



HAL
open science

RENEWAL STRUCTURE AND LOCAL TIME FOR DIFFUSIONS IN RANDOM ENVIRONMENT

Pierre Andreatti, Alexis Devulder, Grégoire Vechambre

► **To cite this version:**

Pierre Andreatti, Alexis Devulder, Grégoire Vechambre. RENEWAL STRUCTURE AND LOCAL TIME FOR DIFFUSIONS IN RANDOM ENVIRONMENT. 2015. hal-01152982v4

HAL Id: hal-01152982

<https://hal.science/hal-01152982v4>

Preprint submitted on 13 May 2016 (v4), last revised 30 Aug 2016 (v5)

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.

Renewal structure and local time for diffusions in random environment

Pierre Andreatti, Alexis Devulder and Grégoire Véchambre

Université d'Orléans, Laboratoire MAPMO - Fédération Denis Poisson, Bâtiment de mathématiques - Rue de Chartres B.P. 6759 - 45067 Orléans cedex 2, France
E-mail address: Pierre.Andreatti@univ-orleans.fr

Laboratoire de Mathématiques de Versailles, UVSQ, CNRS, Université Paris-Saclay, 78035 Versailles, France.
E-mail address: devulder@math.uvsq.fr

Université d'Orléans, Laboratoire MAPMO - Fédération Denis Poisson, Bâtiment de mathématiques - Rue de Chartres B.P. 6759 - 45067 Orléans cedex 2, France
E-mail address: Gregoire.Vechambre@ens-rennes.fr

Abstract. We study a one-dimensional diffusion X in a drifted Brownian potential W_κ , with $0 < \kappa < 1$, and focus on the behavior of the local times $(\mathcal{L}(t, x), x)$ of X before time $t > 0$. In particular we characterize the limit law of the supremum of the local time, as well as the position of the favorite site. These limits can be written explicitly from a two dimensional stable Lévy process. Our analysis is based on the study of an extension of the renewal structure which is deeply involved in the asymptotic behavior of X .

1. Introduction

1.1. *Presentation of the model.* Let $(X(t), t \geq 0)$ be a diffusion in a random càdlàg potential $(V(x), x \in \mathbb{R})$, defined informally by $X(0) = 0$ and

$$dX(t) = d\beta(t) - \frac{1}{2}V'(X(t))dt,$$

where $(\beta(s), s \geq 0)$ is a Brownian motion independent of V . Rigorously, X is defined by its conditional generator given V ,

$$\frac{1}{2}e^{V(x)} \frac{d}{dx} \left(e^{-V(x)} \frac{d}{dx} \right).$$

We put ourselves in the case where V is a negatively drifted Brownian motion: $V(x) = W_\kappa(x) := W(x) - \frac{\kappa}{2}x$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ with $0 < \kappa < 1$ and W a two sided Brownian motion. We explain at the end of Section 1.2 what should be done to extend our results to a more general Lévy potential.

Received by the editors May 13, 2016.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60K37, 60J55, 60J60, 60K05.

Key words and phrases. Diffusion, random potential, renewal process, local time.

This research was partially supported by the french ANR project MEMEMO2 2010 BLAN 0125.

We denote by P the probability measure associated to $W_\kappa(\cdot)$. The probability conditionally on the potential W_κ is denoted by \mathbb{P}^{W_κ} and is called the quenched probability. We also define the annealed probability as

$$\mathbb{P}(\cdot) := \int \mathbb{P}^{W_\kappa}(\cdot) P(W_\kappa \in d\omega).$$

We denote respectively by \mathbb{E}^{W_κ} , \mathbb{E} , and E the expectations with regard to \mathbb{P}^{W_κ} , \mathbb{P} and P . In particular, X is a Markov process under \mathbb{P}^{W_κ} but not under \mathbb{P} .

This diffusion X has been introduced by [Schumacher \(1985\)](#). It is generally considered as a continuous time analogue of random walks in random environment (RWRE). We refer e.g. to [Zeitouni \(2001\)](#) for general properties of RWRE.

In our case, since $\kappa > 0$, the diffusion X is a.s. transient and its asymptotic behavior was first studied by Kawazu and Tanaka: if $H(r)$ is the hitting time of $r \in \mathbb{R}$ by X ,

$$H(r) := \inf\{s > 0, X(s) = r\}, \quad (1.1)$$

[Kawazu and Tanaka \(1997\)](#) proved that, for $0 < \kappa < 1$ under the annealed probability \mathbb{P} , $H(r)/r^{1/\kappa}$ converges in law as $r \rightarrow +\infty$ to a κ -stable distribution (see also [Hu et al. \(1999\)](#), and [Tanaka \(1997\)](#)). Here we are interested in the local time of X , which is the jointly continuous process $(\mathcal{L}(t, x), t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R})$ satisfying, for any positive measurable function f ,

$$\int_0^t f(X(s)) ds = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f(x) \mathcal{L}(t, x) dx, \quad t > 0.$$

On quantity of particular interest is the supremum of the local time of X at time t , defined as

$$\mathcal{L}^*(t) := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \mathcal{L}(t, x), \quad t > 0.$$

For Brox's diffusion, that is, for the diffusion X in the recurrent case $\kappa = 0$, it is proved in [Andreatti and Diel \(2011\)](#) that the local time process until time t re-centered at the localization coordinate b_t (see [Brox \(1986\)](#)) converges in law. This allows the authors of [Andreatti and Diel \(2011\)](#) to derive the law of the supremum of the local time at time $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. We recall their result below in order to compare it with the results of the present paper. To this aim, we introduce for every $\kappa \geq 0$,

$$\mathcal{R}_\kappa := \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-W_\kappa^\uparrow(x)} dx + \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\widetilde{W}_\kappa^\uparrow(x)} dx, \quad (1.2)$$

where $(W_\kappa^\uparrow(x), x \geq 0)$ and $(\widetilde{W}_\kappa^\uparrow(x), x \geq 0)$ are two independent copies of the process $(W_\kappa(x), x \geq 0)$ Doob-conditioned to remain positive.

Theorem 1.1. ([Andreatti and Diel \(2011\)](#)) *If $\kappa = 0$, then*

$$\frac{\mathcal{L}^*(t)}{t} \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{L}} \frac{1}{\mathcal{R}_\kappa},$$

where $\xrightarrow{\mathfrak{L}}$ denotes convergence in law under the annealed probability \mathbb{P} as $t \rightarrow +\infty$.

Extending their approach, and following the results of [Shi \(1998\)](#), [Diel \(2011\)](#) obtains the non-trivial normalisations for the almost sure behavior of the lim sup and the lim inf of $\mathcal{L}^*(t)$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. Notice that corresponding results have been previously established in [Dembo et al. \(2007\)](#) and [Gantert et al. \(2010\)](#) for the discrete analogue of X , the recurrent RWRE generally called Sinai's random walk.

One of our aims in this paper is to extend the study of the local time of X in the case $0 < \kappa < 1$, and deduce from that the weak asymptotic behavior of $\mathcal{L}^*(t)$.

