



**HAL**  
open science

# How big is the minimum of a branching random walk?

Yueyun Hu

► **To cite this version:**

| Yueyun Hu. How big is the minimum of a branching random walk?. 2014. hal-00826652v5

**HAL Id: hal-00826652**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00826652v5>**

Preprint submitted on 2 Jul 2017

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# How big is the minimum of a branching random walk?

Yueyun Hu\*

*Université Paris XIII*

**Summary.** Let  $\mathbb{M}_n$  be the minimal position in the  $n$ -th generation, of a real-valued branching random walk in the boundary case. As  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\mathbb{M}_n - \frac{3}{2} \log n$  is tight (see [1, 9, 2]). We establish here a law of iterated logarithm for the upper limits of  $\mathbb{M}_n$ : upon the system's non-extinction,  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\log \log \log n} (\mathbb{M}_n - \frac{3}{2} \log n) = 1$  almost surely. We also study the problem of moderate deviations of  $\mathbb{M}_n$ :  $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{M}_n - \frac{3}{2} \log n > \lambda)$  for  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\lambda = o(\log n)$ . This problem is closely related to the small deviations of a class of Mandelbrot's cascades.

**Résumé.** Soit  $\mathbb{M}_n$  la position minimale à la  $n^{\text{ième}}$  génération, d'une marche aléatoire branchante réelle dans le cas frontière. Quand  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\mathbb{M}_n - \frac{3}{2} \log n$  est tendue (voir [1, 9, 2]). Nous établissons une loi du logarithme itéré pour décrire les limites supérieures de  $\mathbb{M}_n$ : sur l'événement de la survie du système,  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\log \log \log n} (\mathbb{M}_n - \frac{3}{2} \log n) = 1$  presque sûrement. Nous étudions également les déviations modérées de  $\mathbb{M}_n$ :  $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{M}_n - \frac{3}{2} \log n > \lambda)$  pour  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$  et  $\lambda = o(\log n)$ . Ce problème est directement lié aux petites déviations d'une classe des cascades de Mandelbrot.

**Keywords.** Branching random walk, minimal position, law of iterated logarithm, moderate deviation, Mandelbrot's cascades.

**2000 Mathematics Subject Classification.** 60J80, 60F15.

## 1 Introduction

Let  $\{V(u), u \in \mathbb{T}\}$  be a discrete-time branching random walk (BRW) on the real line  $\mathbb{R}$  driven by a point process  $\Theta$ . At generation 0, there is a single particle at the origin from which we generate a point process  $\Theta$  on  $\mathbb{R}$ . The particles in  $\Theta$  together with their positions in  $\mathbb{R}$  constitute the first generation of the BRW. From the position of each particle at the first generation, we generate an independent copy of  $\Theta$ . The collection of all particles together with their positions gives the second generation of the BRW, and so on. The genealogy of all particles forms a Galton-Watson tree  $\mathbb{T}$  (whose root is denoted by  $\emptyset$ ). For any particle  $u \in \mathbb{T}$ , we denote by  $V(u)$  its position in  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $|u|$  its generation in  $\mathbb{T}$ . The whole system may die out or survive forever.

---

\*Département de Mathématiques (LAGA, CNRS UMR 7539), Université Paris XIII, Sorbonne Paris Cité, 99 avenue J.B. Clément, 93430 Villetaneuse. Research partially supported by ANR (MEMEMOII) 2010 BLAN 0125 Email: yueyun@math.univ-paris13.fr

Plainly  $\Theta = \sum_{|u|=1} \delta_{\{V(u)\}}$ . Let  $\nu = \Theta(\mathbb{R})$ . Throughout this paper and unless stated otherwise, we shall assume that the BRW is in the boundary case, i.e.

$$\mathbb{E}[\nu] \in (1, \infty], \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{|u|=1} e^{-V(u)}\right] = 1, \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{|u|=1} V(u) e^{-V(u)}\right] = 0. \quad (1.1)$$

Notice that under (1.1), it is possible that  $\mathbb{P}(\nu = \infty) > 0$ . See Jaffuel [23] for detailed discussions on how to reduce a general branching random walk to the boundary case.

Denote by  $\mathbb{M}_n := \min_{|u|=n} V(u)$  the minimum of the branching random walk in the  $n$ -th generation (with convention:  $\inf \emptyset \equiv \infty$ ). Hammersly [19], Kingman [24] and Biggins [7] established the law of large numbers for  $\mathbb{M}_n$  (for any general branching random walk), whereas the second order limits have attracted many recent attentions, see [1, 22, 9, 2] and the references therein. In particular, Aidékon [2] proved the convergence in law of  $\mathbb{M}_n - \frac{3}{2} \log n$  under (1.1) and some mild conditions.

On the almost sure limits of  $\mathbb{M}_n$ , it was shown in [22] that there is the following phenomena of fluctuation at the logarithmic scale. Assume (1.1). If there exists some  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\mathbb{E}[\nu^{1+\delta}] < \infty$  and  $\mathbb{E}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}} (e^{\delta x} + e^{-(1+\delta)x}) \Theta(dx)\right] < \infty$ , then

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{M}_n}{\log n} = \frac{3}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{M}_n}{\log n} = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \mathbb{P}^*\text{-a.s.},$$

where here and in the sequel,

$$\mathbb{P}^*(\cdot) := \mathbb{P}(\cdot | \mathcal{S}),$$

and  $\mathcal{S} := \{\mathbb{T} \text{ is not finite}\}$  denotes the event that the whole system survives.

It turns out that much more can be said on the lower limits  $\frac{1}{2} \log n$  of  $\mathbb{M}_n$ : Under (1.1) and the following integrability condition

$$\sigma^2 := \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{|u|=1} (V(u))^2 e^{-V(u)}\right] < \infty, \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\zeta((\log \zeta)^+)^2 + \tilde{\zeta}(\log \tilde{\zeta})^+\right] < \infty, \quad (1.2)$$

with  $\zeta := \sum_{|u|=1} e^{-V(u)}$ ,  $\tilde{\zeta} := \sum_{|u|=1} (V(u))^+ e^{-V(u)}$  and  $x^+ := \max(0, x)$ , Aidékon and Shi [4] proved that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathbb{M}_n - \frac{1}{2} \log n\right) = -\infty, \quad \mathbb{P}^*\text{-a.s.}$$

Furthermore, by following Aidékon and Shi [4]'s methods, we established ([21]) an integral test to describe the lower limits of  $\mathbb{M}_n - \frac{1}{2} \log n$ . As a consequence, we have that under (1.1) and (1.2),

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\log \log n} \left(\mathbb{M}_n - \frac{1}{2} \log n\right) = -1, \quad \mathbb{P}^*\text{-a.s.} \quad (1.3)$$

In this paper, we wish to investigate how big  $\mathbb{M}_n - \frac{3}{2} \log n$  can be. The following law of iterated logarithm (LIL) describes the upper limits of  $\mathbb{M}_n$ :

**Theorem 1.1** *Assume (1.1), (1.2) and that  $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{|u|=1}(V(u)^+)^3 e^{-V(u)}] < \infty$ . We suppose that the law of  $\log \sum_{|u|=1} e^{-V(u)}$  is non-lattice. Then*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\log \log \log n} (\mathbb{M}_n - \frac{3}{2} \log n) = 1, \quad \mathbb{P}^* \text{-a.s.} \quad (1.4)$$

The integrability of  $\sum_{|u|=1}(V(u)^+)^3 e^{-V(u)}$  is used only in the proof of Lemma 4.2, see Remark 4.3, Section 4.

The assumption of the non-lattice law of  $\log \sum_{|u|=1} e^{-V(u)}$  is used only in the proof of Lemma 4.5, see the footnote therein.

Usually, to establish such LIL, the first step would be the study of the moderate deviations:

$$\mathbb{P}^* \left( \mathbb{M}_n - \frac{3}{2} \log n > \lambda \right), \quad \text{when } \lambda = o(\log n) \text{ and } \lambda, n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Denote by  $p_j = \mathbb{P}(\nu = j), j \geq 0$ , the offspring distribution of the Galton-Watson tree  $\mathbb{T}$ . Concerning the small deviations of the size of  $\mathbb{T}$ , there exist two cases: either  $p_0 + p_1 > 0$  (namely the Schröder case) or  $p_0 = p_1 = 0$  (namely the Böttcher case), see e.g. Fleischmann and Wachtel [16, 17] and the references therein. Basically in the Schröder case, the tree  $\mathbb{T}$  may grow linearly whereas it always grows exponentially in the Böttcher case. For the branching random walk, we shall prove that the moderate deviations of  $\mathbb{M}_n$  decay exponentially fast or double-exponentially fast depending on the growth rate of  $\mathbb{T}$ .

Let  $q := \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{T} \text{ is finite}) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}^c) \in [0, 1)$  be the extinction probability. We introduce two separate cases:

**(the Schröder case)** *if the following hypotheses hold:*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{1}_{(\nu \geq 1)} q^{\nu-1} \sum_{|u|=1} e^{\gamma V(u)} \right] = 1, \quad \text{for some constant } \gamma > 0, \quad (1.5)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{|u|=1} e^{aV(u)} \right] < \infty, \quad \text{for some } a > \gamma. \quad (1.6)$$

**(the Böttcher case)** *if the following hypotheses hold:*

$$p_0 = p_1 = 0, \quad (1.7)$$

$$\sup_{|u|=1} V(u) \leq K, \quad \text{for some constant } K > 0. \quad (1.8)$$

**Remark 1.2**

(i) *When a.s.  $\nu \geq 1$  in the Schröder case, the condition (1.5) just amounts to*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{1}_{(\nu=1)} \sum_{|u|=1} e^{\gamma V(u)} \right] = 1, \quad \text{if } q = 0. \quad (1.9)$$

(ii) Under (1.1), the condition (1.6) or (1.8) implies that  $\mathbb{E}[\nu] < \infty$ . The technical conditions (1.6) and (1.8) are made to avoid too large jumps of  $\Theta$  in the moderate deviations.  
(iii) In the Böttcher case, we can define a parameter  $\beta > 0$  by

$$\beta := \sup\{a > 0 : \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{|u|=1} e^{-aV(u)} \geq 1\right) = 1\}. \quad (1.10)$$

Note that  $\beta < 1$  if we assume (1.1).

The parameters  $\gamma$  and  $\beta$  will naturally appear in the small deviations of a class of Mandelbrot's cascades. Under (1.1) and (1.2), the so-called derivative martingale (with convention:  $\sum_{\emptyset} := 0$ )

$$D_n := \sum_{|u|=n} V(u) e^{-V(u)}, \quad n \geq 0,$$

converges almost surely to some limit  $D_\infty$  which is  $\mathbb{P}^*$ -a.s. positive (see e.g. Biggins and Kyprianou [8] and Aïdékon [2]). The nonnegative random variable  $D_\infty$  satisfies the following equation in law (Mandelbrot's cascade):

$$D_\infty \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \sum_{|u|=1} e^{-V(u)} D_\infty^{(u)}, \quad (1.11)$$

where conditioned on  $\{V(u), |u| = 1\}$ ,  $(D_\infty^{(u)})_{|u|=1}$  are independent copies of  $D_\infty$ . The moderate deviations of  $\mathbb{M}_n$  will be naturally related to the small deviations of  $D_\infty$  which were already studied in the literature, see e.g. Liu [26, 27] and the references therein.

We shall work under a more general setting in order that Theorem 1.3 could also be applied to the non-degenerated case of Mandelbrot's cascades. Instead of (1.1), we assume that there exists some constant  $\chi \in (0, 1]$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{|u|=1} e^{-\chi V(u)}\right] \leq 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[\nu] \in (1, \infty], \quad (1.12)$$

where as before,  $\nu := \sum_{|u|=1} 1$ .

The condition (1.12) ensures that there exists a non-trivial nonnegative solution  $Z$  to the following equation:

$$Z \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \sum_{|u|=1} e^{-V(u)} Z^{(u)}, \quad (1.13)$$

where conditioned on  $\{V(u), |u| = 1\}$ ,  $(Z^{(u)})_{|u|=1}$  are independent copies of  $Z$ , see Liu [27], Proposition 1.1.

Denote by  $f(x) \asymp g(x)$  [resp:  $f(x) \sim g(x)$ ] as  $x \rightarrow x_0$  if  $0 < \liminf_{x \rightarrow x_0} f(x)/g(x) \leq \limsup_{x \rightarrow x_0} f(x)/g(x) < \infty$  [resp:  $\lim_{x \rightarrow x_0} f(x)/g(x) = 1$ ]. The following result may arise an interest in Mandelbrot's cascades.

**Theorem 1.3** Assume (1.12). Let  $Z \geq 0$  be a non-trivial solution of (1.13).

**(The Schröder case)** Assume (1.5) and (1.6). Then

$$\mathbb{P}(0 < Z < \varepsilon) \asymp \varepsilon^\gamma, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0, \quad (1.14)$$

and  $\mathbb{E}[e^{-tZ} 1_{(Z>0)}] \asymp t^{-\gamma}$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

**(The Böttcher case)** Assume (1.7), (1.8) and that  $\sum_{|u|=1} e^{-\chi V(u)} \neq 1$ . Then

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-tZ}] = e^{-t^{\beta+o(1)}}, \quad t \rightarrow \infty, \quad (1.15)$$

and  $\mathbb{P}(Z < \varepsilon) = e^{-\varepsilon^{-\frac{\beta}{1-\beta}+o(1)}}$ , as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , with  $\beta$  defined in (1.10).

Obviously we can apply Theorem 1.3 to  $Z := D_\infty$  with  $\chi = 1$ . In the Böttcher case, the two conditions (1.12) and  $\sum_{|u|=1} e^{-\chi V(u)} \neq 1$  imply that  $\beta < \chi$ , hence  $\beta < 1$ ; moreover,  $\text{essinf} \sum_{|u|=1} e^{-\beta V(u)} = 1$ .

Let us mention that (1.14) confirms a prediction in Liu [27] who already proved that if  $q = 0$ , then for any  $a > 0$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[Z^{-a}] < \infty$  if and only if  $a < \gamma$ . When all  $V(u)$ ,  $|u| = 1$ , are equal to some random variable, (1.15) is in agreement with Liu [26], Theorem 6.1. If furthermore, all  $V(u)$  are equal to some constant, then (1.14) and (1.15) give some rough estimates on the limiting law of Galton-Watson processes, see Fleischmann and Wachtel [16], [17] for the precise estimates. We refer to [6] for further studies of the conditioned Galton-Watson tree itself. For instance, we could seek the asymptotic behaviors of the BRW conditioned on  $\{0 < D_\infty < \varepsilon\}$ , as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , but this problem exceeds the scope of the present paper.

Our moderate deviations result on  $\mathbb{M}_n$  reads as follows:

**Theorem 1.4** Assume (1.1), (1.2). Let  $\lambda, n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\lambda = o(\log n)$ .

**(The Schröder case)** Assume (1.5) and that (1.6) hold for all  $a > 0$ . Then

$$\mathbb{P}^*\left(\mathbb{M}_n > \frac{3}{2} \log n + \lambda\right) = e^{-(\gamma+o(1))\lambda}. \quad (1.16)$$

**(The Böttcher case)** Assume (1.7) and (1.8). Then

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{M}_n > \frac{3}{2} \log n + \lambda\right) = \exp(-e^{(\beta+o(1))\lambda}). \quad (1.17)$$

The same estimates hold if we replace  $\mathbb{M}_n$  by  $\max_{n \leq k \leq 2n} \mathbb{M}_k$ .

