

Local times in critical generations of a random walk in random environment on trees

Alexis Kagan

Department of Statistics, University of Auckland. e-mail: alexis.kagan@auckland.ac.nz

Abstract: We consider a null-recurrent randomly biased walk \mathbb{X} on a Galton-Watson tree in the (sub)-diffusive regime and we prove that properly renormalized, the local time in a critical generation converges in law towards some function of a stable continuous-state branching process. We also provide an explicit equivalent of the probability that critical generations are reached by the random walk \mathbb{X} .

MSC2020 : 60K37, 60J80.

Keywords and phrases: randomly biased random walks, branching random walks, Galton-Watson trees, stable continuous-state branching processes.

1. Introduction

1.1. Random walk on a Galton-Watson marked tree

Given, under a probability measure \mathbf{P} , a $\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{R}^k$ -valued random variable \mathcal{P} (\mathbb{R}^0 only contains the sequence with length 0) with $N := \#\mathcal{P}$ denoting the cardinal of \mathcal{P} , we consider the following Galton-Watson marked tree $(\mathbb{T}, (A_x; x \in \mathbb{T}))$ rooted at e : the generation 0 contains one marked individual $(e, A_e) = (e, 0)$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, assume the generation $n - 1$ has been built. If it is empty, then the generation n is also empty. Otherwise, for any vertex x in the generation $n - 1$, let $\mathcal{P}^x := \{A_{x^1}, \dots, A_{x^{N(x)}}\}$ be a random variable distributed as \mathcal{P} where $N(x) := \#\mathcal{P}^x$. The vertex x gives progeny to $N(x)$ marked children $(x^1, A_{x^1}), \dots, (x^{N(x)}, A_{x^{N(x)}})$ independently of the other vertices in generation $n - 1$, thus forming the generation n . We assume $\mathbf{E}[N] > 1$ so that \mathbb{T} is a super-critical Galton-Watson tree with offspring N , that is $\mathbf{P}(\text{non-extinction of } \mathbb{T}) > 0$ and we define $\mathbf{P}^*(\cdot) := \mathbf{P}(\cdot | \text{non-extinction of } \mathbb{T})$, where \mathbf{E} (resp. \mathbf{E}^*) denotes the expectation with respect to \mathbf{P} (resp. \mathbf{P}^*).

For any vertex $x \in \mathbb{T}$, we denote by $|x|$ the generation of x and x^* stands for the parent of x , that is the most recent ancestor of x . For convenience, we add a parent e^* to the root e . For any $x, y \in \mathbb{T}$, we write $x \leq y$ if x is an ancestor of y (y is said to be a descendent of x) and $x < y$ if $x \leq y$ and $x \neq y$.

Let us now introduce the branching potential $V : x \in \mathbb{T} \mapsto V(x) \in \mathbb{R}$: let $V(e) = A_e = 0$ and for any

$x \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{e\}$

$$V(x) := \sum_{e < z \leq x} A_z = \sum_{i=1}^{|x|} A_{x_i}.$$

Under \mathbf{P} , $\mathcal{E} := (\mathbb{T}, (V(x); x \in \mathbb{T}))$ is a real valued branching random walk such that $(V(x); |x| = 1)$ is distributed as \mathcal{P} . We will then refer to \mathcal{E} as the random environment.

We are now ready to introduce the main process of our study. Given a realization of the random environment \mathcal{E} , we define a $\mathbb{T} \cup \{e^*\}$ -valued nearest-neighbour random walk $\mathbb{X} := (X_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$, reflected in e^* whose transition probabilities are, under the quenched probabilities $\{\mathbb{P}_z^\mathcal{E}; z \in \mathbb{T} \cup \{e^*\}\}$: for any $x \in \mathbb{T}$, $\mathbb{P}_x^\mathcal{E}(X_0 = x) = 1$ and

$$p^\mathcal{E}(x, x^*) = \frac{e^{-V(x)}}{e^{-V(x)} + \sum_{i=1}^{N(x)} e^{-V(x^i)}} \quad \text{and for all } 1 \leq j \leq N(x), \quad p^\mathcal{E}(x, x^j) = \frac{e^{-V(x^j)}}{e^{-V(x)} + \sum_{i=1}^{N(x)} e^{-V(x^i)}}.$$

Otherwise, $p^\mathcal{E}(x, u) = 0$ and $p^\mathcal{E}(e^*, e) = 1$. Let $\mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E} := \mathbb{P}_e^\mathcal{E}$, that is the quenched probability of \mathbb{X} starting from the root e and we finally define the following annealed probabilities

$$\mathbb{P}(\cdot) := \mathbf{E}[\mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E}(\cdot)] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}^*(\cdot) := \mathbf{E}^*[\mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E}(\cdot)].$$

R. Lyons and R. Pemantle [LP92] initiated the study of the randomly biased random walk \mathbb{X} .

When, for all $x \in \mathbb{T}$, $V(x) = |x| \log \lambda$ for a some constant $\lambda > 0$, the walk \mathbb{X} is known as the λ -biased random walk on $\mathbb{T} \cup \{e^*\}$ and was first introduced by R. Lyons (see [Lyo90] and [Lyo92]). The λ -biased random walk is transient (on the set of non-extinction) unless the bias is strong enough: if $\lambda \geq \mathbf{E}[N]$ then, \mathbf{P} -almost surely, \mathbb{X} is recurrent (positive recurrent if $\lambda > \mathbf{E}[N]$). R. Lyons, R. Pemantle and Y. Peres (see [LPP96b] and [LPP96a]), later joined by G. Ben Arous, A. Fribergh, N. Gantert, A. Hammond [AFGH12] and E. Aïdékon [Aïd14] for example, studied the transient case and payed a particular attention to the speed $v_\lambda := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |X_n|/n \in [0, \infty)$ of the random walk.

When the bias is random, the behavior of \mathbb{X} depends on the fluctuations of the following log-Laplace transform: for any $t \geq 0$

$$\psi(t) := \log \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{|x|=1} e^{-tV(x)} \right] = \log \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{|x|=1} e^{-tA_x} \right],$$

and we assume that ψ is finite in a neighbourhood of 1 and that $\psi'(1)$ exists. As stated by R. Lyons and R. Pemantle [LP92], if $\inf_{t \in [0,1]} \psi(t)$ is positive, then \mathbf{P}^* -almost surely, \mathbb{X} is transient and we refer to the work of E. Aïdékon [Aïd08] for this case. Otherwise, it is recurrent. More specifically, G. Faraut [Far11] proved that the random walk \mathbb{X} is \mathbf{P} -almost surely positive recurrent either if $\inf_{t \in [0,1]} \psi(t) < 0$ or if $\inf_{t \in [0,1]} \psi(t) = 0$ and $\psi'(1) > 0$. It is null recurrent if $\inf_{t \in [0,1]} \psi(t) = 0$ and $\psi'(1) \leq 0$. We refer

for instance to [HS07], [FHS11], [AD14b], [HS16], [FHS11], [AC18] and [AK24] for further details on the case $\inf_{t \in [0,1]} \psi(t) = 0$ and $\psi'(1) = 0$, also known as the slow regime for the random walk \mathbb{X} because the largest generation reached by $(X_j)_{j \leq n}$ is of order $(\log n)^3$, see in particular [HS07] and [FHS11].

The present paper is dedicated to the null recurrent randomly biased walk \mathbb{X} , and we put ourselves in the following case for the random environment \mathcal{E} : we assume

$$\inf_{t \in [0,1]} \psi(t) = \psi(1) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \psi'(1) < 0. \quad (1)$$

Let us then introduce

$$\kappa := \inf\{t > 1; \psi(t) = 0\}, \quad (2)$$

and assume $\kappa \in (1, \infty)$. We require the following:

Assumption 1. *We assume that there exists $\delta_1 > 0$ such that $\psi(t) < \infty$ for all $t \in (1 - \delta_1, \kappa \wedge 2 + \delta_1)$. Moreover, for any $\kappa \in (1, 2]$*

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{|x|=1} \max(-V(x), 0) e^{-\kappa V(x)} \right], \quad (3)$$

and for all $\kappa > 1$

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{\substack{x \neq y \\ |x|=|y|=1}} e^{-V(x)-V(y)} \right] < \infty. \quad (4)$$

Assumption 2. *The distribution of the $\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{R}^k$ -valued random variable \mathcal{P} is non-lattice.*

When Assumptions 1 and 2 hold, E. Aïdékon and L. de Raphélis (see Theorem 6.1 in [AdR17]) for $\kappa > 2$ and L. de Raphélis (see Theorem 1 in [dR22]) for $\kappa \in (1, 2]$ proved that in law, under the quenched probability $\mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{E}}$ for the space of càdlàg functions $D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$, the sequence of random processes $((|X_{[tn]}|/n^{1-1/(\kappa \wedge 2)}; t \geq 0)$ if $\kappa \neq 2$ (resp. $((|X_{[tn]}|(\log n)^{1/2}/n^{1/2}; t \geq 0)$ if $\kappa = 2$) converges to the continuous-time height process associated with some stable Lévy process, see section 3.1.1 for more details. In particular, the random walk \mathbb{X} is said to be sub-diffusive when $\kappa \in (1, 2]$ and diffusive when $\kappa > 2$.

1.2. The range of the random walk \mathbb{X} and local times

Let $\tau^0 = 0$ and for any $j \geq 1$

$$\tau^j := \inf\{k > \tau^{j-1}; X_{k-1} = e^*, X_k = e\},$$

with the convention $\inf \emptyset = +\infty$. When Assumptions 1 and 2 hold, it is known (see [AD14a], [Hu17] and more recently Theorem 1.2 in [Kag23]) that \mathbf{P}^* -almost surely, in law under $\mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E}$

$$\left(\frac{\tau^n}{n^{\kappa \wedge 2}}\right) \text{ if } \kappa \neq 2 \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\frac{\log n}{n^2} \tau^n\right) \text{ if } \kappa = 2 \quad \text{converge in law to } \mathfrak{C}_\kappa (W_\infty)^{\kappa \wedge 2} \tau_\kappa, \quad (5)$$

for some explicit constant $\mathfrak{C}_\kappa > 0$, τ_κ stands for the first hitting time of -1 by some $(\kappa \wedge 2)$ -stable Lévy process with no negative jump and W_∞ is the limit of the additive martingale $(\sum_{|x|=k} e^{-V(x)})_{k \geq 0}$. It is known that still under the Assumptions 1 and 2, $\mathbf{P}(W_\infty > 0) > 0$, see [Big77], [Lyo97], [Liu00] or [AI09] for instance. Moreover, it is claimed in [Big77] that \mathbf{P} -almost surely, the event $\{W_\infty > 0\}$ coincides with the event of non extinction of the underlying Galton-Watson tree \mathbb{T} . In particular, $\mathbf{P}^*(W_\infty > 0) = 1$. It is also well known that under the Assumptions 1 and 2, (W_k) is bounded in $L^r(\mathbf{P})$ for any $r \in [1, \kappa)$ if $\kappa \in (1, 2]$ and in $L^2(\mathbf{P})$ for all $\kappa > 2$.

For any $x \in \mathbb{T}$ and $p \geq 1$, define the edge local time $N_x^{(p)}$ by

$$N_x^{(p)} := \sum_{j=1}^{\tau^p} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{j-1}=x^*, X_j=x\}},$$

the number of times the oriented edge (x^*, x) has been visited by the random walk \mathbb{X} up to τ^p . Let us also introduce the range $\mathcal{R}^{(p)}$ of \mathbb{X}

$$\mathcal{R}^{(p)} := \{x \in \mathbb{T}; N_x^{(p)} \geq 1\},$$

the sub-tree of \mathbb{T} made up of the vertices visited by the random walk \mathbb{X} up to time τ^p .