Before going any further let us recall to the reader what is known for the slow transient cases. For transient RWRE (see [Kesten et al. \(1975\)](#), for the seminal paper), a result of [Gantert and Shi \(2002\)](#) states the almost sure behavior for the lim sup of the supremum of the local time ($\mathcal{L}_S^*(n)$) of these random walks (denoted by S), before time n : a.s. $\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{L}_S^*(n)/n = c > 0$. Contrarily to the recurrent case ([Gantert et al. \(2010\)](#)) their method, based on a link with the local time of S and a branching process in random environment, is not able to determine the limit law of $\mathcal{L}_S^*(n)/n$.

For the transient diffusion X considered here, the only paper dealing with $\mathcal{L}^*(t)$ is [Devulder \(2016\)](#), in which it is proved that the $\limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{L}^*(t)/t = +\infty$ almost surely. But once again his method can not be used to characterize the limit law of $\mathcal{L}^*(t)/t$ in the case $0 < \kappa < 1$.

Our motivation here is twofold, first we prove that our approach enables to characterize the limit law of $\mathcal{L}^*(t)/t$ and open a way to determine the correct almost sure behavior of $\mathcal{L}^*(t)$ like for Brox's diffusion. Second we make a first step on a specific way to study the local time which could be used in estimation problems in random environment, see [Adelman and Enriquez \(2004\)](#), [Andreoletti \(2011\)](#), [Andreoletti and Diel \(2012\)](#), [Andreoletti et al. \(2016\)](#), [Comets et al. \(2014a\)](#), [Comets et al. \(2014b\)](#), [Falconnet et al. \(2014\)](#).

The method we develop here is an improvement of the one used in [Andreoletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#) about the localization of $X(t)$ for large t .

Before recalling the main result of this paper [Andreoletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#), we need to introduce some new objects. We start with the notion of h -extrema, with $h > 0$, introduced by [Neveu and Pitman \(1989\)](#) and studied more specifically in our case of drifted Brownian motion by [Faggionato \(2009\)](#). For $h > 0$, we say that $x \in \mathbb{R}$ is a h -minimum for a given continuous process V if there exist $u < x < v$ such that $V(y) \geq V(x)$ for all $y \in [u, v]$, $V(u) \geq V(x) + h$ and $V(v) \geq V(x) + h$. Moreover, x is an h -maximum for V iff x is an h -minimum for $-V$. Finally, x is an h -extrema for V iff it is an h -maximum or an h -minimum for V .

As we are interested in the diffusion X until time t , we only focus on h_t -extrema of W_κ , where

$$h_t := \log t - \phi(t), \text{ with } 0 < \phi(t) = o(\log t), \log \log t = o(\phi(t)).$$

It is known (see [Faggionato \(2009\)](#)) that almost surely, the h_t -extrema of W_κ form a sequence indexed by \mathbb{Z} , unbounded from below and above, and that the h_t -minima and h_t -maxima alternate. We denote respectively by $(m_j, j \in \mathbb{Z})$ and $(M_j, j \in \mathbb{Z})$ the increasing sequences of h_t -minima and of h_t -maxima of W_κ , such that $m_0 \leq 0 < m_1$ and $m_j < M_j < m_{j+1}$ for every $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. Define

$$N_t := \max \left\{ k \in \mathbb{N}, \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} X(s) \geq m_k \right\}, \quad (1.3)$$

the number of h_t -minima on \mathbb{R}_+ visited by X until time t . We have the following result

Theorem 1.2. ([Andreoletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#)) *Assume $0 < \kappa < 1$. There exists a constant $\mathcal{C}_1 > 0$, such that*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P} \left(|X(t) - m_{N_t}| \leq \mathcal{C}_1 \phi(t) \right) = 1.$$

This result proves that before time t , the diffusion X visits the N_t leftmost positive h_t -minima, and then gets stuck in a very small neighborhood of an ultimate one, which is m_{N_t} . Notice an analogous result was proved for transient RWRE in the zero speed regime $0 < \kappa < 1$ by [Enriquez et al. \(2009a\)](#). This phenomenon is due to two facts: the first one is the appearance of a renewal structure which is composed of the times it takes the process to move from one h_t -minima to the following one. The second is the fact that like in Brox's case $\kappa = 0$, the process is trapped a significant amount of time in the neighborhood of the local minimum m_{N_t} .

It is the extension of this renewal structure to the sequence of local times at the h_t -minima that we study here. We now detail our results.

1.2. Results. Let us introduce some notation involved in the statement of our results. Denote by $(D([0, +\infty), \mathbb{R}^2), J_1)$ the space of càdlàg functions with J_1 -Skorokhod topology and denote by $\xrightarrow{\mathfrak{L}}^s$ the convergence in law for this topology. On this space, define a 2-dimensional Lévy process $(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)$ taking values in $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+$, which is a pure positive jump process with κ -stable Lévy measure ν given by

$$\forall x > 0, \forall y > 0, \quad \nu([x, +\infty[\times [y, +\infty[) = \frac{\mathcal{C}_2}{y^\kappa} \mathbb{E} \left[(\mathcal{R}_\kappa)^\kappa \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{R}_\kappa \leq \frac{y}{x}} \right] + \frac{\mathcal{C}_2}{x^\kappa} \mathbb{P} \left(\mathcal{R}_\kappa > \frac{y}{x} \right), \quad (1.4)$$

where \mathcal{R}_κ is defined in (1.2) and \mathcal{C}_2 is a positive constant (see Lemma 4.1). The Laplace transform of \mathcal{R}_κ is given by

$$E(e^{-\gamma \mathcal{R}_\kappa}) = \left(\frac{(2\gamma)^{\kappa/2}}{\kappa \Gamma(\kappa) I_\kappa(2\sqrt{2\gamma})} \right)^2 \quad \gamma > 0, \quad (1.5)$$

see Lemma 6.6 for details, therefore \mathcal{R}_κ admits moments of any positive order. In particular $\mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{R}_\kappa)^\kappa]$ is finite and ν is well defined.

For a given function f in $D([0, +\infty), \mathbb{R})$, define for any $s > 0, a > 0$:

$$f^\natural(s) := \sup_{0 \leq r \leq s} (f(r) - f(r^-)), \quad f^{-1}(a) := \inf\{x \geq 0, f(x) > a\},$$

where $f(r^-)$ denotes the left limit of f at r . In words, $f^\natural(s)$ is the largest jump of f before time s , whereas $f^{-1}(a)$ is the first time f is larger than a . We also introduce the couple of random variables $(\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2)$ as follows,

$$\mathcal{I}_1 := \mathcal{Y}_1^\natural(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)^-), \quad \mathcal{I}_2 := (1 - \mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)^-)) \times \frac{\mathcal{Y}_1(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)) - \mathcal{Y}_1(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)^-)}{\mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)) - \mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)^-)}. \quad (1.6)$$

We recall that $\xrightarrow{\mathfrak{L}}$ denotes convergence in law under the annealed probability \mathbb{P} as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. We are now ready to state our first result.