We refer to Aidékon [2], Proposition 4.1 for the precise estimate on  $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{M}_n < \frac{3}{2} \log n - \lambda)$  as  $\lambda \leq \frac{3}{2} \log n$  and  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ .

Comparing Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.4, we remark that the almost sure behaviors of  $\mathbb{M}_n$  are not related to the moderate deviations of  $\mathbb{M}_n$ . This can be explained as follows: Define for all  $\lambda \geq 0$  and  $u \in \mathbb{T}$ ,

$$\tau_\lambda(u) := \inf\{1 \leq i \leq |u| : V(u_i) > \lambda\}, \quad (\text{with convention } \inf \emptyset = \infty), \quad (1.18)$$

where here and in the sequel,  $\{u_0 = \emptyset, u_1, \dots, u_{|u|} := u\}$  denotes the shortest path from  $\emptyset$  to  $u$  such that  $|u_i| = i$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq |u|$ . We introduce the stopping lines:

$$\mathcal{L}_\lambda := \{u \in \mathbb{T} : \tau_\lambda(u) = |u|\}, \quad \lambda \geq 0. \quad (1.19)$$

Roughly speaking, the almost sure limits of  $\mathbb{M}_n$  ( $\limsup$  of  $\mathbb{M}_n$ ) are determined by those of  $\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda$ , whereas the moderate deviations of  $\mathbb{M}_n$  are by the small deviations of  $\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda$ . By Nerman [32],  $\mathbb{P}^*$ -almost surely,  $\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda$  is of order  $e^{(1+o(1))\lambda}$ ; however, to make  $\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda$  to be as small as possible (and conditioned on  $\{\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda > 0\}$ ), in the Schröder case,  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$  will be essentially a singleton or a set of few points with exponential costs (see Lemma 5.3), which is no longer possible in the Böttcher case. To relate  $\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda$  to  $D_\infty$ , we shall use the martingale  $(D_n)$  at the stopping line  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$ :

$$D_{\mathcal{L}_\lambda} := \sum_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} V(u) e^{-V(u)}, \quad (1.20)$$

which, as shown in Biggins and Kyprianou [8], converges almost surely to  $D_\infty$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ . For  $u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda$ ,  $V(u) \approx \lambda$ , hence  $D_{\mathcal{L}_\lambda} \approx \lambda e^{-\lambda} \#\mathcal{L}_\lambda$ . Then the problem of small values of  $\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda$  will be reduced to that of  $D_{\mathcal{L}_\lambda}$  and  $D_\infty$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ . The hypothesis (1.6) and (1.8) are made to control the possible overshoots.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we collect some facts on a one-dimensional random walk and on the branching random walk. In Section 3, we study the cascade equation (1.13) and prove Theorem 1.3. In Section 4, we first prove some uniform tightness of  $\mathbb{M}_n - \frac{3}{2} \log n$  (Lemma 4.5) and then Theorem 1.1. Finally, in Section 5, we prove Theorem 1.4 in two separate subsections on the Schröder case and on the Böttcher case.

Throughout the paper, we adopt the usual conventions that  $\sum_\emptyset := 0$ ,  $\sup_\emptyset := 0$ ,  $\prod_\emptyset := 1$ ,  $\inf_\emptyset := \infty$ ; we also denote by  $(c_i, 1 \leq i \leq 15)$  some positive constants, and by  $C, C'$  and  $C''$  (eventually with a subscript) some unimportant positive constants whose values can vary from one paragraph to another one.

## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 Estimates on a centered real-valued random walk

We collect here some estimates on a real-valued random walk  $\{S_k, k \geq 0\}$ , under  $\mathbb{P}$ , centered and with finite variance  $\sigma^2 > 0$ . Write  $\mathbb{P}_x$  and  $\mathbb{E}_x$  when  $S_0 = x$ . Let  $\underline{S}_n := \min_{0 \leq i \leq n} S_i$ ,

$\forall n \geq 0$ . The renewal function  $R(x)$  related to the random walk  $S$  is defined as follows:

$$R(x) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(S_k \geq -x, S_k < \underline{S}_{k-1}\right), \quad x \geq 0, \quad (2.1)$$

and  $R(x) = 0$  if  $x < 0$ . Moreover (see Feller [15], pp.612),

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{R(x)}{x} = c_1 > 0. \quad (2.2)$$

**Lemma 2.1** *Let  $S$  be a centered random walk with finite and positive variance. There exists some constant  $c_2 > 0$  such that for any  $b \geq a \geq 0, x \geq 0, n \geq 1$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}_x\left(S_n \in [a, b], \underline{S}_n \geq 0\right) \leq c_2 (1+x)(1+b-a)(1+b)n^{-\frac{3}{2}}. \quad (2.3)$$

For any fixed  $0 < r < 1$ , there exists some  $c_3 \equiv c_{3,r} > 0$  such that for all  $b \geq a \geq 0, x, y \geq 0$  and  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_x\left(S_n \in [y+a, y+b], \underline{S}_n \geq 0, \min_{rn \leq i < n} S_i \geq y\right) \leq c_3 (1+x)(1+b-a)(1+b)n^{-\frac{3}{2}}, \quad (2.4)$$

$$\mathbb{P}_x\left(\underline{S}_n \geq 0, \min_{rn \leq i < n} S_i > y, S_n \leq y\right) \leq c_3 (1+x)n^{-\frac{3}{2}}. \quad (2.5)$$

For any  $a > 0$ , if  $\mathbb{E}[S_1^2 e^{aS_1}] < \infty$ , then there exists some  $C_a > 0$  such that for any  $b \geq 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(S_{\tau_b} - b > x\right) \leq C_a e^{-ax}, \quad \forall x \geq 0, \quad (2.6)$$

where  $\tau_b := \inf\{j \geq 0 : S_j > b\}$ .

**Proof of Lemma 2.1.** See Aidékon and Shi [4] for (2.3) and (2.4). To get (2.6), note that  $\mathbb{E}[S_1^2 e^{aS_1}] < \infty$  if and only if  $\mathbb{E}[(S_1^+)^2 e^{aS_1^+}] < \infty$ . By Doney ([12], pp.250), this condition ensures that  $\mathbb{E}[S_{\tau_0} e^{aS_{\tau_0}}] < \infty$ . Then in view of Chang ([10], Proposition 4.2), we have that uniformly in  $b > 0$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[e^{a(S_{\tau_b} - b)}] \leq C_a$  for some constant  $C_a > 0$ , which implies (2.6) by Chebychev's inequality.

It remains to check (2.5). Let  $f(x) := \mathbb{P}(S_1 \leq -x), x \geq 0$ . It follows from the Markov property at  $n-1$  that the probability in LHS of (2.5) equals

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \mathbf{1}_{(\underline{S}_{n-1} \geq 0, \min_{rn \leq i < n} S_i > y)} f(S_{n-1} - y) \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} f(j) \mathbb{P}_x \left( \underline{S}_{n-1} \geq 0, \min_{rn \leq i \leq n-1} S_i > y, y+j < S_{n-1} \leq y+j+1 \right) \\ & \leq C (1+x) n^{-3/2} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} f(j) (2+j) \quad (\text{by (2.4)}) \\ & \leq C' (1+x) n^{3/2}, \end{aligned}$$

yielding (2.5).  $\square$



## 2.2 Change of measures for the branching random walk

In this subsection, we recall some change of measure formulas in the branching random walk, for the details we refer to [8, 11, 29, 4, 20, 33] and the references therein.

At first let us fix some notations: For  $|u| = n$ , we write as before  $\{u_0 := \emptyset, u_1, \dots, u_{n-1}, u_n = u\}$  the path from the root  $\emptyset$  to  $u$  such that  $|u_i| = i$  for any  $0 \leq i \leq n$ . Define  $\bar{V}(u) := \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} V(u_i)$  and  $\underline{V}(u) := \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} V(u_i)$ . For any  $u, v \in \mathbb{T}$ , we use the partial order  $u < v$  if  $u$  is an ancestor of  $v$  and  $u \leq v$  if  $u < v$  or  $u = v$ . We also denote by  $\overleftarrow{u}$  the parent of  $u$  and by  $\nu(u)$  the number of children of  $u$ . Define  $\mathcal{U}(u) := \{v : \overleftarrow{v} = \overleftarrow{u}, v \neq u\}$  the set (eventually empty) of brothers of  $u$  for any  $u \neq \emptyset$ . For any  $u \in \mathbb{T}$ , we denote by  $\mathbb{T}_u := \{v \in \mathbb{T} : u \leq v\}$  the subtree of  $\mathbb{T}$  rooted at  $u$ .

Under (1.1), there exists a centered real-valued random walk  $\{S_n, n \geq 0\}$  such that for any  $n \geq 1$  and any measurable  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{|u|=n} e^{-V(u)} f(V(u_1), \dots, V(u_n)) \right] = \mathbb{E} (f(S_1, \dots, S_n)), \quad (2.7)$$

which is often referred as the ‘‘many-to-one’’ formula. Moreover under (1.2),  $\text{Var}(S_1) = \sigma^2 = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{|u|=1} (V(u))^2 e^{-V(u)} \right] \in (0, \infty)$ . We shall use the notation

$$\tau_0 := \inf \{j \geq 1 : S_j > 0\}. \quad (2.8)$$

Denote by  $(\mathcal{F}_n, n \geq 0)$  the natural filtration of the branching random walk. Under (1.1), the process  $W_n := \sum_{|u|=n} e^{-V(u)}$ ,  $n \geq 1$ , is a  $(\mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_n))$ -martingale. It is well-known (see [8, 11, 29, 4, 20, 33]) that on some enlarged probability space (more precisely on the space of marked trees enlarged by an infinite ray  $(\mathbf{w}_n, n \geq 0)$ , called spine), we may construct a probability  $\mathbb{Q}$  such that the following statements (i), (ii) and (iii) hold:

(i) For all  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \Big|_{\mathcal{F}_n} = W_n, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{Q}(\mathbf{w}_n = u | \mathcal{F}_n) = \frac{1}{W_n} e^{-V(u)}, \quad \forall |u| = n.$$

(ii) Under  $\mathbb{Q}$ , the process  $\{V(\mathbf{w}_n), n \geq 0\}$  along the spine  $(\mathbf{w}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ , is distributed as the random walk  $(S_n, n \geq 0)$  under  $\mathbb{P}$ . Moreover,  $(\sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{w}_k)} \delta_{\{\Delta V(u)\}}, \Delta V(\mathbf{w}_k))_{k \geq 1}$  are i.i.d. under  $\mathbb{Q}$ , where  $\Delta V(u) := V(\overleftarrow{u}) - V(u)$  for any  $u \neq \emptyset$ .

(iii) Let  $\mathcal{G}_n := \sigma\{u, V(u) : \overleftarrow{u} \in \{\mathbf{w}_k, 0 \leq k < n\}\}$ ,  $n \geq 0$ . Then  $\mathcal{G}_\infty$  is the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by the spine. Under  $\mathbb{Q}$  and conditioned on  $\mathcal{G}_\infty$ , for all  $u \notin \{\mathbf{w}_k, k \geq 0\}$  but  $\overleftarrow{u} \in \{\mathbf{w}_k, k \geq 0\}$  the induced branching random walk  $(V(uv), |v| \geq 0)$  are independent and are distributed as  $\mathbb{P}_{V(u)}$ , where  $\{uv, |v| \geq 0\}$  is the subtree  $\mathbb{T}_u$ .

We mention that the above change of measure still holds for the stopping line  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$  (see e.g. [3], Proposition 3, for the detailed statement): i.e. replace  $|u| = n$  by  $u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_n$  by  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}_\lambda}$  the  $\sigma$ -field generated by the BRW up to  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$ , and  $W_n$  by

$$W_{\mathcal{L}_\lambda} := \sum_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} e^{-V(u)}. \quad (2.9)$$

For brevity, we shall write  $\mathbb{Q}[X]$  for the expectation of some random variable  $X$  under the probability  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

### 3 Proof of Theorem 1.3

The following result is due to Liu [27]:

**Lemma 3.1 (Liu [27])** *Assuming (1.5), (1.6) and (1.12). Let  $Z \geq 0$  be a non-trivial solution of (1.13). For any  $0 < \varepsilon < \gamma$ , there exists some positive constant  $c_4 = c_4(\varepsilon)$  such that*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-tZ}1_{(Z>0)}\right] \leq c_4 t^{-\gamma+\varepsilon}, \quad \forall t \geq 1. \quad (3.1)$$

**Proof of Lemma 3.1.** At first we remark that

$$\mathbb{P}(Z = 0) = q. \quad (3.2)$$

In fact, we easily deduce from (1.13) that the probability  $\mathbb{P}(Z = 0)$  is a solution of  $x = \mathbb{E}[x^\nu]$  which only has two solutions  $q$  and  $1$  for  $x \in [0, 1]$ . This gives (3.2).

In the case  $q = 0$ , namely  $Z > 0$  a.s.,  $\gamma$  is defined through (1.9), it is easy to check that  $\mathbb{P}(\sum_{|u|=1} e^{-V(u)} \neq 1) > 0$ , then (3.1) follows exactly from Liu [27], Theorem 2.4, after a standard Tauberian argument (see Lemma 4.4 in [26]). We only need to check that the case  $q > 0$  can be reduced to the case  $q = 0$ .

For brevity, let us denote by  $\{A_i, 1 \leq i \leq \nu\}$  the family  $\{e^{-V(u)}, |u| = 1\}$  [the order of  $A_i$  is arbitrary]. Then  $Z$  satisfies the equation in law

$$Z \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{\nu} A_i Z_i, \quad (3.3)$$

with  $(Z_i, i \geq 1)$  independent copies of  $Z$ , and independent of  $(A_i)_{1 \leq i \leq \nu}$ . Let  $\{\xi, \xi_i, i \geq 1\}$  be a family of i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables, independent of everything else, with common law  $\mathbb{P}(\xi = 0) = q = 1 - \mathbb{P}(\xi = 1)$ . Let  $\widehat{Z}$  be a random variable distributed as  $Z$  conditioned on  $\{Z > 0\}$ . Since  $\mathbb{P}(Z > 0) = 1 - q$ , we have that  $Z \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \xi \widehat{Z}$ . Then we deduce from (3.3) that

$$\widehat{Z} \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{\nu} A_i \xi_i \widehat{Z}_i \text{ conditioned on } \{\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} \xi_i > 0\},$$

where  $(\widehat{Z}_i, i \geq 1)$  are i.i.d. copies of  $\widehat{Z}$ , and  $(\nu, A_i, 1 \leq i \leq \nu)$  and  $(\xi_i, i \geq 1)$  are three independent families of random variables. Let  $\{\widehat{A}_i, 1 \leq i \leq \widehat{\nu}\}$  be a family of random variables such that for any nonnegative measurable function  $f$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{\nu}} f(\widehat{A}_i)}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} \xi_i f(A_i)} \mid \sum_{i=1}^{\nu} \xi_i > 0\right]. \quad (3.4)$$

In other words,  $\sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{\nu}} \delta_{\{\widehat{A}_i\}}$  has the same law as the point process  $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \nu, \xi_i \neq 0} \delta_{\{A_i\}}$  conditioning the latter does not vanish everywhere. Elementary calculations show that  $\mathbb{P}(\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} \xi_i > 0) = 1 - \mathbb{E}[q^{\nu}] = 1 - q$  and for any nonnegative measurable function  $f$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{\nu}} f(\widehat{A}_i)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} \xi_i f(A_i) \mid \sum_{i=1}^{\nu} \xi_i > 0\right] = \frac{1}{1-q} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} \xi_i f(A_i)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} f(A_i)\right]. \quad (3.5)$$

