

# Exponential growth of bifurcating processes with ancestral dependence

Sana Louhichi\* and Bernard Ycart\*

*Laboratoire Jean Kuntzmann  
51 rue des Mathématiques 38041 Grenoble cedex 9, France*

**Abstract:** Branching processes are classical growth models in cell kinetics. In their construction, it is usually assumed that cell lifetimes are independent random variables, which has been proved false in experiments. Models of dependent lifetimes are considered here, in particular bifurcating Markov chains. Under hypotheses of stationarity and multiplicative ergodicity, the corresponding branching process is proved to have the same type of asymptotics as its classic counterpart in the i.i.d. supercritical case: the cell population grows exponentially, the growth rate being related to the exponent of multiplicative ergodicity, in a similar way as to the Laplace transform of lifetimes in the i.i.d. case. An identifiable model for which the multiplicative ergodicity coefficients and the growth rate can be explicitly computed is proposed.

**AMS 2000 subject classifications:** Primary 60J85; secondary 92D25.

**Keywords and phrases:** branching process, bifurcating Markov chain, multiplicative ergodicity, cell kinetics.

## 1. Introduction

Let  $\mathbb{T}$  denote the infinite complete binary tree where each vertex has exactly 2 descendants. Let  $(T_v)_{v \in \mathbb{T}}$  be a bifurcating process, i.e. a family of positive random variables indexed by  $\mathbb{T}$ , defined on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ . The vertices of  $\mathbb{T}$  are interpreted as cells, and  $T_v$  as the lifetime of cell  $v$ . The root (ancestor) of the tree being born at time 0, let  $N_t$  the number of individuals alive at time  $t$ :  $(N_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is a continuous time branching process (precise definitions will be given in section 2). If lifetimes are i.i.d., the population  $N_t$  grows exponentially in  $t$ : this is a particular case of one of the most basic results of the theory (see Bellmann & Harris [3], Harris [17, Chap. VI], and Athreya & Ney [1, Chap. IV]).

**Theorem 1.1.** *Assume that the lifetimes  $T_v$  are i.i.d. copies of an almost surely positive random variable  $T$  with non lattice distribution. Then:*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\nu t} N_t = W \quad a.s., \quad (1.1)$$

where:

- $W$  is a random variable with expectation  $C$  and finite variance,

---

\*Research supported by Laboratoire d'Excellence TOUCAN (Toulouse Cancer)

- the growth rate (also called Malthusian parameter)  $\nu$  is such that:

$$2\mathbb{E}[e^{-\nu T}] = 1, \quad (1.2)$$

- the proportionality constant  $C$  is:

$$C = (4\nu\mathbb{E}[Te^{-\nu T}])^{-1}. \quad (1.3)$$

The aim of this paper is to extend Theorem 1.1 to models in which lifetimes may be dependent, and in particular to Bifurcating Markov Chains (BMC). Our main result (Theorem 3.1) generalizes Theorem 1.1 to the case where  $(T_v)_{v \in \mathbb{T}}$  is a multiplicatively ergodic, stationary BMC. The growth rate  $\nu$  and the proportionality constant  $C$  in that case are related to the multiplicative ergodicity coefficients of birth dates.

Applications of branching process to cell lineage studies have a long history (see e. g. [25] and references therein). Independence of lifetimes was questioned very early: see [24]. Indeed, actual data show two types of correlation [47]: between the lifetimes of a mother and its two daughters, and between the two sisters conditioning on the mother; they will be referred to as mother-correlation and sister-correlation. It was remarked long ago by Powell [42] that sister-correlations do not influence exponential growth (see also [7, 18] and [17, section 28.2 p. 158]). The effect of mother-correlation on growth rates was discussed by Harvey in [18]. Since then, many models have been proposed to account for ancestry dependence, in particular by Smith & Martin [45], Lück & Lück [32], Brook [5], or Murphy et al. [36]; see [33, 38]. Here, lifetimes are seen as a stochastic process indexed by the binary tree; see Pemantle [40] and Benjamini & Peres [4] as general references on tree-indexed processes. Under a minimal hypothesis of stationarity, exponential growth for the mean population size  $\mathbb{E}[N_t]$  is proved and the growth rate  $\nu$  as well as the proportionality constant  $C$  are expressed in terms of the Laplace transforms of cell birth dates (Theorem 2.1). Asymptotics of Laplace transforms for partial sums of a Markov chain are usually described by multiplicative ergodicity properties, which have been thoroughly studied by Meyn and his co-workers [2, 27, 28, 34]; see also [35, p. 519] for a short introduction. It is therefore natural to use a BMC as a model of lifetimes: see Benjamini & Peres [4] for tree-indexed Markov chains, Hwang & Basawa [19] for more asymptotic results, and Guyon [16] for applications to cell lineage data. Under a multiplicative ergodicity condition, Theorem 1.1 is generalized:  $e^{-\nu t}N_t$  is shown to converge almost surely; moreover, the growth rate  $\nu$  and the proportionality constant  $C$  are explicitly related to the multiplicative ergodicity coefficients (Theorem 3.1). The proof follows a classical scheme, already used by Bellman & Harris for the i.i.d. case in [3]. It consists of studying the first and second moments of  $N_t$ , then prove convergence in quadratic mean, and finally deduce almost sure convergence. This is related to what Pemantle calls the “second-moment method” [40, section 2.3]. In applying it, we have tried to give the weakest possible conditions at each step, starting with the stationarity hypothesis of Theorem 2.1. Proposition 6.1 gives sufficient conditions

that ensure quadratic convergence of  $e^{-\nu t}N_t$ , Proposition 6.2 gives conditions for almost sure convergence. These conditions will be shown to hold under the hypotheses of Theorem 3.1.

An obvious drawback for applications is that the growth rate  $\nu$  and the proportionality constant  $C$  cannot be computed in general. Therefore an explicit model, potentially adjustable to observed data and for which  $\nu$  and  $C$  can be computed in terms of the transition kernel, had to be proposed. It was constructed as a quadratic transformation of a bifurcating autoregressive process [6, 16, 10, 9]. It depends on 5 identifiable parameters, (location, scale, and shape for lifetime distribution plus mother- and sister-correlations) and can be fitted to actual data.

Having in mind the application to cell lineage studies, it was natural to write the results for the binary tree. Nevertheless, they extend quite straightforwardly to processes on the infinite complete  $k$ -ary tree for  $k > 2$ , at the only expense of heavier notations. Remarks in the text will make the generalization more precise. Further extensions are possible, firstly to the case where  $\mathbb{T}$  is a supercritical Galton-Watson tree and the lifetimes of daughters are independent conditionally on their common mother, secondly to the case where cell deaths are modelled by a binary process as in [10]. They will be the object of future work.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 the branching process  $(N_t)_{t \geq 0}$  associated to a bifurcating lifetime process  $(T_v)_{v \in \mathbb{T}}$  is defined. Two notions of stationarity along lineages are introduced and the exponential growth of  $\mathbb{E}[N_t]$  is proved. Section 3 is devoted to the definition of a BMC, and the statement of Theorem 3.1. The explicit example of a BMC for which the multiplicative ergodicity coefficients can be computed, is presented in section 4. The relation between mother-correlation and growth rate for a fixed marginal distribution of lifetimes is discussed in section 5. Section 6 is devoted to conditions under which  $e^{-\nu t}N_t$  converges in  $L^2$  and almost surely. These conditions are verified for a multiplicatively ergodic BMC in section 7.

## 2. Stationary bifurcating processes

In this section, notations on bifurcating processes are introduced. The birth date process  $(S_v)_{v \in \mathbb{T}}$  and the branching process  $(N_t)_{t \geq 0}$  associated to a bifurcating process  $(T_v)_{v \in \mathbb{T}}$  are defined, and related by Lemma 2.1. Two notions of stationarity are introduced: birth-stationarity (Definition 2.2) is the stationarity of birth dates in a given generation; fork-stationarity (Definition 2.3) is the stationarity of couples of birth dates when the generations of the two cells and their most recent common ancestor are fixed. Under birth-stationarity the expectation of  $N_t$  is proved to grow exponentially, and the parameters of exponential growth  $\nu$  and  $C$  are related to the Laplace transforms of birth dates (Theorem 2.1).