Theorem 1.3. *Assume $0 < \kappa < 1$. We have,*

$$\frac{\mathcal{L}^*(t)}{t} \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{L}} \mathcal{I} =: \max(\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2).$$

Contrary to the recurrent case $\kappa = 0$, we have no scaling property for the potential, and the diffusion X cannot be localized in a single valley as we can see in Theorem 1.2. However in the transient case we can make appear and use a renewal structure.

We now give an intuitive interpretation of this theorem, explaining the appearance

of the Lévy process $(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)$.

First for any $s > 0$, $\mathcal{Y}_1(s)$ is the limit of the sum of the first $\lfloor se^{\kappa\phi(t)} \rfloor$ normalized (by t) local times taken specifically at the $\lfloor se^{\kappa\phi(t)} \rfloor$ first h_t -minima. $\mathcal{Y}_2(s)$ plays a similar role but for the exit times of the $\lfloor se^{\kappa\phi(t)} \rfloor$ first h_t -valleys, where an h_t -valley is a large neighborhood of an h_t -minimum. For a rigorous definition of these h_t -valleys, see Section 2.2 and Figure 2.1.

So, by definition, \mathcal{I}_1 is the largest jump of the process \mathcal{Y}_1 before the first time \mathcal{Y}_2 is larger than 1. It can be interpreted as the largest (re-normalized) local time among the local times at the h_t -minima visited by X until time t and from which X has already escaped. That is to say, \mathcal{I}_1 is the limit of the random variable $\sup_{k \leq N_t - 1} \mathcal{L}(m_k, t)/t$.

\mathcal{I}_2 is a product of two factors: the first one, $(1 - \mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)^-))$, corresponds to the (re-normalized) amount of time left to the diffusion X before time t after it has reached the ultimate visited h_t -minimum m_{N_t} , that is, to $(t - H(m_{N_t}))/t$. The second factor corresponds to the local time of X at this ultimate h_t -minimum m_{N_t} , that is to say \mathcal{I}_2 is the limit of $\mathcal{L}(t, m_{N_t})/t$. Intuitively \mathcal{Y}_2 is built from \mathcal{Y}_1 by multiplying each of its jumps by an independent copy of the variable \mathcal{R}_κ . Therefore this second factor can be seen as an independent copy of $1/\mathcal{R}_\kappa$ taken at the instant of the overshoot of \mathcal{Y}_2 which makes it larger than 1. Notice that this variable \mathcal{R}_κ plays a similar role than \mathcal{R}_0 of Theorem 1.1. Indeed as in the case $\kappa = 0$, the diffusion X is prisoner in the neighborhood of the last h_t -minimum visited before time t .

We prove Theorem 1.3 by showing first that portions of the trajectory of X re-centered at the local h_t -minima, until time t , are made (in probability) with independent parts. This has been partially proved in [Andreoletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#) but we have to improve their results and add simultaneously the study of the local time.

Second, we prove that what we seek for the supremum of the local time is, mainly, a function of the sum of these independent parts, which converges to a Lévy process. We now provide some details about this.

$(W_\kappa^\uparrow(s), s \geq 0)$ is a canonical process, taking values in \mathbb{R}_+ , with infinitesimal generator given for every $x > 0$ by

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{\kappa}{2} \coth\left(\frac{\kappa}{2}x\right) \frac{d}{dx}.$$

This process W_κ^\uparrow can be thought of as a $(-\kappa/2)$ -drifted Brownian motion W_κ Doob-conditioned to stay positive, with the terminology of [Bertoin \(1950\)](#), which is called Doob conditioned to reach $+\infty$ before 0 in [Faggionato \(2009\)](#) (see Section 2.1 in [Andreoletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#) for more details). We call BES(3, $\kappa/2$) the law of $(W_\kappa^\uparrow(s), s \geq 0)$. For any process $(U(t), t \in \mathbb{R}_+)$ we denote by

$$\tau^U(a) := \inf\{t > 0, U(t) = a\},$$

the first time this process hits a , with the convention $\inf \emptyset = +\infty$. For $a < b$, $(W_\kappa^b(s), 0 \leq s \leq \tau^{W_\kappa^b}(a))$ is a $(-\kappa/2)$ -drifted Brownian motion starting from b and killed when it first hits a . We now introduce some functionals of W_κ and W_κ^\uparrow ,

which already appeared in (Andreatti and Devulder (2015), Section 4.1):

$$F^\pm(x) := \int_0^{\tau^{W_\kappa^\uparrow}(x)} \exp(\pm W_\kappa^\uparrow(s)) ds, \quad x > 0, \quad (1.7)$$

$$G^\pm(a, b) := \int_0^{\tau^{W_\kappa^b}(a)} \exp(\pm W_\kappa^b(s)) ds, \quad a < b. \quad (1.8)$$

Let $0 < \delta < 1$, define

$$n_t := \lfloor e^{\kappa\phi(t)(1+\delta)} \rfloor, \quad t > 0,$$

which is, with large probability, an upper bound for N_t as stated in Lemma 3.1.

Let $(S_j, R_j, \mathbf{e}_j, j \leq n_t)$ be a sequence of i.i.d. random variables depending on t , with S_j, R_j and \mathbf{e}_j independent, $S_1 \stackrel{\mathfrak{L}}{=} F^+(h_t) + G^+(h_t/2, h_t)$, $R_1 \stackrel{\mathfrak{L}}{=} F^-(h_t/2) + \tilde{F}^-(h_t/2)$ and $\mathbf{e}_1 \stackrel{\mathfrak{L}}{=} \mathcal{E}(1/2)$ [an exponential random variable with parameter $1/2$], where \tilde{F}^- is an independent copy of F^- and F^+ is independent of G^+ , and $\stackrel{\mathfrak{L}}{=}$ denotes equality in law. Define $\ell_j := \mathbf{e}_j S_j$ and $\mathcal{H}_j := \ell_j R_j$. Note that to simplify the notation, we do not make appear the dependence in t in the sequel. Typically, ℓ_j plays the role of the local time at the j -th positive h_t -minimum if X escapes from the j -th h_t -valley before time t . Similarly, \mathcal{H}_j plays the role of the time X spends in this h_t -valley before escaping from it.

Define the family of processes $(Y_1, Y_2)^t$ indexed by t , by

$$\forall s \geq 0, \quad (Y_1, Y_2)_s^t := \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor se^{\kappa\phi(t)} \rfloor} (\ell_j, \mathcal{H}_j).$$

Recall that $\xrightarrow{\mathfrak{L}^s}$ denotes convergence in law under J_1 -Skorokhod topology. Here is our next result.