In particular,  $\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{\nu}} \widehat{A}_i^{\chi}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} A_i^{\chi}\right] \leq 1$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\nu}] = \mathbb{E}[\nu] \in (1, \infty]$ . Moreover, we deduce from (3.4) that  $\widehat{\nu}$  is distributed as  $\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} \xi_i$  conditioned on  $\{\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} \xi_i > 0\}$ , hence  $\widehat{\nu} \geq 1$  a.s. It is easy (e.g. by using the Laplace transform) to see that

$$\widehat{Z} \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{\nu}} \widehat{A}_i \widehat{Z}_i.$$

Therefore we can apply the case  $q = 0$  of (3.1) to  $\widehat{Z}$  once we have determined the corresponding parameter  $\gamma$  (as in (1.9)) for  $\widehat{Z}$ . To this end, let  $t_{\xi} = \inf\{1 \leq i \leq \nu : \xi_i = 1\}$ . Then  $\widehat{A}_1 = A_{t_{\xi}}$  if  $t_{\xi} < \infty$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[(\widehat{A}_1)^{-\gamma} 1_{(\widehat{\nu}=1)}\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[A_{t_{\xi}}^{-\gamma} 1_{(\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} \xi_i = 1)} \mid \sum_{i=1}^{\nu} \xi_i > 0\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{1-q} \mathbb{E}\left[1_{(\nu \geq 1)} \sum_{k=1}^{\nu} A_k^{-\gamma} 1_{(\xi_k = 1, \xi_i = 0, \forall i \neq k, 1 \leq i \leq \nu)}\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[1_{(\nu \geq 1)} q^{\nu-1} \sum_{k=1}^{\nu} A_k^{-\gamma}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[1_{(\nu \geq 1)} q^{\nu-1} \sum_{|u|=1} e^{\gamma V(u)}\right] = 1, \end{aligned}$$

by (1.5). Therefore  $\mathbb{E}[e^{-t\widehat{Z}}] = O(t^{-\gamma+\varepsilon})$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . The Lemma follows from the fact that  $\mathbb{P}(0 < Z < x) = (1-q)\mathbb{P}(\widehat{Z} < x)$  for any  $x > 0$ .  $\square$

### 3.1 Proof of Theorem 1.3: the Schröder case

As shown in the proof of Lemma 3.1, we can assume  $q = 0$  (hence we assume (1.9)) in this proof without any loss of generality. Let  $\Phi(t) := \mathbb{E}[e^{-tZ}]$  for  $t \geq 0$ . We are going to prove that

$$\Phi(t) \asymp t^{-\gamma}, \quad t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.6)$$

To this end, we have by (3.3) that

$$\Phi(t) = \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i=1}^{\nu} \Phi(tA_i)\right], \quad t \geq 0. \quad (3.7)$$

Note also that the condition (1.9) can be re-written as  $\mathbb{E}[1_{(\nu=1)}A_1^{-\gamma}] = 1$ . Define  $g(t) := t^\gamma \Phi(t)$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . Then for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$g(t) = t^\gamma \Phi(t) \geq t^\gamma \mathbb{E}[1_{(\nu=1)}\Phi(tA_1)] = \mathbb{E}[1_{(\nu=1)}A_1^{-\gamma}g(tA_1)] = \mathbb{E}[g(t\tilde{A}_1)], \quad (3.8)$$

where  $\tilde{A}_1$  denotes a (positive) random variable whose law is determined by  $\mathbb{E}[f(\tilde{A}_1)] := \mathbb{E}[1_{(\nu=1)}A_1^{-\gamma}f(A_1)]$  for any measurable bounded function  $f$ . In particular,  $\mathbb{E}[\log \tilde{A}_1] = \mathbb{E}[1_{(\nu=1)}A_1^{-\gamma} \log A_1]$ .

Define  $f(t) := \mathbb{E}[1_{(\nu=1)} \sum_{|u|=1} e^{tV(u)}] \equiv \mathbb{E}[1_{(\nu=1)} A_1^{-t}]$  which is finite for  $t \in [-\chi, \gamma]$ , in particular  $f(-\chi) < 1$  and  $f(0) < 1 = f(\gamma)$ . By the assumption of integrability in Theorem 1.3,  $\mathbb{E}[1_{(\nu=1)} A_1^{-\gamma}(-\log A_1)^+] < \infty$  which implies that  $f'(\gamma-)$  exists and equals  $-\mathbb{E}[1_{(\nu=1)}A_1^{-\gamma} \log A_1]$ . By convexity,  $f'(\gamma-) \geq \frac{f(\gamma)-f(0)}{\gamma} > 0$ . Hence

$$\mathbb{E}[\log \tilde{A}_1] = -f'(\gamma-) < 0. \quad (3.9)$$

Let  $(\tilde{A}_i)_{i \geq 2}$  be a sequence of i.i.d. copies of  $\tilde{A}_1$  and define  $X_j := -\sum_{i=1}^j \log \tilde{A}_i$  for all  $j \geq 1$ . Let  $r > 1$  and put

$$\alpha_r := \inf\{j \geq 1 : X_j > \log r\}, \quad (3.10)$$

which is a.s. finite thanks to (3.9). Going back to (3.8), we get that

$$\begin{aligned} g(r) &\geq \mathbb{E}[g(r\tilde{A}_1)1_{(r\tilde{A}_1 < 1)}] + \mathbb{E}[g(r\tilde{A}_1)1_{(r\tilde{A}_1 \geq 1)}] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}[g(r\tilde{A}_1)1_{(r\tilde{A}_1 < 1)}] + \mathbb{E}[g(r\tilde{A}_1\tilde{A}_2)1_{(r\tilde{A}_1 \geq 1)}], \end{aligned}$$

where to get the last inequality, we have applied (3.8) with  $t$  replaced by  $r\tilde{A}_1$  and  $\tilde{A}_1$  replaced by  $\tilde{A}_2$ . Then we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} g(r) &\geq \mathbb{E}[g(r\tilde{A}_1)1_{(r\tilde{A}_1 < 1)}] + \mathbb{E}[g(r\tilde{A}_1\tilde{A}_2)1_{(r\tilde{A}_1 \geq 1, r\tilde{A}_1\tilde{A}_2 < 1)}] + \mathbb{E}[g(r\tilde{A}_1\tilde{A}_2)1_{(r\tilde{A}_1 \geq 1, r\tilde{A}_1\tilde{A}_2 \geq 1)}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[g\left(r \prod_{i=1}^{\alpha_r} \tilde{A}_i\right)1_{(\alpha_r \leq 2)}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[g\left(r \tilde{A}_1 \tilde{A}_2\right)1_{(\alpha_r > 2)}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

By induction, we get that for any  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$g(r) \geq \mathbb{E}\left[g\left(r \prod_{i=1}^{\alpha_r} \tilde{A}_i\right)1_{(\alpha_r \leq n)}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[g\left(r \prod_{i=1}^n \tilde{A}_i\right)1_{(\alpha_r > n)}\right] \geq \mathbb{E}\left[g\left(r \prod_{i=1}^{\alpha_r} \tilde{A}_i\right)1_{(\alpha_r \leq n)}\right].$$

Since  $\alpha_r < \infty$  a.s., we let  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and deduce from the monotone convergence theorem that

$$g(r) \geq \mathbb{E}\left[g\left(r \prod_{i=1}^{\alpha_r} \tilde{A}_i\right)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[g(e^{-\mathcal{R}_r})\right],$$

where  $\mathcal{R}_r := X_{\alpha_r} - \log r > 0$  denotes the overshoot of the random walk  $(X_j)$  at the level  $\log r$ . Note that for any  $0 < t \leq 1$ ,  $g(t) = t^\gamma \Phi(t) \geq \Phi(1)t^\gamma$ , hence

$$g(r) \geq \Phi(1) \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-\gamma \mathcal{R}_r} \right], \quad \forall r > 1. \quad (3.11)$$

By the assumption (1.6),  $\mathbb{E} \left[ ((-\log \tilde{A}_1)^+)^2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{(\nu=1)} \sum_{|u|=1} (V(u)^+)^2 e^{\gamma V(u)} \right] < \infty$ , then by Lorden [28], Theorem 1,  $\sup_{r \geq 1} \mathbb{E} [\mathcal{R}_r] < \infty$ . Consequently for some positive constant  $C$ ,

$$g(r) \geq \Phi(1) e^{-\gamma \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{R}_r]} \geq C > 0, \quad \forall r > 1.$$

Hence

$$\Phi(r) \geq C r^{-\gamma}, \quad \forall r > 1, \quad (3.12)$$

which implies the lower bound in (3.6).

To prove the upper bound in (3.6), let  $a > \gamma$  be as in (1.6) such that  $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{i=1}^\nu A_i^{-a}] \equiv \mathbb{E}[\sum_{|u|=1} e^{aV(u)}] < \infty$ . Choose (and then fix)  $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2} \min(a - \gamma, \gamma)$  small and  $b := \frac{\gamma + \varepsilon}{2} < \gamma$ . By Lemma 3.1,  $\Phi(t) \leq c_4 t^{-b}$  for all  $t \geq 1$  (with  $c_4 \geq 1$ ). Since  $\Phi(t) \leq 1$  for all  $0 < t < 1$ , we obtain immediately that

$$g(t) \leq c_4 t^{\gamma-b}, \quad \forall t > 0. \quad (3.13)$$

By (3.7) and using again the notation  $\tilde{A}_i, i \geq 1$ , we get that for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} g(t) &\leq t^\gamma \mathbb{E} \left[ \Phi(tA_1) 1_{(\nu=1)} \right] + t^\gamma \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{(\nu \geq 2)} \Phi(tA_1) \Phi(tA_2) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ g(t\tilde{A}_1) \right] + t^{-\gamma} \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{(\nu \geq 2)} g(tA_1) g(tA_2) A_1^{-\gamma} A_2^{-\gamma} \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ g(t\tilde{A}_1) \right] + c_4^2 t^{\gamma-2b} \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{(\nu \geq 2)} A_1^{-b} A_2^{-b} \right] \quad (\text{by (3.13)}) \\ &=: \mathbb{E} \left[ g(t\tilde{A}_1) \right] + C_\varepsilon t^{-\varepsilon}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

with  $C_\varepsilon := c_4^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{(\nu \geq 2)} A_1^{-b} A_2^{-b} \right] \leq c_4^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^\nu A_i^{-2b} \right]$  by Cauchy-Schwarz' inequality. Then  $C_\varepsilon < \infty$  by the assumption (1.6) and the choice that  $b < a/2$ .

Let  $r > 1$ . As before, we shall iterate (3.14) up to the stopping time  $\alpha_r$  (cf. (3.10)). We have that

$$\begin{aligned} g(r) &\leq C_\varepsilon r^{-\varepsilon} + \mathbb{E} \left[ g(r\tilde{A}_1) 1_{(\alpha_r=1)} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{(\alpha_r > 1)} (C_\varepsilon (r\tilde{A}_1)^{-\varepsilon} + g(r\tilde{A}_1\tilde{A}_2)) \right] \\ &= C_\varepsilon r^{-\varepsilon} + C_\varepsilon \mathbb{E} \left[ (r\tilde{A}_1)^{-\varepsilon} 1_{(\alpha_r > 1)} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ g(r \prod_{i=1}^{2 \wedge \alpha_r} \tilde{A}_i) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By induction, we get that for any  $n \geq 2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} g(r) &\leq C_\varepsilon r^{-\varepsilon} + C_\varepsilon \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{(\alpha_r > k)} (r \prod_{i=1}^k \tilde{A}_i)^{-\varepsilon} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ g(r \prod_{i=1}^{n \wedge \alpha_r} \tilde{A}_i) \right] \\ &= C_\varepsilon r^{-\varepsilon} + C_\varepsilon \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{n \wedge \alpha_r - 1} e^{\varepsilon(X_k - \log r)} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ g(re^{-X_{n \wedge \alpha_r}}) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

by using the random walk  $X_j \equiv -\sum_{i=1}^j \log \tilde{A}_i$ ,  $j \geq 1$ . The random walk  $(X_j)$  has positive drift and  $\mathbb{E}[X_1^2] = \mathbb{E}\left[1_{(\nu=1)} \sum_{|u|=1} (V(u))^2 e^{\gamma V(u)}\right] < \infty$  by the assumption (1.6), then by Lemma 5 in [3],

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{\alpha_r-1} e^{\varepsilon(X_k - \log r)}\right] \leq C'_\varepsilon < \infty,$$

for some constant  $C'_\varepsilon$  independent of  $r$ . On the other hand,  $g(re^{-X_{\alpha_r}}) \leq 1$  (since  $re^{-X_{\alpha_r}} \leq 1$ ), then we obtain that for all  $r > 1$ ,  $n \geq 2$ ,

$$g(r) \leq C_\varepsilon + C'_\varepsilon + 1 + \mathbb{E}\left[g(re^{-X_n})1_{(n < \alpha_r)}\right] \leq C''_\varepsilon + c_4 r^\varepsilon \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\varepsilon X_n} 1_{(n < \alpha_r)}\right], \quad (3.16)$$

where in the last inequality we have used the facts that  $t := re^{-X_n} \geq 1$  on  $\{n < \alpha_r\}$  and that  $g(t) \leq c_4 t^\varepsilon$  for any  $t \geq 1$  by Lemma 3.1.

