, o, \mathbf{1})$ can be considered as the *restriction* of the characteristic function $\zeta_{Y_n(\mathbf{1})}$ of a nine-dimensional random vector

$$Y_n(\mathbf{1}) := \sum_{|v|=n} l(v) \mathbf{vec}(\tilde{X}(v) u(v)^\top), \quad (\text{A.3})$$

evaluated *only* at $r\mathbf{vec}(o)$, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In view of (2.6), $(Y_n(\mathbf{l}))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are row sums in a triangular null array.

However, in contrast to the (one-dimensional) considerations in Proposition 5.1, we cannot show that $\zeta_{Y_n(\mathbf{l})}$ converges as a function on \mathbb{R}^9 as $n \rightarrow \infty$, because the convergence of the multiplicative martingale $M_n(r, o, \mathbf{l})$ only yields the pointwise convergence of $\zeta_{Y_n(\mathbf{l})}$ at the lower-dimensional subset of points $\{r\mathbf{vec}(o) : r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq}, o \in \mathbb{O}(3)\}$. That is, we cannot conclude that the row sums $(Y_n(\mathbf{l}))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in the triangular array converge in distribution.

What we can do instead is to prove, for fixed \mathbf{l} , that the sequence $(Y_n(\mathbf{l}))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ has a convergent subsequence, the limit of which can be identified as an infinitely divisible random vector by means of [21, Theorem 13.28].

Lemma A.1. *For any $\mathbf{l} \in N^c$ let $(Y_n(\mathbf{l}))_n$ be a sequence of \mathbb{R}^9 -vectors defined by (A.3). Suppose, that assumptions (A1), (A2) and (A4) hold with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Then there exists an infinitely divisible random vector $Y(\mathbf{l})$ in \mathbb{R}^9 and a subsequence $(Y_{n_m}(\mathbf{l}))_m$, such that*

$$Y_{n_m}(\mathbf{l}) \xrightarrow{d} Y(\mathbf{l}), \quad m \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Moreover, for any $r \geq 0$ and $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$ one has

$$M_\infty(r, o, \mathbf{l}) = \zeta_{Y(\mathbf{l})}(r\mathbf{vec}(o)), \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where $\zeta_{Y(\mathbf{l})}$ is the characteristic function of $Y(\mathbf{l})$ and M_∞ is the a.s. limit of the multiplicative martingale M , defined by formula (5.1).

Remark A.2. Note that the choice of the subsequence $(Y_{n_m}(\mathbf{l}))_m$ will in general depend on \mathbf{l} and we cannot use relation (A.5) to prove that all subsequential limits are equal, since (A.5) does not evaluate $\zeta_{Y(\mathbf{l})}$ at a dense set of points. We have tried hard to consider $\zeta_{Y(\mathbf{l})}$ as a characteristic function not on 9-dimensional space, but on some suitable lower-dimensional set of equivalence classes, but have failed so far.

This has made it impossible for us to prove the measurability of Y or ζ_Y as a function of \mathbf{l} , which would be required to obtain a representation of $\zeta_{\mathbf{vec}(\tilde{X})}$ in terms of random Lévy-Khintchine exponent as in (5.9).

Proof of Lemma A.1. Our approach is based on direct construction of the limiting infinitely divisible random vector $Y(\mathbf{l})$, which satisfies our needs. In steps 1–3 we construct the three components of the (deterministic) Lévy-triplet, associated with $Y(\mathbf{l})$, namely the Lévy measure $\nu(\mathbf{l})$, shift $\mu(\mathbf{l})$ and covariance matrix $\Theta(\mathbf{l})$. In step 4 we prove the assertions (A.4) and (A.5).