Some classical notations for infinite trees will be recalled first: see Pemantle [40]. The infinite rooted complete binary tree is denoted by  $\mathbb{T}$  and its root by 0. If  $v$

is a vertex of  $\mathbb{T}$ , the number of edges connecting  $v$  to the root is denoted by  $|v|$ . If  $v$  and  $w$  are two vertices of  $\mathbb{T}$ ,  $v \preceq w$  is the order relation that holds if  $v$  is in the path from 0 to  $w$ ;  $v \wedge w$  is the most recent common ancestor of  $v$  and  $w$ , i.e. the vertex at which the paths from 0 to  $v$  and  $w$  diverge. If  $v \neq 0$ ,  $\tilde{v}$  is the vertex such that  $\tilde{v} \preceq v$  and  $|\tilde{v}| = |v| - 1$  (referred to as the mother of  $v$ ). For  $n \geq 0$ , the  $n$ -th generation  $\Gamma_n$  is the set of vertices  $v$  such that  $|v| = n$  (vertices at distance  $n$  from the root). One simple way to explicitly construct  $\mathbb{T}$  is to identify  $\Gamma_n$  to the set of binary vectors of length  $n + 1$ , with first coordinate 0. With that identification,  $v \preceq w$  iff  $v$  coincides with the  $|v| + 1$  first coordinates of  $w$ . The mother of  $v$ ,  $\tilde{v}$  is deduced from  $v$  by removing its last coordinate. The two daughters of  $v$  are obtained by appending to  $v$  a new coordinate 0 or 1: they will be denoted by  $v0$  and  $v1$ . The concatenation of  $n$  zeros will be denoted by  $0^n \in \Gamma_{n-1}$ . Besides algorithmic considerations, one advantage of this construction is to naturally endow  $\mathbb{T}$  with the alphabetical order.

A bifurcating process is a set of almost surely positive random variables  $(T_v)_{v \in \mathbb{T}}$  indexed by the binary tree  $\mathbb{T}$ :  $T_v$  is the lifetime of cell  $v$ . The birth date process  $(S_v)_{v \in \mathbb{T}}$  is also a bifurcating process:  $S_v$  is the sum of cell lifetimes from 0 to  $\tilde{v}$ . The branching process  $(N_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is the counting process of living cells at time  $t$ .

**Definition 2.1.** *Let  $(T_v)_{v \in \mathbb{T}}$  be a bifurcating process.*

1. *For  $v \in \mathbb{T}$ , The birth date of cell  $v$  is defined by  $S_0 = 0$  and for  $|v| > 0$ :*

$$S_v = S_{\tilde{v}} + T_{\tilde{v}} . \quad (2.1)$$

2. *For  $t \geq 0$ , the number of living cells at time  $t$  is defined by:*

$$N_t = \sum_{v \in \mathbb{T}} \mathbb{I}_{S_v \leq t} - \sum_{v \in \mathbb{T}} \mathbb{I}_{S_{v0} \leq t} , \quad (2.2)$$

where  $\mathbb{I}_A$  denotes the indicator of event  $A$ .

If  $S_v$  is the birth date of cell  $v$ , the common birth date of its two daughters  $S_{v0} = S_{v1}$  is also the death date of  $v$ . So (2.2) expresses the fact that cells alive at time  $t$  are the set difference of cells born no later than  $t$  with cells dead no later than  $t$ . A simpler expression will be used.

**Lemma 2.1.** *With the notations above,*

$$N_t = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in \mathbb{T}} \mathbb{I}_{S_v \leq t} . \quad (2.3)$$

*Proof.* From (2.2), and using the relation  $S_{v0} = S_{v1}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} N_t &= \sum_{v \in \mathbb{T}} \mathbb{I}_{S_v \leq t} - \sum_{v \in \mathbb{T}} \mathbb{I}_{S_{v0} \leq t} \\ &= \sum_{v \in \mathbb{T}} \mathbb{I}_{S_v \leq t} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{w \in \mathbb{T} \\ w \neq 0}} \mathbb{I}_{S_w \leq t} \\ &= 1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{v \in \mathbb{T} \\ v \neq 0}} \mathbb{I}_{S_v \leq t}, \end{aligned}$$

hence (2.3). □

**Remark 2.1.** On the  $k$ -ary tree, (2.3) becomes:

$$N_t = \frac{1}{k} + \frac{k-1}{k} \sum_{v \in \mathbb{T}} \mathbb{I}_{S_v \leq t}.$$

Consider the particular case where lifetimes in a given generation are constant:

$$\forall v \in \Gamma_n, \quad T_v = T_{0^{n+1}},$$

Denote by  $S_n$  the common birth date of all cells in generation  $\Gamma_n$ , and assume a law of large numbers is satisfied.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{S_n}{n} = \bar{t} > 0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

The rank of the generation alive at time  $t$ , denoted by  $G_t$ , is the counting process associated to the sequence  $(S_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , and  $N_t = 2^{G_t}$ . Since  $N_t$  doubles at  $S_n$ ,  $e^{-\nu t} N_t$  never converges, although

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(N_t)}{t} = \frac{\log(2)}{\bar{t}} \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Consider now

$$\frac{\log(\mathbb{E}[N_t])}{t} = \frac{\log(\mathbb{E}[e^{G_t \log 2}])}{t}.$$

The convergence of  $\frac{\log(\mathbb{E}[e^{\theta G_t}])}{t}$  is a Gärtner-Ellis condition on  $G_t$ . Glynn and Whitt [15] have proved that it is equivalent to the analogous condition on  $S_n$ . But the convergence of  $\frac{\log(\mathbb{E}[N_t])}{t}$  does not imply that of  $e^{-\nu t} \mathbb{E}[N_t]$  (cf. the case where all lifetimes are equal to some constant). A law of large numbers, even strengthened by large deviations inequalities, does not suffice to prove our results: additional hypotheses are needed. We begin with stationarity requirements.

The notion of stationarity that seems the most natural is invariance through automorphisms of the tree, as in Pemantle [39]. It will be satisfied by the BMC

models of the next two sections. Weaker hypotheses will suffice for our preliminary convergence results. The first one says that birth dates of cells in a given generation have the same distribution. For  $n \geq 0$ , we shall denote by  $S_n$  the birth date of the first cell in generation  $\Gamma_n$ , by alphabetical order.

$$S_n = S_{0^n} = T_0 + T_{0^2} + \dots + T_{0^n} .$$

**Definition 2.2.** *The bifurcating process  $(T_v)_{v \in \mathbb{T}}$  is birth-stationary if for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and for all  $v \in \Gamma_n$ :*

$$S_v \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} S_n .$$

Observe that birth-stationarity does not imply that lifetimes  $T_v$  are identically distributed, even in a given generation. It will be used to prove the Cesàro convergence of  $\mathbb{E}[e^{-\nu t} N_t]$  in Theorem 2.1 below. For the convergence in quadratic mean and almost sure, a stronger notion will be used: the joint distribution of the birth dates of two cells in generations  $n+i$  and  $n+j$  with most recent common ancestor in generation  $n$ , should depend only on  $n$ ,  $i$ , and  $j$ . The first such couple in alphabetical order is  $(0^{n+i}, 0^n 10^{j-1})$ . The corresponding birth dates will be denoted by  $S_{n,i}^{(0)}$  and  $S_{n,j}^{(1)}$  (Figure 1):

$$S_{n,i}^{(0)} = S_{n+i} = S_{0^{n+i}} \quad \text{and} \quad S_{n,j}^{(1)} = S_{0^n 10^{j-1}} . \tag{2.4}$$




FIG 1. Birth dates  $S_{n,i}^{(0)}$  and  $S_{n,j}^{(1)}$  of the first two cells of generations  $n+i$  and  $n+j$ , whose most recent common ancestor is in generation  $n$ .

**Definition 2.3.** *The bifurcating process  $(T_v)_{v \in \mathbb{T}}$  is fork-stationary if for all  $(n, i, j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}^*$  and for all  $(v, w) \in \Gamma_{n+i} \times \Gamma_{n+j}$  such that  $v \wedge w \in \Gamma_n$ :*

$$(S_v, S_w) \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} (S_{n,i}^{(0)}, S_{n,j}^{(1)}) .$$

For  $i = 0$  the definition includes the case  $v \preceq w$ : for all  $n, k \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}^*$ , for all  $(v, w) \in \Gamma_n \times \Gamma_{n+k}$  such that  $v \preceq w$ ,

$$(S_v, S_w) \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} (S_n, S_{n+k}) .$$

In particular all couples  $(S_v, S_{v_0})$  are identically distributed for  $v \in \Gamma_n$ , hence lifetimes in a given generation have the same distribution.