Remark that  $\mathbb{E}[e^{-\varepsilon X_1}] = \mathbb{E}[(\tilde{A}_1)^\varepsilon] = \mathbb{E}\left[1_{(\nu=1)}(A_1)^{-\gamma+\varepsilon}\right] < 1$  by convexity. Then  $\mathbb{E}[e^{-\varepsilon X_n}] \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , which in view of (3.16) yield that for any  $r > 1$  ( $\varepsilon$  being fixed),  $g(r) \leq C''_\varepsilon$ , i.e.

$$\Phi(r) \leq C''_\varepsilon r^{-\gamma}, \quad \forall r > 1.$$

This and (3.12) imply (3.6):  $\Phi(r) \asymp r^{-\gamma}$  for all  $r \geq 1$ . The small deviation in (1.14) follows from a standard Tauberian argument (see e.g. [26], Lemma 4.4).  $\square$

### 3.2 Proof of Theorem 1.3: the Böttcher case

The proof of (1.15) goes in the same spirit as that of (3.6). Let  $h(t) := -\log \mathbb{E}[e^{-tZ}]$ ,  $t \geq 0$ . Note that  $h$  is an increasing, concave function and vanishing at zero. Using the notations introduced in (3.3), we get that

$$e^{-h(t)} = \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\sum_{i=1}^\nu h(tA_i)}\right], \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

On an enlarged probability space, we may find a random variable  $\xi$  such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\xi = i \mid \mathcal{A}\right) = \frac{A_i^\beta}{\sum_{j=1}^\nu A_j^\beta}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq \nu,$$

where  $\mathcal{A} := \sigma\{A_i, 1 \leq i \leq \nu, \nu\}$ . Then  $\sum_{i=1}^\nu h(tA_i) = (\sum_{i=1}^\nu A_i^\beta) \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{h(tA_\xi)}{A_\xi^\beta} \mid \mathcal{A}\right]$ , and by Jensen's inequality, we have that for any  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$e^{-\sum_{i=1}^\nu h(tA_i)} \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\left(\sum_{i=1}^\nu A_i^\beta\right) \frac{h(tA_\xi)}{A_\xi^\beta}\right) \mid \mathcal{A}\right].$$

Write for brevity

$$B := A_\xi, \quad \eta := \frac{1}{A_\xi^\beta} \left(\sum_{i=1}^\nu A_i^\beta\right) > 1, \quad \text{a.s.}$$

[ $\eta > 1$  because  $\nu \geq 2$  a.s.] Then for any  $t \geq 0$ , we have

$$e^{-h(t)} \leq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\eta h(tB)}\right]. \quad (3.17)$$

We shall iterate the inequality (3.17) up to some random times: Let  $(\eta_i, B_i)_{i \geq 1}$  be an i.i.d. copies of  $(\eta, B)$ . Let  $r > 1$  and define

$$\Upsilon_r := \inf\left\{i \geq 1 : \prod_{j=1}^i B_j \leq \frac{1}{r}\right\}.$$

Observe that

$$\mathbb{E}[\log B] = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} A_i^{\beta} \log A_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} A_i^{\beta}}\right] = -\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\sum_{|u|=1} e^{-\beta V(u)} V(u)}{\sum_{|u|=1} e^{-\beta V(u)}}\right] = \psi'(\beta),$$

where  $\psi(x) := \mathbb{E}[\log \sum_{|u|=1} e^{-xV(u)}]$  for  $0 \leq x \leq \chi$ . Note that  $\psi$  is convex on  $[0, \chi]$ ,  $\psi(\chi) < \log \mathbb{E}[\sum_{|u|=1} e^{-\chi V(u)}] \leq 0$ , and  $\psi(\beta) \geq 0$  since  $\sum_{|u|=1} e^{-\beta V(u)} \geq 1$  by the definition of  $\beta$ . By convexity,  $\psi'(\beta) \leq \frac{\psi(\chi) - \psi(\beta)}{\chi - \beta} < 0$ . Then  $\mathbb{E}[\log B] < 0$  which implies that  $\Upsilon_r < \infty$ , a.s. By (3.17), we see that for

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-h(r)} &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\eta_1 h(rB_1)} \mathbf{1}_{(rB_1 \leq 1)}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\eta_1 h(rB_1)} \mathbf{1}_{(rB_1 > 1)}\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\eta_1 h(rB_1)} \mathbf{1}_{(\Upsilon_r = 1)}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\eta_1 h(rB_1)} \mathbf{1}_{(rB_1 > 1)}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Applying (3.17) to  $t = rB_1$ , we get that

$$e^{-\eta_1 h(rB_1)} \leq \left(\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\eta_2 h(rB_1 B_2)} \mid \sigma\{\eta_1, B_1\}\right]\right)^{\eta_1} \leq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\eta_1 \eta_2 h(rB_1 B_2)} \mid \sigma\{\eta_1, B_1\}\right],$$

by Jensen's inequality, since  $\eta_1 > 1$ . It follows that  $\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\eta_1 h(rB_1)} \mathbf{1}_{(rB_1 > 1)}\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{1}_{(rB_1 > 1)} e^{-\eta_1 \eta_2 h(rB_1 B_2)}\right]$ , hence

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-h(r)} &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\eta_1 h(rB_1)} \mathbf{1}_{(\Upsilon_r = 1)}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{1}_{(rB_1 > 1)} e^{-\eta_1 \eta_2 h(rB_1 B_2)}\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\eta_1 h(rB_1)} \mathbf{1}_{(\Upsilon_r = 1)}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\eta_1 \eta_2 h(rB_1 B_2)} \mathbf{1}_{(\Upsilon_r = 2)}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{1}_{(rB_1 B_2 > 1)} e^{-\eta_1 \eta_2 h(rB_1 B_2)}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Again applying (3.17) to  $t = rB_1 B_2$  and using Jensen's inequality (since  $\eta_1 \eta_2 > 1$ ), we get that  $\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{1}_{(rB_1 B_2 > 1)} e^{-\eta_1 \eta_2 h(rB_1 B_2)}\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{1}_{(rB_1 B_2 > 1)} e^{-\eta_1 \eta_2 \eta_3 h(rB_1 B_2 B_3)}\right]$ , and so on. We get that for any  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-h(r)} &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-(\prod_{i=1}^{\Upsilon_r} \eta_i) h(r \prod_{i=1}^{\Upsilon_r} B_i)} \mathbf{1}_{(\Upsilon_r \leq n)}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-(\prod_{i=1}^n \eta_i) h(r \prod_{i=1}^n B_i)} \mathbf{1}_{(\Upsilon_r > n)}\right] \\ &=: A_{(3.18)} + C_{(3.18)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

By (1.8),  $B \geq e^{-K}$  a.s., then  $\frac{1}{r} \geq \prod_{i=1}^{\Upsilon_r} B_i > \frac{1}{r} e^{-K}$ . Notice that by (1.10) the definition of  $\beta$ ,  $\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} A_i^\beta \geq 1$  a.s.; Then  $\eta \geq B^{-\beta}$  and  $\prod_{i=1}^{\Upsilon_r} \eta_i \geq r^\beta$ . It follows that for any  $n$ ,

$$A_{(3.18)} \leq e^{-r^\beta h(e^{-K})}.$$

To deal with  $C_{(3.18)}$ , we remark that on  $\{\Upsilon_r > n\}$ ,  $r \prod_{i=1}^n B_i \geq 1$ . It follows that

$$C_{(3.18)} \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-h(1) \prod_{i=1}^n \eta_i} \right].$$

Since  $\eta_i > 1$  a.s.,  $\prod_{i=1}^n \eta_i \uparrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , then by the monotone convergence theorem  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} C_{(3.18)} = 0$ . Letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in (3.18), we obtain that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-rZ} \right] \equiv e^{-h(r)} \leq e^{-h(e^{-K}) r^\beta}, \quad \forall r > 1, \quad (3.19)$$

which is stronger than the upper bound in (1.15).

To prove the lower bound, recalling that  $\text{essinf} \sum_{i=1}^{\nu} A_i^\beta = 1$  and  $A_i \geq e^{-K}$ , we deduce that for any small  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there are some integer  $2 \leq k \leq \text{esssup} \nu$ , and some real numbers  $a_1, \dots, a_k \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^k a_i^\beta \geq 1$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^k a_i^{\beta+\varepsilon} < 1$  and  $p := \mathbb{P}(A_i \leq a_i, \forall 1 \leq i \leq k, \nu = k) > 0$ . Therefore

$$e^{-h(t)} = \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} h(tA_i)} \right] \geq p e^{-\sum_{i=1}^k h(ta_i)}, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Let  $b := \log(1/p) > 0$  and define a random variable  $Y \in \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$  such that for any measurable and nonnegative function  $f$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[f(Y)] = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k f(a_i)$ . Therefore,

$$h(t) \leq b + k \mathbb{E}[h(tY)], \quad \forall t \geq 0. \quad (3.20)$$

As in the proof of the upper bound, we shall iterate the above inequality up to some random times: Let  $(Y_j)_{j \geq 1}$  be an i.i.d. copies of  $Y$ . For  $r > 1$ , we define

$$\theta := \theta_r := \inf \left\{ j \geq 1 : \prod_{i=1}^j Y_i \leq \frac{1}{r} \right\}.$$

Since  $Y \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} a_i < 1$ ,  $\theta$  is a bounded random variable. Going back to (3.20), we get that

$$\begin{aligned} h(r) &\leq b + k \mathbb{E} \left[ h(rY_1) 1_{(rY_1 \leq 1)} \right] + k \mathbb{E} \left[ h(rY_1) 1_{(rY_1 > 1)} \right] \\ &\leq b + k \mathbb{E} \left[ h(rY_1) 1_{(\theta=1)} \right] + k \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{(rY_1 > 1)} (b + k h(rY_1 Y_2)) \right] \\ &= b + k \mathbb{E} \left[ h(rY_1) 1_{(\theta=1)} \right] + bk \mathbb{P}(\theta > 1) + k^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{(rY_1 > 1)} h(rY_1 Y_2) \right]. \end{aligned}$$



By induction, we get that for any  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} h(r) &\leq b \sum_{j=0}^n k^j \mathbb{P}(\theta > j) + \mathbb{E} \left[ k^{\theta \wedge n} h(r \prod_{i=1}^{\theta \wedge n} Y_i) \right] \\ &=: A_{(3.21)} + C_{(3.21)}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

Elementary computations yield that

$$A_{(3.21)} = \frac{b}{k-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ k^{\theta \wedge (n+1)} - 1 \right] \leq \frac{b}{k-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ k^\theta \right].$$

Recalling  $\theta$  is bounded hence  $\mathbb{E} \left[ k^\theta \right] < \infty$ . For  $C_{(3.21)}$ , we use the fact that  $Y_i \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} a_j =: \bar{a} < 1$ . Remark that  $r \prod_{i=1}^n Y_i \leq 1$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} C_{(3.21)} &:= \mathbb{E} \left[ k^\theta h(r \prod_{i=1}^{\theta} Y_i) 1_{(\theta \leq n)} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ k^n h(r \prod_{i=1}^n Y_i) 1_{(\theta > n)} \right] \\ &\leq h(1) \mathbb{E} \left[ k^\theta \right] + h(r \bar{a}^n) \mathbb{E} \left[ k^n 1_{(\theta > n)} \right] \\ &\leq h(1) \mathbb{E} \left[ k^\theta \right] + h(r \bar{a}^n) \mathbb{E} \left[ k^\theta \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $r \bar{a}^n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we get that [recalling that  $\theta$  depends on  $r$ ]

$$h(r) \leq (h(1) + \frac{b}{k-1}) \mathbb{E} \left[ k^\theta \right], \quad \forall r > 1. \tag{3.22}$$

To estimate  $\mathbb{E} \left[ k^\theta \right]$ , let us find  $\lambda > 0$  such that  $\mathbb{E} \left[ Y^\lambda \right] = \frac{1}{k}$ . By the law of  $Y$ , this is equivalent to  $\sum_{i=1}^k a_i^\lambda = 1$ .

By the choice of  $(a_i)$ , we have  $\beta \leq \lambda < \beta + \varepsilon$ . Then the process  $n \rightarrow k^n \prod_{i=1}^n Y_i^\lambda$  is a martingale (moreover uniformly integrable on  $[0, \theta]$ ). Hence the optional stopping theorem implies that

$$1 = \mathbb{E} \left[ k^\theta \prod_{i=1}^{\theta} Y_i^\lambda \right] \geq \mathbb{E} \left[ k^\theta \right] r^{-\lambda} \min_{1 \leq i \leq k} a_i^\lambda,$$

since  $\prod_{i=1}^{\theta} Y_i \geq \frac{1}{r} \min_{1 \leq i \leq k} a_i$ . This and (3.22) give that

$$h(r) \leq (h(1) + \frac{b}{k-1}) \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} a_i^{-\lambda} r^\lambda, \quad \forall r > 1,$$

yielding the lower bound in (1.15) since  $\lambda < \beta + \varepsilon$ . This completes the proof of (1.15). Finally, by using the elementary inequalities: for any  $\varepsilon, t > 0$ ,  $e^{-\varepsilon t} \mathbb{P}(Z < \varepsilon) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-tZ} \right] \leq \mathbb{P}(Z < \varepsilon) + e^{-\varepsilon t}$ , we immediately deduce from (1.15) that  $\mathbb{P}(Z < \varepsilon) = e^{-\varepsilon^{-\beta/(1-\beta)+o(1)}}$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ .  $\square$ .

## 4 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Let us give some preliminary estimates on the branching random walk:

**Lemma 4.1** *Assume (1.1) and (1.2). There exists some constants  $c_5, c_6 > 0$  such that for  $n \geq 1$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\min_{|u|=n} \bar{V}(u) < c_5 n^{1/3}\right) \leq c_6 e^{-c_5 n^{1/3}}, \quad (4.1)$$

where we recall that for any  $|u| = n$ ,  $\bar{V}(u) := \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} V(u_i)$ . Consequently, for any  $0 < \lambda \leq c_5 n^{1/3}$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} |u| > n\right) \leq c_6 e^{-c_5 n^{1/3}}. \quad (4.2)$$

We mention that under an extra integrability condition, i.e.  $\exists \delta > 0$  such that  $\mathbb{E}[\nu^{1+\delta}] < \infty$ ,  $n^{-1/3} \min_{|u|=n} \bar{V}(u) \rightarrow (\frac{3\pi^2\sigma^2}{2})^{1/3}$   $\mathbb{P}^*$ -a.s. (see [14] and [13]) and the probability term in (4.1) is equal to  $e^{(c_5 - (\frac{3\pi^2\sigma^2}{2})^{1/3} + o(1))n^{1/3}}$  for any  $0 < c_5 < (\frac{3\pi^2\sigma^2}{2})^{1/3}$  (see [14], Proposition 2.3). Here, we only assume (1.1) and (1.2), and we do not seek the precise upper bound in (4.1).

**Proof of Lemma 4.1.** We shall use the following fact (see Shi [33]):

$$\mathbb{P}(\inf_{u \in \mathbb{T}} V(u) < -\lambda) \leq e^{-\lambda}, \quad \forall \lambda \geq 0. \quad (4.3)$$

Consider  $0 < c < (\frac{\pi^2\sigma^2}{8})^{1/3}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\min_{|u|=n} \bar{V}(u) < cn^{1/3}, \inf_{u \in \mathbb{T}} V(u) \geq -cn^{1/3}\right) &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{|u|=n} 1_{(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |V(u_i)| \leq cn^{1/3})}\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[e^{S_n} 1_{(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |S_i| \leq cn^{1/3})}\right] \quad (\text{by (2.7)}) \\ &\leq e^{cn^{1/3}} \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |S_i| \leq cn^{1/3}\right) \\ &= e^{cn^{1/3}} e^{-(\frac{\pi^2\sigma^2}{8c^2} + o(1))n^{1/3}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Mogulskii [31]. This and (4.3) easily yield the Lemma by choosing a sufficiently small constant  $c$ .  $\square$

Recall (1.19). Define for  $a \in (0, \infty]$  and  $\lambda > 0$ ,

$$\mathcal{L}_\lambda^{(a)} := \left\{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda : V(u) \leq \lambda + a\right\}. \quad (4.4)$$

In particular,  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda^{(\infty)} = \mathcal{L}_\lambda$ . Recall (1.20). Since the function  $x \rightarrow xe^{-x}$  is decreasing for  $x \geq 1$ , then for any  $\lambda > 1$ ,  $D_{\mathcal{L}_\lambda} \leq \lambda e^{-\lambda} \#\mathcal{L}_\lambda$ , which implies that

$$\liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \lambda e^{-\lambda} \#\mathcal{L}_\lambda \geq D_\infty > 0. \quad \text{a.s. on } \mathcal{S}. \quad (4.5)$$

If  $\nu = \infty$  [which is allowed under (1.1) and (1.2)], then  $\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda = \infty$  hence (4.5) cannot be strengthened into a true limit. We present a similar result for  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda^{(a)}$ :

**Lemma 4.2** Assume (1.1), (1.2) and that  $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{|u|=1}(V(u)^+)^3 e^{-V(u)}] < \infty$ . There exists some  $a_0 > 0$  such that for all large  $a \geq a_0$ , almost surely on the set of non-extinction  $\mathcal{S}$ ,

$$0 < \liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \lambda e^{-\lambda} \#\mathcal{L}_\lambda^{(a)} \leq \limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \lambda e^{-\lambda} \#\mathcal{L}_\lambda^{(a)} < \infty.$$

**Proof of Lemma 4.2.** We only deal with the case when the distribution of  $\Theta$  is non-lattice, in this case, the limit exists. The lattice case can be treated in a similar way, by applying Gatzouras ([18], Theorem 5.2), a lattice version of Nerman [32]'s result, but the cyclic phenomenon could prevent from the existence of limit. In the non-lattice case, we are going to prove that for any  $a > 0$ , almost surely on the set of non-extinction  $\mathcal{S}$ ,

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \lambda e^{-\lambda} \#\mathcal{L}_\lambda^{(a)} = c_7(a) D_\infty, \quad (4.6)$$

where  $c_7(a) := \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[S_{\tau_0}]} \mathbb{E}[e^{\min(a, S_{\tau_0})} - 1]$ , and  $S$  and  $\tau_0$  are defined by (2.7) and (2.8) respectively. Obviously,  $c_7(a) > 0$  for all large  $a$ .