Throughout the proof we assume $\mathbf{l} \in N^c$ to be fixed. To simplify notations, we denote $\xi(v) := l(v)\mathbf{vec}(\tilde{X}(v)u(v)^\top)$, hence

$$Y_n(\mathbf{l}) = \sum_{|v|=n} \xi(v).$$

Step 1: We start with the construction of the Lévy measure. Consider a family of (deterministic) measures $(\nu_n(\mathbf{1}))_n$ on \mathbb{R}^9 , defined by

$$\nu_n(\mathbf{1}) := \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbb{P} \circ \xi(v)^{-1} \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^9 \setminus \{0\}$$

and $\nu_n(\mathbf{1})(\{0\}) := 0$. We prove, that there exists a subsequence of $(\nu_n(\mathbf{1}))_n$ which converges vaguely on $\mathbb{R}^9 \setminus \{0\}$, and its limit, which we denote by $\nu(\mathbf{1})$, is a Lévy measure. By assumption (A4), for any $r > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_n(\mathbf{1})(B_r^c(0)) &= \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbb{P} \left(\xi(v) \in B_r^c(0) \right) = \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbb{P} \left(\|l(v) \mathbf{vec}(\tilde{X}(v)u(v)^\top)\| \geq r \right) \\ &= \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbb{P} \left(l(v) \|\tilde{X}(v)u(v)^\top\|_{\mathbf{F}} \geq r \right) = \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbb{P} \left(l(v) \|\tilde{X}(v)\|_{\mathbf{F}} \geq r \right) \\ &= \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbb{P} \left(l(v) \|X(v)\| \geq r \right) \leq \sum_{|v|=n} Cr^{-\alpha} l(v)^\alpha = Cr^{-\alpha} W_n(\mathbf{1}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{F}}$ is the Frobenius norm and $W_n(\mathbf{1})$ is a deterministic constant, which is the realization of an additive martingale $(W_n)_n$. Recall, that on N^c we have $W_n(\mathbf{1}) \rightarrow W_\infty(\mathbf{1}) \in (0, \infty)$, and hence $\sup_n W_n(\mathbf{1}) < \infty$. Fix any function $f \in C_c^+(\mathbb{R}^9 \setminus \{0\})$ and assume w.l.o.g. that f is supported on a compact set $A \subset B_\delta^c(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^9 \setminus \{0\}$ for some $\delta > 0$. By (A.6) we have

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \int f d\nu_n(\mathbf{1}) \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \nu_n(\mathbf{1})(B_\delta^c(0)) \max_{x \in A} f(x) \right\} \leq \tilde{C} \delta^{-\alpha} < \infty$$

for some constant \tilde{C} . Thus we may apply the converse implication in [21, Theorem A2.3], part (ii), and conclude, that there exists a subsequence $(\nu_{n_k}(\mathbf{1}))_k$, such that

$$\nu_{n_k}(\mathbf{1}) \xrightarrow{v} \nu(\mathbf{1}), \quad k \rightarrow \infty, \quad (\text{A.7})$$

for some locally finite measure $\nu(\mathbf{1})$ on $\mathbb{R}^9 \setminus \{0\}$, where \xrightarrow{v} denotes vague convergence. Since also $\nu_n(\mathbf{1})(\{0\}) = 0$ for all n , we may well-define $\nu(\mathbf{1})(\{0\}) := 0$. The fact, that $\nu(\mathbf{1})$ is a Lévy measure then follows from the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \int (\|x\|^2 \wedge 1) \nu(\mathbf{1})(dx) &\leq \nu(B_1^c(0)) + \int_{B_1(0)} \|x\|^2 \nu(\mathbf{1})(dx) \leq \tilde{C}_1 + \int_{(0,1]} t^2 d\nu(\mathbf{1})(B_t^c) \\ &\leq \tilde{C}_1 + \int_0^1 t^2 d\tilde{C}_2 t^{-\alpha} = \tilde{C}_1 + \tilde{C}_2 \int_0^1 t^{1-\alpha} dt < \infty \end{aligned}$$

for some constants \tilde{C}_1 and \tilde{C}_2 , where the upper bound on $\nu(\mathbf{1})(B_t^c)$ is derived from (A.6). We may therefore assume, that $\nu(\mathbf{1})$ is the deterministic Lévy measure which corresponds to an infinitely divisible random \mathbb{R}^9 -vector $Y(\mathbf{1})$.