**Remark 2.2.** *On the  $k$ -ary tree, one might think that forks should have  $k$  teeth. Yet fork-stationarity is used in Proposition 6.1 to express  $\mathbb{E}[N_t N_{t+\tau}]$  in terms of the joint distribution of  $(S_{n,i}^{(0)}, S_{n,j}^{(1)})$ . This remains the same on the  $k$ -ary tree.*

The main result of this section concerns the exponential growth of  $\mathbb{E}[N_t]$ ; it relates the growth rate  $\nu$  and the proportionality constant  $C$  to the Laplace transform of  $S_n$ . In order to enhance the link with Theorem 1.1, we chose to express our results in terms of Laplace transforms, instead of characteristic functions or logarithmic moment generating functions, as is customary in large deviations theory (see e.g. [11]). Throughout the paper, the Laplace transforms evaluated at  $\gamma \geq 0$  of  $S_n$ , and of  $S_n$  conditioned on  $T_0 = u$ , will be denoted by  $\mathcal{L}_n(\gamma)$  and  $\mathcal{L}_n(\gamma, u)$ :

$$\mathcal{L}_n(\gamma) = \mathbb{E}[e^{-\gamma S_n}] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}_n(\gamma, u) = \mathbb{E}[e^{-\gamma S_n} | T_0 = u] .$$

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $(T_v)_{v \in \mathbb{T}}$  be a birth-stationary bifurcating process. Assume that  $\nu$  and  $C$  given below are well defined, positive, and finite.*

$$\nu := \inf \left\{ \gamma > 0, \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^n \mathcal{L}_n(\gamma) < \infty \right\} , \tag{2.5}$$

$$C := \lim_{\gamma \searrow 0} \frac{\gamma}{\gamma + \nu} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{n-1} \mathcal{L}_n(\gamma + \nu) . \tag{2.6}$$

Then for all  $t \geq 0$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[N_t] < \infty$  and:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t e^{-\nu s} \mathbb{E}[N_s] ds = C . \tag{2.7}$$

In the particular case where the lifetimes  $T_v$  are i.i.d. random variables,  $\mathcal{L}_n(\gamma) = (\mathbb{E}[e^{-\gamma T_0}])^n$ ; it can be easily checked that (2.5) and (2.6) reduce to (1.2) and (1.3).

*Proof.* From (2.3):

$$\begin{aligned} N_t &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in \mathbb{T}} \mathbb{I}_{S_v \leq t} \\ &= 1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{v \in \Gamma_n} \mathbb{I}_{S_v \leq t} . \end{aligned}$$

By birth-stationarity:

$$\mathbb{E}[N_t] = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{n-1} \mathbb{P}[S_n \leq t] . \quad (2.8)$$

By Markov's inequality, for all  $\gamma > 0$  and  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}[S_n \leq t] \leq e^{\gamma t} \mathbb{E}[e^{-\gamma S_n}] .$$

The hypotheses of Theorem 2.1 imply that there exists  $\gamma > \nu$  such that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{n-1} \mathbb{E}[e^{-\gamma S_n}] < \infty .$$

Hence  $\mathbb{E}[N_t] < \infty$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . Consider now:

$$A_\nu(t) = e^{-\nu t} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{n-1} \mathbb{P}[S_n \leq t] .$$

Let  $\tilde{A}_\nu(\gamma)$  be the Laplace transform of  $A_\nu$ . The Laplace transform of  $\mathbb{P}[S_n \leq t]$ , evaluated at  $\gamma > 0$  is  $\frac{1}{\gamma} \mathcal{L}_n(\gamma)$ . The Laplace transform of  $e^{-\nu t} \mathbb{P}[S_n \leq t]$  is  $\frac{1}{\gamma + \nu} \mathcal{L}_n(\gamma + \nu)$ . Therefore:

$$\tilde{A}_\nu(\gamma) = \frac{1}{\gamma + \nu} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{n-1} \mathcal{L}_n(\gamma + \nu) .$$

By (2.6):

$$\lim_{\gamma \searrow 0} \gamma \tilde{A}_\nu(\gamma) = C .$$

If both  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} A_\nu(t)$  and  $\lim_{\gamma \searrow 0} \gamma \tilde{A}_\nu(\gamma)$  exist, the fact that they are equal is a well known basic result of Laplace transform theory, known as the Final Value Theorem. Deducing that the former limit exists from the existence of the latter requires a Tauberian theorem: see Feller [14, section XIII.5] or Korevaar [29]. As a particular case of [14, Theorem 2 p. 445]:

$$\lim_{\gamma \searrow 0} \gamma \tilde{A}_\nu(\gamma) = C \iff \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t A_\nu(s) ds = C ,$$

which is the announced result.  $\square$



**Remark 2.3.** On the  $k$ -ary tree, (2.5) and (2.6) become:

$$\nu = \inf\{\gamma > 0, \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} k^n \mathcal{L}_n(\gamma) < \infty\},$$

and

$$C = \lim_{\gamma \searrow 0} \frac{\gamma(k-1)}{\gamma + \nu} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} k^{n-1} \mathcal{L}_n(\gamma + \nu).$$

The proof is the same.

Without any further assumption, nothing more can be obtained than the Cesàro convergence (2.7), as the example of constant lifetimes shows. To conclude that  $\lim A_\nu(t) = C$  in the i.i.d. case, Bellman and Harris [3] use Ikehara's Tauberian theorem. For the BMC case, we shall need not only a limit, but also an exponential speed of convergence. Although we have not found Lemma 2.2 in the literature, it cannot be considered as new; it is closely related to a large corpus of results going back to Haar, Wiener, and Ikehara: see [29] as a general reference, [13, 37] for similar results.

**Lemma 2.2.** Let  $f$  be a function and  $\tilde{f}$  its Laplace transform. Suppose that there exist two positive reals  $\delta$  and  $\epsilon$  such that:

1.  $\tilde{f}$  is analytic in  $\{z = x + iy, |x| < \delta + \epsilon\} \setminus \{0\}$ ,
2.  $\tilde{f}$  has a simple pole at 0, with residue  $C$ ,
- 3.

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\tilde{f}(\delta + iy)| dy < \infty,$$

- 4.

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \pm\infty} \tilde{f}(x + iy) = 0,$$

uniformly in  $x \in [-\delta, \delta]$ ,

- 5.

$$\psi := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\tilde{f}(-\delta + iy)| dy < \infty.$$

Then, for all  $t > 0$ ,

$$|f(t) - C| \leq \frac{\psi}{2\pi} e^{-\delta t}.$$

*Proof.* By the inversion formula,

$$f(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\delta - i\beta}^{\delta + i\beta} \tilde{f}(\gamma) e^{\gamma t} d\gamma.$$

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the closed rectangular contour linking the points  $\delta - i\beta$ ,  $\delta + i\beta$ ,  $-\delta + i\beta$ ,  $-\delta - i\beta$ . This contour encloses the simple pole at  $\gamma = 0$ . By the residue theorem,

$$\int_{\mathcal{C}} \tilde{f}(\gamma) e^{\gamma t} d\gamma = 2\pi i \operatorname{res}_{\gamma=0}(\tilde{f}(\gamma) e^{\gamma t}),$$

where

$$\operatorname{res}_{\gamma=0}(\tilde{f}(\gamma) e^{\gamma t}) = \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} \gamma \tilde{f}(\gamma) e^{\gamma t} = C .$$

Consequently,

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\delta-i\beta}^{\delta+i\beta} \tilde{f}(\gamma) e^{\gamma t} d\gamma - C = I_1 + I_2 + I_3 ,$$

with:

$$I_1 = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\delta+i\beta}^{-\delta+i\beta} \tilde{f}(\gamma) e^{\gamma t} d\gamma ,$$

$$I_2 = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-\delta+i\beta}^{-\delta-i\beta} \tilde{f}(\gamma) e^{\gamma t} d\gamma ,$$

$$I_3 = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-\delta-i\beta}^{\delta-i\beta} \tilde{f}(\gamma) e^{\gamma t} d\gamma .$$

By condition 4,  $I_1$  and  $I_3$  tend to 0 as  $\beta$  tends to infinity. Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} |f(t) - C| &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \left| \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \tilde{f}(-\delta + iy) e^{(-\delta+iy)t} dy \right| \\ &\leq \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\tilde{f}(-\delta + iy)| e^{-\delta t} dy \\ &= \frac{\psi}{2\pi} e^{-\delta t} , \end{aligned}$$

by condition 5 . □

### 3. Bifurcating Markov chains

Bifurcating Markov chains (BMC) were considered long ago, beginning with Spitzer [46] in the binary valued case (see Benjamini & Peres [4] for further reference). They were studied as cell lineage models by Guyon [16]. As in the one-dimensional case, the probability distribution of a BMC is determined by an initial measure and a transition kernel. Here is the definition, adapted to our case (as usual,  $\mathcal{B}$  denotes the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra).

**Definition 3.1.** A transition kernel  $P$  is a mapping defined on  $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+)$  such that:

- For all  $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+)$ ,  $t \mapsto P(t, B)$  is  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^+)$ -measurable,
- For all  $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ ,  $B \mapsto P(t, B)$  is a probability measure on  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+)$ .

**Definition 3.2.** Let  $\mu$  be a probability measure on  $\mathbb{R}^+$ , and  $P$  be a transition kernel. The distribution of a BMC  $(T_v)_{v \in \mathbb{T}}$  with initial measure  $\mu$  and transition kernel  $P$  is inductively defined as follows.