Fact 1.1 (Lemma 3.1, [AdR17]). *Under \mathbb{P} , for any $p \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $(\mathcal{R}^{(p)}, (N_x^{(p)}; x \in \mathcal{R}^{(p)}))$ is a multi-type Galton-Watson tree with initial type equal to p . Moreover, we have the following characterization: for any $x \in \mathbb{T}$, $x \neq e$, any $k_1, \dots, k_{N(x)} \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \geq 1$*

$$\mathbb{1}_{\{N_x^{(1)}=k\}} \mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E} \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{N(x)} \{N_{x^i}^{(1)} = k_i\} \mid N_z^{(1)}; z \leq x \right) = \frac{(k-1 + \sum_{i=1}^{N(x)} k_i)!}{(k-1)! k_1! \cdots k_{N(x)}!} \times p^\mathcal{E}(x, x^*)^k \prod_{i=1}^{N(x)} p^\mathcal{E}(x, x^i)^{k_i} \mathbb{1}_{\{N_x^{(1)}=k\}}.$$

As a consequence of Fact 1.1, the following branching property is satisfied: let $\mathcal{U} := \bigcup_{j \geq 0} (\mathbb{N})^j$ be the set of finite \mathbb{N} -valued sequences (by convention, \mathbb{N}^0 only contains the sequence with length 0). For any collection measurable and non-negative functions $\{f_u : \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}; u \in \mathcal{U}\}$, any $p, \ell \in \mathbb{N}^*$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{|u|=\ell} \mathbb{1}_{\{N_u^{(p)} \geq 1\}} f_u((N_x^{(p)}; x \geq u)) \mid \mathcal{G}_\ell^{(p)} \right] = \prod_{|u|=\ell} \mathbb{1}_{\{N_u^{(p)} \geq 1\}} F_u(N_u^{(p)}), \quad (\text{BP})$$

where for any $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $F_u(m) := \mathbb{E}[f_u((N_x^{(m)}; x \geq e))]$ and $\mathcal{G}_\ell^{(p)}$ the sigma-algebra generated by $\{x \in \mathbb{T}, |x| \leq \ell; N_x^{(p)}\}$. For any $p \geq 1$ and $k \geq 0$, define

$$L_k^{(p)} := \sum_{j=1}^{\tau^p} \mathbf{1}_{\{|X_j|=k\}}, \quad (6)$$

the local time of $(|X_j|)_{j \geq 1}$ at level k and time τ^p . One can notice that $L_k^{(p)} = Z_k^{(p)} + Z_{k+1}^{(p)}$ where

$$Z_k^{(p)} := \sum_{|x|=k} N_x^{(p)}. \quad (7)$$

Note that thanks to Fact 1.1 and using that $\psi(1) = 0$, we have for any $k \geq 1$ that $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{|x|=k} N_x^{(p)} | \mathcal{G}_{k-1}^{(p)}] = \mathbb{E}[\sum_{|x|=k-1} \sum_{z; z^*=x} N_z^{(p)} | \mathcal{G}_{k-1}^{(p)}] = \sum_{|x|=k-1} N_x^{(p)}$. Hence, $(Z_k^{(p)}/p)_{k \geq 0}$ is, under the annealed probability \mathbb{P} and for any $p \in \mathbb{N}^*$, a non-negative $(\mathcal{G}_k^{(p)})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ -martingale such that $\mathbb{E}[Z_k^{(p)}/p] = Z_0^{(p)}/p = 1$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. $(Z_k^{(p)}/p)_{k \geq 0}$ is referred to as the *multi-type additive martingale* in [dR22].

Note that interesting results about the behavior of $\{N_x^{(p)}; x \in \mathbb{T}\}$ exist. For instance, it is proved in [CdR20] that under technical assumptions, $(\max\{N_x^{(n)}; x \in \mathbb{T}\}/n)_{n \geq 1}$ converges in law to an explicit positive random variable.

2. Main results

Let us now introduce, for any $\kappa \in (1, 2]$

$$c_\kappa := \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^\kappa \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}} \mathbf{1}_{\{N_x^{(1)}=1, \min_{e < z < x} N_z^{(1)} \geq 2\}} > r\right), \quad (8)$$

with the convention $\sum_\emptyset = 0$. The proof of the existence of $c_\kappa \in (0, \infty)$ under the Assumptions 1 and 2 is one of the main purposes of the paper of L. de Raphélis ([dR22], Proposition 2). When $\kappa > 2$, let $c_0 := \mathbf{E}[\sum_{x \neq y; |x|=|y|=1} e^{-V(x)-V(y)}] / (1 - e^{\psi(2)})$.

Let $(S_j - S_{j-1})_{j \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ be a sequence of i.i.d real valued random variables such that $S_0 = 0$ and for any measurable and non-negative function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$\mathbf{E}[f(S_1)] = \mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{|x|=1} e^{-V(x)} f(V(x))\right]. \quad (9)$$

For any $\kappa > 1$, introduce the positive constant $C_\infty := \mathbf{E}[(\sum_{j \geq 0} e^{-S_j})^{-2}]$ and

$$\mathbf{C}_\kappa := \begin{cases} c_\kappa |\Gamma(1 - \kappa)| & \text{if } \kappa \in (1, 2), \\ \frac{c_2}{2} & \text{if } \kappa = 2, \\ \frac{c_0}{C_\infty} & \text{if } \kappa > 2, \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

where $\Gamma(\cdot)$ stands for the Gamma function.

We are interested in the behavior of the local time up to the first return time to the root. P. Rousselín proved (Theorem 1.2 in [Rou23]) that for any $\kappa > 1$, \mathbf{P}^* -almost surely, $\mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{E}}(L_m^{(1)} > 0)/\mathbb{P}(L_m^{(1)} > 0) \rightarrow W_\infty$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$ but was unfortunately only able to obtain the rate of convergence of $\mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{E}}(L_m^{(1)} > 0)$ and $\mathbb{P}(L_m^{(1)} > 0)$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$ when $\kappa \in (1, 2]$. Our first result allows to provide an explicit equivalent of these probabilities.

Theorem 2.1. *Assume that the Assumptions 1 and 2 hold.*

(i) *If $\kappa \in (1, 2)$, then in \mathbf{P}^* -probability*

$$n\mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{E}}(L_{\lfloor n^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(1)} > 0) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} W_\infty ((\kappa - 1)C_\infty c_\kappa |\Gamma(1 - \kappa)|)^{-1/(\kappa-1)},$$

(ii) *If $\kappa = 2$, then in \mathbf{P}^* -probability*

$$n\mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{E}}(L_{\lfloor n/\log n \rfloor}^{(1)} > 0) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{W_\infty}{C_\infty c_2},$$

(iii) *If $\kappa > 2$, then in \mathbf{P}^* -probability*

$$n\mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{E}}(L_n^{(1)} > 0) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{W_\infty}{c_0},$$

Moreover, for any $\kappa > 1$, in \mathbf{P}^* -probability

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{E}}(L_m^{(1)} > 0)}{\mathbb{P}(L_m^{(1)} > 0)} \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} W_\infty.$$

Remark 1. *It is not difficult to show, under the Assumptions 1 and 2, that the sequence $(\mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{E}}(L_m^{(1)} > 0)/\mathbb{P}(L_m^{(1)} > 0))$ is bounded in $L^r(\mathbf{P})$ for any $r \in [1, \kappa)$ if $\kappa \in (1, 2]$ and in $L^2(\mathbf{P})$ for all $\kappa > 2$. For example, it is proved in Lemma 2.3 of [Rou23] that $\mathbf{E}[(\mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{E}}(L_m^{(1)} > 0)/\mathbb{P}(L_m^{(1)} > 0))^r] \leq \mathbf{E}[(W_m)^r]$ for any $r \geq 1$.*

Remark 2 (Critical generations). *In view of Theorem 2.1, we say that $(\ell_n)_{n \geq 1}$, a sequence of positive integers, is a sequence of critical generations for $(\mathcal{R}^{(n)})_{n \geq 1}$ if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \ell_n/n^{\kappa \wedge 2 - 1} \in (0, \infty)$ (resp. $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\log n)\ell_n/n \in (0, \infty)$) when $\kappa \neq 2$ (resp. $\kappa = 2$).*

For our next result, we need to introduce a few definitions. Let $(\mathcal{Y}_a^{(\kappa)}; a \geq 0)$ be a continuous state branching process (CSBP) with branching mechanism $\lambda \mapsto C_\infty \mathbf{C}_\kappa \lambda^{\kappa \wedge 2}$, in the sense that for almost every environment \mathcal{E} , $(\mathcal{Y}_a^{(\kappa)}; a \geq 0)$ is a real-valued Markov process such that $\mathcal{Y}_0^{(\kappa)} = 1$ and for any $\lambda \geq 0$ and any $0 \leq a \leq b$

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}} \left[e^{-\lambda \mathcal{Y}_b^{(\kappa)}} \mid \mathcal{Y}_a^{(\kappa)} \right] = \exp \left(-\lambda \mathcal{Y}_a^{(\kappa)} (1 + (b - a)(\kappa \wedge 2 - 1)C_\infty \mathbf{C}_\kappa \lambda^{\kappa \wedge 2 - 1})^{-1/(\kappa \wedge 2 - 1)} \right). \quad (11)$$

When $\kappa \geq 2$, the random process $(\mathcal{Y}_a^{(\kappa)}; a \geq 0)$ has continuous paths and is also referred to as the Feller diffusion, that is the unique strong solution of

$$d\mathcal{Y}_a^{(\kappa)} = (2C_\infty \mathbf{C}_\kappa \mathcal{Y}_a^{(\kappa)})^{1/2} dB_a \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Y}_0^{(\kappa)} = 1,$$

where $(B_a; a \geq 0)$ is a standard Brownian motion.

Before stating our next result, let us introduce the following definition. Let $(Y^{(n)})_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of random variables taking values in a metric space \mathcal{Q} and let Y be a \mathcal{Q} -valued random variable. We say that $(Y^{(n)})_{n \geq 1}$ converges to Y in \mathbf{P}^* -law if for any increasing sequence of positive integers $(n_q)_{q \geq 1}$, there exists an increasing sequence of positive integers $(m_\ell)_{\ell \geq 1}$ such that \mathbf{P}^* -almost surely, the sequence $(Y^{(n_{m_\ell})})_{\ell \geq 1}$ converges in law to Y under the quenched probability $\mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E}$. Note that the convergence in \mathbf{P}^* -law implies that for any bounded and continuous function $F : \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, in \mathbf{P}^* -probability and in $L^r(\mathbf{P}^*)$ for any $r > 0$

$$\mathbb{E}^\mathcal{E} [F(Y^{(n)})] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}^\mathcal{E} [F(Y)].$$

In particular, the convergence in \mathbf{P}^* -law implies the convergence in law under the probability \mathbb{P}^* .

Our next result is dedicated to the convergence of the rescaled local time up to the n -th return time to the root.

Theorem 2.2. *Assume that the Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Let $a > 0$.*

(i) *if $\kappa \in (1, 2)$, then in \mathbf{P}^* -law*

$$\frac{1}{n} L_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 2W_\infty \mathcal{Y}_{a/(W_\infty)^{\kappa-1}}^{(\kappa)} ;$$

(ii) *if $\kappa = 2$, then in \mathbf{P}^* -law*

$$\frac{1}{n} L_{\lfloor an/\log n \rfloor}^{(n)} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 2W_\infty \mathcal{Y}_{a/W_\infty}^{(2)} ;$$

(iii) *if $\kappa > 2$, then in \mathbf{P}^* -law*

$$\frac{1}{n} L_{\lfloor an \rfloor}^{(n)} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 2W_\infty \mathcal{Y}_{a/W_\infty}^{(\kappa)} .$$

Theorem 2.2 reminds us of very well-known results about the convergence of rescaled critical Galton-Watson processes, see for instance [DLG05].

In our next result, we deal with the limiting quenched law of the rescaled local time up to the first return time to the root conditionally on the survival of the population. For any $\lambda \geq 0$, define $\phi^{(\kappa)}(\lambda)$ by

$$\phi^{(\kappa)}(\lambda) := 1 - \lambda(1 + \lambda^{\kappa \wedge 2 - 1})^{-1/(\kappa \wedge 2 - 1)}. \quad (12)$$

One can notice that for all $\kappa \geq 2$, $\phi^{(\kappa)}$ is the Laplace transform of an exponential random variable with mean 1.