Step 2: In the next step we construct the shift $\mu(\mathbf{1})$, associated with $Y(\mathbf{1})$. We fix any $h \in (0, 1)$ such that $\nu(\mathbf{1})(\{\|x\| = h\}) = 0$. Define a sequence of nine-dimensional vectors $(\mu_n^h(\mathbf{1}))_n$ as

$$\mu_n^h(\mathbf{1}) := \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbb{E}[\xi(v) : \|\xi(v)\| \leq h].$$

Utilizing assumption (A4), we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mu_n^h(\mathbf{1})\| &= \left\| \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbb{E}[\xi(v) : \|\xi(v)\| \leq h] \right\| \leq \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\xi(v)\| \mathbf{1}_{\|\xi(v)\| \leq h} \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{|v|=n} \int_0^h \mathbb{P}(\|\xi(v)\| > x) dx \leq \sum_{|v|=n} \int_0^h \mathbb{P}(\|l(v) \mathbf{vec}(\tilde{X}(v) u(v)^\top)\| > x) dx \\ &= \sum_{|v|=n} \int_0^h \mathbb{P}(l(v) \|X(v)\| > x) dx \leq \sum_{|v|=n} Cl(v)^\alpha \int_0^h x^{-\alpha} dx < \tilde{C} \sup_n W_n(\mathbf{1}) < \infty \end{aligned}$$

for some constant \tilde{C} . This implies, that the sequence $(\|\mu_n^h(\mathbf{1})\|)_n$ is uniformly bounded. Furthermore, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ each of nine entries of the vector $\mu_n^h(\mathbf{1}) = (\{\mu_n^h(\mathbf{1})\}_1, \dots, \{\mu_n^h(\mathbf{1})\}_9)^\top$ is bounded by $\|\mu_n^h(\mathbf{1})\|$. This implies uniform boundedness in \mathbb{R}^9 of the sequence $(\mu_n^h(\mathbf{1}))_n$, hence there exists a convergent subsequence $(\mu_{n_j}^h(\mathbf{1}))_j$ such that

$$\mu_{n_j}^h(\mathbf{1}) \rightarrow \mu^h(\mathbf{1}), \quad j \rightarrow \infty, \tag{A.8}$$

for a certain finite vector $\mu^h(\mathbf{1})$ in \mathbb{R}^9 . Let us define

$$\mu(\mathbf{1}) := \mu^h(\mathbf{1}) + \int_{\{h < \|x\| \leq 1\}} \nu(\mathbf{1})(dx). \tag{A.9}$$

Since the integral in the right-hand side is finite as the consequence of (A.6), $\mu(\mathbf{1})$ is finite as well. We may therefore assume, that $\mu(\mathbf{1})$ is a (deterministic) shift in the Lévy-triplet, associated with $Y(\mathbf{1})$.

Step 3: It remains to construct the covariance matrix $\Theta(\mathbf{1})$. We proceed in a similar way as before. Let h be the same, as the one used in the definition of $(\mu_n^h)_n$ previously in step 2. Define a sequence of matrices $(\Theta_n^h(\mathbf{1}))_n$ in $\mathbb{R}^{9 \times 9}$ as

$$\Theta_n^h(\mathbf{1}) := \sum_{|v|=n} \text{Cov} \left[\xi(v) : \|\xi(v)\| \leq h \right].$$

We proceed with proving the boundedness of entries on the main diagonal of $\Theta_n^h(\mathbf{1})$. Denote by $\{\Theta_n^h(\mathbf{1})\}_{ij}$ an entry in the i -th row and j -th column of $\Theta_n^h(\mathbf{1})$, $i, j = 1, \dots, 9$. Likewise, let $\{\xi(v)\}_i$ be the i -th entry of $\xi(v)$. Direct calculations based on the estimate in assumption (A4) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}\left[\{\xi(v)\}_i : \|\xi(v)\| \leq h\right] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\{\xi(v)\}_i \mathbf{1}_{\|\xi(v)\| \leq h}\right]^2 - \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\{\xi(v)\}_i \mathbf{1}_{\|\xi(v)\| \leq h}\right]\right)^2 \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\{\xi(v)\}_i \mathbf{1}_{\|\xi(v)\| \leq h}\right]^2 \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\{\xi(v)\}_i\right)^2 \mathbf{1}_{\left(\{\xi(v)\}_i\right)^2 \leq h}\right] = \int_0^h \mathbb{P}\left(\left(\{\xi(v)\}_i\right)^2 > x\right) dx \\ &\leq \int_0^h \mathbb{P}\left(\|\xi(v)\|^2 > x\right) dx \leq \int_0^h \mathbb{P}\left(l(v)\|X\| > \sqrt{x}\right) dx \leq Cl(v)^\alpha \int_0^h x^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} dx \leq \tilde{C}l(v)^\alpha \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