- The distribution of  $T_0$  is  $\mu$ .
- For  $n \geq 1$ ,  $(T_w)_{w \in \Gamma_{n+1}}$  and  $(T_u)_{u \in \Gamma_0 \cup \dots \cup \Gamma_{n-1}}$  are independent conditionally upon  $(T_v)_{v \in \Gamma_n}$ .
- For all  $n \geq 0$ , the conditional distribution of  $(T_w)_{w \in \Gamma_{n+1}}$  knowing  $(T_v)_{v \in \Gamma_n}$  is defined for  $(B_v)_{v \in \Gamma_n} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+)$  by:

$$\mathbb{P}[\forall v \in \Gamma_n, (T_{v0}, T_{v1}) \in B_v \mid \forall v \in \Gamma_n, T_v = t_v] = \prod_{v \in \Gamma_n} P(t_v, B_v).$$

In other words, given the lifetimes of mothers in generation  $n$ , the lifetimes of couples of daughters in generation  $n + 1$  are drawn independently, each according to the transition kernel  $P$ . Unlike in [16],  $P$  must be symmetric to ensure stationarity: for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ , for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^+)$ ,

$$P_0(t, B) := P(t, B \times \mathbb{R}^+) = P(t, \mathbb{R}^+ \times B) =: P_1(t, B). \quad (3.1)$$

The initial measure  $\mu$  is supposed to be invariant for both marginal kernels.

$$\forall B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^+), \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} P_0(u, B) d\mu(u) = \mu(B). \quad (3.2)$$

Symmetry and invariance imply that the distribution of  $(T_v)_{v \in \mathbb{T}}$  is automorphism invariant in the sense of [39]. In particular it is birth- and fork-stationary, in the sense of Definitions 2.2 and 2.3.

**Remark 3.1.** *On the  $k$ -ary tree, a transition kernel is a mapping defined on  $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathcal{B}((\mathbb{R}^+)^k)$ . The generalization of Definition 3.2 is straightforward: knowing the lifetimes of mothers in generation  $n$ , the lifetimes for all  $k$ -tuples of daughters are drawn independently according to the transition kernel.*

Let  $(N_t)_{t \geq 0}$  be the branching process associated to  $(T_v)_{v \in \mathbb{T}}$  (Definition 2.1). Our goal is to prove the extension of Theorem 1.1, i.e. the almost sure convergence of  $e^{-\nu t} N_t$ . Asymptotics on the Laplace transform of  $S_n$  will be needed; the expressions of  $\nu$  and  $C$  given in Theorem 2.1 suggest using multiplicative ergodicity for the sums of lifetimes  $S_n$ : see [2, 27, 28, 34]. In order to enhance the similarity with the i.i.d. case, we chose to express multiplicative ergodicity in a slightly different manner.

**Definition 3.3.** *The sums  $S_n$  are said to be multiplicatively ergodic if for all  $u \in \mathbb{R}^+$ ,  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^+$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,*

$$\mathcal{L}_n(\gamma, u) = \alpha(\gamma, u)L^n(\gamma) + r_n(\gamma, u), \quad (3.3)$$

where  $\alpha$ ,  $L$  and  $r_n$  are such that:

1. the equation  $2L(\gamma) = 1$  has a unique solution denoted by  $\nu$ ,
2. the mapping  $L$  is derivable at  $\nu$  and  $L'(\nu) < 0$ ,
3. the series  $\sum_n 2^n r_n(\gamma, u)$  converges uniformly in  $\gamma$  in a neighborhood of  $\nu$ , uniformly in  $u$ ,

4. the mappings  $u \mapsto \alpha(\gamma, u)$  and  $u \mapsto r_n(\gamma, u)$  are  $\mu$ -integrable, uniformly in the other variables,
5. the mapping  $(y, z) \mapsto a(\nu, y)a(\nu, z)$  is  $P(x, (y, z))$ -integrable, uniformly in  $x$ .

Observe that under Definition 3.3, for all  $u$  the sum  $\sum_n 2^n \mathcal{L}_n(\gamma, u)$  converges for  $\gamma > \nu$ , diverges for  $\gamma \leq \nu$ . Therefore, the same holds for  $\sum_n 2^n \mathcal{L}_n(\gamma)$ , and the definition of  $\nu$  by  $2L(\nu) = 1$  is coherent with (2.5).

Theorem 4.1 p. 325 of Kontoyannis and Meyn [27] relates multiplicative ergodicity to geometric ergodicity. More precise analyticity conditions will be needed for the following function:

$$B_\nu(t, u) = e^{-\nu t} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{n-1} \mathbb{P}[S_n \leq t \mid T_0 = u]. \quad (3.4)$$

Under (3.3), its Laplace transform is:

$$\tilde{B}_\nu(\gamma, u) = \frac{\alpha(\nu + \gamma, u)}{\nu + \gamma} \frac{L(\nu + \gamma)}{1 - 2L(\nu + \gamma)} + \frac{1}{\nu + \gamma} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{n-1} r_n(\nu + \gamma, u). \quad (3.5)$$

Our hypotheses will be the following.

- (C<sub>1</sub>) For all  $u > 0$ ,  $B_\nu(t, u)$  and  $\tilde{B}_\nu(\gamma, u)$  satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma 2.2, for some  $\delta > 0$  (not depending on  $u$ ), and

$$C(u) = \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} \gamma \tilde{B}_\nu(\gamma, u) = -\frac{\alpha(\nu, u)}{4\nu L'(\nu)}.$$

Let

$$\psi(u) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\tilde{B}_\nu(-\delta + iy, u)| dy.$$

- (C<sub>2</sub>) The mapping  $(y, z) \mapsto \alpha(\nu, y)\psi(z)$  is  $P(x, (y, z))$ -integrable, uniformly in  $x$ .

Admittedly, (C<sub>1</sub>) and (C<sub>2</sub>) are not easy to verify, unless an explicit expression of  $\mathcal{L}_n(\gamma, u)$  is available. This will be the case for the model to be presented in the next section.

Using point 4 of Definition 3.3, let

$$\alpha(\gamma) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} \alpha(\gamma, u) d\mu(u) \quad \text{and} \quad r_n(\gamma) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} r_n(\gamma, u) d\mu(u).$$

Then:

$$\mathcal{L}_n(\gamma) = \alpha(\gamma)L^n(\gamma) + r_n(\gamma). \quad (3.6)$$

The proportionality constant  $C$  naturally relates to  $\alpha(nu)$  and  $L(\nu)$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *Assume that symmetry (3.1), invariance (3.2), multiplicative ergodicity (3.6) hold together with  $(\mathcal{C}_1)$  and  $(\mathcal{C}_2)$ . Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\nu t} N_t = W \quad a.s., \quad (3.7)$$

where:

- $W$  is a random variable with expectation  $C$  and finite variance,
- the growth rate  $\nu$  is such that:

$$2L(\nu) = 1, \quad (3.8)$$

- the proportionality constant  $C$  is:

$$C = -\frac{\alpha(\nu)}{4\nu L'(\nu)}. \quad (3.9)$$

**Remark 3.2.** *On the  $k$ -ary tree, (3.8) and (3.9) become:*

$$kL(\nu) = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad C = -\frac{(k-1)\alpha(\nu)}{k^2\nu L'(\nu)}.$$

As mentioned in the introduction, we have tried to give the weakest possible conditions to ensure convergence in  $L^2$  on the one hand (Proposition 6.1), almost sure convergence on the other hand (Proposition 6.2). The proof of Theorem 3.1 will be completed in section 7.

#### 4. An explicit model

In this section an explicit example for the result of the previous section is constructed: a BMC with prescribed invariant measure  $\mu$ , for which symmetry (3.1), invariance (3.2), and multiplicative ergodicity (3.6) hold. The model depends on an identifiable set of parameters, potentially adjustable to observed data.