To get (4.6), we consider a new point process  $\hat{\Theta} := \sum_{u \in \mathcal{L}_0} \delta_{\{V(u)\}}$  on  $(0, \infty)$ . Generate a branching random walk  $(\hat{V}(u), u \in \hat{\mathbb{T}})$  from the point process  $\hat{\Theta}$ , in the same way as  $(V(u), u \in \mathbb{T})$  do from  $\Theta$ . Remark that  $\mathcal{S} = \{\sup_{u \in \mathbb{T}} V(u) = \infty\} = \{\hat{\mathbb{T}} \text{ is infinite}\}$ , and

$$\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda^{(a)} = \sum_{u \in \hat{\mathbb{T}}} \phi_u(\lambda - \hat{V}(u)), \quad \sum_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} e^{-V(u)+\lambda} = \sum_{u \in \hat{\mathbb{T}}} \psi_u(\lambda - \hat{V}(u)),$$

where

$$\phi_u(y) := 1_{(y \geq 0)} \sum_{\substack{\leftarrow \\ v: \bar{v}=u}} 1_{(y < \hat{V}(v) - \hat{V}(u) \leq y+a)}, \quad \psi_u(y) := 1_{(y \geq 0)} \sum_{\substack{\leftarrow \\ v: \bar{v}=u}} e^{y - (\hat{V}(v) - \hat{V}(u))} 1_{(\hat{V}(v) - \hat{V}(u) > y)}.$$

Applying Theorem 6.3 in Nerman [32] (with  $\alpha = 1$  there) gives that almost surely on  $\mathcal{S}$ ,

$$\frac{\sum_{u \in \hat{\mathbb{T}}} \phi_u(\lambda - \hat{V}(u))}{\sum_{u \in \hat{\mathbb{T}}} \psi_u(\lambda - \hat{V}(u))} \rightarrow \frac{\mathbb{E}[\sum_{|u|=1, u \in \hat{\mathbb{T}}} (e^{-(\hat{V}(u)-a)^+} - e^{-\hat{V}(u)})]}{\mathbb{E}[\sum_{|u|=1, u \in \hat{\mathbb{T}}} \hat{V}(u) e^{-\hat{V}(u)}]}.$$

Remark that  $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{|u|=1, u \in \hat{\mathbb{T}}} (e^{-(\hat{V}(u)-a)^+} - e^{-\hat{V}(u)})] = \mathbb{E}[\sum_{u \in \mathcal{L}_0} (e^{-(V(u)-a)^+} - e^{-V(u)})] = \mathbb{E}[e^{\min(a, S_{\tau_0})} - 1]$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{|u|=1, u \in \hat{\mathbb{T}}} \hat{V}(u) e^{-\hat{V}(u)}] = \mathbb{E}[\sum_{u \in \mathcal{L}_0} V(u) e^{-V(u)}] = \mathbb{E}[S_{\tau_0}]$ . Hence on  $\mathcal{S}$ , a.s.,

$$\frac{\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda^{(a)}}{\sum_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} e^{-V(u)+\lambda}} \rightarrow c_7(a). \quad (4.7)$$

On the other hand, almost surely,

$$D_{\mathcal{L}_\lambda} = \lambda e^{-\lambda} \left( \sum_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} e^{-V(u)+\lambda} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \eta_\lambda \right) \rightarrow D_\infty, \quad \lambda \rightarrow \infty, \quad (4.8)$$

where  $\eta_\lambda := \sum_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} (V(u) - \lambda)e^{-V(u)+\lambda}$ . By the many-to-one formula and the assumption,  $\mathbb{E}[(S_1^+)^3] = \mathbb{E}[\sum_{|u|=1} (V(u)^+)^3 e^{-V(u)}] < \infty$ . Then by Doney [12],  $\mathbb{E}[S_{\tau_0}^2] < \infty$ .

Note that  $\eta_\lambda = \sum_{u \in \mathbb{T}} \tilde{\psi}_u(\lambda - \widehat{V}(u))$  with  $\tilde{\psi}_u(y) := 1_{(y \geq 0)} \sum_{v: \overleftarrow{v}=u} e^{y - (\widehat{V}(v) - \widehat{V}(u))} (\widehat{V}(v) - \widehat{V}(u) - y) 1_{(\widehat{V}(v) - \widehat{V}(u) > y)}$ . In the same manner we get that almost surely on  $\mathcal{S}$ ,

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\eta_\lambda}{\sum_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} e^{-V(u)+\lambda}} = c_8, \quad (4.9)$$

with  $c_8 := \frac{1}{2} \frac{\mathbb{E}[S_{\tau_0}^2]}{\mathbb{E}[S_{\tau_0}]} > 0$ . It follows that a.s. on  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $\sum_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} e^{-V(u)+\lambda} \sim \frac{1}{\lambda} e^\lambda D_{\mathcal{L}_\lambda} \sim \frac{1}{\lambda} e^\lambda D_\infty$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ . This combined with (4.7) and (4.8) yield (4.6), as desired.  $\square$

**Remark 4.3** *The condition  $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{|u|=1} (V(u)^+)^3 e^{-V(u)}] < \infty$  was used in the above proof of Lemma 4.2 only to obtain (4.9) which controls the contribution of  $\eta_\lambda$  in  $D_{\mathcal{L}_\lambda}$ . We do not know how to relax this condition.*

We consider now some deviations on the minimum  $\mathbb{M}_n$ . If the distribution of  $\Theta$  is non-lattice, Aïdékon (Proposition 4.1, [2]) proved that for any  $A > 0$  and for all large  $n, \lambda$  such that  $A \leq \lambda \leq \frac{3}{2} \log n - A$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{M}_n < \frac{3}{2} \log n - \lambda\right) = (c_9 + o_A(1)) \lambda e^{-\lambda},$$

with  $c_9$  some positive constant and  $o_A(1) \rightarrow 0$  as  $A \rightarrow \infty$  uniformly in  $n, \lambda$ . We shall need in the proof of Theorem 1.1 an estimate which holds uniformly in  $\lambda$ .

**Lemma 4.4 (Mallein [30], Lemma 4.2)** *Assume (1.1) and (1.2). There is some constant  $c_{10} > 0$  such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{M}_n < \frac{3}{2} \log n - \lambda\right) \leq c_{10} (1 + \lambda) e^{-\lambda}, \quad \forall n \geq 1, \lambda \geq 0.$$

The tightness of  $(\mathbb{M}_n - \frac{3}{2} \log n)_{n \geq 1}$  under (1.1) and (1.2) was implicitly contained in Aïdékon ([2]) (see also [9], and see [1] for exponential decay under some additional assumptions): Assume (1.1) and (1.2). We have<sup>†</sup>

$$\limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}^*\left(\mathbb{M}_n - \frac{3}{2} \log n \geq \lambda\right) = 0, \quad (4.10)$$

where as before,  $\mathbb{P}^*(\cdot) := \mathbb{P}(\cdot | \mathcal{S})$ . We need some tightness uniformly in  $n$ :

---

<sup>†</sup>In fact, by Lemma 3.6 in [2] and using the fact that  $\mathbb{M}_n$  is stochastically smaller than  $M_n^{\text{kill}}$ , we obtain that  $\sup_{n \geq 3} \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{M}_n \geq \frac{3}{2} \log n) \leq e^{-C}$  for some (small) constant  $C > 0$ . For any  $k \geq 1$ , denote by  $Z_k := \sum_{|u|=k} 1$  the number of individuals at generation  $k$ . By the triangular inequality and the branching property at  $k$ , we get that for any  $n \geq k + 3$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{M}_n \geq \frac{3}{2} \log n + \lambda, \mathcal{S}) \leq \mathbb{P}(\exists |u| = k : V(u) > \lambda) + \mathbb{E}[1_{(Z_k > 0)} e^{-C Z_k}]$ . Letting  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$  and then  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , we get (4.10). The left tail  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{M}_n - \frac{3}{2} \log n < -\lambda)$ , as  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ , follows from [2], see also Lemma 4.4.

**Lemma 4.5** *Assume (1.1) and (1.2). For any fixed  $a > 1$ , we have*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}^* \left( \max_{n \leq k \leq an} \mathbb{M}_k \geq \frac{3}{2} \log n + x \right) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty.$$

**Proof of Lemma 4.5.** Obviously, it is enough to prove the Lemma for  $a = 2$ . By Lemma 4.4, there exists some  $\lambda_0 > 0$  such that for all  $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$  and for all  $n \leq k \leq 3n$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \mathbb{M}_{4n-k} \geq \frac{3}{2} \log n - \lambda \right) \geq \exp \left( -2c_{10} \lambda e^{-\lambda} \right). \quad (4.11)$$

Let  $x \geq 2\lambda_0$  and  $n \gg x$ . Define

$$\kappa_x \equiv \kappa_x(n) := \inf \{ k \geq n : \mathbb{M}_k \geq \frac{3}{2} \log n + x \}, \quad (\inf_{\emptyset} = \infty).$$

Let  $n \leq k \leq 3n$ . Denote by  $\mathcal{S}_k$  the event that the Galton-Watson tree  $\mathbb{T}$  survives up to the generation  $k$ . Then  $\mathcal{S}_k$  is non-increasing on  $k$ . On the set  $\{\kappa_x = k\} \cap \mathcal{S}_k$ ,  $V(u) > \frac{3}{2} \log n + x$  for any  $|u| = k$ . Let  $0 < y < x - \lambda_0$ . It follows from the branching property that on  $\{\kappa_x = k\} \cap \mathcal{S}_k$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left( \mathbb{M}_{4n} > \frac{3}{2} \log n + y \mid \mathcal{F}_k \right) &= \prod_{|u|=k} \mathbb{P} \left( \mathbb{M}_{4n-k} \geq \frac{3}{2} \log n - \lambda \right) \Big|_{\lambda=V(u)-y} \\ &\geq \exp \left( -2c_{10} \sum_{|u|=k} (V(u) - y) e^{-(V(u)-y)} \right) \\ &\geq \exp \left( -2c_{10} e^y D_k \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (4.11) to get the above first inequality.

Therefore for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $n \leq k \leq 3n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left( \mathbb{M}_{4n} > \frac{3}{2} \log n + y, \mathcal{S}_k, \kappa_x = k \right) &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-2c_{10} e^y D_k} 1_{(\mathcal{S}_k \cap \{\kappa_x = k\})} \right] \\ &\geq e^{-\varepsilon} \mathbb{P} \left( A_{(4.13)} \cap \{\kappa_x = k\} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

where

$$A_{(4.13)} := \mathcal{S} \cap \left\{ \sup_{n \leq j \leq 4n} D_j \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2c_{10}} e^{-y} \right\}. \quad (4.13)$$

Since  $\mathcal{S}_k \subset \mathcal{S}_n$  for  $k \geq n$ , (4.12) still holds if we replace  $\mathcal{S}_k$  by  $\mathcal{S}_n$  in the LHS. Taking the sum over  $n \leq k \leq 3n$  for (4.12) (with  $\mathcal{S}_k$  replaced by  $\mathcal{S}_n$ ), we get that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $0 < y < x - \lambda_0$  and all  $n \geq n_0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left( A_{(4.13)} \cap \left\{ \max_{n \leq k \leq 3n} \mathbb{M}_k \geq \frac{3}{2} \log n + x \right\} \right) &\leq e^\varepsilon \mathbb{P} \left( \mathbb{M}_{4n} > \frac{3}{2} \log n + y, \mathcal{S}_n \right) \\ &\leq e^\varepsilon \mathbb{P} \left( \mathbb{M}_{4n} > \frac{3}{2} \log n + y, \mathcal{S} \right) + e^\varepsilon \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}^c \cap \mathcal{S}_n) \\ &\leq \varepsilon + e^\varepsilon \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}^c \cap \mathcal{S}_n), \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

by using (4.10) if we choose a sufficiently large constant  $y = y(\varepsilon)$  only depending on  $\varepsilon$ . Since  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}^c \cap \mathcal{S}_n) = 0$ , then for  $x > y(\varepsilon) + \lambda_0$  and all large  $n \geq n_1(\varepsilon)$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(A_{(4.13)} \cap \left\{ \max_{n \leq k \leq 3n} \mathbb{M}_k \geq \frac{3}{2} \log n + x \right\}\right) \leq 2\varepsilon. \quad (4.15)$$

Note the factor  $3n$  in the above estimate and we fix our choice of  $y \equiv y(\varepsilon)$  in  $A_{(4.13)}$ .

Now, we shall get rid of the term  $A_{(4.13)}$  in (4.15). Let  $z \in (y, x - \lambda_0)$ . Recalling the definition of  $\mathcal{L}_z$  in (1.19). Define

$$A_{(4.16)} := \left\{ \exists u \in \mathcal{L}_z : |u| \leq x, V(u) \leq x, \sup_{\frac{n}{2} \leq j \leq 3n} D_j^{(u)} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2c_{10}} e^{-y}, \mathcal{S}^{(u)} \right\}, \quad (4.16)$$

where  $(D_j^{(u)}, j \geq 0), \mathbb{M}^{(u)}, \mathcal{S}^{(u)}$  are defined from the subtree  $\mathbb{T}_u$  in the same way as  $(D_j, j \geq 0), \mathbb{M}, \mathcal{S}$  do from  $\mathbb{T}$ . Let  $n > 2x$ . The event  $\{\max_{n \leq k \leq 2n} \mathbb{M}_k \geq \frac{3}{2} \log n + 2x, \mathcal{S}\}$  implies that for some  $n \leq k \leq 2n$ , for any  $|v| = k$ ,  $V(v) \geq \frac{3}{2} \log n + 2x$ . If  $A_{(4.16)} \neq \emptyset$ , then we take an arbitrary  $u \in A_{(4.16)}$  and get that  $\mathbb{M}_{k-|u|}^{(u)} \geq \frac{3}{2} \log n + 2x - V(u) \geq \frac{3}{2} \log n + x$ . By conditioning on  $|u|$ , we get that for  $z \in (y, x - \lambda_0)$  and for all large  $n \geq n_2(x, \varepsilon)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{n \leq k \leq 2n} \mathbb{M}_k \geq \frac{3}{2} \log n + 2x, \mathcal{S}, A_{(4.16)} \neq \emptyset\right) \\ & \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq x} \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{n-i \leq k \leq 2n-i} \mathbb{M}_k \geq \frac{3}{2} \log n + x, \sup_{\frac{n}{2} \leq j \leq 3n} D_j \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2c_{10}} e^{-y}, \mathcal{S}\right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{\frac{2n}{3} \leq k \leq 2n} \mathbb{M}_k \geq \frac{3}{2} \log n + x, \sup_{\frac{n}{2} \leq j \leq 3n} D_j \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2c_{10}} e^{-y}, \mathcal{S}\right) \\ & \leq 2\varepsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

by applying (4.15) to get the last inequality. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(A_{(4.16)} = \emptyset, \mathcal{S}\right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\forall u \in \mathcal{L}_z, \sup_{\frac{n}{2} \leq j \leq 3n} D_j^{(u)} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2c_{10}} e^{-y} \text{ or } (\mathcal{S}^{(u)})^c, \mathcal{L}_z \neq \emptyset\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{u \in \mathcal{L}_z} \max(V(u), |u|) \geq x\right) \\ & = \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-p_n(\varepsilon, y) \#\mathcal{L}_z} 1_{(\#\mathcal{L}_z > 0)}\right] + \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{u \in \mathcal{L}_z} \max(V(u), |u|) \geq x\right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

where the last equality is due to the branching property at  $\mathcal{L}_z$ , and  $p_n(\varepsilon, y)$  is defined by  $e^{-p_n(\varepsilon, y)} := \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{\frac{n}{2} \leq j \leq 3n} D_j \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2c_{10}} e^{-y} \text{ or } \mathcal{S}^c\right)$ . As  $D_n \rightarrow D_\infty$ , almost surely on  $\mathcal{S}$ , we see that  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-p_n(\varepsilon, y)} \leq \mathbb{P}\left(D_\infty > \frac{\varepsilon}{2c_{10}} e^{-y} \text{ or } \mathcal{S}^c\right)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

By Liu [27], Theorem 2.6<sup>‡</sup>,  $\mathbb{P}\left(0 < D_\infty \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2c_{10}} e^{-y}, \mathcal{S}\right) > 0$  hence  $\mathbb{P}\left(D_\infty > \frac{\varepsilon}{2c_{10}} e^{-y} \text{ or } \mathcal{S}^c\right) < 1$  and there exists some  $p(\varepsilon, y) > 0$  such that for all large  $n$ ,  $e^{-p_n(\varepsilon, y)} \leq e^{-p(\varepsilon, y)}$ .