for some constant $\tilde{C} < \infty$. Therefore, for any $i = 1, \dots, 9$ we obtain

$$[\Theta_n^h(\mathbf{1})]_{ii} = \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbb{V}\left[\{\xi(v)\}_i : \|\xi(v)\| \leq h\right] \leq \tilde{C} \sup_n W_n(\mathbf{1}). \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Furthermore, by (A.10) all off-diagonal elements $\{\Theta_n^h(\mathbf{1})\}_{ij}$ can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} \{\Theta_n^h(\mathbf{1})\}_{ij} &\leq \sum_{|v|=n} \left(\mathbb{V}\left[\{\xi(v)\}_i : \|\xi(v)\| \leq h\right] \mathbb{V}\left[\{\xi(v)\}_j : \|\xi(v)\| \leq h\right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \tilde{C} \sup_n W_n(\mathbf{1}) < \infty, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

where we used the fact, that $\text{Cov}[X, Y] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{V}(X)\mathbb{V}(Y)}$ is true for any X and Y . Combining (A.11) and (A.12) we infer, that $\|\Theta_n^h(\mathbf{1})\|_{\mathbf{F}} \leq f(\tilde{C} \sup_n W_n(\mathbf{1}))$ for a certain continuous function f . Since $\sup_n W_n(\mathbf{1})$ is finite under our assumptions, it follows that the sequence $(\Theta_n^h(\mathbf{1}))_n$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathbb{R}^{9 \times 9}$. Hence, there exists a subsequence $(\Theta_{n_i}^h(\mathbf{1}))_i$ such that

$$\Theta_{n_i}^h(\mathbf{1}) \rightarrow \Theta^h(\mathbf{1}), \quad i \rightarrow \infty, \quad (\text{A.13})$$

where $\Theta^h(\mathbf{1})$ is a bounded (in norm) matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{9 \times 9}$. Since $\nu(\mathbf{1})$ is a Lévy measure, a matrix defined as

$$\Theta(\mathbf{1}) := \Theta^h(\mathbf{1}) + \int_{\|x\| \leq h} xx^\top \nu(\mathbf{1})(dx) \quad (\text{A.14})$$

is finite. Since the matrix $\Theta_{n_i}^h(\mathbf{1})$ is symmetric as the sum of symmetric matrices for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$, the limit $\Theta^h(\mathbf{1})$ and consequently $\Theta(\mathbf{1})$ are both symmetric matrices as well. By similar arguments, $\Theta(\mathbf{1})$ is also positive semi-definite. It follows, that $\Theta(\mathbf{1})$ is a covariance

matrix of some vector in \mathbb{R}^9 . As in step 1 and 2, we assume that $\Theta(\mathbf{1})$ is a (deterministic) covariance matrix, associated with $Y(\mathbf{1})$.

Step 4: It remains to prove, that there exists a subsequence of $(Y_n(\mathbf{1}))_n$, which converges in distribution to $Y(\mathbf{1})$. Combining results (A.7), (A.8) and (A.13), by a diagonal argument we infer, that there exists a sequence of indices $(n_m)_m \subset \mathbb{N}$, such that for any $h \in (0, 1)$ with $\nu(\mathbf{1})(\{\|x\| = h\}) = 0$ the relations