Proposition 1.4. *Assume $0 < \kappa < 1$. We have under \mathbb{P} , as $t \rightarrow +\infty$,*

$$(Y_1, Y_2)^t \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{L}^s} (\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2).$$

Once this is proved, we check that what we need for the supremum of the local time can be written as a function of $(Y_1, Y_2)^t$. We obtain such an expression in Proposition 5.1. Then to obtain the limit, we prove the continuity (in J_1 -topology) of the involved mapping and apply a continuous mapping Theorem (see Section 4.3). It appears that with this method we can obtain other asymptotics, like for the supremum of the local time before the last h_t -valley is reached (before the instant t) and once it left it for good as well as for the position of the favorite site:

Theorem 1.5. *Assume $0 < \kappa < 1$. We have the following convergences in law under \mathbb{P} as $t \rightarrow +\infty$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathcal{L}^*(H(m_{N_t+1}))}{t} &\xrightarrow{\mathfrak{L}} \mathcal{Y}_1^{\natural}(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)), \\ \frac{\mathcal{L}^*(H(m_{N_t}))}{t} &\xrightarrow{\mathfrak{L}} \mathcal{Y}_1^{\natural}(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)^-). \end{aligned}$$

Let us call F_t^* , the position of the first favorite site, $F_t^* := \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{L}(t, x) = \mathcal{L}^*(t)\}$. Then,

$$\frac{F_t^*}{X(t)} \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{L}} \mathcal{B}U_{[0,1]} + 1 - \mathcal{B},$$

where \mathcal{B} is a Bernoulli random variable with parameter $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{I}_1 < \mathcal{I}_2)$, and $U_{[0,1]}$ is a uniform random variable on $[0, 1]$, independent of \mathcal{B} .

We remark that with probability one there is at most one point x such that $\mathcal{L}(t, x) = \mathcal{L}^*(t)$ so F_t^* is actually the favorite site. Note that similar questions about favorite points for X have been studied in the recurrent case $\kappa = 0$ by [Cheliotis \(2008\)](#).

One question we may ask here is: what happens in the discrete case or with a more general Lévy potential?

For the discrete case, we expect a very similar behavior because the renewal structures which appear in both cases (continuous and discrete) are very similar (see [Enriquez et al. \(2009a\)](#)). The main difference comes essentially from the functional \mathcal{R}_κ , which should be replaced by a sum of exponentials of simple random walks conditioned to remain positive (see [Enriquez et al. \(2009b\)](#), [Enriquez et al. \(2009a\)](#)).

For a more general Lévy potential, we have in mind for example a spectrally negative Lévy process (studied in the case of diffusion in random environment by [Singh \(2008\)](#)). More work needs to be done, especially for the environment. First, to obtain a specific decomposition of the Lévy's path (similar to what is done for the drifted Brownian motion in [Faggionato \(2009\)](#)), and also to study the more complicated functional \mathcal{R}_κ which is less known than in the brownian case. This is a work in preparation by [Véchambre \(2016+\)](#).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows.

In [Section 2](#), we recall the results of [Faggionato](#) on the path decomposition of the trajectories of W_κ . Also we recall from [Andreoletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#) the construction of specific h_t -minima which plays an important role in the appearance of independence, under \mathbb{P} , on the path of X before time t .

In [Section 3](#), we study the joint process of the first n_t hitting times and local times. We show that parts of the trajectory of X are not important for what we seek. We then prove the main result of this section: [Proposition 3.5](#). It shows that the joint process (exit time, local time) can be approximated in probability by *i.i.d* random variables. This part makes use of some technical results inspired from [Andreoletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#), they are resumed in [Section 6](#).

In [Section 4](#), we prove [Proposition 1.4](#), and study the continuity of certain functionals of $(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)$ which appear in the expression of the limit law \mathcal{L} . This section is independent of the other ones, we essentially prove a basic functional limit theorem and prepare to the application of continuous mapping theorem.

[Section 5](#) is where we make appear the renewal structure in the problem we want to solve. In particular we show how the distribution of the supremum of the local time can be approximated by the distribution of some function of the couple $(Y_1, Y_2)^t$, the main step being [Proposition 5.1](#).

[Section 6](#) is a reminder of some key results and their extensions extracted from [Andreoletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#). For some of these results, sketch of proofs or complementary proofs are added in order for this paper to be more self-contained.

The *appendix* is a reminder of some estimates on Brownian motion, Bessel processes, and functionals of both of these processes.

1.3. *Notation.* In this section we introduce typical notation and tools for the study of diffusions in a random potential.

For any process $(U(t), t \in \mathbb{R}_+)$ we denote by \mathcal{L}_U a bicontinuous version of the local time of U when it exists. Notice that for our main process X we simply write \mathcal{L} for its local time. The inverse of the local time for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$ is denoted $\sigma_U(t, x) := \inf\{s > 0, \mathcal{L}_U(s, x) \geq t\}$ and in the same way $\sigma(t, x) := \sigma_X(t, x)$. We also denote by U^a the process U starting from a , and by P^a the law of U^a ; with the notation $U = U^0$. Now let us introduce the following functional of W_κ ,

$$A(r) := \int_0^r e^{W_\kappa(x)} dx, \quad r \in \mathbb{R}.$$

We recall that whenever $\kappa > 0$, $A_\infty := \lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} A(r) < \infty$ a.s. As in [Brox \(1986\)](#), there exists a Brownian motion B independent of W_κ , such that $X(t) = A^{-1}[B(T^{-1}(t))]$, where

$$T(r) := \int_0^r \exp\{-2W_\kappa[A^{-1}(B(s))]\} ds, \quad 0 \leq r \leq \tau^B(A_\infty). \quad (1.9)$$

The local time of the diffusion X at location x within time t , simply denoted by $\mathcal{L}(t, x)$, can be written as (see [Shi \(1998\)](#), eq. (2.5))

$$\mathcal{L}(t, x) = e^{-W_\kappa(x)} \mathcal{L}_B(T^{-1}(t), A(x)), \quad t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (1.10)$$

With this notation, we recall the following expression of the hitting times of X ,

$$H(r) = T[\tau^B(A(r))] = \int_{-\infty}^r e^{-W_\kappa(u)} \mathcal{L}_B[\tau^B(A(r)), A(u)] du, \quad r \geq 0. \quad (1.11)$$

2. Path decomposition and Valleys

2.1. *Path decomposition in the neighborhood of the h_t -minima m_i .* We first recall some results for h_t -extrema of W_κ . Let

$$V^{(i)}(x) := W_\kappa(x) - W_\kappa(m_i), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, i \in \mathbb{N}^*,$$

which is the potential W_κ translated so that it is 0 at the local minimum m_i . We also define

$$\tau_i^-(h) := \sup\{s < m_i, V^{(i)}(s) = h\}, \quad h > 0, \quad (2.1)$$

$$\tau_i(h) := \inf\{s > m_i, V^{(i)}(s) = h\}, \quad h > 0. \quad (2.2)$$

The following result has been proved by [Faggionato \(2009\)](#) [for **(i)** and **(ii)**], and the last fact comes from the strong Markov property (see also [Andreatti and Devulder \(2015\)](#), Fact 2.1) and its proof).

Fact 2.1. (path decomposition of W_κ around the h_t -minima m_i)

(i) The truncated trajectories $(V^{(i)}(m_i - s), 0 \leq s \leq m_i - \tau_i^-(h_t))$, $(V^{(i)}(m_i + s), 0 \leq s \leq \tau_i(h_t) - m_i)$, $i \geq 1$ are independent.