<sup>‡</sup>This is where we use the condition that the law of  $\log \sum_{|u|=1} e^{-V(u)}$  is non-lattice.

Assembling (4.17) and (4.18) give that for any  $z > y$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} C_{(4.19)} &:= \limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \max_{n \leq k \leq 2n} \mathbb{M}_k \geq \frac{3}{2} \log n + 2x, \mathcal{S} \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-p(\varepsilon, y) \# \mathcal{L}_z} 1_{(\# \mathcal{L}_z > 0)} \right] + 2\varepsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

Notice that  $\{\# \mathcal{L}_z > 0\}$  is nonincreasing on  $z$  and its limit as  $z \rightarrow \infty$  equals  $\mathcal{S}$ . Then  $\mathbb{P}(\{\# \mathcal{L}_z > 0\} \cap \mathcal{S}^c) \rightarrow 0$  as  $z \rightarrow \infty$ . On  $\mathcal{S}$ , we have from (4.5) that  $\mathcal{L}_z \rightarrow \infty$  as  $z \rightarrow \infty$  almost surely, hence  $\mathbb{E}[e^{-p(\varepsilon, y) \# \mathcal{L}_z} 1_{(\# \mathcal{L}_z > 0)}] \leq \mathbb{E}[e^{-p(\varepsilon, y) \# \mathcal{L}_z} 1_{\mathcal{S}}] + \mathbb{P}(\{\# \mathcal{L}_z > 0\} \cap \mathcal{S}^c) \rightarrow 0$  as  $z \rightarrow \infty$ . Then letting  $z \rightarrow \infty$ , we see that  $C_{(4.19)} \leq 2\varepsilon$ . This proves the Lemma since  $\varepsilon$  can be arbitrarily small.  $\square$

We are now ready to give the proof of Theorem 1.1.

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.**

*Proof of the lower bound in Theorem 1.1.* Consider large integer  $j$ . Let  $n_j := 2^j$  and  $\lambda_j := a \log \log \log n_j$  with some constant  $0 < a < 1$ . Fix  $\alpha > 0$  and put

$$A_j := \left\{ \mathbb{M}_{n_j} > \frac{3}{2} \log n_j + \lambda_j \right\}.$$

Recall that if the system dies out at generation  $n_j$ , then by definition  $\mathbb{M}_{n_j} = \infty$ . Define  $\mathbb{M}^{(u)}$  from the subtree  $\mathbb{T}_u$  in the same way as  $\mathbb{M}$  does from  $\mathbb{T}$ . Then  $A_j = \{\forall |u| = n_{j-1}, \mathbb{M}_{n_j - n_{j-1}}^{(u)} \geq \frac{3}{2} \log n_j + \lambda_j - V(u)\}$ , which by the branching property at  $n_{j-1}$  implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(A_j | \mathcal{F}_{n_{j-1}}) = \prod_{|u|=n_{j-1}} \mathbb{P} \left( \mathbb{M}_{n_j - n_{j-1}} \geq \frac{3}{2} \log n_j + \lambda_j - x \right) \Big|_{x=V(u)},$$

with the usual convention:  $\prod_{\emptyset} := 1$ . By the lower limits of  $\mathbb{M}_{n_{j-1}}$  (cf. (1.3)), a.s. for all large  $j$ ,  $\mathbb{M}_{n_{j-1}} \geq \frac{1}{3} \log n_{j-1} \sim \frac{\log 2}{3} j$ , hence  $x \equiv V(u) \gg \lambda_j$  since  $\lambda_j \sim a \log \log j$ . Applying Lemma 4.4 gives that on  $\{\mathbb{M}_{n_{j-1}} \geq \frac{1}{3} \log n_{j-1}\}$ , for some constant  $C > 0$ , for all  $|u| = n_{j-1}$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \mathbb{M}_{n_j - n_{j-1}} < \frac{3}{2} \log n_j + \lambda_j - x \right) \Big|_{x=V(u)} \leq C V(u) e^{-(V(u) - \lambda_j)}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(A_j | \mathcal{F}_{n_{j-1}}) &\geq 1_{(\mathbb{M}_{n_{j-1}} \geq \frac{1}{3} \log n_{j-1})} \prod_{|u|=n_{j-1}} \left( 1 - C V(u) e^{-(V(u) - \lambda_j)} \right) \\ &\geq 1_{(\mathbb{M}_{n_{j-1}} \geq \frac{1}{3} \log n_{j-1})} \exp \left( - 2C \sum_{|u|=n_{j-1}} V(u) e^{-(V(u) - \lambda_j)} \right) \\ &= 1_{(\mathbb{M}_{n_{j-1}} \geq \frac{1}{3} \log n_{j-1})} \exp \left( - 2C e^{\lambda_j} D_{n_{j-1}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $D_{n_{j-1}} \rightarrow D_\infty$ , a.s., and  $e^{\lambda_j} \sim (\log j)^a$  with  $a < 1$ , we get that almost surely,

$$\sum_j \mathbb{P}\left(A_j \mid \mathcal{F}_{n_{j-1}}\right) = \infty,$$

which according to Lévy's conditional form of Borel-Cantelli's lemma ([25], Corollary 68), implies that  $\mathbb{P}(A_i, \text{i.o.}) = 1$ . Then

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\log \log \log n} (\mathbb{M}_n - \frac{3}{2} \log n) \geq a, \quad \text{a.s.}$$

The lower bound follows by letting  $a \rightarrow 1$ .  $\square$

*Proof of the upper bound in Theorem 1.1.* Let  $\delta > 0$  be small. Recall (4.4). Let  $a \geq a_0$  be as in Lemma 4.2 such that a.s. on  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda^{(a)} \geq e^{(1-\delta)\lambda}$  for all large  $\lambda$ . Let  $b > 0$  such that  $e^{-b} > q \equiv \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}^c)$ . By Lemma 4.5, there exists some constant  $x_0 > 0$  such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{n \leq k \leq 4n} \mathbb{M}_k > \frac{3}{2} \log n + x_0\right) \leq e^{-b}, \quad \forall n \geq n_0.$$

Let  $x_1 := x_0 + a$ . Consider large integer  $j$  and define  $n_j := 2^j$ ,  $\lambda_j := (1 + 2\delta) \log \log \log n_j$ . Define

$$B_j := \left\{ \max_{n_j < k \leq n_{j+1}} \mathbb{M}_k > \frac{3}{2} \log n_j + \lambda_j + x_1 \right\} \cap \mathcal{S}.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(B_j, \#\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_j}^{(a)} \geq e^{(1-\delta)\lambda_j}, \max_{u \in \mathcal{L}_{\lambda_j}^{(a)}} |u| \leq n_{j-1}\right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\forall u \in \mathcal{L}_{\lambda_j}^{(a)} : \max_{n_{j-1} \leq k \leq n_{j+1}} \mathbb{M}_k^{(u)} > \frac{3}{2} \log n_j + x_0, \#\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_j}^{(a)} \geq e^{(1-\delta)\lambda_j}\right) \\ & \leq \exp\left(-b e^{(1-\delta)\lambda_j}\right), \end{aligned}$$

whose sum on  $j$  converges [ $\delta$  being small]. On the other hand, by (4.2),  $\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{u \in \mathcal{L}_{\lambda_j}^{(a)}} |u| > n_{j-1}\right) \leq c_6 e^{-c_5 n_j^{1/3}}$  whose sum again converges. Therefore,  $\sum_j \mathbb{P}(B_j, \#\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_j}^{(a)} \geq e^{(1-\delta)\lambda_j}) < \infty$ . By Borel-Cantelli's lemma, almost surely, for all large  $j$ , the event  $\{B_j, \#\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_j}^{(a)} \geq e^{(1-\delta)\lambda_j}\}$  does not hold; but we have chosen  $a$  such that on  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $\#\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_j}^{(a)} \geq e^{(1-\delta)\lambda_j}$  for all large  $j$ . Hence a.s. on  $\mathcal{S}$ , for all large  $j$ ,  $\max_{n_j < k \leq n_{j+1}} \mathbb{M}_k \leq \frac{3}{2} \log n_j + \lambda_j + x_1$ , from which we get that a.s. on  $\mathcal{S}$ ,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\log \log \log n} (\mathbb{M}_n - \frac{3}{2} \log n) \leq 1 + 2\delta,$$

yielding the upper bound as  $\delta > 0$  can be arbitrarily small.  $\square$



## 5 Proof of Theorem 1.4

### 5.1 The Böttcher case: Proof of (1.17)

Recall (1.19) for the stopping line  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$ .

**Lemma 5.1 (The Böttcher case)** *Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 1.4, for any constant  $a > 0$ , we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-a\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda}\right] = e^{-e^{(\beta+o(1))\lambda}}, \quad \lambda \rightarrow \infty. \quad (5.1)$$

**Proof of Lemma 5.1.** Let us check at first the lower bound in (5.1). Observe that  $\mathbb{P}$ -almost surely,

$$D_\infty = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} e^{-V(u)} D_\infty(u), \quad (5.2)$$

where conditioned on  $\{V(u), u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda\}$ ,  $D_\infty(u)$  are independent copies of  $D_\infty$ . Take  $K_0$  large enough such that  $\mathbb{E}[e^{-K_0 D_\infty}] \leq e^{-a}$ , that is possible because  $D_\infty > 0$ ,  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. Let  $x = K_0 e^{\lambda+K}$ , where  $K = \text{esssup} \max_{|u|=1} V(u) < \infty$  is as in (1.8). Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-x D_\infty}\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-x e^{-y} D_\infty}\right] \Big|_{y=V(u) \leq \lambda+K}\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} e^{-a}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-a\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-a\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda}\right] \geq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-x D_\infty}\right] = e^{-x\beta+o(1)} = e^{-e^{(\beta+o(1))\lambda}}$  gives the lower bound of (5.1).

For the upper bound of (5.1), we use again (5.2) to see that  $D_\infty \leq e^{-\lambda} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} D_\infty(u)$ . Take a constant  $b > 0$  such that  $\mathbb{E}[e^{-b D_\infty}] \geq e^{-a}$ . It follows that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-b e^\lambda D_\infty}\right] \geq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-b \sum_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} D_\infty(u)}\right] \geq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-a\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda}\right],$$

since conditioned on  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$ ,  $(D_\infty(u))_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda}$  are i.i.d. copies of  $D_\infty$ . Then (1.15) implies the upper bound of (5.1).  $\square$

**Proof of (1.17).** By Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5, we can choose two positive constants  $c_{11}$  and  $c_{12}$  such that for any  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$\min_{\frac{n}{2} \leq j \leq n} \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{M}_j \geq \frac{3}{2} \log n - c_{11}\right) \geq e^{-c_{12}}, \quad (5.3)$$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{\frac{n}{2} \leq j \leq 3n} \mathbb{M}_j \geq \frac{3}{2} \log n + c_{11}\right) \leq e^{-c_{12}}, \quad (5.4)$$

For any  $u \in \mathbb{T}$ , define as before  $\mathbb{M}_j^{(u)} := \min_{v \in \mathbb{T}_u, |v|=|u|+j} (V(v) - V(u))$  for any  $j \geq 0$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{M}_n > \frac{3}{2} \log n + \lambda - c_{11}\right) &\geq \mathbb{P}\left(\forall u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda, |u| \leq \frac{n}{2}, M_{n-|u|}^{(u)} \geq \frac{3}{2} \log n - c_{11}\right) \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-c_{12} \#\mathcal{L}_\lambda} \mathbf{1}_{(\max_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} |u| \leq \frac{n}{2})}\right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-c_{12} \#\mathcal{L}_\lambda}\right] - \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} |u| > \frac{n}{2}\right) \\ &\geq e^{-e^{(\beta+o(1))\lambda}} - c_6 e^{-c_5 n^{1/3}}, \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 5.1 and (4.2). The lower bound in (1.17) follows from the assumption that  $\lambda = o(\log n)$ .

To get the upper bound in (1.17), we use the hypothesis (1.8) and obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{n \leq k \leq 2n} \mathbb{M}_k > \frac{3}{2} \log n + \lambda + c_{11} + K\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\forall u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda, \max_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} |u| \leq \frac{n}{2}, \max_{n \leq k \leq 2n} \mathbb{M}_{k-|u|}^{(u)} \geq \frac{3}{2} \log n + c_{11}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} |u| > \frac{n}{2}\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-c_{12} \#\mathcal{L}_\lambda}\right] + c_6 e^{-c_5 n^{1/3}}, \end{aligned}$$

by (5.4) and (4.2). The upper bound follows from Lemma 5.1.  $\square$

## 5.2 The Schröder case: Proof of (1.16)

In the case  $q := \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}^c) > 0$ , we need to estimate the probability that the extinction happens after  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$ :

**Lemma 5.2** *Assume (1.1), (1.2) and (1.5). Then for any  $\lambda > 0$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\{\mathcal{L}_\lambda \neq \emptyset\} \cap \mathcal{S}^c\right) = \mathbb{E}\left[q^{\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda} \mathbf{1}_{(\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda > 0)}\right] \leq q e^{-\gamma\lambda}.$$

**Proof of Lemma 5.2.** The above equality is an immediate consequence of the branching property at the optional line  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$  (cf. [8]).

To show the above inequality, we recall that  $\nu(u)$ , for any  $u \in \mathbb{T}$ , denotes the number of children of  $u$ . Write  $u < \mathcal{L}_\lambda$  if there exists some particle  $v \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda$  such that  $u < v$  [i.e.  $u$  is an ancestor of  $v$ ]. Then for the tree up to  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$ , the following equality holds: almost surely,

$$\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda = 1 + \sum_{\emptyset \leq u < \mathcal{L}_\lambda} (\nu(u) - 1). \quad (5.5)$$

Recall (1.5). Define a process

$$X_n := \sum_{|u|=n} \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} (q^{\nu(u_i)-1} \mathbf{1}_{(\nu(u_i) \geq 1)}) e^{\gamma V(u)}, \quad n \geq 1,$$

where as before,  $u_i$  denotes the ancestor of  $u$  at  $i$ th generation. It is straightforward to check, by using the branching property, that  $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$  is a (nonnegative) martingale with mean 1. Define

$$X_{\mathcal{L}_\lambda} := \sum_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} \prod_{i=0}^{|u|-1} (q^{\nu(u_i)-1} 1_{(\nu(u_i) \geq 1)}) e^{\gamma V(u)}, \quad \lambda > 0.$$

According to Biggins and Kyprianou ([8], Lemma 14.1),  $\mathbb{E}[X_{\mathcal{L}_\lambda}]$  equals  $\mathbb{E}[X_1]$  times some probability term, hence  $\mathbb{E}[X_{\mathcal{L}_\lambda}] \leq \mathbb{E}[X_1] = 1$ .