The construction of stationary processes with prescribed marginal distribution has been the object of many studies: see Pitt et al. [41] and references therein. We shall follow a simple approach, first constructing a bifurcating autoregressive process, then transforming it to obtain the desired marginals. Bifurcating autoregressive (BAR) processes were introduced by Cowan and Staudte [6] precisely as cell lineage models. They have been extensively studied since, and the problem of parameter estimation has recently received a lot of attention [16, 20, 10, 9]. Our model is similar to that of Guyon [16]. The construction begins with a family of i.i.d. random variables  $(\epsilon_v)_{v \in \mathbb{T}}$ , each with standard Gaussian  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  distribution. Let  $\rho_m$  and  $\rho_s$  be two reals in  $(-1; 1)$ ; they will be the mother- and sister-correlations of our BAR process. It is defined inductively by  $X_0 = \epsilon_0$ , and for all  $v \in \mathbb{T}$ :

$$\begin{cases} X_{v0} &= \rho_m X_v + \sqrt{1 - \rho_m^2} \epsilon_{v0} \\ X_{v1} &= \rho_m X_v + \sqrt{1 - \rho_m^2} (\rho_s \epsilon_{v0} + \sqrt{1 - \rho_s^2} \epsilon_{v1}). \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

By construction,  $(X_v)_{v \in \mathbb{T}}$  is both a BMC on  $\mathbb{T}$  and a Gaussian process. It is symmetric in the sense of (3.1) and the standard Gaussian distribution is the invariant distribution of the marginal kernel, in the sense of (3.2). Let  $f$  denote the composition of the quantile function of the desired distribution  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}^+$  by the distribution function of the  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ . If  $X$  follows the  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ , then  $T = f(X)$  has distribution  $\mu$ . For all  $v \in \mathbb{T}$ , let  $T_v = f(X_v)$ :  $(T_v)_{v \in \mathbb{T}}$  is a BMC on  $\mathbb{T}$ , for which (3.1) and (3.2) hold. Observe moreover that  $(X_v)$  converges at geometric speed along the rays of  $\mathbb{T}$ , hence multiplicative ergodicity holds for the birth dates of  $(T_v)$ , by Theorem 4.1 p. 325 of [27]. Of course the mother- and sister-correlations are not  $\rho_m$  and  $\rho_s$  anymore. But they can be computed in terms of  $f$ ,  $\rho_m$ , and  $\rho_s$ , and so the model can be adjusted to fit not only the observed distribution of lifetimes but also estimated correlations.

As remarked as early as 1932 by Rahn [43], actual lifetime data show a unimodal right-skewed shape (see also Murphy et al. [36]). They have been fitted by many types of distributions: from Gamma and logbeta (Kendall [23]), to lognormal and reciprocal normal (Kubitschek [30]): see John [22] and references therein. The difficulty is to exhibit a realistic example where the hypotheses of Theorem 3.1 hold, with explicitly computable  $\alpha$  and  $L$ . We propose to transform the standard Gaussian variables  $X_v$  of the BAR process defined by (4.1), by the following function, depending on three parameters:

$$f(x) = a + b(x + c)^2 .$$

If  $X$  is normally distributed, then  $(X + c)^2$  has a noncentral chi-squared distribution and the shape can be adjusted by  $c$ ; using the location and scale parameters  $a$  and  $b$ , it can be fitted to actual lifetime data. The Laplace transforms of quadratic forms of auto-regressive processes can be explicitly computed, using a technique due to Klepsyna et al. [26]. The expression of the Laplace transform  $\mathcal{L}_n(\gamma)$  below is due to Alain Le Breton [31].

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $(\epsilon_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of i.i.d. random variables, with common distribution  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ . Let  $\rho = \rho_m \in (-1, 1)$ . Let  $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be the stationary autoregressive chain defined by  $X_0 = \epsilon_0$  and for  $n \geq 0$ :*

$$X_{n+1} = \rho X_n + \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} \epsilon_{n+1} .$$

Let

$$S_n = \sum_{k=0}^n f(X_k) = \sum_{k=0}^n (a + b(X_k + c)^2) .$$

Denote:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1 &= 2\gamma b(1 - \rho^2), & \gamma_2 &= \frac{1 - \rho}{\gamma_1 + (1 - \rho)^2}, \\ A &= (1 - \rho)\gamma_2, & B &= -2\rho\gamma_2^2, & C &= \frac{2\rho\gamma_1}{1 - \rho^2}\gamma_2^2, \\ \lambda_{\pm} &= \frac{\gamma_1 + 1 + \rho^2 \pm \sqrt{(\gamma_1 + (\rho + 1)^2)(\gamma_1 + (\rho - 1)^2)}}{2} . \end{aligned}$$

$$\beta_+ = \frac{1 - \lambda_- + \frac{\gamma_1}{1-\rho^2}}{\lambda_+ - \lambda_-}; \quad \beta_- = \frac{\lambda_+ - 1 + \frac{\gamma_1}{1-\rho^2}}{\lambda_+ - \lambda_-},$$

$$\pi_n = \beta_+ \lambda_+^{n+1} + \beta_- \lambda_-^{n+1}, \quad \psi_n = \beta_+ \left(\frac{\lambda_+}{\rho}\right)^n + \beta_- \left(\frac{\lambda_-}{\rho}\right)^n.$$

Then:

$$\mathcal{L}_n(\gamma) = e^{-(n+1)a\gamma} (\pi_n)^{-1/2} \exp\left(-\frac{c^2\gamma_1}{2(1-\rho^2)}\Sigma_n\right) \quad (4.2)$$

with

$$\Sigma_n = nA + \frac{1}{\pi_0} + B\left(\frac{\rho}{\pi_0} - \frac{\psi_n}{\psi_{n+1}}\right) + C\left(\frac{\rho}{\pi_0} - \frac{1}{\psi_{n+1}}\right).$$

The asymptotics of (4.2) is easy to write, because  $\lambda_+$  and  $\lambda_-$  are such that:

$$\frac{\lambda_+}{\rho} > 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\lambda_-}{\rho} < 1.$$

From there it follows that, as  $n$  tends to  $+\infty$ ,

$$\mathcal{L}_n = \alpha(\gamma)L^n(\gamma)\left(1 + O((\rho/\lambda_+)^n)\right),$$

with

$$\alpha(\gamma) = (\beta_+\lambda_+)^{-1/2} \exp\left(-\frac{c^2\gamma_1}{2(1-\rho^2)}\left(\frac{1}{\pi_0} + B\left(\frac{\rho}{\pi_0} - \frac{\rho}{\lambda_+}\right) + C\left(\frac{\rho}{\pi_0}\right)\right)\right), \quad (4.3)$$

and

$$L(\gamma) = e^{-a\gamma}(\lambda_+)^{-1/2} \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma bc^2(1-\rho)}{2\gamma b(1+\rho) + (1-\rho)}\right). \quad (4.4)$$

Alain Le Breton [31] as also obtained an analogous, though more complicated result for the conditional Laplace transform  $\mathcal{L}_n(\gamma, u)$  that will not be reproduced here. From that result, it can be deduced that the hypotheses of Theorem 3.1 are satisfied. Actually, it can be checked that  $\alpha(\gamma, u)$  and  $r_n(\gamma, u)$  are uniformly bounded in  $u$  and  $\gamma$  over  $(\mathbb{R}^+)^2$ , which considerably simplifies conditions 4 and 5 of Definition 3.3 as well as conditions  $(\mathcal{C}_1)$  and  $(\mathcal{C}_2)$ .

The growth rate  $\nu$  and the proportionality constant  $C$  can be derived from (4.3) and (4.4), through (3.8) and (3.9). The growth rate  $\nu$  is the solution of  $2L(\nu) = 1$ . It has no general explicit expression, but it can be numerically computed. In the particular case  $a = c = 0$  ( $f(x) = bx^2$ ),  $\nu = \nu_0$  is found to be:

$$\nu_0 = \frac{3}{2b} \frac{1 - \rho^2/4}{1 - \rho^2}.$$

In the general case, it can be checked that  $\nu \leq \nu_0$ .

### 5. Correlations and growth rate

As mentioned in the introduction, the influence of lifetime correlations on the exponential growth of the colony was discussed long ago [42, 7, 18]. That sister-correlations do not change the exponential growth rate was remarked by all early authors, and is confirmed by Theorem 2.1. The influence of mother-correlation is discussed here.

The hypotheses in this section are those of Theorem 2.1: birth-stationarity and definition of  $\nu$  and  $C$  by (2.5) and (2.6). A general comparison result will first be obtained under association hypotheses. Recall that a sequence of random variables  $(X_n)_{n \geq 0}$  is *associated* if for all  $n$ , the vector  $X^{(n)} = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$  satisfies the following condition: for any coordinatewise bounded and nondecreasing functions  $f, g$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\text{Cov}(f(X^{(n)}), g(X^{(n)})) \geq 0$ . We refer to Esary et al. [12] for more about this notion. The sequence  $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$  is *negatively associated* if for any coordinatewise bounded and nondecreasing functions  $f, g$  defined respectively on  $\mathbb{R}^{|I|}, \mathbb{R}^{|J|}$  where  $I$  and  $J$  are disjoint subsets of  $\mathbb{N}$ ,  $\text{Cov}(f((X_i)_{i \in I}), g((X_i)_{i \in J})) \leq 0$ . This definition was introduced by Joag-Dev and Proschan [21].