(ii) Let $(W_\kappa^\uparrow(s), s \geq 0)$ be a process with law $BES(3, \kappa/2)$. All the truncated trajectories $(V^{(i)}(m_i - s), 0 \leq s \leq m_i - \tau_i^-(h_t))$ for $i \geq 2$ and $(V^{(j)}(m_j + s), 0 \leq s \leq \tau_j(h_t) - m_j)$ for $j \geq 1$ are equal in law to $(W_\kappa^\uparrow(s), 0 \leq s \leq \tau_\kappa^\uparrow(h_t))$.

(iii) For $i \geq 1$, the truncated trajectory $(V^{(i)}(s + \tau_i(h_t)), s \geq 0)$ is independent

of $(W_\kappa(s), s \leq \tau_i(h_t))$ and is equal in law to $(W_\kappa^{h_t}(s), s \geq 0)$, that is, to a $(-\kappa/2)$ -drifted Brownian motion starting from h_t .

2.2. *Definition of h_t -valleys and of standard h_t -minima $\tilde{m}_j, j \in \mathbb{N}^*$.*

We are interested in the potential around the h_t -minima $m_i, i \in \mathbb{N}^*$, in fact intervals containing at least $[\tau_i^-((1 + \kappa)h_t), M_i]$. However, these valleys could intersect. In order to define valleys which are well separated and i.i.d., we introduce the following notation. This notation is used to define valleys of the potential around some \tilde{m}_i , which are shown in Lemma 2.2 to be equal to the m_i for $1 \leq i \leq n_t$ with large probability.

Let

$$h_t^+ := (1 + \kappa + 2\delta)h_t.$$

As in [Andreoletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#), we define $\tilde{L}_0^+ := 0, \tilde{m}_0 := 0$, and recursively for $i \geq 1$ (see Figure 2.1),

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{L}_i^\# &:= \inf\{x > \tilde{L}_{i-1}^+, W_\kappa(x) \leq W_\kappa(\tilde{L}_{i-1}^+) - h_t^+\}, \\ \tilde{\tau}_i(h_t) &:= \inf\{x \geq \tilde{L}_i^\#, W_\kappa(x) - \inf_{[\tilde{L}_i^\#, x]} W_\kappa \geq h_t\}, \\ \tilde{m}_i &:= \inf\{x \geq \tilde{L}_i^\#, W_\kappa(x) = \inf_{[\tilde{L}_i^\#, \tilde{\tau}_i(h_t)]} W_\kappa\}, \\ \tilde{L}_i^+ &:= \inf\{x > \tilde{\tau}_i(h_t), W_\kappa(x) \leq W_\kappa(\tilde{\tau}_i(h_t)) - h_t - h_t^+\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

We also introduce the following random variables for $i \in \mathbb{N}^*$:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{M}_i &:= \inf\{s > \tilde{m}_i, W_\kappa(s) = \max_{\tilde{m}_i \leq u \leq \tilde{L}_i^+} W_\kappa(u)\}, \\ \tilde{L}_i^* &:= \inf\{x > \tilde{\tau}_i(h_t), W_\kappa(x) - W_\kappa(\tilde{m}_i) = 3h_t/4\}, \\ \tilde{L}_i &:= \inf\{x > \tilde{\tau}_i(h_t), W_\kappa(x) - W_\kappa(\tilde{m}_i) = h_t/2\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

$$\tilde{\tau}_i(h) := \inf\{s > \tilde{m}_i, W_\kappa(s) - W_\kappa(\tilde{m}_i) = h\}, \quad h > 0, \quad (2.5)$$

$$\tilde{\tau}_i^-(h) := \sup\{s < \tilde{m}_i, W_\kappa(s) - W_\kappa(\tilde{m}_i) = h\}, \quad h > 0, \quad (2.6)$$

$$\tilde{L}_i^- := \tilde{\tau}_i^-(h_t^+).$$

We stress that these random variables depend on t , which we do not write as a subscript to simplify the notation. Notice also that $\tilde{\tau}_i(h_t)$ is the same in definitions (2.3) and (2.5) with $h = h_t$. Moreover by continuity of $W_\kappa, W_\kappa(\tilde{\tau}_i(h_t)) = W_\kappa(\tilde{m}_i) + h_t$. So, the $\tilde{m}_i, i \in \mathbb{N}^*$, are h_t -minima, since $W_\kappa(\tilde{m}_i) = \inf_{[\tilde{L}_{i-1}^+, \tilde{\tau}_i(h_t)]} W_\kappa, W_\kappa(\tilde{\tau}_i(h_t)) = W_\kappa(\tilde{m}_i) + h_t$ and $W_\kappa(\tilde{L}_{i-1}^+) \geq W_\kappa(\tilde{m}_i) + h_t$. Moreover,

$$\tilde{L}_{i-1}^+ < \tilde{L}_i^\# \leq \tilde{m}_i < \tilde{\tau}_i(h_t) < \tilde{L}_i^* < \tilde{L}_i < \tilde{L}_i^+, \quad i \in \mathbb{N}^*, \quad (2.7)$$

$$\tilde{L}_{i-1}^+ \leq \tilde{L}_i^- < \tilde{m}_i < \tilde{\tau}_i(h_t) < \tilde{M}_i < \tilde{L}_i^+, \quad i \in \mathbb{N}^*. \quad (2.8)$$

Furthermore by induction the random variables $\tilde{L}_i^\#, \tilde{\tau}_i(h_t)$ and $\tilde{L}_i^+, i \in \mathbb{N}^*$ are stopping times for the natural filtration of $(W_\kappa(x), x \geq 0)$, and so $\tilde{L}_i, \tilde{L}_i^*, i \in \mathbb{N}^*$, are also stopping times. Also by induction,

$$\begin{aligned} W_\kappa(\tilde{L}_i^\#) &= \inf_{[0, \tilde{L}_i^\#]} W_\kappa, & W_\kappa(\tilde{m}_i) &= \inf_{[0, \tilde{\tau}_i(h_t)]} W_\kappa, \\ W_\kappa(\tilde{L}_i^+) &= \inf_{[0, \tilde{L}_i^+]} W_\kappa = W_\kappa(\tilde{m}_i) - h_t^+, \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

for $i \in \mathbb{N}^*$. We also introduce the analogue of $V^{(i)}$ for \tilde{m}_i as follows:

$$\tilde{V}^{(i)}(x) := W_\kappa(x) - W_\kappa(\tilde{m}_i), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, i \in \mathbb{N}^*.$$




FIGURE 2.1. Schema of the potential between \tilde{L}_{i-1}^+ and \tilde{L}_i^+ , in the case $\tilde{L}_i^\# < \tilde{L}_i^-$.

We call i th h_t -valley the translated truncated potential $(\tilde{V}^{(i)}(x), \tilde{L}_i^- \leq x \leq \tilde{L}_i)$, for $i \geq 1$.