Notice that for any  $u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda$ ,  $\nu(u_i) \geq 1$  for all  $i < |u|$  and  $\prod_{i=0}^{|u|-1} (q^{\nu(u_i)-1} 1_{(\nu(u_i) \geq 1)}) = q^{\sum_{0 \leq i < |u|} (\nu(u_i)-1)} \geq q^{\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda-1}$  by (5.5) [recalling  $q < 1$ ]. Then  $X_{\mathcal{L}_\lambda} \geq q^{\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda-1} e^{\gamma \lambda}$  on  $\{\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda > 0\}$ . The Lemma follows from  $\mathbb{E}[X_{\mathcal{L}_\lambda}] \leq 1$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.3** *Assume (1.1), (1.2), (1.5) and (1.6). For any  $\delta > 0$ , there exist an integer  $m_\delta \geq 1$  and a constant  $\lambda_0(\delta) > 0$  such that for all  $\lambda \geq \lambda_0(\delta)$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}(0 < \#\mathcal{L}_\lambda \leq m_\delta) \geq e^{-(\gamma+\delta)\lambda}.$$

**Proof of Lemma 5.3:** We discuss the case  $q = 0$  and the case  $q > 0$  separately.

(i) *First case:  $q = 0$ .* We shall prove that

$$\mathbb{P}(\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda = 1) \geq e^{-(\gamma+o(1))\lambda}, \quad (5.6)$$

where as usual  $o(1)$  denotes a quantity which goes to 0 as  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ . To this end, we have by the change of measure (see Section 2.2 and (2.9)) that

$$\mathbb{P}(\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda = 1) = \mathbb{Q}\left[\frac{1}{W_{\mathcal{L}_\lambda}} 1_{(\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda=1)}\right] = \mathbb{Q}\left[e^{V(\mathbf{w}_{\tau_\lambda(\mathbf{w})})} 1_{(\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda=1)}\right] \geq e^\lambda \mathbb{Q}(\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda = 1). \quad (5.7)$$

Notice that under  $\mathbb{Q}$ ,  $\{\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda = 1\}$  means that  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda = \{\mathbf{w}_{\tau_\lambda(\mathbf{w})}\}$ . Recall that  $\nu(u)$  denotes the number of children of  $u \in \mathbb{T}$ . Then  $\mathbb{Q}(\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda = 1 | \mathcal{G}_\infty) = 1_{(0 \leq k < \tau_\lambda(\mathbf{w}), \nu(\mathbf{w}_k)=1)}$  and thus

$$\mathbb{P}(\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda = 1) \geq e^\lambda \mathbb{Q}(0 \leq k < \tau_\lambda(\mathbf{w}), \nu(\mathbf{w}_k) = 1). \quad (5.8)$$

Recall (1.9) for  $\gamma$ . We claim that

$$\mathbb{Q}(0 \leq k < \tau_\lambda(\mathbf{w}), \nu(\mathbf{w}_k) = 1) = e^{-(1+\gamma+o(1))\lambda}. \quad (5.9)$$

To get (5.9), we use the fact (cf. Section 2.2) that  $(\sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{w}_k)} \delta_{\{\Delta V(u)\}}, \Delta V(\mathbf{w}_k))_{k \geq 1}$  are i.i.d. under  $\mathbb{Q}$ , where  $\Delta V(u) := V(u) - V(\tilde{u})$  for any  $u \neq \emptyset \equiv \mathbf{w}_0$ . Notice that  $\nu(\mathbf{w}_{k-1}) = 1 + \#\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{w}_k)$ .

Let us check that the process

$$U_n := e^{(1+\gamma)V(\mathbf{w}_n)} 1_{(\forall 1 \leq k \leq n, \nu(\mathbf{w}_{k-1})=1)}, \quad n \geq 1,$$

is a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -martingale of mean 1. In fact,  $U_n$  is a product of  $n$  i.i.d. variables, then it is enough to check that  $\mathbb{Q}[U_1] = 1$ . But  $\mathbb{Q}[U_1] = \mathbb{Q}[e^{(1+\gamma)V(\mathbf{w}_1)} 1_{(\nu(\mathbf{w}_0)=1)}] = \mathbb{E}[\sum_{|u|=1} e^{\gamma V(u)} 1_{(\nu=1)}] = 1$ , as claimed. By the optional stopping theorem and the Fatou lemma, we get that  $\mathbb{Q}[U_{\tau_\lambda(\mathbf{w})}] \leq 1$ , which implies the upper bound in (5.9) since  $V(\tau_\lambda(\mathbf{w})) > \lambda$  [under  $\mathbb{Q}$ ,  $\tau_\lambda(\mathbf{w})$  is a.s. finite].

To get the lower bound in (5.9), let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be small. Fix some large constant  $C$  whose value will be determined later. Let us find some  $\gamma_C$  such that the process

$$U_n^{(C)} := e^{(1+\gamma_C)V(\mathbf{w}_n)} 1_{(\forall 1 \leq k \leq n, \nu(\mathbf{w}_{k-1})=1, \Delta V(\mathbf{w}_k) \leq C)}, \quad n \geq 1,$$

is a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -martingale with mean 1. As for  $U_n$ , the constant  $\gamma_C$ <sup>§</sup> is determined by

$$1 = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{|u|=1} e^{\gamma_C V(u)} 1_{(\nu=1, V(u) \leq C)} \right],$$

where for  $|u| = 1$ ,  $\Delta V(u) = V(u)$ . Plainly  $\gamma_C \rightarrow \gamma$  as  $C \rightarrow \infty$ . Choose  $C$  sufficiently large such that  $\gamma_C \leq \gamma + \varepsilon$ . Since  $(U_k^{(C)}, k \leq \tau_\lambda(\mathbf{w}))$  is uniformly bounded by  $e^{(1+\gamma_C)(\lambda+C)}$ . By the optional stopping theorem, we obtain that

$$1 = \mathbb{Q} \left[ U_{\tau_\lambda(\mathbf{w})}^{(C)} \right] \leq e^{(1+\gamma_C)(\lambda+C)} \mathbb{Q} \left( \forall 1 \leq k \leq n, \nu(\mathbf{w}_{k-1}) = 1 \right),$$

finishing the proof of (5.9) as  $\varepsilon$  can be arbitrarily small. The Lemma (in the case  $q = 0$ ) follows from (5.9) and (5.8).

(ii) *Second (and last) case:*  $q > 0$ . We can not repeat the same proof as before, for instance  $p_1 \equiv \mathbb{P}(\nu = 1)$  may vanish.

Again by the change of measure we have that for any integer  $m \geq 1$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( 0 < \#\mathcal{L}_\lambda \leq m \right) = \mathbb{Q} \left[ \frac{1}{W_{\mathcal{L}_\lambda}} 1_{(\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda \leq m)} \right] \geq \frac{1}{m} e^\lambda \mathbb{Q} \left( \#\mathcal{L}_\lambda \leq m \right), \quad (5.10)$$

where we used the facts that  $W_{\mathcal{L}_\lambda} = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} e^{-V(u)} \leq m e^{-\lambda}$  on  $\{\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda \leq m\}$  and under  $\mathbb{Q}$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$  contains at least the singleton  $\{\mathbf{w}_{\tau_\lambda(\mathbf{w})}\}$ . Define for any  $x > 0$ ,

$$q(x) := \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{v \in \mathbb{T}} V(v) \leq x \right) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L}_x = \emptyset),$$

with the usual convention that  $\sup_\emptyset = 0$ . Plainly,  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} q(x) = \mathbb{P}(\sup_{v \in \mathbb{T}} V(v) < \infty) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}^e) = q$ . For any small  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists some  $x_0 = x_0(\varepsilon) > 0$  such that  $q(x) \geq q - \varepsilon$  for all  $x \geq x_0$ .

---

<sup>§</sup>For the existence of such constant, we used the integrability assumption (1.6): the convex function  $f : b \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[\sum_{|u|=1} e^{bV(u)} 1_{(\nu=1)}]$  has a derivative  $f'(\gamma) \geq \frac{f(\gamma) - f(0)}{\gamma} > 0$  hence  $f$  is increasing at  $\gamma$ . Then  $f(a) > f(\gamma) = 1$ . Take  $C_0$  large enough such that  $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{|u|=1} e^{aV(u)} 1_{(\nu=1, V(u) \leq C_0)}] > 1$ , then such  $\gamma_C$  exists for all  $C \geq C_0$ . We shall use the existences of similar constants later without further explanations.

Let  $\delta > 0$  be small. Before bounding below  $\mathbb{Q}(\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda \leq m)$  with some  $m = m_\delta$ , we first choose some constants. Let  $\alpha$  be large and  $\varepsilon$  be small whose values will be determined later. Recall that  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{w}_k)$  denotes the set of brothers of  $\mathbf{w}_k$ . Let us choose a constant  $\gamma_{\alpha,\varepsilon}$  such that

$$U_n^{(\alpha,\varepsilon)} := e^{(1+\gamma_{\alpha,\varepsilon})V(\mathbf{w}_n)} (q - \varepsilon)^{\sum_{0 \leq k < n} (\nu(\mathbf{w}_k) - 1)} \mathbf{1}_{(\forall k < n, \forall u \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{w}_k), \Delta V(u) \leq \alpha)}, \quad n \geq 1, \quad (5.11)$$

is a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -martingale with mean 1. As before, such  $\gamma_{\alpha,\varepsilon}$  is determined by the following equalities

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \mathbb{Q} \left[ e^{(1+\gamma_{\alpha,\varepsilon})V(\mathbf{w}_1)} (q - \varepsilon)^{\nu(\mathbf{w}_0) - 1} \mathbf{1}_{(\max_{|u|=1, u \neq \mathbf{w}_1} V(u) \leq \alpha)} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{|u|=1} e^{\gamma_{\alpha,\varepsilon} V(u)} (q - \varepsilon)^{\nu - 1} \mathbf{1}_{(\max_{|v|=1, v \neq u} V(v) \leq \alpha)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The existence of  $\gamma_{\alpha,\varepsilon}$  follows from (1.5) and (1.6). Clearly  $\gamma_{\alpha,\varepsilon} \rightarrow \gamma$  as  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . Fix now  $\alpha \equiv \alpha(\delta) > 0$  (large enough) and  $\varepsilon \equiv \varepsilon(\delta) > 0$  (small enough) such that  $\gamma_{\alpha,\varepsilon} < \gamma + \delta$ . Choose a constant  $x_0 \equiv x_0(\delta) > 0$  such that  $q(x) \geq q - \varepsilon$  for all  $x \geq x_0$ .

On the other hand, we remark that (1.1) and (1.5) imply that

$$\mathbb{P} \left( 1 \leq \nu < \infty, \max_{|u|=1} V(u) > 0 \right) > 0. \quad (5.12)$$

In fact,  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{1}_{(1 \leq \nu < \infty)} q^{\nu-1} \sum_{|u|=1} e^{\gamma V(u)} \mathbf{1}_{(V(u) > 0)} \right] = 1 - \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{1}_{(1 \leq \nu < \infty)} q^{\nu-1} \sum_{|u|=1} e^{\gamma V(u)} \mathbf{1}_{(V(u) \leq 0)} \right] > 1 - \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{1}_{(1 \leq \nu < \infty)} q^{\nu-1} \nu \right] > 0$ , hence (5.12) holds. It follows that there are some integer  $n_* \geq 1$  and some positive constants  $c_*$  and  $b_*$  such that

$$b_* \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{1}_{(\nu \leq n_*)} \sum_{|u|=1} e^{-V(u)} \mathbf{1}_{(V(u) \geq c_*)} \right] = \mathbb{Q} \left( \nu(\mathbf{w}_0) \leq n_*, V(\mathbf{w}_1) \geq c_* \right), \quad (5.13)$$

where the last equality follows from the change of measure formula (Section 2.2 (i),  $\mathbf{w}_0 = \emptyset$ ).

Choose (and fix) a constant  $L \geq \alpha + x_0$  such that  $\frac{L}{c_*}$  is an integer. Define  $m_\delta := (n_*)^{L/c_*}$ . Recall (1.18) for the definition of  $\tau_\lambda(u)$ . For any  $\lambda > 2L$ , we consider the following events

$$A_1 := \left\{ \forall k < \tau_{\lambda-L}(\mathbf{w}), \forall u \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{w}_k), \Delta V(u) \leq \alpha, \mathcal{L}_\lambda^{(u)} = \emptyset \right\},$$

$$A_2 := \left\{ \forall \tau_{\lambda-L}(\mathbf{w}) \leq k < \tau_{\lambda-L}(\mathbf{w}) + \frac{L}{c_*}, \forall u \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{w}_k), \nu(u) = 0, \nu(\mathbf{w}_{k-1}) \leq n_*, \Delta V(\mathbf{w}_k) \geq c_* \right\},$$

where  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda^{(u)} := \mathbb{T}_u \cap \mathcal{L}_\lambda$  and  $\nu(u)$  denotes the number of children of  $u$ .

Observe that on  $A_1 \cap A_2$ ,  $\tau_\lambda(\mathbf{w}) \leq \tau_{\lambda-L}(\mathbf{w}) + \frac{L}{c_*}$ , and  $\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda \leq (n_*)^{L/c_*} \equiv m_\delta$ . Since  $q > 0$ ,  $p_0 \equiv \mathbb{P}(\nu = 0) > 0$ , it follows from the spinal decomposition (Section 2.2 (iii)) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Q}(\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda \leq m_\delta) &\geq \mathbb{Q}(A_1 \cap A_2) \\ &= \mathbb{Q} \left[ B_1 \prod_{k=\tau_{\lambda-L}(\mathbf{w})}^{\tau_{\lambda-L}(\mathbf{w}) + \frac{L}{c_*} - 1} \prod_{u \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{w}_k)} p_0 \times \mathbf{1}_{(\nu(\mathbf{w}_{k-1}) \leq n_*, \Delta V(\mathbf{w}_k) \geq c_*)} \right] \\ &\geq p_0^{m_\delta} \mathbb{Q} \left[ B_1 \prod_{k=\tau_{\lambda-L}(\mathbf{w})}^{\tau_{\lambda-L}(\mathbf{w}) + \frac{L}{c_*} - 1} \mathbf{1}_{(\nu(\mathbf{w}_{k-1}) \leq n_*, \Delta V(\mathbf{w}_k) \geq c_*)} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

where

$$B_1 := \prod_{k < \tau_{\lambda-L}(\mathbf{w})} \prod_{u \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{w}_k)} q(\lambda - V(u)) 1_{(\Delta V(u) \leq \alpha)} \geq \prod_{k < \tau_{\lambda-L}(\mathbf{w})} (q - \varepsilon)^{\nu(\mathbf{w}_{k-1})-1} 1_{(\max_{u \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{w}_k)} \Delta V(u) \leq \alpha)} =: B_2,$$

by using the fact that for any  $u \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{w}_k)$  with  $k < \tau_{\lambda-L}(\mathbf{w})$ ,  $V(u) \leq \lambda - L + \alpha \leq \lambda - x_0$ , and  $q(\lambda - V(u)) \geq q(x_0) \geq q - \varepsilon$ .