**Proposition 5.1.** *Suppose that the sequence  $(T_{0^n})_{n \geq 1}$  is associated (respectively: negatively associated) and that the hypotheses of Theorem 2.1 are satisfied. Let  $(T_{0^n}^*)_{n \geq 1}$  be a sequence of independent random variables such that  $T_{0^n}^*$  and  $T_{0^n}$  have the same distribution. Let  $\nu, \nu^*$  and  $C, C^*$  be the respective growth rates and proportionality constants corresponding to  $(T_{0^n})_{n \geq 1}$  and  $(T_{0^n}^*)_{n \geq 1}$  through (2.5) and (2.6). Then  $\nu^* \leq \nu$  and  $C \leq C^*$  (respectively:  $\nu \leq \nu^*$  and  $C^* \leq C$ ).*

*Proof.* We only give the proof for the case of association, the case of negative association is symmetric. Let  $S_n^* = T_0^* + T_{0^2}^* + \dots + T_{0^n}^*$ . If  $(T_{0^n})_{n \geq 1}$  is an associated sequence, then for any positive real  $\gamma$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-\gamma S_n^*}] \leq \mathbb{E}[e^{-\gamma S_n}]. \tag{5.1}$$

From there, it follows immediately that  $\nu^* \leq \nu$ , by (2.5). The inequality  $C \leq C^*$  then follows from the fact that  $S_n$  stochastically dominates  $S_n^*$ : for all  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}[S_n \leq t] \leq \mathbb{P}[S_n^* \leq t]. \tag{5.2}$$

Stochastic comparison results such as (5.1) and (5.2) are well known decoupling inequalities, and we shall omit their proofs: see de la Peña and Lai [8, p. 118] and Shao [44].  $\square$

Proposition 5.1 indicates that for a fixed marginal distribution of lifetimes, the growth rate  $\nu$  should increase as the mother-correlation increases from 0 to 1. This is indeed what can be observed on the explicit model of section 4. In that model,  $\nu$  is defined by  $2L(\nu) = 1$ , where  $L$  is given by (4.4). In (4.4)  $\rho$  is the correlation between successive steps of the BAR process, which differs from the correlation between the lifetimes of a mother and its daughter. The latter will



be denoted by  $\varrho$ . The expression of  $\varrho$  as a function of the parameters  $a, b, c, \rho$  is easily calculated. It only depends on  $c$  and  $\rho$ .

$$\varrho = \text{Cor}(T_v, T_{v0}) = \frac{\rho^2 + 2c^2\rho}{1 + 2c^2} .$$

As  $\rho$  increases from 0 to 1, so does  $\varrho$ . As  $\varrho$  tends to +1,  $\nu$  tends to:

- $+\infty$  if  $a = 0$ ,
- $\log(2)/a$  else.

The limit value  $\log(2)/a$  is the growth rate that would be achieved if all lifetimes were equal to  $a$ , which is the minimal value that a lifetime can take in the model.

### 6. Convergence in quadratic mean and almost sure

Conditions for the convergence of  $e^{-\nu t}N_t$  are given in this section. Under the hypothesis of fork-stationarity of Definition 2.3, Proposition 6.1 below gives a general condition under which  $e^{-\nu t}N_t$  converges in  $L^2$ .

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let  $(T_v)_{v \in \mathbb{T}}$  be a fork-stationary bifurcating process. Assuming that the hypotheses of Theorem 2.1 hold, let  $\nu$  and  $C$  be defined by (2.5) and (2.6). For all  $t, \tau \geq 0$ , let:*

$$\Sigma_1(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+1)2^n \mathbb{P}[S_n \leq t] , \tag{6.1}$$

$$\Sigma_2(t, \tau) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{n+i+j} \mathbb{P}[S_{n,i}^{(0)} \leq t, S_{n,j}^{(1)} \leq t + \tau] . \tag{6.2}$$

Assume that for all  $t, \tau \geq 0$ ,  $\Sigma_1(t)$  and  $\Sigma_2(t, \tau)$  are finite, that the following limits exist and the second one does not depend on  $\tau$ .

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} e^{-2\nu t} \Sigma_1(t) = 0 , \tag{6.3}$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} e^{-\nu(2t+\tau)} \Sigma_2(t, \tau) = C_2 < +\infty . \tag{6.4}$$

Then as  $t$  tends to infinity,  $e^{-\nu t}N_t$  converges in quadratic mean to a random variable  $W$  with expectation  $C$ .

Observe that since  $L^2$ -convergence implies  $L^1$ -convergence,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[e^{-\nu t}N_t] = \mathbb{E}[W] = C > 0 .$$

*Proof.* We first express the product  $N_t N_{t+\tau}$  as a function of birth dates. For this, recall the expression (2.3) of  $N_t$ , given in Lemma 2.1:

$$N_t = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in \mathbb{T}} \mathbb{I}_{S_v \leq t} .$$

Hence:

$$(2N_t - 1)(2N_{t+\tau} - 1) = \sum_{(v,w) \in \mathbb{T}^2} \mathbb{I}_{S_v \leq t} \mathbb{I}_{S_w \leq t+\tau} .$$

For any couple  $(v, w) \in \mathbb{T}^2$ , one and only one of the following three cases occurs.

1.  $w \preceq v$ , in which case  $\mathbb{I}_{S_v \leq t} \mathbb{I}_{S_w \leq t+\tau} = \mathbb{I}_{S_v \leq t}$ ,
2.  $|v \wedge w| < \min\{|v|, |w|\}$ ,
3.  $v \preceq w$  and  $v \neq w$ .

Decomposing the sum over the three cases, taking expectations on both sides and using fork-stationarity:

$$\mathbb{E}[(2N_t - 1)(2N_{t+\tau} - 1)] = \Sigma_1(t) + \Sigma_2(t, \tau) + \Sigma_3(t, \tau) , \quad (6.5)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_1(t) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+1) 2^n \mathbb{P}[S_n \leq t] , \\ \Sigma_2(t, \tau) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{n+i+j} \mathbb{P}[S_{n,i}^{(0)} \leq t, S_{n,j}^{(1)} \leq t + \tau] , \\ \Sigma_3(t, \tau) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{n+j} \mathbb{P}[S_n \leq t, S_{n+j} \leq t + \tau] . \end{aligned}$$

From the hypotheses for all  $t, \tau \geq 0$ ,  $\Sigma_1(t)$  and  $\Sigma_2(t, \tau)$  are finite. Remark that:

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_3(t, \tau) &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{n+j} \mathbb{P}[S_{n+j} \leq t + \tau] \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m 2^m \mathbb{P}[S_m \leq t + \tau] \\ &\leq \Sigma_1(t + \tau) . \end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $\Sigma_3(t, \tau)$  is also finite. In particular,  $\mathbb{E}[N_t^2] < \infty$  for all  $t$ . Since  $\Sigma_3(t, \tau) \leq \Sigma_1(t + \tau)$ ,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\nu(2t+\tau)} \Sigma_3(t, \tau) = 0 . \quad (6.6)$$

Collecting (6.5), (6.3), (6.4), (6.6), and using the fact that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[e^{-\nu(2t+\tau)} N_t] = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[e^{-\nu(2t+\tau)} N_{t+\tau}] = 0,$$

one gets:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[e^{-\nu(2t+\tau)} N_t N_{t+\tau}] = \frac{C_2}{4} .$$

Hence:

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[(e^{-\nu t} N_t - e^{-\nu(t+\tau)} N_{t+\tau})^2] \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[e^{-2\nu t} N_t^2 - 2e^{-\nu(2t+\tau)} N_t N_{t+\tau} + e^{-2\nu(t+\tau)} N_{t+\tau}^2] \\ &= \frac{C_2}{4} - 2\frac{C_2}{4} + \frac{C_2}{4} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

hence the result.  $\square$

A reinforcement of (6.3) and (6.4) ensures almost sure convergence.

**Proposition 6.2.** *Under the hypotheses of Proposition 6.1, assume that  $W$  is almost surely positive and that:*

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-2\nu t} \Sigma_1(t) dt < \infty, \quad (6.7)$$

$$\int_0^\infty |e^{-2\nu t} \Sigma_2(t, 0) - C_2| dt < \infty. \quad (6.8)$$

Then as  $t$  tends to infinity,  $e^{-\nu t} N_t$  converges almost surely to  $W$ .