Corollary 2.3. *Assume that the Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Let $\lambda \geq 0$*

(i) *If $\kappa \in (1, 2)$, then in \mathbf{P}^* -probability*

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}} \left[e^{-\frac{\lambda}{n} L_{\lfloor n^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(1)}} \mid L_{\lfloor n^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(1)} > 0 \right] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi^{(\kappa)} \left(2\lambda ((\kappa - 1) C_{\infty} c_{\kappa} |\Gamma(1 - \kappa)|)^{1/(\kappa-1)} \right);$$

(ii) *If $\kappa = 2$, then in \mathbf{P}^* -probability*

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}} \left[e^{-\frac{\lambda}{n} L_{\lfloor n/\log n \rfloor}^{(1)}} \mid L_{\lfloor n/\log n \rfloor}^{(1)} > 0 \right] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi^{(\kappa)} (2\lambda C_{\infty} c_2);$$

(iii) *If $\kappa > 2$, then in \mathbf{P}^* -probability*

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}} \left[e^{-\frac{\lambda}{n} L_n^{(1)}} \mid L_n^{(1)} > 0 \right] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi^{(\kappa)} (2\lambda c_0).$$

Corollary 2.3 says in particular that for any $\kappa > 1$, the sequences $\mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{E}}(L_{\lfloor n^{\kappa \wedge 2-1} \rfloor}^{(1)}/n \in \cdot \mid L_{\lfloor n^{\kappa \wedge 2-1} \rfloor}^{(1)} > 0)_{n \geq 1}$ if $\kappa \neq 2$ and $\mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{E}}(L_{\lfloor n/\log n \rfloor}^{(1)}/n \in \cdot \mid L_{\lfloor n/\log n \rfloor}^{(1)} > 0)_{n \geq 1}$ if $\kappa = 2$ both converge towards the law of a random variable which is proportional to the random variable with Laplace transform given by $\phi^{(\kappa)}$. This is strongly reminiscent of results previously obtained for critical Galton-Watson processes, see for instance [Yag47], [KNS66], [Sla68] and [Sla72].

Our previous results are based on the following proposition. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $p_k^{\mathcal{E}} := \mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{E}}(Z_k^{(1)} > 0)$ and $p_k := \mathbf{E}[p_k^{\mathcal{E}}] = \mathbb{P}(Z_k^{(1)} > 0)$.

Proposition 2.4. *Assume that the Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Let $i \geq 1$ be an integer, $(\gamma_{i,m})_{m \geq 1}$ and $(\rho_{i,m})_{m \geq 1}$ be two sequences of positive integers such that $\gamma_m^- \leq \gamma_{i,m} \leq \gamma_m^+$ and $\rho_m^- \leq \rho_{i,m} \leq \rho_m^+$ where $\gamma_m^-/m \rightarrow 1$, $\gamma_m^+/m \rightarrow 1$ and $\rho_m^+/m \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. For any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \geq 0$, we have, uniformly in $i \geq 1$ that*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\lambda_1 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)}} e^{-\lambda_2 p_m L_{\rho_{i,m} + \rho_{i,m}}^{(1)}} \right] \right)^{1/p_m} = e^{-(1 - \phi^{(\kappa)})(2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2)}.$$

As a consequence of Proposition 2.4, one can deduce an annealed version of Corollary 2.3. Let $\theta \geq 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If we denote $\mathbb{E}[e^{-\theta L_k^{(1)}} \mid L_k^{(1)} > 0] := \mathbb{E}[e^{-\theta L_k^{(1)}}] / \mathbb{P}(L_k^{(1)} > 0)$, which is different from $\mathbf{E}[\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}[e^{-\theta L_k^{(1)}} \mid L_k^{(1)} > 0]]$, then for any $\lambda \geq 0$

(i) *if $\kappa \in (1, 2)$, then*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{\lambda}{n} L_{\lfloor n^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(1)}} \mid L_{\lfloor n^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(1)} > 0 \right] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi^{(\kappa)} \left(2\lambda ((\kappa - 1) C_{\infty} c_{\kappa} |\Gamma(1 - \kappa)|)^{1/(\kappa-1)} \right);$$

(ii) *if $\kappa = 2$, then*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{\lambda}{n} L_{\lfloor n/\log n \rfloor}^{(1)}} \mid L_{\lfloor n/\log n \rfloor}^{(1)} > 0 \right] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi^{(\kappa)} (2\lambda C_{\infty} c_2);$$

(iii) if $\kappa > 2$, then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{\lambda}{n} L_n^{(1)}} \mathbf{1}_{L_n^{(1)} > 0} \right] \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \phi^{(\kappa)}(2\lambda c_0).$$

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: in order to prove our results properly, we first present a few preliminary results, see section 3.1. After this, the proofs of our theorems and corollary are presented and we finally end the paper with the proof of Proposition 2.4.

3. Proofs of the results

3.1. Preliminary results

Let $x \in \mathbb{T}$. It is well known that

$$\mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E}(N_x^{(1)} \geq 1) = \frac{e^{-V(x)}}{H_x} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}_{x^*}^\mathcal{E}(N_x^{(1)} \geq 1) = 1 - \frac{1}{H_x}, \quad (13)$$

where $H_x := \sum_{e \leq w \leq x} e^{-V(x)}$. Moreover, under $\mathbb{P}_{x^*}^\mathcal{E}$, $N_x^{(1)}$ follows a Geometric law on \mathbb{N} with probability of success $1 - \mathbb{P}_{x^*}^\mathcal{E}(N_x^{(1)} \geq 1)$. In particular, $\mathbb{E}^\mathcal{E}[N_x^{(1)}] = e^{-V(x)}$.

For any $s \in [0, 1]$ and any $k \geq 1$, introduce $G_\ell^\mathcal{E}(s, p) := \mathbb{E}^\mathcal{E}[s^{Z_k^{(p)}}]$ with the convention $G_\ell^\mathcal{E}(s, 0) = 1$ and $G_k(s, p) := \mathbf{E}[G_k(s, p)] = \mathbb{E}[s^{Z_k^{(p)}}]$, $G_\ell^\mathcal{E}(s) := G_\ell^\mathcal{E}(s, 1)$ and $G_k(s) := G_k(s, 1)$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $p, k, \ell \geq 1$ be integers, $s \in [0, 1]$ and $\alpha > 1$. We have*

$$(G_\ell(s))^p \leq G_\ell(s, p) \leq e^{-p(1-G_\ell(s)) + p^\alpha \mathbf{E}[(1-G_\ell^\mathcal{E}(s))^\alpha]},$$

and in particular

$$G_k(G_\ell(s)) \leq G_{k+\ell}(s) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-Z_k^{(1)}(1-G_\ell(s))} e^{\sum_{|u|=k} (N_u^{(1)})^\alpha} \mathbf{E}[(1-G_\ell^\mathcal{E}(s))^\alpha] \right].$$

Proof. Since $Z_\ell^{(p)}$ is a sum of i.i.d copies of $Z_\ell^{(1)}$ under the quenched probability $\mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E}$, the Jensen inequality yields $G_\ell(s, p) = \mathbf{E}[(G_\ell^\mathcal{E}(s))^p] \geq (G_\ell(s))^p$, thus giving the lower bound. For the upper bound, one can notice that using the convexity of the function $t \mapsto e^{t-1}$ first and the fact that $e^{-t} \leq 1 - t + t^\alpha$ in a second time, we have

$$G_\ell^\mathcal{E}(s, p) = (G_\ell^\mathcal{E}(s))^p \leq e^{-p(1-G_\ell^\mathcal{E}(s))} \leq 1 - p(1 - G_\ell^\mathcal{E}(s)) + p^\alpha (1 - G_\ell^\mathcal{E}(s))^\alpha.$$

Then taking the expectation and using the convexity of the function $t \mapsto e^{-t}$, we obtain

$$\mathbf{E}[G_\ell^\mathcal{E}(s, p)] \leq 1 - p(1 - G_\ell(s)) + p^\alpha \mathbf{E}[(1 - G_\ell^\mathcal{E}(s))^\alpha] \leq e^{-p(1-G_\ell(s)) + p^\alpha \mathbf{E}[(1-G_\ell^\mathcal{E}(s))^\alpha]},$$

and this yields the first result.

Now, by the branching property (BP) and the fact that $G_\ell(s, p) = 1$, we have

$$G_{k+\ell}(s) = \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{|u|=k} G_\ell(s, N_u^{(1)}) \right],$$

so using what we have just proved with $p = N_u^{(1)}$, we finally obtain

$$G_k(G_\ell(s)) = \mathbb{E} \left[(G_k(0))^{Z_\ell^{(1)}} \right] \leq G_{k+\ell}(s) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-Z_k^{(1)}(1-G_\ell(s))} e^{\sum_{|u|=k} (N_u^{(1)})^\alpha} \mathbf{E} \left[(1-G_\ell^\varepsilon(s))^\alpha \right] \right].$$

□

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\kappa > 1$ and $\alpha \in (1, \kappa \wedge 2)$. Let $i \geq 1$ be an integer and $(\gamma_{i,m})_{m \geq 1}$ be a sequence of positive integers, $(t_m)_{m \geq 1}$ and $(s_m)_{m \geq 1}$ are two $(0, 1)$ -valued sequences such that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} s_m/t_m = 0$. We have, uniformly in $i \geq 1$*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t_m} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[e^{s_m \sum_{|u|=\gamma_{i,m}} (N_u^{(1)})^\alpha} \right] - 1 \right) = 0.$$

Proof. Let us first prove that

$$\sup_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{|x|=k} (N_x^{(1)})^\alpha \right] < \infty.$$

Indeed, recall that for any $x \in \mathbb{T}$, $N_x^{(1)}$ is, under $\mathbb{P}_{x^*}^\varepsilon$, a Geometric random variable on \mathbb{N} with probability of success $1 - \mathbb{P}_{x^*}^\varepsilon(N_x^{(1)} \geq 1)$, see section 3.1 so the strong Markov property yields $\mathbb{P}^\varepsilon(N_x^{(1)} > \ell) = \mathbb{P}^\varepsilon(N_x^{(1)} \geq 1)(\mathbb{P}_{x^*}^\varepsilon(N_x^{(1)} \geq 1))^\ell = e^{-V(x)}(1 - 1/H_x)^\ell/H_x$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{|x|=k} (N_x^{(1)})^\alpha \right] &= \alpha \mathbf{E} \left[\int_0^\infty t^{\alpha-1} \sum_{|x|=k} e^{-V(x)} \frac{1}{H_x} \left(1 - \frac{1}{H_x}\right)^{\lfloor t \rfloor} dt \right] \\ &\leq \alpha \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{|x|=k} (H_x)^{\alpha-1} e^{-V(x)} \frac{1}{(H_x)^\alpha} \sum_{k \geq 0} k^\alpha \left(1 - \frac{1}{H_x}\right)^\alpha \right] \\ &\leq \alpha \sup_{\ell \geq 0} \mathbf{E} \left[\sum_{|x|=\ell} (H_x)^{\alpha-1} e^{-V(x)} \right] \sup_{s \in (0,1]} s^\alpha \sum_{k \geq 0} k^\alpha (1-s)^\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $H_x \geq 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{T}$ for the last inequality. By Lemma 2.2 in [AD20], we have $\sup_{\ell \geq 0} \mathbf{E}[\sum_{|x|=\ell} (H_x)^{\alpha-1} e^{-V(x)}] < \infty$ and it is a very well-known fact that $\sup_{s \in (0,1]} s^\alpha \sum_{k \geq 0} k^\alpha (1-s)^\alpha < \infty$ so we get what we wanted.

Now, since $t_m \leq 1$ for all $m \geq 1$, the Jensen inequality leads to

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{s_m \sum_{|u|=\gamma_{i,m}} (N_u^{(1)})^\alpha} \right] - 1 \leq \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\frac{s_m}{t_m} \sum_{|u|=\gamma_{i,m}} (N_u^{(1)})^\alpha} \right]^{t_m} - 1.$$

Besides, thanks to what we have just proved and the fact that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} s_m/t_m = 0$, we have

$$\frac{s_m}{t_m} \sup_{i \geq 1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{|u|=\gamma_{i,m}} (N_u^{(1)})^\alpha \right] \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

In particular, $\mathbb{E} \left[e^{\frac{s_m}{t_m} \sum_{|u|=\gamma_{i,m}} (N_u^{(1)})^\alpha} \right] \rightarrow 1$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$ and uniformly in $i \geq 1$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{s_m \sum_{|u|=\gamma_{i,m}} (N_u^{(1)})^\alpha} \right] - 1 &\leq \frac{1}{t_m} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[e^{\frac{s_m}{t_m} \sum_{|u|=\gamma_{i,m}} (N_u^{(1)})^\alpha} \right]^{t_m} - 1 \right) \\ &= \left(\mathbb{E} \left[e^{\frac{s_m}{t_m} \sum_{|u|=\gamma_{i,m}} (N_u^{(1)})^\alpha} \right] - 1 \right) (1 + o(1)), \end{aligned}$$

as $m \rightarrow \infty$, uniformly in $i \geq 1$ and the proof is completed. \square

Lemma 3.3. *Let $i \geq 1$ be an integer and $(\gamma_{i,m})_{m \geq 1}$ be a sequence of positive integers, let $(t_{i,m})$ and $(s_{i,m})$ be two $(0, 1)$ -valued sequences such that $t_{i,m}/p_{\gamma_{i,m}} \rightarrow \nu$ and $s_{i,m}/p_{\gamma_{i,m}} \rightarrow \nu$ for some $\nu \in [0, \infty)$ and $\gamma_{i,m} \rightarrow \infty$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$ and uniformly in $i \geq 1$. We have*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-t_{i,m} Z_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)} | Z_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)} > 0} \right]}{\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-s_{i,m} Z_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)} | Z_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)} > 0} \right]} = 1,$$

and

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{G_{\gamma_{i,m}}(e^{-t_{i,m}})}{G_{\gamma_{i,m}}(e^{-s_{i,m}})} \right)^{1/t_{i,m}} = 1,$$

uniformly in $i \geq 1$.