The following lemma states that, with an overwhelming high probability, the first $n_t + 1$ positive h_t -minima m_i , $1 \leq i \leq n_t + 1$, coincide with the random variable \tilde{m}_i , $1 \leq i \leq n_t + 1$. We introduce the corresponding event $\mathcal{V}_t := \cap_{i=1}^{n_t+1} \{m_i = \tilde{m}_i\}$.

Lemma 2.2. *Assume $0 < \delta < 1$. For t large enough,*

$$P(\bar{\mathcal{V}}_t) \leq C_1 n_t e^{-\kappa h_t/2} = e^{[-\kappa/2 + o(1)]h_t}, \quad C_1 > 0.$$

Moreover, the sequence $\left((\tilde{V}^{(i)}(x + \tilde{L}_{i-1}^+), 0 \leq x \leq \tilde{L}_i^+ - \tilde{L}_{i-1}^+), i \geq 1 \right)$, is i.i.d.

Proof: This lemma is proved in [Androletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#): Lemma 2.3. \square

The following remark is used several times in the rest of the paper.

Remark 2.3. On \mathcal{V}_t , we have for every $1 \leq i \leq n_t$, $m_i = \tilde{m}_i$, and as a consequence, $\tilde{V}^{(i)}(x) = V^{(i)}(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\tau_i^-(h) = \tilde{\tau}_i^-(h)$ and $\tau_i(h) = \tilde{\tau}_i(h)$ for $h > 0$. Moreover, $\tilde{M}_i = M_i$. Indeed, \tilde{M}_i is an h_t -maximum for W_κ , which belongs to $[\tilde{m}_i, \tilde{m}_{i+1}] = [m_i, m_{i+1}]$ on \mathcal{V}_t , and there is exactly one h_t -maximum in this interval since the h_t -maxima and minima alternate, which we defined as M_i , so $\tilde{M}_i = M_i$. So in the following, on \mathcal{V}_t , we can write these random variables with or without tilde.

3. Contributions for hitting and local times

3.1. Negligible parts for hitting times.

In the following lemma we recall results of [Androletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#) which say, roughly speaking, that the time spent by the diffusion X outside the h_t -valleys is negligible compared to the amount of time spent by X inside the h_t -valleys. This lemma also gives an upper bound for the number of visited h_t -valleys. Finally, it tells us that with large probability, up to time t , after first hitting the bottom \tilde{m}_j of

each h_t -valley $[\tilde{L}_j^-, \tilde{L}_j]$, X leaves this h_t -valley on its right, that is on \tilde{L}_j , and that X never backtracks in a previously visited h_t -valley. We define $H_{x \rightarrow y} := \inf\{s > H(x), X(s) = y\} - H(x)$ for any $x \geq 0$ and $y \geq 0$, which is equal to $H(y) - H(x)$ if $x < y$. Let

$$U_0 := 0, \quad U_i := H(\tilde{L}_i) - H(\tilde{m}_i) = H_{\tilde{m}_i \rightarrow \tilde{L}_i}, \quad i \geq 1,$$

$$\mathcal{B}_1(m) := \bigcap_{k=1}^m \left\{ 0 \leq H(\tilde{m}_k) - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i < \tilde{v}_t \right\}, \quad m \geq 1,$$

where $\tilde{v}_t := 2t/\log h_t$ and $\sum_{i=1}^0 U_i = 0$ by convention. Finally, we introduce

$$\mathcal{B}_2(m) := \bigcap_{j=1}^m \left\{ H_{\tilde{m}_j \rightarrow \tilde{L}_j} < H_{\tilde{m}_j \rightarrow \tilde{L}_j^-}, H_{\tilde{L}_j \rightarrow \tilde{m}_{j+1}} < H_{\tilde{L}_j \rightarrow \tilde{L}_j^*} \right\}. \quad m \geq 1.$$

Lemma 3.1. *For any δ small enough, we have for all large t ,*

$$\mathbb{P}(H(\tilde{m}_1) \leq \tilde{v}_t) \geq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_1(n_t)) \geq 1 - C_2 v_t, \quad (3.1)$$

with $v_t := n_t \cdot (\log h_t) e^{-\phi(t)} = o(1)$ and $C_2 > 0$. Moreover,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_2(n_t)) \geq 1 - C_3 n_t e^{-\delta \kappa h_t}, \quad C_3 > 0, \quad (3.2)$$

$$\mathbb{P}(N_t < n_t) \geq 1 - e^{-\phi(t)}. \quad (3.3)$$

Proof: The first statement is Lemma 3.7 in [Andreoletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#). The second one follows directly from Lemmata 3.2 and 3.3 in [Andreoletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#). For the proof of (3.3) see Lemma 6.1. \square

3.2. Negligible parts for local times.

We now provide estimates for the local time of X at time t . We first prove that the local time of X outside the first n_t h_t -valleys is negligible compared to t . Second, we prove that for every $1 \leq j \leq n_t$ the local time of X inside the h_t -valley $[\tilde{L}_j^-, \tilde{L}_j]$ but outside a small neighborhood of \tilde{m}_j is also negligible compared to t .

3.2.1. Supremum of the local time outside the valleys.

The aim of this subsection is to prove that at time t , the maximum of the local time outside the h_t -valleys is negligible compared to t . More precisely, let $f(t) := t e^{[\kappa(1+3\delta)-1]\phi(t)}$ and, for $m \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_3^1(m) &:= \left\{ \sup_{x \in [0, \tilde{m}_1]} \mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{m}_1), x) \leq f(t) \right\} \\ &\quad \cap \bigcap_{j=1}^{m-1} \left\{ \sup_{x \in [\tilde{L}_j, \tilde{m}_{j+1}]} \mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{m}_{j+1}), x) \leq f(t) \right\}, \\ \mathcal{B}_3^2(m) &:= \bigcap_{j=1}^{m-1} \left\{ \sup_{x \leq \tilde{L}_j} \left(\mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{m}_{j+1}), x) - \mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{L}_j), x) \right) \leq f(t) \right\}, \\ \mathcal{B}_3(m) &:= \mathcal{B}_3^1(m) \cap \mathcal{B}_3^2(m). \end{aligned}$$

This section is devoted to the proof of the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *Assume δ small enough such that $\kappa(1+3\delta) < 1$. There exists $C_5 > 0$ such that for any large t*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_3(n_t)) \geq 1 - C_5 w_t,$$

with $w_t := e^{-\kappa\delta\phi(t)}$.

Its proof is based on Lemma 3.3 below, for which we introduce the following notation, depending only on the potential W_κ :

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_1^*(h) &:= \inf\{u \geq 0, W_\kappa(u) - \inf_{[0,u]} W_\kappa \geq h\}, & h > 0, \\ m_1^*(h) &:= \inf\{y \geq 0, W_\kappa(y) = \inf_{[0,\tau_1^*(h)]} W_\kappa\}, & h > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Throughout the paper, C_+ (resp. c_-) denotes a positive constant that may grow (resp. decrease) from line to line.