Recall that under  $\mathbb{Q}$ ,  $(\sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{w}_k)} \delta_{\{\Delta V(u)\}}, \Delta V(\mathbf{w}_k))_{k \geq 1}$  are i.i.d.; then the strong Markov property implies that under  $\mathbb{Q}$  and conditioned on  $\mathcal{G}_{\tau_{\lambda-L}(\mathbf{w})}$ ,  $(\nu(\mathbf{w}_{k-1}), \Delta V(\mathbf{w}_k))_{k \geq \tau_{\lambda-L}(\mathbf{w})}$  are i.i.d., of common law that of  $(\nu(\mathbf{w}_0), V(\mathbf{w}_1))$ . Therefore,

$$\mathbb{Q}(\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda \leq m_\delta) \geq p_0^{m_\delta} \mathbb{Q}[B_2] \mathbb{Q}(\nu(\mathbf{w}_0) \leq n_*, V(\mathbf{w}_1) \geq c_*)^{L/c_*} \geq p_0^{m_\delta} b_*^{L/c_*} \mathbb{Q}[B_2]. \quad (5.15)$$

It remains to estimate  $\mathbb{Q}[B_2]$ . Going back to (5.11) and applying the optional stopping theorem at  $\tau_{\lambda-L}$  for  $U^{(\alpha, \varepsilon)}$  (which remains bounded up to  $\tau_{\lambda-L}$ ), we get that

$$\mathbb{Q}[B_2] = \mathbb{Q}\left[(q - \varepsilon)^{\sum_{0 \leq k < \tau_{\lambda-L}(\mathbf{w})} (\nu(\mathbf{w}_k) - 1)} 1_{(\forall k < n, \forall u \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{w}_k), \Delta V(u) \leq \alpha)}\right] \geq e^{-(1+\gamma_{\alpha, \varepsilon})(\lambda-L+\alpha)}.$$

In view of (5.10) and (5.15), this implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(0 < \#\mathcal{L}_\lambda \leq m_\delta) \geq \frac{1}{m_\delta} p_0^{m_\delta} b_*^{L/c_*} e^{L-\alpha} e^{-\gamma_{\alpha, \varepsilon}(\lambda-L+\alpha)}.$$

Then we have proved the Lemma in the case  $q > 0$  [by choosing a sufficiently large  $\lambda_0(\delta)$ ].  
□

**Lemma 5.4 (The Schröder case)** *Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 1.4, for any constant  $a > 0$ , we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-a \#\mathcal{L}_\lambda} 1_{(\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda > 0)}\right] = e^{-(\gamma+o(1))\lambda}, \quad \lambda \rightarrow \infty. \quad (5.16)$$

**Proof of Lemma 5.4.** From Lemma 5.3, the lower bound of (5.16) follows immediately. We also mention that in the cases when  $q = 0$  or  $q > 0$  but  $0 < a < \log(1/q)$ , we can give a proof of the lower bound of (5.16) in the same way as that of (5.1).

For the upper bound, we proceed in the same way as in the proof of Lemma 5.1, but by paying attention to the possibility of extinction of the system. Take  $b > 0$  such that  $\mathbb{E}[e^{-bD_\infty}] \geq e^{-a}$ . By (5.2),  $e^\lambda D_\infty \leq \sum_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} D_\infty(u)$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-b e^\lambda D_\infty} 1_{(D_\infty > 0)}\right] &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-b \sum_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} D_\infty(u)} 1_{(D_\infty > 0)}\right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-b \sum_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} D_\infty(u)} 1_{(\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda > 0)}\right] - \mathbb{P}\left(\{\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda > 0\} \cap \mathcal{S}^c\right) \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-a \#\mathcal{L}_\lambda} 1_{(\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda > 0)}\right] - \mathbb{P}\left(\{\#\mathcal{L}_\lambda > 0\} \cap \mathcal{S}^c\right). \end{aligned}$$

By (1.14),  $\mathbb{E}[e^{-be^\lambda D_\infty} 1_{(D_\infty > 0)}] \leq Ce^{-\gamma\lambda}$ , which together with Lemma 5.2 yield the upper bound in (5.16).  $\square$

We now are ready to give the proof of (1.16):

**Proof of (1.16).** Let us prove at first the the lower bound in (1.16). By Lemma 4.4, there are  $c_{13} > 0$  (large enough) and  $c_{14} > 0$  (small enough) such that  $\min_{\frac{n}{2} \leq k \leq n} \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{M}_k \geq \frac{3}{2} \log n - c_{13}, \mathcal{S}) \geq c_{14}$  for all  $n \geq 1$ .

Let  $\delta > 0$  be small and let  $m_\delta \geq 1$  and  $\lambda_0(\delta) > 0$  be as in Lemma 5.3. Let  $\lambda \geq \lambda_0(\delta)$ . Remark that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{M}_n > \frac{3}{2} \log n + \lambda - c_{13}, \mathcal{S}\right) \geq \mathbb{P}\left(0 < \#\mathcal{L}_\lambda \leq m_\delta, \forall u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda, \mathbb{M}_{n-|u|}^{(u)} > \frac{3}{2} \log n - c_{13}, |u| \leq \frac{n}{2}, \mathcal{S}^{(u)}\right),$$

where as before,  $\mathcal{S}^{(u)} = \{\mathbb{T}_u \text{ survives}\}$  and  $\mathbb{M}_j^{(u)} := \min_{v \in \mathbb{T}_u, |v|=|u|+j} (V(v) - V(u))$  for any  $j \geq 0$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbb{M}_n > \frac{3}{2} \log n + \lambda - c_{13}, \mathcal{S}\right) &\geq (c_{14})^{m_\delta} \mathbb{P}\left(0 < \#\mathcal{L}_\lambda \leq m_\delta, \max_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} |u| \leq \frac{n}{2}\right) \\ &\geq (c_{14})^{m_\delta} \left(\mathbb{P}\left(0 < \#\mathcal{L}_\lambda \leq m_\delta\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} |u| > \frac{n}{2}\right)\right) \\ &\geq (c_{14})^{m_\delta} \left(e^{-(\gamma+\delta)\lambda} - c_6 e^{-c_5 n^{1/3}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 5.3 and (4.2). The lower bound of (1.16) follows.

We prove now the upper bound in (1.16). By assumption (1.6) holds for any  $a > 0$ , hence  $\mathcal{S}_1$  has all exponential moments. It follows from (2.6) that for any  $a > 0$ , there exists some  $C_a > 0$  such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{S}_{\tau_\lambda} - \lambda \geq x\right) \leq C_a e^{-ax}, \quad \forall x \geq 0. \quad (5.17)$$

Let  $\delta > 0$  be small and  $a > (1 + \gamma)/\delta + 1$ . Then

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} V(u) > (1 + \delta)\lambda\right) \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} 1_{(V(u) > (1+\delta)\lambda)}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\mathcal{S}_{\tau_\lambda}} 1_{(\mathcal{S}_{\tau_\lambda} \geq (1+\delta)\lambda)}\right] = o(e^{-\gamma\lambda}), \quad (5.18)$$

where the last equality follows easily from (5.17). Define

$$A_{(5.19)} := \left\{ \max_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} V(u) \leq (1 + \delta)\lambda, \max_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} |u| \leq \frac{n}{2} \right\}. \quad (5.19)$$

Then by (4.2), for all large  $n \geq n_0$  and  $0 < \lambda = o(\log n)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(A_{(5.19)}^c\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} V(u) > (1 + \delta)\lambda\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda} |u| > \frac{n}{2}\right) \\ &\leq o(e^{-\gamma\lambda}) + c_6 e^{-c_5 n^{1/3}} = o(e^{-\gamma\lambda}). \end{aligned}$$

On  $\mathcal{S} \cap \{\mathbb{M}_n > \frac{3}{2} \log n + (1 + 2\delta)\lambda\}$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda \neq \emptyset$ . Consider  $\lambda$  such that  $\delta\lambda < \log n$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{n \leq k \leq 2n} \mathbb{M}_k > \frac{3}{2} \log n + (1 + 2\delta)\lambda, \mathcal{S}\right) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{n \leq k \leq 2n} \mathbb{M}_k > \frac{3}{2} \log n + (1 + 2\delta)\lambda, A_{(5.19)}, \mathcal{L}_\lambda \neq \emptyset\right) + o(e^{-\gamma\lambda}) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\forall u \in \mathcal{L}_\lambda, \max_{\frac{n}{2} \leq j \leq 2n} \mathbb{M}_j^{(u)} > \frac{3}{2} \log n + \delta\lambda, \mathcal{L}_\lambda \neq \emptyset\right) + o(e^{-\gamma\lambda}) \\
& =: B_{(5.20)} + o(e^{-\gamma\lambda}), \tag{5.20}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbb{M}_k^{(u)} := \max_{v \in \mathbb{T}_u, |v|=|u|+k} (V(v) - V(u))$ . Conditioning on  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}_\lambda}$ ,  $\mathbb{M}^{(u)}$  are i.i.d. copies of  $\mathbb{M}$ . By Lemma 4.5 (with  $a = 4$ ), there exist some  $c_{15} > 0$  and  $\lambda_0$  such that ( $\delta$  being fixed) for all large  $n \geq n_0(\lambda_0)$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{\frac{n}{2} \leq k \leq 2n} \mathbb{M}_k \geq \frac{3}{2} \log n + \delta\lambda_0\right) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}^c) + \mathbb{P}^*\left(\max_{\frac{n}{2} \leq k \leq 2n} \mathbb{M}_k \geq \frac{3}{2} \log n + \delta\lambda_0\right) \leq e^{-c_{15}}.$$

Then by conditioning on  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}_\lambda}$ , we get that

$$B_{(5.20)} \leq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-c_{15} \#\mathcal{L}_\lambda} 1_{(\mathcal{L}_\lambda \neq \emptyset)}\right] = e^{-(\gamma+o(1))\lambda},$$

by Lemma 5.4. This and (5.20) prove the upper bound in (1.16) since  $\delta$  can be arbitrarily small.  $\square$

**Acknowledgments.** We are very grateful to two anonymous referees for their careful readings and helpful comments on the first version of this paper. We also thank Zhan Shi for the reference [18].

## References

- [1] Addario-Berry, L. and Reed, B. (2009). Minima in branching random walks. *Ann. Probab.* **37** pp. 1044–1079.
- [2] Aïdékon, E. (2013). Convergence in law of the minimum of a branching random walk. *Ann. Probab.* **41** pp. 1362–1426.
- [3] Aïdékon, E., Y. Hu and O. Zindy. (2013). The precise tail behavior of the total progeny of a killed branching random walk. *Ann. Probab.* **41** pp. 3786–3878.
- [4] Aïdékon, E. and Shi, Z. (2014). The Seneta-Heyde scaling for the branching random walk. *Ann. Probab.* **42** pp. 959–993.
- [5] Athreya, K.B and Ney, P.E. (1972). *Branching processes*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, New-York.
- [6] Berestycki, N., Gantert, N., Morters, P. and Sidorova, N. (2014) Galton-Watson trees with vanishing martingale limit. *J. Stat. Phys.* **155** pp. 737–762.



- [7] Biggins, J.D. (1976). The first- and last-birth problems for a multitype age-dependent branching process. *Adv. Appl. Probab.* **8**, 446–459.
- [8] Biggins, J.D. and Kyprianou, A.E. (2004). Measure change in multitype branching. *Adv. Appl. Probab.* **36**, 544–581.
- [9] Bramson, M.D. and Zeitouni, O. (2009). Tightness for a family of recursion equations. *Ann. Probab.*, **37**, 615–653
- [10] Chang, J.T. (1994). Inequalities for the overshoot. *Annals Appl. Probab.* **4** No. 4 pp. 1223–1233.
- [11] Chauvin, B., Rouault, A. and Wakolbinger, A. (1991). Growing conditioned trees. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* **39**, 117–130.
- [12] Doney, R.A. (1980). Moments of ladder heights in handom walks. *J. Appl. Probab.*, **17**, 248–252.
- [13] Fang, M. and Zeitouni, O. (2010). Consistent minimal displacement of branching random walks. *Electronic Comm. Probab.* 106–115.
- [14] Faraud, G., Hu, Y. and Shi, Z. (2012). Almost sure convergence for stochastically biased random walks on trees. *Prob. Th. Rel. Fields.* **154** 621–660.
- [15] Feller, W. (1971). *An Introduction to Probability Theory and its Applications*. Vol. II. Second edition. Wiley, New York.
- [16] Fleischmann, K. and Wachtel, V. (2007). Lower deviation probabilities for supercritical Galton-Watson processes. *Ann. I. H. Poincaré* **43** 233–255.
- [17] Fleischmann, K. and Wachtel, V. (2009). On the left tail asymptotics for the limit law of supercritical Galton-Watson processes in the Böttcher case. *Ann. I. H. Poincaré* **45** 201–225.
- [18] Gatzouras, D. (2000). On the lattice case of an almost sure renewal theorem for branching random walk. *Adv. Appl. Proba.* **32** 720–737.
- [19] Hammersley, J.M. (1974). Postulates for subadditive processes. *Ann. Probab.* **2**, 652–680.
- [20] Harris, S.C. and Roberts, M.I. (2011+). The many-to-few lemma and multiple spines. (Preprint, arXiv:1106.4761)
- [21] Hu, Y. (2012+). The almost sure limits of the minimal position and the additive martingale in a branching random walk. *J. Theor. Probab.* (to appear) available at arXiv:1211.5309
- [22] Hu, Y. and Shi, Z. (2009). Minimal position and critical martingale convergence in branching random walks, and directed polymers on disordered trees. *Ann. Probab.*, **37**, 742–789.
- [23] Jaffuel, B. (2012). The critical barrier for the survival of the branching random walk with absorption. To appear in *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré*. **48** pp. 989–1009.

- [24] Kingman, J.F.C. (1975). The first birth problem for an age-dependent branching process. *Ann. Probab.* **3**, 790–801.
- [25] Lévy, P. (1937). *Théorie de l'addition des variables aléatoires*. Gauthier-Villars, Paris.
- [26] Liu, Q.S. (1999). Asymptotic properties of supercritical age-dependent branching processes and homogeneous branching random walks. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* **82** 61–87.
- [27] Liu, Q.S. (2001). Asymptotic properties and absolute continuity of laws stable by random weighted mean. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* **95**, 83–107.
- [28] Lorden, G. (1970). On excess over the boundary. *Ann. Math. Stat.* **41** 520–527.
- [29] Lyons, R. (1997). A simple path to Biggins' martingale convergence for branching random walk. In: *Classical and Modern Branching Processes* (Eds.: K.B. Athreya and P. Jagers). *IMA Volumes in Mathematics and its Applications* **84**, 217–221. Springer, New York.
- [30] Mallein, B. (2016+). Asymptotic of the maximal displacement in a branching random walk. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1605.08292>
- [31] Mogulskii, A. A. (1974). Small deviations in the space of trajectories. *Theory Probab. Appl.* **19**, 726–736.
- [32] Nerman, O. (1981). On the convergence of supercritical general (C-M-J) branching processes. *Z. Wahrsche. verw. Gebiete* **57** 365–395.
- [33] Shi, Z. (2015). *Branching Random Walks*. Lecture notes from the 42nd Probability Summer School held in Saint Flour, 2012. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 2151. École d'Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour. Springer, Cham.