Proof. For any $M > 0$, thanks to Markov inequality and together with $\mathbb{E}[Z_k^{(1)}] = 1$ for all $k \geq 1$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)} > p_{\gamma_{i,m}} M | Z_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)} > 0) \leq \frac{1}{M},$$

so there exists a random variable $Z \in [0, \infty)$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\theta p_{\gamma_{i,m}} Z_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)} | Z_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)} > 0} \right] \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\theta Z} \right],$$

along a sub-sequence, for any $\theta \geq 0$ and uniformly in $i \geq 1$. Using that $\sup_{i \geq 1} |t_{i,m}/p_{\gamma_{i,m}} - \nu| \rightarrow 0$ and $\sup_{i \geq 1} |s_{i,m}/p_{\gamma_{i,m}} - \nu| \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-t_{i,m} Z_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)} | Z_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)} > 0} \right]}{\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-s_{i,m} Z_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)} | Z_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)} > 0} \right]} = \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\nu Z} \right]}{\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\nu Z} \right]} = 1,$$

uniformly in $i \geq 1$. Besides, $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{i \geq 1} p_{\gamma_{i,m}} = 0$ so

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{G_{\gamma_{i,m}}(e^{-t_{i,m}})}{G_{\gamma_{i,m}}(e^{-s_{i,m}})} \right)^{1/t_{i,m}} &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{1 - p_{\gamma_{i,m}} \times \left(1 - \mathbb{E}[e^{-t_{i,m} Z_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)}} | Z_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)} > 0] \right)}{1 - p_{\gamma_{i,m}} \times \left(1 - \mathbb{E}[e^{-s_{i,m} Z_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)}} | Z_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)} > 0] \right)} \right)^{1/t_{i,m}} \\ &= \frac{e^{(1 - \mathbb{E}[e^{-\nu Z}])/\nu}}{e^{(1 - \mathbb{E}[e^{-\nu Z}])/\nu}} = 1, \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $i \geq 1$ and the proof is completed. \square

3.1.1. Reduced range

We introduce what we call the reduced range. Roughly speaking, the reduced range associated with $\mathcal{B}^{(p)}$ is a range for which we get rid of vertices that do not give a sufficient contribution. We will see that it is easier to deal with a reduced *multi-type additive martingale* than we the actual one. For any $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}^*$, define

$$\mathcal{B}_\ell^{(p)} := \{x \in \mathbb{T}, |x| > \ell; N_x^{(p)} = 1 \text{ and } \min_{\ell < i < |x|} N_{x_i}^{(p)} \geq 2\}, \quad (14)$$

with the convention $\mathcal{B}_\ell^{(0)} = \emptyset$. This set was first introduced by E. Aïdékon and L. de Raphélis in [AdR17]. $B_\ell^{(p)}$ stands for the cardinal of $\mathcal{B}_\ell^{(p)}$. We know thanks to Lemma 2.6 in [Kag23] that for any $r > 0$, \mathbf{P} -almost surely, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E} \left((\mathcal{B}_{\lfloor (\log n)^2 \rfloor}^{(p)})_{p \leq \lfloor n^r \rfloor} \right)$ is non-decreasing, $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{B}_{\lfloor (\log n)^2 \rfloor}^{(\lfloor n^r \rfloor)}} |x| \leq \lfloor (\log n)^3 \rfloor = 1$ and by Lemma 2.7 in [Kag23] that \mathbf{P}^* -almost surely

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E} \left(\forall |y| \geq \lfloor (\log n)^3 \rfloor, \exists x \in \mathcal{B}_{\lfloor (\log n)^2 \rfloor}^{(\lfloor n^r \rfloor)} : x \leq y \right) = 1.$$

Also, thanks to Lemma 2.9 in [Kag23], we know that for any $r > 0$, in \mathbb{P} -probability (and \mathbb{P}^* -probability)

$$\frac{1}{n^r} B_{\lfloor (\log n)^2 \rfloor}^{(\lfloor n^r \rfloor)} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} W_\infty. \quad (15)$$

Let $\mathcal{B}^{(n)} := \mathcal{B}_{\lfloor (\log n)^2 \rfloor}^{(\lfloor n^2 \rfloor)}$, $\bar{\mathcal{B}}^{(n)} := \mathcal{B}_{\lfloor (\log n)^2 \rfloor}^{(n)}$ and denote by $B^{(n)}$ the cardinal of $\mathcal{B}^{(n)}$ and $\bar{B}^{(n)}$ the cardinal of $\bar{\mathcal{B}}^{(n)}$. For any $i \in \{1, \dots, B^{(n)}\}$ let $e_i^{(n)}$ (to simplify, we will use the notation e_i instead) be the i -th element of $\mathcal{B}^{(n)}$ visited by the random walk \mathbb{X} and define the tree $\mathcal{R}_i^{(n)}$ rooted at e_i by

$$\mathcal{R}_i^{(n)} := \{x \in \mathbb{T}; x \geq e_i\} \cap \mathcal{B}^{(n)}. \quad (16)$$

By definition, the oriented edge $((e_i)^*, e_i)$ is visited exactly once by the random walk \mathbb{X} up to time τ^n so one should think of $\mathcal{R}_i^{(n)}$ as the range of a random walk on \mathbb{T} up to its return time to the edge $((e_i)^*, e_i)$.

Precisely, for any $i \in \{1, \dots, B^{(n)}\}$ and $x \in \mathcal{R}_i^{(n)}$, let $\mathbf{t}_x^{(n)} := N_x^{(n)}$. Let $((\mathcal{R}_i^{(n)}, (\mathbf{t}_x^{(n)}; x \in \mathcal{R}_i^{(n)})); i > B^{(n)})$, be, under \mathbb{P} , a collection of i.i.d copies of $(\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, (N_x^{(1)}, x \in \mathcal{R}^{(1)}))$, independent of any random variable we have introduced so far. We still denote by e_i the root of $\mathcal{R}_i^{(n)}$ when $i > B^{(n)}$. Therefore, $((\mathcal{R}_i^{(n)}, (\mathbf{t}_x^{(n)}; x \in \mathcal{R}_i^{(n)})); i \geq 1)$ is a collection of i.i.d copies of the multi-type Galton-Watson tree $(\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, (N_x^{(1)}, x \in \mathcal{R}^{(1)}))$ with initial type 1, see Fact 1.1.

The idea of considering this new range is due to E. Aïdékon and L. de Raphelis in the paper [AdR17] and is significantly easier to deal with than the actual range $\mathcal{R}^{(n)}$.

Define $\mathcal{F}^{(n)} := (\mathcal{R}_i^{(n)})_{i \geq 1}$, denote by $F^{(n)}(p)$ the number of vertices in the first p trees of the forest $\mathcal{F}^{(n)}$ and $H^{(n)}$ stands for the height function of the forest $\mathcal{F}^{(n)}$ as defined below:

let \mathfrak{T} be a tree rooted at $u(0)$ and $\#\mathfrak{T}$ stands for the number of vertices of \mathfrak{T} and assume that $\#\mathfrak{T} < \infty$. For any $i \in \{0, \dots, \#\mathfrak{T} - 1\}$, denote by $u(i)$ the $(i+1)$ -th vertex of the tree \mathfrak{T} for the depth first search order. We then define $H^{\mathfrak{T}} : \{0, \dots, \#\mathfrak{T}\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ to be the height function of the tree \mathfrak{T} , with the convention $H^{\mathfrak{T}}(\#\mathfrak{T}) = 0$. Then, for any $i \in \{0, \dots, \#\mathfrak{T} - 1\}$, $H^{\mathfrak{T}}(i)$ is the generation of the vertex $u(i)$ in the tree \mathfrak{T} . We extend this definition to a collection of trees (or forest) $\mathfrak{F} = (\mathfrak{T}_j)_{j \geq 1}$: we define the height function $H^{\mathfrak{F}} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ of the forest \mathfrak{F} by setting: for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $H^{\mathfrak{F}}(i) = H^{\mathfrak{T}_j}(i - \sum_{l < j} \#\mathfrak{T}_l)$ if and only if $\sum_{l < j} \#\mathfrak{T}_l \leq i < \sum_{l \leq j} \#\mathfrak{T}_l - 1$, for some $j \geq 1$, with the convention $\#\mathfrak{T}_0 = 0$.

Before stating an important fact, we need a few more definitions. Let $\kappa > 1$ and define $Y_\kappa := (Y_{\kappa, s}; s \geq 0)$ to be a $(\kappa \wedge 2)$ -stable Lévy process with no negative jump and Laplace exponent $\lambda \in [0, \infty) \mapsto \mathbf{C}_\kappa \lambda^{\kappa \wedge 2}$ (see (10) for the definition of \mathbf{C}_κ) such that, almost surely, $\inf_{s \geq 0} Y_{\kappa, s} = -\infty$ and denote by $\mathbf{H}_\kappa := (\mathbf{H}_\kappa(s); s \geq 0)$ the continuous-time height process associated with Y_κ . For any $s \geq 0$, $\mathbf{H}_\kappa(s)$ is defined as the "Lebesgue measure" of the set $\{t \leq s; Y_{\kappa, t} = \inf_{r \in [t, s]} Y_{\kappa, r}\}$, see Definition 1.2.1 in [DLG05] for a rigorous definition. Besides, by Theorem 1.4.3 in [DLG05], \mathbf{H}_κ has continuous paths almost-surely. One can notice that for any $\kappa \geq 2$, \mathbf{H}_κ is distributed as $(2/\mathbf{C}_\kappa)^{1/2}|B|$, with B a standard Brownian motion. There is a strong link between $H^{(n)}$ and \mathbf{H}_κ , see Fact 3.4.

For any $t \geq 0$, define $\tau_{-t}(Y_\kappa)$ to be the first hitting time of $-t$ by Y_κ , that is

$$\tau_{-t}(Y_\kappa) := \inf\{s > 0; Y_{\kappa, s} = -t\},$$

which is finite almost surely. Let $\mathbf{c}_\infty := \mathbf{E}[(\sum_{j \geq 1} e^{-S_j})^{-1}]$, see (9) for the definition of (S_j) .

Fact 3.4. *Assume that the Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. For any $\kappa > 1$*

(i) *if $\kappa \neq 2$, then in \mathbf{P}^* -law for the Skorokhod product topology on $D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}) \times D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\left(\frac{\mathbf{C}_\infty}{n^{\kappa \wedge 2 - 1}} \mathbf{H}^{(n)}(\lfloor sn^{\kappa \wedge 2} \rfloor); s \geq 0 \right), \left(\frac{\mathbf{C}_\infty}{n^{\kappa \wedge 2}} \mathbf{F}^{(n)}(\lfloor tn \rfloor); t \geq 0 \right) \right) \\ & \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \left((\mathbf{H}_\kappa(s \mathbf{C}_\infty / \mathbf{c}_\infty); s \geq 0), (\mathbf{c}_\infty \tau_{-t}(Y_\kappa); t \geq 0) \right); \end{aligned}$$

(ii) if $\kappa = 2$, then in \mathbf{P}^* -law for the Skorokhod product topology on $D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}) \times D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\left(2C_\infty \frac{\log n}{n} \mathbf{H}^{(n)}(\lfloor sn^2 / \log n^2 \rfloor); s \geq 0 \right); \left(\frac{2C_\infty \log n}{n^2} \mathbf{F}^{(n)}(\lfloor tn \rfloor); t \geq 0 \right) \right) \\ & \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \left((\mathbf{H}_\kappa(sC_\infty/c_\infty); s \geq 0); (c_\infty \tau_{-t}(Y_2); t \geq 0) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The proof of the convergence of the rescaled height function for the Skorokhod topology on $D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$ can be found in the proof of Theorem 6.1 in [AdR17] when $\kappa > 2$ and in the proof Theorem 1 in [dR22] when $\kappa \in (1, 2]$. The proof of the convergence of the rescaled number of vertices for the Skorokhod topology on $D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$ can be deduced from Proposition 1.5 in [Kag23]. In both cases, the idea is to link $\mathbf{H}^{(n)}$ and $\mathbf{F}^{(n)}$ with functions of the same critical Galton-Watson forest. Precisely, it turns out that $\mathbf{H}^{(n)}$ is a simple function of $\mathbf{H}^{(n,1)}$ with high probability and $\mathbf{F}^{(n)}$ is a simple function of $\mathbf{V}^{(n,1)}$ with high probability, where $\mathbf{H}^{(n,1)}$ and $\mathbf{V}^{(n,1)}$ are respectively the height function and the Lukasiewicz path of the same critical Galton-Watson forest $\mathcal{F}^{(n,1)}$ (which is closely related to $\{x \in \mathcal{F}^{(n)}; \mathbf{t}_x^{(n)} = 1\}$). Hence, the convergence for the Skorokhod topology on $D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}) \times D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$ is a consequence of Corollary 2.5.2 in [DLG05].