Lemma 3.3. *Assume that $\kappa(1+3\delta) < 1$. For large t ,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x \in [0, m_1^*(h_t)]} \mathcal{L}[H(\tau_1^*(h_t)), x] > t e^{[\kappa(1+3\delta)-1]\phi(t)}\right) \leq \frac{C_+}{n_t e^{\kappa\delta\phi(t)}}. \quad (3.4)$$

Proof of Lemma 3.3: Thanks to (1.10) and (1.11) there exists a Brownian motion $(B(s), s \geq 0)$, independent of W_κ , such that

$$\mathcal{L}[H(\tau_1^*(h_t)), x] = e^{-W_\kappa(x)} \mathcal{L}_B[\tau^B(A(\tau_1^*(h_t))), A(x)], \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (3.5)$$

By the first Ray–Knight theorem (see e.g. Revuz and Yor (1999), chap. XI), for every $\alpha > 0$, there exists a Bessel processes Q_2 of dimension 2 starting from 0, such that $\mathcal{L}_B(\tau^B(\alpha), x)$ is equal to $Q_2^2(\alpha - x)$ for every $x \in [0, \alpha]$. Consequently, using (3.5) and the independence of B and W_κ , there exists a 2-dimensional Bessel process Q_2 such that

$$\mathcal{L}[H(\tau_1^*(h_t)), x] = e^{-W_\kappa(x)} Q_2^2[A(\tau_1^*(h_t)) - A(x)] \quad 0 \leq x \leq \tau_1^*(h_t). \quad (3.6)$$

In order to evaluate this quantity, the idea is to say that loosely speaking, Q_2^2 grows almost linearly. More formally, we consider the functions $k(t) := e^{2\kappa^{-1}\phi(t)}$, $a(t) := 4\phi(t)$ and $b(t) := 6\kappa^{-1}\phi(t)e^{\kappa h_t}$, and define the following events

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_0 &:= \left\{ A_\infty := \int_0^{+\infty} e^{W_\kappa(u)} du \leq k(t) \right\}, \\ \mathcal{A}_1 &:= \left\{ \forall u \in (0, k(t)), Q_2^2(u) \leq 2eu[a(t) + 4\log\log[ek(t)/u]] \right\}, \\ \mathcal{A}_2 &:= \left\{ \inf_{[0, \tau_1^*(h_t)]} W_\kappa \geq -b(t) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We know that $P(A_\infty \geq y) \leq C_+ y^{-\kappa}$ for $y > 0$ since $2/A_\infty$ is a gamma variable of parameter $(\kappa, 1)$ (see Dufresne (2000), or Borodin and Salminen (2002) IV.48 p. 78), having a density equal to $e^{-x} x^{\kappa-1} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x)/\Gamma(\kappa)$, so $P(\overline{\mathcal{A}}_0) \leq C_+ k(t)^{-\kappa} = C_+ e^{-2\phi(t)}$. Moreover, $\mathbb{P}(\overline{\mathcal{A}}_1) \leq C_+ \exp[-a(t)/2] = C_+ e^{-2\phi(t)}$ by Lemma 7.5. Also we know that $-\inf_{[0, \tau_1^*(h)]} W_\kappa$, denoted by $-\beta$ in Faggionato (2009), eq. (2.2) is exponentially distributed with mean $2\kappa^{-1} \sinh(\kappa h/2) e^{\kappa h/2}$ (Faggionato (2009), eq. (2.4)). So for large t ,

$$\begin{aligned} P(\overline{\mathcal{A}}_2) &= P[-\inf_{[0, \tau_1^*(h_t)]} W_\kappa > b(t)] \\ &= \exp\left[-b(t)\kappa/(2 \sinh(\kappa h_t/2) e^{\kappa h_t/2})\right] \\ &\leq e^{-2\phi(t)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, assume we are on $\mathcal{A}_0 \cap \mathcal{A}_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_2$. Due to (3.6), we have for every $0 \leq x < \tau_1^*(h_t)$, since $0 < A(\tau_1^*(h_t)) - A(x) \leq A_\infty \leq k(t)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{L}[H(\tau_1^*(h_t)), x] \\ & \leq e^{-W_\kappa(x)} 2e[A(\tau_1^*(h_t)) - A(x)] \{a(t) + 4 \log \log [ek(t)/[A(\tau_1^*(h_t)) - A(x)]]\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

We now introduce

$$f_i := \inf\{u \geq 0, W_\kappa(u) \leq -i\} = \tau^{W_\kappa}(-i), \quad i \in \mathbb{N},$$

and let $0 \leq x < \tau_1^*(h_t)$. There exists $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f_i \leq x < f_{i+1}$. Moreover, we are on \mathcal{A}_2 , so $i \leq b(t)$. Furthermore, $x < f_{i+1}$, so $W_\kappa(x) \geq -(i+1)$ and then $e^{-W_\kappa(x)} \leq e^{i+1} = e^{-W_\kappa(f_i)+1}$. All this leads to

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-W_\kappa(x)} [A(\tau_1^*(h_t)) - A(x)] &= e^{-W_\kappa(x)} \int_x^{\tau_1^*(h_t)} e^{W_\kappa(u)} du \\ &\leq e \int_{f_i}^{\tau_1^*(h_t)} e^{W_\kappa(u) - W_\kappa(f_i)} du. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

To bound this, we introduce the event

$$\mathcal{A}_3 := \bigcap_{i=0}^{\lfloor b(t) \rfloor} \left\{ \int_{f_i}^{\tau_1^*(h_t)} e^{W_\kappa(u) - W_\kappa(f_i)} du \leq e^{(1-\kappa)h_t} b(t) n_t e^{\kappa \delta \phi(t)} \right\}.$$

We now consider $\tau_1^*(u, h_t) := \inf\{y \geq u, W_\kappa(y) - \inf_{[u, y]} W_\kappa \geq h_t\} \geq \tau_1^*(h_t)$ for $u \geq 0$. We have

$$E \left(\int_{f_i}^{\tau_1^*(h_t)} e^{W_\kappa(u) - W_\kappa(f_i)} du \right) \leq E \left(\int_{f_i}^{\tau_1^*(f_i, h_t)} e^{W_\kappa(u) - W_\kappa(f_i)} du \right) = \beta_0(h_t),$$

by the strong Markov property applied at stopping time f_i , where we define $\beta_0(h) := E \left(\int_0^{\tau_1^*(h)} e^{W_\kappa(u)} du \right)$. By (6.15), $\beta_0(h) \leq C_+ e^{(1-\kappa)h}$ for large h . Hence for large t by Markov inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} P(\overline{\mathcal{A}}_3) &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor b(t) \rfloor} P \left(\int_{f_i}^{\tau_1^*(h_t)} e^{W_\kappa(u) - W_\kappa(f_i)} du > e^{(1-\kappa)h_t} b(t) n_t e^{\kappa \delta \phi(t)} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{[b(t) + 1] \beta_0(h_t)}{e^{(1-\kappa)h_t} b(t) n_t e^{\kappa \delta \phi(t)}} \leq \frac{C_+}{n_t e^{\kappa \delta \phi(t)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, on $\cap_{j=0}^3 \mathcal{A}_j$, (3.7) and (3.8) lead to