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{|v|=n_m} \mathbb{P} \circ \left(l(v) \mathbf{vec}(\tilde{X}(v)u(v)^\top) \right)^{-1} &\xrightarrow{v} \nu(\mathbf{1}) \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^9 \setminus \{0\}; \\ \sum_{|v|=n_m} \mathbb{E} \left[l(v) \mathbf{vec}(\tilde{X}(v)u(v)^\top) : \left\| l(v) \mathbf{vec}(\tilde{X}(v)u(v)^\top) \right\| \leq h \right] &\rightarrow \mu^h(\mathbf{1}); \\ \sum_{|v|=n_m} \text{Cov} \left[l(v) \mathbf{vec}(\tilde{X}(v)u(v)^\top) : \left\| l(v) \mathbf{vec}(\tilde{X}(v)u(v)^\top) \right\| \leq h \right] &\rightarrow \Theta^h(\mathbf{1}) \end{aligned}$$

hold simultaneously, as $m \rightarrow \infty$. By the converse implication in [21, Theorem 13.28] we infer, that

$$Y_{n_m}(\mathbf{1}) = \sum_{|v|=n_m} l(v) \mathbf{vec}(\tilde{X}(v)u(v)^\top)$$

converges in distribution to a limiting infinitely divisible \mathbb{R}^9 -vector, as $m \rightarrow \infty$, which in view of (A.9) and (A.14) coincides with $Y(\mathbf{1})$ and has the Lévy-triplet $(\mu(\mathbf{1}), \Theta(\mathbf{1}), \nu(\mathbf{1}))$ corresponding to it. Thus, the convergence in (A.4) is proved. Applying formula (A.2), for any $r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq}$ and $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$ we have

$$M_{n_m}(r, o, \mathbf{1}) = \zeta_{Y_{n_m}(\mathbf{1})}(r \mathbf{vec}(o)).$$

Since by (A.4) we particularly have the convergence of characteristic functions, by sending $m \rightarrow \infty$ in the above formula we obtain

$$M_\infty(r, o, \mathbf{1}) = \zeta_{Y(\mathbf{1})}(r \mathbf{vec}(o)).$$

The proof is complete. □

By comparing the representations of $M_\infty(r, o, \mathbf{1})$ derived in Lemma A.1 and Proposition 5.9, respectively, we obtain an interpretation of ν^o , μ^o and Θ^o as marginals of the corresponding objects in the Lévy-Khintchine exponent of $\zeta_{Y(\mathbf{1})}$.

Proposition A.3. *Assume that (A1), (A2) and (A4) hold with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Fix $\mathbf{1} \in N^c$ and let $Y(\mathbf{1})$ be an infinitely divisible random vector in \mathbb{R}^9 with the corresponding Lévy-triplet $(\mu(\mathbf{1}), \Theta(\mathbf{1}), \nu(\mathbf{1}))$ given by Lemma A.1, and denote by $\Psi(\mathbf{1})$ the characteristic exponent of*

$Y(\mathbf{1})$. For any fixed $o \in \mathbb{O}(3)$ let Ψ^o and (μ^o, Θ^o, ν^o) be the characteristic exponent and the Lévy-triplet respectively, given by Proposition 5.9. Then, the following identities hold almost surely:

$$\begin{aligned}
(i) \quad & \mu^o(\mathbf{1}) = \langle \mathbf{vec}(o), \mu(\mathbf{1}) \rangle - \int \langle \mathbf{vec}(o), y \rangle \left(\mathbb{1}_{[0,1]}(\|y\|) - \mathbb{1}_{[0,1]}(|\langle \mathbf{vec}(o), y \rangle|) \right) \nu(\mathbf{1})(dy); \\
(ii) \quad & \Theta^o(\mathbf{1}) = \mathbf{vec}(o)^\top \Theta(\mathbf{1}) \mathbf{vec}(o); \\
(iii) \quad & \int f(y) \nu^o(\mathbf{1})(dy) = \int f(\langle \mathbf{vec}(o), y \rangle) \nu(\mathbf{1})(dy) \text{ for all } f \in C_c(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}). \tag{A.15}
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. This follows by standard calculations when comparing the Lévy-Khintchine exponent $\Psi^o(\mathbf{1})$ with that of $\langle \mathbf{vec}(o), Y(\mathbf{1}) \rangle$ c.f. e.g [18, 1.3.3 (b)]. \square

Acknowledgement

The authors are very grateful to Alexander Marynych for various fruitful discussions on the subject.