Let us now introduce the reduced *multi-type additive martingale*:

$$\mathbf{Z}_k^{(n)}(p) := \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbf{Z}_k^{(n,i)} \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbf{Z}_k^{(n,i)} := \sum_{x \in \mathcal{R}_i^{(n)}} \mathbb{1}_{\{|x|_i=k\}} \mathbf{t}_x^{(n)}, \quad (17)$$

and for any $x \in \mathcal{R}_i^{(n)}$, $|x|_i$ is the generation of the vertex x relatively to the tree $\mathcal{R}_i^{(n)}$. In particular, $|e_i|_i = 0$ and for any $i \in \{1, \dots, B^{(n)}\}$, $|x| = |x|_i + |e_i|$. Also introduce the following reduced local time

$$\mathbf{L}_k^{(n)}(p) := \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbf{L}_k^{(n,i)} \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbf{L}_k^{(n,i)} := \mathbf{Z}_k^{(n,i)} + \mathbf{Z}_{k+1}^{(n,i)}. \quad (18)$$

Note that $\mathbf{Z}_k^{(n)}(p)$ (resp. $\mathbf{L}_k^{(n)}(p)$) is a sum of p i.i.d copies of $\mathbf{Z}_k^{(1)}$ (resp. $\mathbf{L}_k^{(1)}$) under the annealed probability \mathbb{P} .

3.2. Proofs of Theorem 2.1, Theorem 2.2 and Corollary 2.3

We begin this section with the proof of Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. We proceed in two steps.

Step 1: we provide an equivalent for $\mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E}(L_m^{(1)} > 0)$.

First assume that $\kappa \neq 2$. One can see that a direct consequence of the fact that $\mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E}(\sup_{x \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}^{(n)}} |x| \leq \lfloor (\log n)^3 \rfloor; \forall |y| \geq \lfloor (\log n)^3 \rfloor, \exists x \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}^{(n)} : x \leq y, \bar{\mathcal{B}}^{(n)} \subset \mathcal{B}^{(n)})$ goes to 1 for almost every environment is that, \mathbf{P}^* -almost surely as $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$\mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E} \left(\forall a \geq 0, L_{\lfloor an^{\kappa \wedge 2-1} \rfloor}^{(n)} = \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{B}^{(n)}} \mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa \wedge 2-1} \rfloor - |e_i|}^{(n,i)} \right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1. \quad (19)$$

Hence, by (19), using again that \mathbf{P} -almost surely, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E}(\forall 1 \leq i \leq \bar{B}^{(n)}; \lfloor (\log n)^2 \rfloor \leq |e_i| \leq \lfloor (\log n)^3 \rfloor) = 1$, together with the fact that $\{\mathbf{L}_{k-k^+}^{(n)}(\bar{B}^{(n)}) > 0\} \subset \{\sum_{i=1}^{\bar{B}^{(n)}} \mathbf{L}_{k-|e_i|}^{(n,i)} > 0\} \subset \{\mathbf{L}_{k-k^-}^{(n)}(\bar{B}^{(n)}) > 0\}$ for any $k^- \leq |e_i| \leq k^+ \leq k$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E} \left(L_{\lfloor n^{\kappa \wedge 2-1} \rfloor}^{(n)} > 0 \right) \leq \mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E} \left(\mathbf{L}_{\lfloor n^{\kappa \wedge 2-1} \rfloor - \lfloor (\log n)^3 \rfloor}^{(n)}(\bar{B}^{(n)}) > 0 \right) + o^\mathcal{E}(1),$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E} \left(L_{\lfloor n^{\kappa \wedge 2-1} \rfloor}^{(n)} > 0 \right) \geq \mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E} \left(\mathbf{L}_{\lfloor n^{\kappa \wedge 2-1} \rfloor - \lfloor (\log n)^2 \rfloor}^{(n)}(\bar{B}^{(n)}) > 0 \right) + o^\mathcal{E}(1),$$

where $o^\mathcal{E}(1)$ represent any sequence converging to 0, \mathbf{P}^* -almost surely as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let (a_n) be a sequence of positive integers such that $a_n/n^{\kappa \wedge 2-1} \rightarrow 1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E} \left(\mathbf{L}_{a_n}^{(n)}(\bar{B}^{(n)}) > 0 \right) &= \mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E} \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq \bar{B}^{(n)}} \mathbf{L}_{a_n}^{(n,i)} > 0 \right) = \mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E} \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq \bar{B}^{(n)}} \max_{x \in \mathcal{R}_i^{(n)}} |x| \geq a_n \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E} \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq \mathbf{F}^{(n)}(\bar{B}^{(n)})} \mathbf{H}^{(n)}(j) \geq a_n \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to Fact 3.4 (i) and (15) (noticing that W_∞ is deterministic at fixed environment), we have, in \mathbf{P}^* -law on $D([0, \infty)) \times \mathbb{R}$

$$\left(\left(\frac{C_\infty}{n^{\kappa \wedge 2-1}} \mathbf{H}^{(n)}(\lfloor sn^{\kappa \wedge 2} \rfloor); s \geq 0 \right), \frac{C_\infty}{n^{\kappa \wedge 2}} \mathbf{F}^{(n)}(\bar{B}^{(n)}) \right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \left((\mathbf{H}_\kappa(sC_\infty/c_\infty); s \geq 0), c_\infty \tau_{-W_\infty}(Y_\kappa) \right),$$

the giving, in \mathbf{P}^* -probability

$$\mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E} \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq \mathbf{F}^{(n)}(\bar{B}^{(n)})} \mathbf{H}^{(n)}(j) \geq a_n \right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} = \mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E} \left(\sup_{t \leq \tau_{-W_\infty}(Y_\kappa)} \mathbf{H}_\kappa(t) > C_\infty \right) = 1 - e^{-W_\infty v(C_\infty)},$$

where we have used excursion theory for the last equality and $v(a)$ satisfies $\int_{v(a)}^\infty d\lambda / (C_\kappa \lambda^{\kappa \wedge 2}) = a$. In other words, $v(C_\infty) = ((\kappa \wedge 2 - 1)C_\infty C_\kappa)^{-1/(\kappa \wedge 2-1)}$ thus giving (taking $a_n = \lfloor n^{\kappa \wedge 2-1} \rfloor - \lfloor (\log n)^3 \rfloor$ in a first time and $a_n = \lfloor n^{\kappa \wedge 2-1} \rfloor - \lfloor (\log n)^2 \rfloor$ in a second time), in \mathbf{P}^* -probability

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E} \left(L_{\lfloor n^{\kappa \wedge 2-1} \rfloor}^{(n)} > 0 \right) = 1 - \exp \left(-W_\infty ((\kappa \wedge 2 - 1)C_\infty C_\kappa)^{-1/(\kappa \wedge 2-1)} \right). \quad (20)$$

On the other hand, using that under $\mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E}$, $Z_k^{(p)}$ is a sum of p i.i.d random variables with law $Z_k^{(1)}$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E}\left(L_{\lfloor n^{\kappa \wedge 2-1} \rfloor}^{(n)} > 0\right) = 1 - \left(1 - \mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E}\left(Z_{\lfloor n^{\kappa \wedge 2-1} \rfloor}^{(1)} > 0\right)\right)^n,$$

and thanks to (20), we have, in \mathbf{P}^* -probability

$$n\mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E}\left(Z_{\lfloor n^{\kappa \wedge 2-1} \rfloor}^{(1)} > 0\right) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} W_\infty \left((\kappa \wedge 2 - 1) C_\infty \mathbf{C}_\kappa \right)^{-1/(\kappa \wedge 2 - 1)}. \quad (21)$$

We conclude by recalling the definition of \mathbf{C}_κ in (10). Now assume that $\kappa = 2$. Similarly, thanks to Fact 3.4 (ii)

$$\mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E}\left(L_{\lfloor n/\log n \rfloor}^{(n)} > 0\right) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} = \mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E}\left(\sup_{t \leq \tau - W_\infty(Y_\kappa)} \mathbf{H}_\kappa(t) > 2C_\infty\right) = 1 - e^{-W_\infty v(2C_\infty)} = 1 - e^{-W_\infty/(C_\infty c_2)},$$

where we have used that $\mathbf{C}_2 = c_2/2$, see (10). This yields, in \mathbf{P}^* -probability

$$n\mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E}\left(L_{\lfloor n/\log n \rfloor}^{(1)} > 0\right) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \frac{W_\infty}{C_\infty c_2},$$

and this ends the first step.

Step 2: we provide an equivalent for $\mathbb{P}(L_n^{(1)} > 0)$.

First assume that $\kappa \neq 2$. We have

$$n\mathbb{P}\left(L_{\lfloor n^{\kappa \wedge 2-1} \rfloor}^{(1)} > 0\right) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \left((\kappa \wedge 2 - 1) C_\infty \mathbf{C}_\kappa \right)^{-1/(\kappa \wedge 2 - 1)}. \quad (22)$$

Indeed, on the one hand, thanks to (20)

$$\mathbb{P}^*\left(\mathbf{L}_{\lfloor n^{\kappa \wedge 2-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\bar{B}^{(n)}) > 0\right) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \mathbf{E}^*\left[1 - \exp\left(-W_\infty \left((\kappa \wedge 2 - 1) C_\infty \mathbf{C}_\kappa \right)^{-1/(\kappa \wedge 2 - 1)}\right)\right].$$

On the other hand, by definition of $\mathbf{L}_k^{(n)}(\bar{B}^{(n)})$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{L}_{\lfloor n^{\kappa \wedge 2-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\bar{B}^{(n)}) > 0\right) &= 1 - \mathbb{P}\left(\forall 1 \leq i \leq \bar{B}^{(n)} : \mathbf{L}_{\lfloor n^{\kappa \wedge 2-1} \rfloor}^{(n,i)} = 0, \bar{B}^{(n)} > 0\right) - \mathbb{P}(\bar{B}^{(n)} = 0) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[1 - \left(1 - \mathbb{P}(L_{\lfloor n^{\kappa \wedge 2-1} \rfloor}^{(1)} > 0)\right)^{\bar{B}^{(n)}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\bar{B}^{(n)} > 0\}}\right] - \mathbb{P}(\bar{B}^{(n)} = 0) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[1 - \left(1 - \mathbb{P}(L_{\lfloor n^{\kappa \wedge 2-1} \rfloor}^{(1)} > 0)\right)^{\bar{B}^{(n)}}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Besides, using that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(\text{non-extinction of } \mathbb{T}) \times \mathbb{P}^*(\bar{B}^{(n)} > 0) = \mathbb{P}(\bar{B}^{(n)} > 0)$ yields, as $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$\mathbb{P}^*\left(\mathbf{L}_{\lfloor n^{\kappa \wedge 2-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\bar{B}^{(n)}) > 0\right) = \mathbf{E}^*\left[1 - \left(1 - \mathbb{P}(L_{\lfloor n^{\kappa \wedge 2-1} \rfloor}^{(1)} > 0)\right)^{\bar{B}^{(n)}}\right] + o(1).$$

By (15), we have that $\bar{B}^{(n)}/n \rightarrow W_\infty$ in \mathbf{P}^* -probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and since $\inf_{n \geq 1} \mathbf{P}^*(\mathbf{L}_{\lfloor n^{\kappa \wedge 2 - 1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\bar{B}^{(n)}) > 0) = 1 - \mathbf{E}^*[\exp(-W_\infty((\kappa \wedge 2 - 1)C_\infty \mathbf{C}_\kappa)^{-1/(\kappa \wedge 2 - 1)})] \in (0, 1)$, we deduce that the sequence $(n\mathbf{P}(L_{\lfloor n^{\kappa \wedge 2 - 1} \rfloor}^{(1)} > 0))_{n \geq 1}$ is bounded and if we denote by $\zeta \in (0, 1]$ the limit of a sub-sequence, we then also deduce that

$$\mathbf{E}^*[\exp(-\zeta W_\infty)] = \mathbf{E}^*\left[\exp\left(-W_\infty((\kappa \wedge 2 - 1)C_\infty \mathbf{C}_\kappa)^{-1/(\kappa \wedge 2 - 1)}\right)\right].$$

Finally, since $\mathbf{P}^*(W_\infty > 0) = 1$, the function $\theta \in (0, \infty) \mapsto \mathbf{E}^*[\exp(-\theta W_\infty)]$ is injective and in particular, we necessarily have $\zeta = ((\kappa \wedge 2 - 1)C_\infty \mathbf{C}_\kappa)^{-1/(\kappa \wedge 2 - 1)}$ and this is what we wanted.