*Proof.* From the proof of Proposition 6.1, the additional hypothesis yields that:

$$\int_0^\infty \mathbb{E}[(e^{-\nu t} N_t - W)^2] dt < \infty.$$

Almost sure convergence is deduced exactly as in the proof of Theorem 21.1 p. 148 of [17]. That  $W$  is almost surely positive cannot be obtained without stronger hypotheses. It will be proved for the BMC model in section 7.  $\square$

**Remark 6.1.** *The only change for the  $k$ -ary tree consists of replacing 2 by  $k$  in the definitions of  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$ .*

## 7. Proof of Theorem 3.1

As already remarked, symmetry (3.1) and invariance (3.2) imply path- and fork-stationarity. We have also observed that the solution of  $2L(\nu) = 1$  is such that:

$$\nu = \inf\left\{\gamma > 0, \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^n \mathcal{L}_n(\gamma) < \infty\right\}.$$

The main ingredient in the proof consists in applying Lemma 2.2 to  $B_\nu(t, u)$  defined by (3.4), thanks to condition  $(\mathcal{C}_1)$ . This yields:

$$\left| e^{-\nu t} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{n-1} \mathbb{P}[S_n \leq t | T_0 = u] + \frac{\alpha(\nu, u)}{4\nu L'(\nu)} \right| \leq \frac{\psi(u)}{2\pi} e^{-\delta t}. \quad (7.1)$$

Recall from (2.8) and (3.4) that:

$$\mathbb{E}[N_t] = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{n-1} \mathbb{P}[S_n \leq t] = 1 + A_\nu(t) = 1 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} B_\nu(t, u) d\mu(u).$$

Integrating against  $\mu$  (condition 4 of Definition 3.3), one gets:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\nu t} \mathbb{E}[N_t] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} C(u) d\mu(u) = -\frac{\alpha(\nu)}{4\nu L'(\nu)} = C.$$

Consider now  $\Sigma_1(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+1)2^n \mathbb{P}[S_n \leq t]$ . The series  $\sum (n+1)2^n L^n(\gamma)$  converges for  $\gamma > \nu$ , diverges for  $\gamma \leq \nu$ . Choose  $\gamma > \nu$ . By Markov's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_1(t) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+1)2^n \mathbb{P}[S_n \leq t] \\ &\leq e^{\gamma t} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+1)2^n \mathcal{L}_n(\gamma). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\Sigma_1(t)$  is finite for all  $t$ . Take  $\gamma$  such that  $\nu < \gamma < 2\nu$ .

$$e^{-2\nu t} \Sigma_1(t) \leq e^{(\gamma-2\nu)t} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+1)2^n \mathcal{L}_n(\gamma).$$

There exists a constant  $K_1$  such that for all  $t \geq 0$ ,  $e^{-2\nu t} \Sigma_1(t) \leq K_1 e^{(\gamma-2\nu)t}$ , hence (6.3) and (6.7).

The convergence of  $e^{-\nu(2t+\tau)} \Sigma_2(t, \tau)$  remains to be proved. Consider:

$$e^{-\nu(2t+\tau)} \Sigma_2(t, \tau) = e^{-\nu(2t+\tau)} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{n+i+j} \mathbb{P}[S_{n,i}^{(0)} \leq t, S_{n,j}^{(1)} \leq t + \tau].$$

We use the Markov property after conditioning on the event:

$$B_n := \{S_{n-1} = u, T_{0^n} = x, T_{0^{n+1}} = y, T_{0^{n1}} = z\}.$$

By Definition 3.2,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}[S_{n,i}^{(0)} \leq t, S_{n,j}^{(1)} \leq t + \tau | B_n] \\ &= \mathbb{P}[S_i \leq t - u - x | T_0 = y] \mathbb{P}[S_j \leq t + \tau - u - x | T_0 = z]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} &e^{-\nu(2t+\tau)} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{i+j} \mathbb{P}[S_{n,i}^{(0)} \leq t, S_{n,j}^{(1)} \leq t + \tau | B_n] \\ &= e^{-2\nu(u+x)} \left( e^{-\nu(t-u-x)} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 2^i \mathbb{P}[S_i \leq t - u - x | T_0 = y] \right) \\ &\quad \left( e^{-\nu(t+\tau-u-x)} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^j \mathbb{P}[S_j \leq t + \tau - u - x | T_0 = z] \right). \end{aligned}$$

By (7.1):

$$\left| \left( e^{-\nu(t-u-x)} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 2^i \mathbb{P}[S_i \leq t-u-x | T_0 = y] \right) + \frac{\alpha(\nu, y)}{2\nu L'(\nu)} \right| \leq \frac{\psi(y)}{\pi} e^{-\delta(t-u-x)},$$

and

$$\left| \left( e^{-\nu(t+\tau-u-x)} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^j \mathbb{P}[S_j \leq t+\tau-u-x | T_0 = z] \right) + \frac{\alpha(\nu, z)}{2\nu L'(\nu)} \right| \leq \frac{\psi(z)}{\pi} e^{-\delta(t+\tau-u-x)}.$$

For  $t$  large enough:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \left( e^{-\nu(t-u-x)} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 2^i \mathbb{P}[S_i \leq t-u-x | T_0 = y] \right) \times \right. \\ & \left. \left( e^{-\nu(t+\tau-u-x)} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^j \mathbb{P}[S_j \leq t+\tau-u-x | T_0 = z] \right) - \frac{\alpha(\nu, y)\alpha(\nu, z)}{(2\nu L'(\nu))^2} \right| \\ & \leq \frac{-2}{\pi\nu L'(\nu)} (\alpha(\nu, z)\psi(y) + \alpha(\nu, y)\psi(z)) e^{-\delta(t-u-x)}. \end{aligned}$$

Denoting by  $Q_n$  the joint distribution of  $(S_{n-1}, T_{0^n})$ , define:

$$C_2 = \frac{1}{(2\nu L'(\nu))^2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^n \int_{u,x} e^{-2\nu(u+x)} \left( \int_{y,z} \alpha(\nu, y) \alpha(\nu, z) dP(x, (y, z)) \right) dQ_n(u, x).$$

By condition 5 of Definition 3.3, there exists  $K_2$  such that for all  $x$ ,

$$\int_{y,z} \alpha(\nu, y) \alpha(\nu, z) dP(x, (y, z)) \leq K_2.$$

Hence:

$$\begin{aligned} C_2 & \leq \frac{K_2}{(2\nu L'(\nu))^2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^n \int_{u,x} e^{-2\nu(u+x)} dQ_n(u, x) \\ & = \frac{K_2}{(2\nu L'(\nu))^2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^n \mathbb{E}[e^{-2\nu S_{n-1} + T_{0^n}}] \\ & = \frac{K_2}{(2\nu L'(\nu))^2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^n \mathcal{L}_n(2\nu) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

One gets:

$$\left| e^{-\nu(2t+\tau)} \Sigma_2(t, \tau) - C_2 \right| \leq \frac{-2}{\pi\nu L'(\nu)} e^{-\delta t} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^n \int_{u,x} e^{-(2\nu-\delta)(u+x)} \left( \int_{y,z} (\alpha(\nu, z)\psi(y) + \alpha(\nu, y)\psi(z)) dP(x, (y, z)) \right) dQ_n(u, x).$$

From condition  $(C_2)$  and symmetry (3.1), there exists  $K_3$  such that for all  $x$ :

$$\frac{-2}{\pi\nu L'(\nu)} \left( \int_{y,z} (\alpha(\nu, z)\psi(y) + \alpha(\nu, y)\psi(z)) dP(x, (y, z)) \right) \leq K_3.$$

Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| e^{-\nu(2t+\tau)} \Sigma_2(t, \tau) - C_2 \right| \\ & \leq K_3 e^{-\delta t} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^n \int_{u,x} e^{-(2\nu-\delta)(u+x)} dQ_n(u, x) \\ & = K_3 e^{-\delta t} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^n \mathbb{E}[e^{-(2\nu-\delta)(S_{n-1}+T_0^n)}] \\ & = K_3 e^{-\delta t} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^n \mathcal{L}_n(2\nu - \delta). \end{aligned}$$

For  $\delta < \nu$ , the series converges, hence (6.8). What has been proved implies that  $\Sigma_2(t, \tau)$  is finite for all  $\tau$  and for  $t$  large enough. But  $\Sigma_2(t, \tau)$  is a nondecreasing function of  $t$ , hence it is finite for all  $t$  and  $\tau$ .

Only one point remains to be proved, that the limit of  $e^{-\nu t} N_t$  is almost surely positive. Assume  $T_0 = u$  and take  $t > u$ . Cells alive at time  $t$  descend either from 00 or from 01. Therefore:

$$N_t = N_{t-u}^{(0)} + N_{t-u}^{(1)},$$

where  $(N_s^{(0)})_{s \geq 0}$  and  $(N_s^{(1)})_{s \geq 0}$  have the same distribution as  $(N_s)_{s \geq 0}$ . Multiply by  $e^{-\nu t}$ :

$$e^{-\nu t} N_t = e^{-\nu u} \left( e^{-\nu(t-u)} N_{t-u}^{(0)} + e^{-\nu(t-u)} N_{t-u}^{(1)} \right).$$

Taking the limit in  $L^2$  as  $t$  tends to infinity, the conditional distribution of  $W$  on  $T_0 = u$  is the same as the distribution of  $e^{-\nu u}(W^{(0)} + W^{(1)})$ , where  $W^{(0)}$  and  $W^{(1)}$  have the same distribution as  $W$ . In particular, for all  $u > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}[W = 0 | T_0 = u] = \mathbb{P}[W^{(0)} = 0, W^{(1)} = 0] \leq \mathbb{P}[W = 0].$$

Hence  $\mathbb{P}[W = 0 | T_0 = u] = \mathbb{P}[W = 0]$   $\mu$ -a.e. Let

$$p = \mathbb{P}[W = 0] = \mathbb{P}[W^{(0)} = 0, W^{(1)} = 0].$$

$$\begin{aligned}
p &= \int_{(\mathbb{R}^+)^3} \mathbb{P}[W^{(0)} = 0, W^{(1)} = 0 \mid (T_0, T_{00}, T_{01}) = (x, y, z)] dP(x, (y, z)) d\mu(x) \\
&= \int_{(\mathbb{R}^+)^3} \mathbb{P}[W^{(0)} = 0 \mid T_{00} = y] \mathbb{P}[W^{(1)} = 0 \mid T_{01} = z] dP(x, (y, z)) d\mu(x),
\end{aligned}$$

by Definition 3.2. Since  $\mathbb{P}[W^{(0)} = 0 \mid T_{00} = y] = \mathbb{P}[W^{(1)} = 0 \mid T_{01} = z] = p$ , it follows that  $p = p^2$ . But  $p = 1$  is excluded since  $\mathbb{E}[W] > 0$ . Hence  $p = 0$ .

### Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Alain Le Breton for the explicit calculations of section 4, and Christine Laurent-Thiébaud for her expertise on Tauberian lemmas.

### References

- [1] ATHREYA, K. B. and NEY, P. E. (1972). *Branching processes*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- [2] BALAJI, S. and MEYN, S. P. (2000). Multiplicative ergodicity and large deviations for an irreducible Markov chain. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* **90** 123–144.
- [3] BELLMAN, R. and HARRIS, T. (1952). On age-dependent binary branching processes. *Ann. Math.* **55** 280–295.
- [4] BENJAMINI, I. and PERES, Y. (1994). Markov chains indexed by trees. *Ann. Probab.* **22** 219–243.
- [5] BROOK, R. F. (1981). Variability in the cell cycle and control of proliferation. In *The cell cycle* (P. C. John, ed.) 35–62. Cambridge University Press.
- [6] COWAN, R. and STAUDTE, R. (1986). The bifurcating autoregression model in cell lineage studies. *Biometrics* **42** 769–783.
- [7] CRUMP, K. S. and MODE, C. J. (1969). An age-dependent branching process with correlation among sister cells. *J. Appl. Probab.* **6** 205–210.
- [8] DE LA PEÑA, V. H. and LAI, T. L. (2001). Theory and applications of decoupling. In *Probability and statistical models with applications* (C. A. Charalambides, M. V. Koutras and N. Balakrishnan, eds.) 117 – 145. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton.
- [9] DE SAPORTA, B., GÉGOUT-PETIT, A. and MARSALLE, L. (2011). Parameter estimation for asymmetric bifurcating autoregressive processes with missing data. *Elect. J. Statist.* **5** 1313–1353.
- [10] DELMAS, J. F. and MARSALLE, L. (2010). Detection of cellular aging in a Galton-Watson process. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* **120** 2495–2519.
- [11] DEMBO, A. and ZEITOUNI, O. (1998). *Large deviations techniques and applications*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Springer, New York.
- [12] ESARY, J., PROSCHAN, F. and WALKUP, D. (1967). Negative association of random variables with applications. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **38** 1466–1476.
- [13] FELLER, W. (1941). On the integral equation of renewal theory. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **12** 243–267.

- [14] FELLER, W. (1971). *An introduction to probability theory and its applications II*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Wiley, London.
- [15] GLYNN, P. W. and WHITT, W. (1994). Large deviations behavior of counting processes and their inverses. *Queueing Systems. Th. Appl* **17** 107–128.
- [16] GUYON, J. (2007). Limit theorems for bifurcating Markov chains. Application to the detection of cellular aging. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **17** 1538–1569.
- [17] HARRIS, T. E. (1963). *The theory of branching processes*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- [18] HARVEY, J. E. (1972). Synchronous growth of cells and the generation time distribution. *J. General Microbiol.* **70** 99–107.
- [19] HWANG, S. Y. and BASAWA, I. V. (2009). Branching Markov processes and related asymptotics. *J. Multivariate. Anal.* **100** 1155–1167.
- [20] HWANG, S. Y. and BASAWA, I. V. (2011). Asymptotic optimal inference for multivariate branching-Markov processes via martingale estimating functions and mixed normality. *J. Multivariate. Anal.* **102** 1018–1031.
- [21] JOAG-DEV, K. and PROSCHAN, F. (1983). Negative association of random variables with applications. *Ann. Statist.* **11** 286–295.
- [22] JOHN, P. C. (1981). *The cell cycle*. Cambridge University Press.
- [23] KENDALL, D. G. (1948). On the role of variable generation time in the development of a stochastic birth process. *Biometrika* **35** 316–330.
- [24] KENDALL, D. G. (1952). On the choice of a mathematical model to represent normal bacterial growth. *J. R. Statist. Soc. B* **14** 41–44.
- [25] KIMMEL, M. and AXELROD, D. (2002). *Branching processes in Biology*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- [26] KLEPTSZYNA, M. L., LE BRETON, A. and VIOT, M. (2002). New formulas concerning Laplace transforms of quadratic forms for general Gaussian sequences. *J. Appl. Math. Stoch. Anal.* **15** 309–325.
- [27] KONTOYIANNIS, I. and MEYN, S. P. (2003). Spectral theory and limit theorems for geometrically ergodic Markov processes. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **13** 304–362.
- [28] KONTOYIANNIS, I. and MEYN, S. P. (2005). Large deviation asymptotics and the spectral theory of multiplicatively regular Markov processes. *Elect. J. Probab.* **10** 61–123.
- [29] KOREVAAR, J. (2004). *Tauberian theory, a century of developments*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- [30] KUBITSCHKE, H. E. (1971). The distribution of cell generation times. *Cell proliferation* **4** 113–122.
- [31] LE BRETON, A. (2013). Laplace transform of quadratic forms for an AR1 process. Private communication.
- [32] LÜCK, H. B. and LÜCK, J. (1976). Cell number and cell size in filamentous organisms with ancestrally and positionally dependent generation times. In *Automata, Languages, Development* (A. Lindenmayer and G. Rozenberg, eds.) 109–124. North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- [33] MARKHAM, J. F., WELLARD, C. J., HAWKINS, E. D., DUFFY, K. R. and HODGKIN, P. D. (2010). A minimum of two distinct heritable factors are required to explain correlation structures in proliferating lymphocytes. *J.*



*R. Soc. Interface* **7** 1049–1059.

- [34] MEYN, S. P. (2006). Large deviation asymptotics and control variates for simulating large functions. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **16** 310–339.
- [35] MEYN, S. P. and TWEEDIE, R. L. (2009). *Markov chains and stochastic stability*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Cambridge University Press.
- [36] MURPHY, J. S., LANDSBERGER, F. R., KIKUCHI, T. and TAMM, I. (1984). Occurrence of cell division is not exponentially distributed: differences in the generation times of sister cells can be derived from the theory of survival of populations. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **81** 2379–2384.
- [37] NAKAGAWA, K. (2005). Tail probability of random variable and Laplace transform. *Applicable Analysis* **84** 499–522.
- [38] NORDON, R. E., KO, K. H. and SCHROEDER, T. (2011). Multitype branching models to describe cell differentiation programs. *J. Theor. Biol.* **277** 7–18.
- [39] PEMANTLE, R. (1992). Automorphism invariant measures on trees. *Ann. Probab.* **20** 1549–1566.
- [40] PEMANTLE, R. (1995). Tree-indexed processes. *Statist. Sci.* **10** 200–213.
- [41] PITT, M. K., CHATFIELD, D. and WALKER, S. G. (2002). Constructing first order stationary autoregressive models via latent processes. *Scand. J. Statist.* **29** 659–663.
- [42] POWELL, E. O. (1955). Growth rate and generation time of bacteria with special reference to continuous culture. *J. General Microbiol.* **15** 492–511.
- [43] RAHN, O. (1932). A chemical explanation of the variability of the growth rate. *J. Gen. Physiol.* **15** 257–277.
- [44] SHAO, Q. M. (2000). A comparison theorem on moment inequalities between negatively associated and independent random variables. *J. Theoret. Probab.* **13** 343–356.
- [45] SMITH, J. A. and MARTIN, L. (1973). Do cells cycle? *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **70** 1263–1267.
- [46] SPITZER, F. (1975). Markov random fields on an infinite tree. *Ann. Probab.* **3** 387–398.
- [47] WANG, P., ROBERT., L., PELLETIER, J., DANG, W. L., TADDEI, F., WRIGHT, A. and JUN, S. (2010). Robust growth of *Escherichia Coli*. *Curr. Biol.* **20** 1099–1103.