References

- [1] G. Alsmeyer, J. D. Biggins, and M. Meiners. The functional equation of the smoothing transform. *Ann. Probab.*, 40(5):2069–2105, 2012.
- [2] G. Alsmeyer and M. Meiners. Fixed points of the smoothing transform: two-sided solutions. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 155(1):165–199, 2013.
- [3] F. Bassetti and L. Ladelli. Self-similar solutions in one-dimensional kinetic models: a probabilistic view. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 22(5):1928–1961, 2012.
- [4] F. Bassetti, L. Ladelli, and D. Matthes. Central limit theorem for a class of one-dimensional kinetic equations. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 150(1):77–109, 2011.
- [5] F. Bassetti, L. Ladelli, and D. Matthes. Infinite energy solutions to inelastic homogeneous boltzmann equations. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 20, no. 89, 1–34, 2015.
- [6] J. D. Biggins. Martingale convergence in the branching random walk. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 14(1):25–37, 1977.
- [7] K. Bogus, D. Buraczewski, and A. Marynych. Self-similar solutions of kinetic-type equations: The boundary case. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 130(2):677–693, 2020.
- [8] D. Buraczewski, P. Dyszewski, and A. Marynych. Solutions of kinetic-type equations with perturbed collisions. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 159:199–224, 2023.

- [9] D. Buraczewski, K. Kolesko, and M. Meiners. Self-similar solutions to kinetic-type evolution equations: beyond the boundary case. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 26, no. 2, 1–18, 2021.
- [10] A. Caliebe. Symmetric fixed points of a smoothing transformation. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.*, 35(2):377–394, 2003.
- [11] E. A. Carlen, M. C. Carvalho, and E. Gabetta. Central limit theorem for Maxwellian molecules and truncation of the Wild expansion. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 53(3):370–397, 2000.
- [12] M. Pulvirenti, C. Cercignani and R. Illner. *The Mathematical Theory of Dilute Gases*. Applied Mathematical Sciences. Springer New York, NY, 1994.
- [13] E. Dolera and E. Regazzini. Proof of a McKean conjecture on the rate of convergence of Boltzmann-equation solutions. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 160(1-2):315–389, 2014.
- [14] M. Dwass and H. Teicher. On infinitely divisible random vectors. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 28:461–470, 1957.
- [15] E. Gabetta and E. Regazzini. Central limit theorem for the solutions of the Kac equation. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 18(6):2320–2336, 2008.
- [16] B. V. Gnedenko and A. N. Kolmogorov. *Limit distributions for sums of independent random variables*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., Cambridge, MA, 1954. Translated and annotated by K. L. Chung. With an Appendix by J. L. Doob.
- [17] Y. Guivarc’h. Extension d’un théorème de Choquet-Deny à une classe de groupes non abéliens. In *Séminaire KGB sur les Marches Aléatoires (Rennes, 1971–1972)*, volume 4 of *Astérisque*, pages 41–59. Soc. Math. France, Paris, 1973.
- [18] W. Hazod and E. Siebert. *Stable probability measures on Euclidean spaces and on locally compact groups*, volume 531 of *Mathematics and its Applications*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 2001. Structural properties and limit theorems.
- [19] A. H. Jessen and T. Mikosch. Regularly varying functions. *Institut Mathématique. Publications. Nouvelle Série*, 80(94):171–192, 2006.
- [20] M. Kac. Foundations of kinetic theory. In *Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, 1954–1955, vol. III*, pages 171–197, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1956. University of California Press.
- [21] O. Kallenberg. *Foundations of modern probability*. Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997.

- [22] Q. Liu. Fixed points of a generalized smoothing transformation and applications to the branching random walk. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.*, 30(1):85–112, 1998.
- [23] M. Meiners and S. Mentemeier. Solutions to complex smoothing equations. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 168(1):199–268, 2017.
- [24] A. Pulvirenti and G. Toscani. Probabilistic treatment of some dissipative kinetic models. In “*WASCOM 2003*”—*12th Conference on Waves and Stability in Continuous Media*, pages 407–420. World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 2004.
- [25] Z. Shi. *Branching Random Walks*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics 2151. Springer International Publishing Switzerland, 2012.
- [26] C. Villani. A review of mathematical topics in collisional kinetic theory. volume 1 of *Handbook of Mathematical Fluid Dynamics*, pages 71–74. North-Holland, 2002.