The exact same strategy for $\kappa = 2$ gives

$$n\mathbf{P}(L_{\lfloor n/\log n \rfloor}^{(1)} > 0) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{C_\infty c_2},$$

and the second step is completed.

Finally, combining **Step 1** and **Step 2** yields, for any $\kappa > 1$, in \mathbf{P}^* -probability

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E}(L_m^{(1)} > 0)}{\mathbb{P}(L_m^{(1)} > 0)} \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} W_\infty,$$

which ends the proof of our first theorem. \square

We are now ready to prove our second result, Theorem 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. We only deal with the case $\kappa \in (1, 2)$, the proof is the same for $\kappa \geq 2$. We want to prove that for any $a > 0$, in \mathbf{P}^* -law

$$\frac{1}{n}L_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 2W_\infty \mathcal{Y}_{a/(W_\infty)^{\kappa-1}}^{(\kappa)},$$

where we recall the definition of $\mathcal{Y}^{(\kappa)}$ in (11). The proof is divided into four steps.

Step 1: we can restrict ourselves to the convergence of the reduced local time.

Let us first prove that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and any $a > 0$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\left|L_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)} - \mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\bar{B}^{(n)})\right| > n\varepsilon\right) = 0, \quad (23)$$

where we recall that $\mathbf{L}_k^{(n)}(p) = \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbf{L}_k^{(n,i)}$ with $\mathbf{L}_k^{(n,i)} = \mathbf{Z}_k^{(n,i)} + \mathbf{Z}_{k+1}^{(n,i)}$ and $\mathbf{Z}_k^{(n,i)} = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{R}_i^{(n)}} \mathbb{1}_{\{|x|=k\}} \mathbf{t}_x^{(n)}$. Thanks to (19), it is enough to show

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^{\bar{B}^{(n)}} \mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor - |e_i|}^{(n,i)} - \mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\bar{B}^{(n)})\right| > n\varepsilon\right) = 0. \quad (24)$$

For that, we prove

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{\lambda_1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{B}^{(n)}} \mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor - |e_i|}^{(n,i)} e^{-\frac{\lambda_2}{n} \mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\bar{B}^{(n)})} \right] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) W_\infty \mathcal{Y}_{a/W_\infty}^{(\kappa)}} \right], \quad (25)$$

for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \geq 0$. Let $q_n := p_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}$ and recall that $\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_{j \geq 0} (\mathbb{N})^j$ is the set of finite \mathbb{N} -valued sequences, with the convention that \mathbb{N}^0 only contains the sequence with length 0. For any $b \geq 0$, introduce $\mathbf{C}_{\kappa,b} := (b(\kappa - 1)C_\infty \mathbf{C}_\kappa)^{-1/(\kappa-1)}$, recall the definition of \mathbf{C}_κ in (10). By definition of the reduced range, we have

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\lambda_1 q_n \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{B}^{(n)}} \mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor - |e_i|}^{(n,i)} e^{-\lambda_2 q_n \mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\bar{B}^{(n)})} \right] - \mathbf{E} \left[e^{-\mathbf{C}_{\kappa,a} W_\infty (1 - \phi^{(\kappa)}(2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2))} \right] \right|$$

is smaller than

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{U = \{u(i); i \geq 1\} \subset \mathcal{U} \\ \lfloor (\log n)^2 \rfloor \leq |u(i)| \leq \lfloor (\log n)^3 \rfloor}} \mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}^{(n)} = U) \\ & \times \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \prod_{i=1}^{\bar{B}^{(n)}} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\lambda_1 q_n L_{\kappa_i, n}^{(1)} e^{-\lambda_2 q_n L_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(1)}} \right] - \mathbf{E} \left[e^{-\mathbf{C}_{\kappa,a} W_\infty (1 - \phi^{(\kappa)}(2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2))} \right] \right| \right] + o(1), \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where $\kappa_{i,n} := \lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor - |u(i)|$ and we have used that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{E}}(\forall x \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}^{(n)}, \lfloor (\log n)^2 \rfloor \leq |x| \leq \lfloor (\log n)^3 \rfloor, \bar{\mathcal{B}}^{(n)} \subset \mathcal{B}^{(n)}) = 1$, \mathbf{P} -almost surely. Now, by Proposition 2.4

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\lambda_1 q_n L_{\kappa_i, n}^{(1)} e^{-\lambda_2 q_n L_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(1)}} \right]^{1/q_n} = e^{-(1 - \phi^{(\kappa)}(2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2))},$$

uniformly in $i \geq 1$. By (15), we have $\bar{B}^{(n)}/n \rightarrow W_\infty$ in \mathbb{P} -probability so Theorem 2.1 gives $q_n \bar{B}^{(n)} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_{\kappa,a} W_\infty$. Hence, (26) yields

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\lambda_1 q_n \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{B}^{(n)}} \mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor - |e_i|}^{(n,i)} e^{-\lambda_2 q_n \mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\bar{B}^{(n)})} \right] = \mathbf{E} \left[e^{-\mathbf{C}_{\kappa,a} W_\infty (1 - \phi^{(\kappa)}(2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2))} \right].$$

To obtain (25), we are only left to check that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) \mathbf{C}_{\kappa,a} W_\infty \mathcal{Y}_{a/W_\infty}^{(\kappa)}} \right] = \mathbf{E} \left[e^{-\mathbf{C}_{\kappa,a} W_\infty (1 - \phi^{(\kappa)}(2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2))} \right].$$

Indeed, by definition of $\mathcal{Y}^{(\kappa)}$ in (11), we have, for any $\theta \geq 0$ and any $b \geq 0$

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}} \left[e^{-\theta \mathcal{Y}_b^{(\kappa)}} \right] = e^{-\mathbf{C}_{\kappa,b} (1 - \phi^{(\kappa)}(\theta / \mathbf{C}_{\kappa,b}))},$$

so taking $b = a/(W_\infty)^{\kappa-1}$ and $\theta = 2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) \mathbf{C}_{\kappa,a} W_\infty$ gives $\mathbf{C}_{\kappa,b} = \mathbf{C}_{\kappa,a} W_\infty$ and $\phi^{(\kappa)}(\theta / \mathbf{C}_{\kappa,b}) = 2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)$ so the proof of (25) is completed. We now deduce from (25) that the sequence of random variables

$(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{B}^{(n)}} \mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n,i)} - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\bar{B}^{(n)}))_{n \geq 1}$ converges in law under \mathbb{P} to 0, thus implying the convergence to 0 in \mathbb{P} -probability (and also in \mathbb{P}^* -probability) and we finally get (24). In view of (24), we only have to prove that in \mathbf{P}^* -law

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\bar{B}^{(n)}) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 2W_\infty \mathcal{Y}_{a/(W_\infty)^{\kappa-1}}^{(\kappa)}. \quad (27)$$

The next steps are devoted to the proof of (27).

Step 2: convergence of the reduced local time under \mathbb{P}

This step is dedicated to the following: we show that under the annealed probability \mathbb{P} , in law for the Skorokhod topology on $D((0, \infty], \mathbb{R})$

$$\left(\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\lfloor tn \rfloor); t \geq 0 \right) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} (2t \mathcal{Y}_{a/t^{\kappa-1}}^{(\kappa)}; t \geq 0). \quad (28)$$

Recall that under \mathbb{P} , $\mathbf{L}_k^{(n)}(p)$ is a sum of p independent copies of $L_k^{(1)}$ under \mathbb{P} . Therefore, the convergence of finite-dimensional marginals comes from **Step 1** with (by replacing $\bar{B}^{(n)}$ with $\lfloor tn \rfloor$ and then W_∞ with t and taking $\lambda_1 = 0$ in (25)). Let us now check that, in law under \mathbb{P} , $2\mathcal{Y}_a^{(\kappa)} - 2(1-\delta)\mathcal{Y}_{a/(1-\delta)^{\kappa-1}}^{(\kappa)} \rightarrow 0$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. For any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \geq 0$, we have, by (11)

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\lambda_1 \mathcal{Y}_a^{(\kappa)}} e^{-\lambda_2 (1-\delta) \mathcal{Y}_{a/(1-\delta)^{\kappa-1}}^{(\kappa)}} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-C_{\delta, \lambda_1, \lambda_2} \mathcal{Y}_a^{(\kappa)}} \right],$$

where $C_{\delta, \lambda_1, \lambda_2} := \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 (1 + ((1-\delta)^{1-\kappa} - 1)(\lambda_1(1-\delta)/\mathbf{C}_{\kappa, a})^{\kappa-1})^{-1/(\kappa-1)}$. Note that $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} C_{\delta, \lambda_1, \lambda_2} = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2$ so

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\lambda_1 \mathcal{Y}_a^{(\kappa)}} e^{-\lambda_2 (1-\delta) \mathcal{Y}_{a/(1-\delta)^{\kappa-1}}^{(\kappa)}} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) \mathcal{Y}_a^{(\kappa)}} \right],$$

and in particular, $2\mathcal{Y}_a^{(\kappa)} - 2(1-\delta)\mathcal{Y}_{a/(1-\delta)^{\kappa-1}}^{(\kappa)} \rightarrow 0$ in law under \mathbb{P} as $\delta \rightarrow \infty$. Finally, let $B > 0$, $0 < r < s < t$ and $n \geq 1$. We have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\lfloor sn \rfloor) - \mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\lfloor rn \rfloor) \right| \wedge \left| \mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\lfloor tn \rfloor) - \mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\lfloor sn \rfloor) \right| \geq Bn \right) \leq \frac{16}{B^2} (t-r)^2.$$

Indeed

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\lfloor sn \rfloor) - \mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\lfloor rn \rfloor) \right| \wedge \left| \mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\lfloor tn \rfloor) - \mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\lfloor sn \rfloor) \right| \geq Bn \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(\mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\lfloor sn \rfloor) - \mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\lfloor rn \rfloor) \geq Bn \right) \mathbb{P} \left(\mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\lfloor tn \rfloor) - \mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\lfloor sn \rfloor) \geq Bn \right) \\ &\leq \frac{4}{B^2} \frac{(\lfloor sn \rfloor - \lfloor rn \rfloor)(\lfloor tn \rfloor - \lfloor sn \rfloor)}{n^2} \leq \frac{4}{B^2} \frac{(\lfloor tn \rfloor - \lfloor rn \rfloor)^2}{n^2} \leq \frac{16}{B^2} (t-r)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Markov inequality and the fact that $\mathbb{E}[L_k^{(p)}] = 2p$ for the first inequality. We then obtain the convergence in law under \mathbb{P} (28) by using Theorem 13.5 in [Bil99].

Step 3: convergence of the reduced local time under $\mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E}$

We show in this step that the convergence (28) actually holds under the quenched probability $\mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E}$ for \mathbf{P}^* -almost every environment \mathcal{E} . Precisely, using the same argument as in proof of Theorem 1.1 in [AdR17], one can show that for any continuous and bounded function $\Phi : D([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, \mathbf{P}^* -almost surely

$$\mathbb{E}^\mathcal{E} \left[\Phi \left((\mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\lfloor tn \rfloor)/n; t \geq 0) \right) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\Phi \left((\mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\lfloor tn \rfloor)/n; t \geq 0) \right) \right] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Besides, we know thanks to **Step 2** that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\Phi((\mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\lfloor tn \rfloor)/n; t \geq 0))] = \mathbb{E}[\Phi((2t\mathcal{Y}_{a/t^{\kappa-1}}^{(\kappa)}; t \geq 0))]$, and in particular $(\mathbb{E}^\mathcal{E}[\Phi((\mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\lfloor tn \rfloor)/n; t \geq 0))])_{n \geq 1}$ converges to the same limit for \mathbf{P}^* -almost every environment, thus giving the convergence under the quenched probability $\mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E}$.

Step 4: convergence in \mathbf{P}^* -law of the local time

We have reached the final step of the proof and we are now ready to show (27), that in \mathbf{P}^* -law

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\bar{B}^{(n)}) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 2W_\infty \mathcal{Y}_{a/(W_\infty)^{\kappa-1}}^{(\kappa)}.$$

Let $\lambda \geq 0$. By **Step 3**, we have, for any $M > 0$, \mathbf{P}^* -almost surely

$$\mathbb{E}^\mathcal{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, M]} e^{-\frac{\lambda}{n} \mathbf{L}_{\lfloor an^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}(\lfloor tn \rfloor)} \right] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}^\mathcal{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, M]} e^{-\lambda 2t \mathcal{Y}_{a/t^{\kappa-1}}^{(\kappa)}} \right],$$

and we conclude by recalling that $\bar{B}^{(n)}/n \rightarrow W_\infty$ in \mathbb{P}^* -probability, see (15) and this ends the proof of our theorem. \square

We end this section with the proof of Corollary 2.3.

Proof of Corollary 2.3. Again, we only deal with the case $\kappa \in (1, 2)$, the proof is the same when $\kappa \geq 2$. Corollary 2.3 is a direct consequence of Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2. Indeed, on the one hand, in \mathbf{P}^* -probability

$$\mathbb{E}^\mathcal{E} \left[e^{-\frac{\lambda}{n} L_{\lfloor n^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(1)}} \right]^n = \mathbb{E}^\mathcal{E} \left[e^{-\frac{\lambda}{n} L_{\lfloor n^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(n)}} \right] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}^\mathcal{E} \left[e^{-2\lambda W_\infty \mathcal{Y}_{1/(W_\infty)^{\kappa-1}}^{(\kappa)}} \right] = e^{-\mathbf{C}_{\kappa,1} W_\infty (1 - \phi^{(\kappa)}(2\lambda/\mathbf{C}_{\kappa,1}))},$$

where we have used Theorem 2.2 and we recall that $\mathbf{C}_{\kappa,b} = (b(\kappa - 1)C_\infty \mathbf{C}_\kappa)^{-1/(\kappa-1)}$, see **Step 1** in the proof of Theorem 2.2, see (26). On the other hand

$$\mathbb{E}^\mathcal{E} \left[e^{-\frac{\lambda}{n} L_{\lfloor n^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(1)}} \right] = 1 - \mathbb{P}^\mathcal{E} \left(L_{\lfloor n^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(1)} > 0 \right) \left(1 - \mathbb{E}^\mathcal{E} \left[e^{-\frac{\lambda}{n} L_{\lfloor n^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(1)}} \mid L_{\lfloor n^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(1)} > 0 \right] \right),$$

so Theorem 2.1 immediately gives, in \mathbf{P}^* -probability

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}} \left[e^{-\frac{\lambda}{n} L_{\lfloor n^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(1)}} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{ L_{\lfloor n^{\kappa-1} \rfloor}^{(1)} > 0 \right\}} \right] = \phi^{(\kappa)}(2\lambda/\mathbf{C}_{\kappa,1}),$$

which is exactly what we wanted. \square

3.3. Proof of Proposition 2.4

The last section of this paper is dedicated to the proof of Proposition 2.4.

Proof of Proposition 2.4. Recall that $p_k^{\mathcal{E}} = \mathbb{P}^{\mathcal{E}}(Z_k^{(1)} > 0)$, $p_k = \mathbf{E}[p_k^{\mathcal{E}}] = \mathbb{P}(Z_k^{(1)} > 0)$, $G_k^{\mathcal{E}}(s, p) = \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}[s^{Z_k^{(p)}}]$, $G_k(s, p) = \mathbf{E}[G_k^{\mathcal{E}}(s, p)]$, $G_k^{\mathcal{E}}(s) = G_k^{\mathcal{E}}(s, 1)$ and $G_k(s) = \mathbf{E}[G_k^{\mathcal{E}}(s)]$. Also, for any integer $i \geq 1$, $(\gamma_{i,m})_{m \geq 1}$ and $(\rho_{i,m})_{m \geq 1}$ are two sequences of positive integers such that $\gamma_m^- \leq \gamma_{i,m} \leq \gamma_m^+$ and $\rho_m^- \leq \rho_{i,m} \leq \rho_m^+$ where $\gamma_m^-/m \rightarrow 1$, $\gamma_m^+/m \rightarrow 1$ and $\rho_m^+/m \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. We want to prove that for any $\lambda > 0$, uniformly in $i \geq 1$

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\lambda_1 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)}} e^{-\lambda_2 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,m} + \rho_{i,m}}^{(1)}} \right] \right)^{1/p_m} = e^{-(1-\phi^{(\kappa)})(2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2)}.$$

where $\phi^{(\kappa)}(\lambda)$ is defined in (12). For that, we follow an idea developed in the proof of Theorem 1 in [Sla68]. Let us first prove that for any $\lambda \geq 0$

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(G_{\gamma_{i,m}}(e^{-\lambda p_m}) \right)^{1/p_m} = e^{-(1-\phi^{(\kappa)}(\lambda))}, \quad (29)$$

uniformly in $i \geq 1$. Since $e^{-\lambda p_m} \rightarrow 1$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$, there exists a sequence $(k_m)_{m \geq 1}$ of integers (depending on λ) such that $k_m \rightarrow \infty$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$ and for any $m \geq 1$

$$G_{k_m}(0) \leq e^{-\lambda p_m} < G_{k_m+1}(0). \quad (30)$$

Note that we necessarily have $m/k_m \rightarrow \lambda^{\kappa \wedge 2 - 1}$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$ for all $\kappa > 1$. Indeed, noticing that $G_k(0) = 1 - p_k$, we have by Theorem 2.1 that $\ell^{1/(\kappa \wedge 2 - 1)}(1 - G_\ell(0))$ goes to $((\kappa \wedge 2 - 1)C_\infty \mathbf{C}_\kappa)^{-1/(\kappa \wedge 2 - 1)}$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ when $\kappa \neq 2$ and $(\ell \log \ell)(1 - G_\ell(0))$ goes to $(C_\infty \mathbf{C}_2)^{-1}$ when $\kappa = 2$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, by definition, $(1 - e^{-\lambda p_m})/(1 - G_m(0)) \rightarrow \lambda$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, by (30), $\liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} (1 - G_{k_m})/(1 - G_m(0)) \geq \lambda$ and $\limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} (1 - G_{k_m+1})/(1 - G_m(0)) \leq \lambda$ thus giving $m/k_m \rightarrow \lambda^{\kappa \wedge 2 - 1}$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$ for all $\kappa > 1$.

Let us now deal with the upper bound in (29). We have

$$G_{\gamma_{i,m}}(e^{-\lambda p_m}) \leq G_{\gamma_{i,m}}(G_{k_m+1}(0)) \leq G_{\gamma_{i,m} + k_m + 1}(0) \leq G_{\gamma_m^+ + k_m + 1}(0) = 1 - p_{\gamma_m^+ + k_m + 1},$$

where we have used (30) and the fact that G_k is non-decreasing for the first inequality, Lemma 3.1 (lower bound) saying that $G_k(G_\ell(s)) \leq G_{k+\ell}(s)$ for the second one and the fact that the sequence $(G_k(0))_{k \geq 1}$

is non-decreasing for the last inequality. Using again Theorem 2.1, we get that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} p_{\gamma_m^+ + k_m + 1} / p_m = (1 + \lambda^{-(\kappa \wedge 2 - 1)})^{-1/(\kappa \wedge 2 - 1)}$ which is nothing but $1 - \phi^{(\kappa)}(\lambda)$. Therefore, uniformly in $i \geq 1$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(G_{\gamma_{i,m}}(e^{-\lambda p_m}) \right)^{1/p_m} \leq e^{-(1 - \phi^{(\kappa)}(\lambda))}.$$

We now deal with the lower bound in (29). Note that $\mathbf{E}[(p_{k_m}^{\mathcal{E}})^\alpha] / p_{k_m} \leq (p_{k_m})^{\alpha-1} \sup_{\ell \geq 0} \mathbf{E}[(p_\ell^{\mathcal{E}} / p_\ell)^\alpha] \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$ for any $\alpha \in (1, \kappa \wedge 2)$ by Remark 1 (we recall that $k_m \rightarrow \infty$). Hence, by Lemma 3.2 with $t_m = p_{k_m}$ and $s_m = \mathbf{E}[(p_{k_m}^{\mathcal{E}})^\alpha]$, recalling that $p_k = 1 - G_k(0)$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-p_{k_m} Z_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)} + \sum_{|u|=\gamma_{i,m}} (N_u^{(1)})^\alpha \mathbf{E}[(p_{k_m}^{\mathcal{E}})^\alpha]} \right] = G_{\gamma_{i,m}}(e^{-p_{k_m}}) + o(p_{k_m}),$$

as $m \rightarrow \infty$, uniformly in $i \geq 1$. Now, if $t_{i,m} := p_{k_m}$ and $s_{i,m} := -\log G_{k_m}(0) = -\log(1 - p_{k_m})$ for all $i \geq 1$, then by Theorem 2.1, since $m/k_m \rightarrow \lambda^{\kappa \wedge 2 - 1}$, we have $\sup_{i \geq 1} |t_{i,m} / p_{\gamma_{i,n}} - \lambda| \rightarrow 0$ and $\sup_{i \geq 1} |s_{i,m} / p_{\gamma_{i,n}} - \lambda| \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$, uniformly in $i \geq 1$ so Lemma 3.3 yields

$$G_{\gamma_{i,m}}(G_{k_m}(0)) = (1 + o(1))^{p_{k_m}} \left(o(p_{k_m}) + \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-p_{k_m} Z_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)} + \sum_{|u|=\gamma_{i,m}} (N_u^{(1)})^\alpha \mathbf{E}[(p_{k_m}^{\mathcal{E}})^\alpha]} \right] \right),$$

as $m \rightarrow \infty$, uniformly in $i \geq 1$. Hence, Lemma 3.1 (upper bound) together with the fact that $(G_k(0))_{k \geq 1}$ is non-decreasing lead to

$$G_{\gamma_{i,m}}(G_{k_m}(0)) \geq (1 + o(1))^{p_{k_m}} \left(o(p_{k_m}) + G_{\gamma_{i,m} + k_m}(0) \right) \geq (1 + o(1))^{p_{k_m}} \left(o(p_{k_m}) + 1 - p_{\gamma_m^- + k_m} \right),$$

and since, by (30), $G_{\gamma_{i,m}}(G_{k_m}(0)) \leq G_{\gamma_{i,m}}(e^{-\lambda p_m})$, we finally obtain

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(G_{\gamma_{i,m}}(e^{-\lambda p_m}) \right)^{1/p_m} \geq e^{-(1 - \phi^{(\kappa)}(\lambda))},$$

uniformly in $i \geq 1$, where we have used that $p_{\gamma_m^- + k_m} / p_m \rightarrow (1 - \phi^{(\kappa)}(\lambda))$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$, thus giving (29).

Let us now prove that for any $i \geq 1$ and any sequence $(a_{i,m})_{m \geq 1}$ of positive integers such that $a_m^- \leq a_{i,m} \leq a_m^+$ where $a_m^+ = o(m)$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$, we have, uniformly in $i \geq 1$

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(G_{a_{i,m}}(e^{-\lambda p_m}) \right)^{1/p_m} = e^{-\lambda}. \quad (31)$$

Indeed, we still have

$$(1 + o(1))^{p_{k_m}} \left(o(p_{k_m}) + (1 - p_{a_m^- + k_m}) \right) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\lambda p_m Z_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)}} \right] \leq 1 - p_{a_m^+ + k_m},$$

as $m \rightarrow \infty$ and uniformly in $i \geq 1$. Finally, recalling that $m/k_m \rightarrow \lambda^{\kappa \wedge 2 - 1}$ and since $a_m^- \leq a_m^+ = o(m)$, we have $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} p_{a_m^- + k_m} / p_m = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} p_{a_m^+ + k_m} / p_m = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (m/k_m)^{1/(\kappa \wedge 2 - 1)} = \lambda$ thus giving (31).

We are now ready to prove our main statement. Thanks to the branching property **(BP)**

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\lambda_1 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)}} e^{-\lambda_2 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,m} + \rho_{i,m}}^{(1)}} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\lambda_1 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,n}}^{(1)}} e^{-\lambda_2 p_m Z_{\gamma_{i,m} + \rho_{i,m}}^{(1)}} \prod_{|u|=\gamma_{i,m} + \rho_{i,m}} G_1 \left(e^{-\lambda_2 p_m}, N_u^{(1)} \right) \right].$$

For the lower bound, by Lemma 3.1, we have $G_\ell(s, p) \geq (G_\ell(s))^p$ so

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\lambda_1 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)}} e^{-\lambda_2 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,m} + \rho_{i,m}}^{(1)}} \right] \geq \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\lambda_1 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,n}}^{(1)}} \left(e^{-\lambda_2 p_m G_1(e^{-\lambda_2 p_m})} \right)^{Z_{\gamma_{i,m} + \rho_{i,m}}^{(1)}} \right].$$

Again, thanks to the branching property **(BP)** and the fact that $G_\ell(s, p) \geq (G_\ell(s))^p$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\lambda_1 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,n}}^{(1)}} \left(e^{-\lambda_2 p_m G_1(e^{-\lambda_2 p_m})} \right)^{Z_{\gamma_{i,m} + \rho_{i,m}}^{(1)}} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\lambda_1 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,n}}^{(1)}} \prod_{|u|=\gamma_{i,m} + 1} G_{\rho_{i,m} - 1} \left(e^{-\lambda_2 p_m G_1(e^{-\lambda_2 p_m})}, N_u^{(1)} \right) \right] \geq \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\lambda_1 p_m Z_{\gamma_{i,n}}^{(1)}} (\mathfrak{g}_{i,m})^{Z_{\gamma_{i,m} + 1}^{(1)}} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathfrak{g}_{i,m} := e^{-\lambda_1 p_m G_{\rho_{i,m} - 1} \left(e^{-\lambda_2 p_m G_1(e^{-\lambda_2 p_m})} \right)}.$$

Doing this one more time to finally obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\lambda_1 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)}} e^{-\lambda_2 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,m} + \rho_{i,m}}^{(1)}} \right] \geq G_{\gamma_{i,m}} \left(e^{-\lambda_1 p_m G_1(\mathfrak{g}_{i,m})} \right).$$

Clearly, $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (e^{-\lambda_2 p_m G_1(e^{-\lambda_2 p_m})})^{1/p_m} = e^{-2\lambda_2}$ and recalling that $\rho_m^- \leq \rho_{i,m} \leq \rho_m^+ = o(m)$, (31) yields $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (\mathfrak{g}_{i,m})^{1/p_m} = e^{-\lambda_1 - 2\lambda_2}$. Then, we get that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (e^{-\lambda_1 p_m G_1(\mathfrak{g}_{i,m})})^{1/p_m} = e^{-2\lambda_1 - 2\lambda_2}$, uniformly in $i \geq 1$. Hence, recalling that $\gamma_m^- \leq \gamma_{i,m} \leq \gamma_m^+$ with $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_m^-/m = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_m^+/m = 1$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$ and that the sequence $(p_k)_{k \geq 1}$ is non-increasing, we have, by Lemma 3.3 with $t_{i,m} = (2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2)p_m$ and $s_{i,m} = \lambda_1 p_m - \log G_1(\mathfrak{g}_{i,m})$, that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\lambda_1 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)}} e^{-\lambda_2 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,m} + \rho_{i,m}}^{(1)}} \right] \geq (1 + o(1))^{p_m} G_{\gamma_{i,m}} \left(e^{-2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)p_m} \right),$$

as $m \rightarrow \infty$, uniformly in $i \geq 1$. Therefore, (29) yields

$$\liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\lambda_1 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)}} e^{-\lambda_2 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,m} + \rho_{i,m}}^{(1)}} \right]^{1/p_m} \geq e^{-(1 - \phi(\kappa))(2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2)},$$

uniformly in $i \geq 1$. For the upper bound, we have, thanks to the branching property **(BP)** and Lemma 3.1 (upper bound), that for any $\alpha \in (1, \kappa \wedge 2)$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\lambda_1 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)}} e^{-\lambda_2 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,m} + \rho_{i,m}}^{(1)}} \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\lambda_1 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,n}}^{(1)}} e^{-(\lambda_2 p_m + 1 - G_1(e^{-\lambda_2 p_m})) Z_{\gamma_{i,m} + \rho_{i,m}}^{(1)}} e^{\sum_{|u|=\gamma_{i,m} + \rho_{i,m}} (N_u^{(1)})^\alpha \mathbf{E} \left[(1 - G_1^\alpha(e^{-\lambda_2 p_m}))^\alpha \right]} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $(1 - G_1^\varepsilon(e^{-\lambda_2 p_m}))^\alpha = (\mathbb{E}^\varepsilon[1 - e^{-\lambda_2 p_m Z_1^{(1)}}])^\alpha \leq (\mathbb{E}^\varepsilon[\lambda_2 p_m Z_1^{(1)}])^\alpha = (\lambda_2 p_m)^\alpha (W_1)^\alpha$. Recall that under the Assumptions 1 and 2, we have $\sup_{\ell \geq 0} \mathbf{E}[(W_\ell)^\alpha] < \infty$ so Lemma 3.2 with $t_m = p_m$ and $s_m = \mathbf{E}[(1 - G_1^\varepsilon(e^{-\lambda_2 p_m}))^\alpha]$ yields

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\lambda_1 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)}} e^{-\lambda_2 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,m} + \rho_{i,m}}^{(1)}}\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\lambda_1 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)}} e^{-\left(\lambda_2 p_m + 1 - G_1(e^{-\lambda_2 p_m})\right) Z_{\gamma_{i,m} + \rho_{i,m}}^{(1)}}\right] + o(p_m),$$

as $m \rightarrow \infty$, uniformly in $i \geq 1$. Repeating this procedure, one can prove using similar arguments as in the proof of the lower bound that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\lambda_1 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)}} e^{-\lambda_2 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,m} + \rho_{i,m}}^{(1)}}\right] \leq G_{\gamma_{i,m}}\left(e^{-(\lambda_1 p_m + \mathfrak{z}_{i,m})}\right) + o(p_m),$$

where for any $i \geq 1$, $(\mathfrak{z}_{i,m})_{m \geq 1}$ is a sequence of positive numbers such that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{z}_{i,m}/p_m = \lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2$ uniformly in $i \geq 1$. Hence, using Lemma 3.3 with $t_{i,m} = (2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2)p_m$ and $s_{i,m} = \mathfrak{z}_{i,m}$, we get

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\lambda_1 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)}} e^{-\lambda_2 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,m} + \rho_{i,m}}^{(1)}}\right] \leq (1 + o(1))^{p_m} G_{\gamma_{i,m}}\left(e^{-2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)p_m}\right) + o(p_m),$$

as $m \rightarrow \infty$, uniformly in $i \geq 1$. Therefore, (29) yields

$$\limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\lambda_1 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,m}}^{(1)}} e^{-\lambda_2 p_m L_{\gamma_{i,m} + \rho_{i,m}}^{(1)}}\right]^{1/p_m} \leq e^{-(1 - \phi(\kappa))(2\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2)},$$

uniformly in $i \geq 1$, thus completing the proof. \square

Acknowledgments. This work is partially funded by Hua Loo-Keng Center for Mathematical Sciences (AMSS, Chinese Academy of Sciences) and by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12288201). The author is also partially supported for this work by the NZ Royal Society Te Apārangi Marsden Fund (22-UOA-052) entitled "Genealogies of samples of individuals selected at random from stochastic populations: probabilistic structure and applications".

References

- [AC18] Pierre Andreatti and Xinxin Chen. Range and critical generations of a random walk on Galton-Watson trees. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 54(1):466–513, 2018.
- [AD14a] P. Andreatti and P. Debs. The number of generations entirely visited for recurrent random walks on random environment. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 27: 518 – 538, 2014.
- [AD14b] P. Andreatti and P. Debs. Spread of visited sites of a random walk along the generations of a branching process. *Electronic Journal of Probab.*, 19:1–22, 2014.

- [AD20] Pierre Andreatti and Roland Diel. The heavy range of randomly biased walks on trees. Stochastic Processes and their Applications, 130(2):962 – 999, 2020.
- [AdR17] E. Aïdékon and L. de Raphélis. Scaling limit of the recurrent biased random walk on a Galton-Watson tree. Probability Theory and Related Fields, 169(3):643–666, 2017.
- [AFGH12] Gérard Ben Arous, Alexander Fribergh, Nina Gantert, and Alan Hammond. Biased random walks on Galton–Watson trees with leaves. The Annals of Probability, 40(1):280 – 338, 2012.
- [AI09] Gerold Alsmeyer and Alex Iksanov. A Log-Type Moment Result for Perpetuities and Its Application to Martingales in Supercritical Branching Random Walks. Electronic Journal of Probability, 14(none):289 – 313, 2009.
- [Aïd08] E. Aïdékon. Transient random walks in random environment on a Galton-Watson tree. Probability Theory and Related, 142(3):525–559, 2008.
- [Aïd14] Elie Aïdékon. Speed of the biased random walk on a Galton–Watson tree. Probability Theory and Related Fields, 159(3):597–617, 2014.
- [AK24] Pierre Andreatti and Alexis Kagan. Generalized range of slow random walks on trees. Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques, 60(2):1458 – 1509, 2024.
- [Big77] J. D. Biggins. Martingale convergence in the branching random walk. Journal of Applied Probability, 14(1):25–37, 1977.
- [Bil99] P. Billingsley. Convergence of Probability Measures, Second Edition. John Wiley Sons, 1999.
- [CdR20] Xinxin Chen and Loïc de Raphélis. Maximal local time of randomly biased random walks on a Galton-Watson tree, 2020.
- [DLG05] Thomas Duquesne and Jean-Francois Le Gall. Random trees, levy processes and spatial branching processes. Astérisque, 281, 10 2005.
- [dR22] Loïc de Raphélis. Scaling limit of the subdiffusive random walk on a Galton–Watson tree in random environment. The Annals of Probability, 50(1):339 – 396, 2022.
- [Far11] G. Faraud. A central limit theorem for random walk in a random environment on marked Galton-Watson trees. Electronic Journal of Probability, 16(6):174–215, 2011.
- [FHS11] G. Faraud, Y. Hu, and Z. Shi. Almost sure convergence for stochastically biased random walks on trees. Probab. Theory Relat. Fields, 154:621–660, 2011.
- [HS07] Y. Hu and Z. Shi. Slow movement of recurrent random walk in random environment on a regular tree. Ann. Probab., 35:1978–1997, 2007.
- [HS16] Y. Hu and Z. Shi. The potential energy of biased random walks on trees. arXiv : <http://arxiv.org/abs/1403.6799>, 2016.
- [Hu17] Y. Hu. Local times of subdiffusive biased walks on trees. J. of Theoret. Probab., 30(2):529–550, 2017.
- [Kag23] Alexis Kagan. Scaling limit for local times and return times of a randomly biased walk on a

- Galton-Watson tree. Preprint, 2023.
- [KNS66] H. Kesten, P. Ney, and F. Spitzer. The galton-watson process with mean one and finite variance. Theory of Probability & Its Applications, 11(4):513–540, 1966.
- [Liu00] Quansheng Liu. On generalized multiplicative cascades. Stochastic Processes and their Applications, 86(2):263–286, 2000.
- [LP92] Russell Lyons and Robin Pemantle. Random walk in a random environment and first-passage percolation on trees. Annals of Probability, 20:125–136, 1992.
- [LPP96a] Russell Lyons, Robin Pemantle, and Yuval Peres. Biased random walks on Galton-Watson trees. Probability Theory and Related Fields, 106, 10 1996.
- [LPP96b] Russell Lyons, Robin Pemantle, and Yuval Peres. Ergodic theory on Galton-Watson trees: Speed of random walk and dimension of harmonic measure. Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems, 15, 10 1996.
- [Lyo90] R. Lyons. Random walks and percolation on trees. Ann. Probab., 18:931–958, 1990.
- [Lyo92] R. Lyons. Random walks, capacity and percolation on trees. Ann. Probab., 20:2043–2088, 1992.
- [Lyo97] Russell Lyons. A Simple Path to Biggins’ Martingale Convergence for Branching Random Walk, pages 217–221. Springer New York, New York, NY, 1997.
- [Rou23] Pierre Rousselin. Conductance of a subdiffusive random weighted tree. ALEA-Latin American Journal of Probability and Mathematical Statistics, 20(1):885–903, 2023.
- [Sla68] R. S. Slack. A branching process with mean one and possibly infinite variance. Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete, 9:139–145, 1968.
- [Sla72] RS Slack. Further notes on branching processes with mean 1. Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete, 25(1):31–38, 1972.
- [Yag47] AM Yaglom. Some limit theorems of theory of branching random processes. In Doklady AN SSSR, volume 13, pages 795–798, 1947.