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{L}[H(\tau_1^*(h_t)), x] \\ & \leq 2e^{2+(1-\kappa)h_t} b(t) n_t e^{\kappa \delta \phi(t)} \{a(t) + 4 \log \log [ek(t)/[A(\tau_1^*(h_t)) - A(x)]]\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

We now consider only $0 \leq x \leq m_1^*(h_t)$. By definition of \mathcal{A}_2 , $\inf_{[0, \tau_1^*(h_t)]} W_\kappa \geq -b(t)$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} A(\tau_1^*(h_t)) - A(x) &= \int_x^{\tau_1^*(h_t)} e^{W_\kappa(u)} du \\ &\geq \int_{m_1^*(h_t)}^{\tau_1^*(h_t)} e^{W_\kappa(u)} du \\ &\geq e^{-b(t)} [\tau_1^*(h_t) - m_1^*(h_t)] \\ &\geq e^{-b(t)} \end{aligned}$$

on the event $\cap_{i=0}^4 \mathcal{A}_i$ with $\mathcal{A}_4 := \{\tau_1^*(h_t) - m_1^*(h_t) \geq 1\}$. Since $m_1 = m_1^*(h_t)$ and $\tau_1(h_t) = \tau_1^*(h_t)$ on $\{M_0 \leq 0\}$ by definition of h_t -extrema, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(\overline{\mathcal{A}}_4) &\leq P(0 < M_0 < m_1) + P[\tau_1(h_t) - m_1 < 1] \\ &\leq C_+ h_t e^{-\kappa h_t} + P[\tau^{W_\kappa^\uparrow}(h_t) - \tau^{W_\kappa^\uparrow}(h_t/2) < 1] \\ &\leq 2\kappa h_t e^{-\kappa h_t} + C_+ \exp[-(c_-)h_t^2] \end{aligned}$$

due to (Androletti and Devulder (2015), eq. (2.8), coming from Faggionato (2009)), Fact 2.1 (ii) and (7.4).

Now, we have $ek(t)/[A(\tau_1^*(h_t)) - A(x)] \leq ek(t)e^{b(t)}$ on $\cap_{i=0}^4 \mathcal{A}_i$, and then, on this event, (3.9) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}[H(\tau_1^*(h_t)), x] &\leq 2e^{2+(1-\kappa)h_t} b(t) n_t e^{\kappa\delta\phi(t)} \{a(t) + 4 \log \log [ek(t)e^{b(t)}]\} \\ &\leq C_+ t \phi(t) e^{[\kappa(1+\delta)-1]\phi(t)} e^{\kappa\delta\phi(t)} h_t, \end{aligned}$$

since $\phi(t) = o(\log t)$, $h_t = \log t - \phi(t)$ and $n_t = \lfloor e^{\kappa(1+\delta)\phi(t)} \rfloor$. We notice that for large t , $C_+ \phi(t) h_t \leq e^{\kappa\delta\phi(t)}$ since $\log \log t = o(\phi(t))$. Hence, for large t ,

$$\mathcal{L}[H(\tau_1^*(h_t)), x] \leq t e^{[\kappa(1+3\delta)-1]\phi(t)},$$

on $\cap_{i=0}^4 \mathcal{A}_i$ for every $0 \leq x \leq m_1^*(h_t)$. This gives for large t ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x \in [0, m_1^*(h_t)]} \mathcal{L}[H(\tau_1^*(h_t)), x] \leq t e^{[\kappa(1+3\delta)-1]\phi(t)}\right) \geq \mathbb{P}(\cap_{i=0}^4 \mathcal{A}_i) \geq 1 - \frac{C_+}{n_t e^{\kappa\delta\phi(t)}},$$

due to the previous bounds for $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_i)$, $0 \leq i \leq 4$. This proves the lemma. \square

With the help of the previous lemma, we can now prove Lemma 3.2.

Proof of Lemma 3.2: The method is to do a coupling, similarly as in the proof of Lemma 3.7 of Androletti and Devulder (2015). Recall the definition of $\tilde{L}_i^* < \tilde{L}_i < \tilde{L}_{i+1}^\sharp$ just above (2.5). Also, let

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\tau}_{i+1}^*(h_t) &:= \inf \{u \geq \tilde{L}_i^*, W_\kappa(u) - \inf_{[\tilde{L}_i^*, u]} W_\kappa \geq h_t\} \leq \tilde{\tau}_{i+1}(h_t), \quad i \geq 1, \\ \tilde{m}_{i+1}^*(h_t) &:= \inf \{u \geq \tilde{L}_i^*, W_\kappa(u) = \inf_{[\tilde{L}_i^*, \tilde{\tau}_{i+1}^*(h_t)]} W_\kappa\}, \quad i \geq 1, \\ \mathcal{A}_5 &:= \cap_{i=1}^{n_t-1} \{\tilde{\tau}_{i+1}^*(h_t) = \tilde{\tau}_{i+1}(h_t)\}, \\ X_i(u) &:= X(u + H(\tilde{L}_i)), \quad X_i^*(u) := X(u + H(\tilde{L}_i^*)), \quad u \geq 0, i \geq 1. \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Let $i \geq 1$. By the strong Markov property, X_i and X_i^* are diffusions in the potential W_κ , starting respectively from \tilde{L}_i and \tilde{L}_i^* . We denote respectively by \mathcal{L}_{X_i} , $\mathcal{L}_{X_i^*}$,

H_{X_i} and $H_{X_i^*}$ the local times and hitting times of X_i and X_i^* . We have for every $x \geq \tilde{L}_i^*$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{m}_{i+1}), x) - \mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{L}_i), x) &\leq \mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{m}_{i+1}), x) - \mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{L}_i^*), x) \\ &= \mathcal{L}_{X_i^*}(H_{X_i^*}(\tilde{m}_{i+1}), x). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, on $\mathcal{A}_5 \cap \mathcal{A}_6$ with $\mathcal{A}_6 := \cap_{j=1}^{n_t-1} \{H_{X_j}(\tilde{m}_{j+1}) < H_{X_j}(\tilde{L}_j^*)\}$, for $1 \leq i \leq n_t - 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left(\mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{m}_{i+1}), x) - \mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{L}_i), x) \right) \\ &= \sup_{\tilde{L}_i^* \leq x \leq \tilde{m}_{i+1}} \left(\mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{m}_{i+1}), x) - \mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{L}_i), x) \right) \\ &\leq \sup_{\tilde{L}_i^* \leq x \leq \tilde{m}_{i+1}} \mathcal{L}_{X_i^*}(H_{X_i^*}(\tilde{m}_{i+1}), x) \\ &\leq \sup_{\tilde{L}_i^* \leq x \leq \tilde{m}_{i+1}^*} \mathcal{L}_{X_i^*}(H_{X_i^*}(\tilde{\tau}_{i+1}^*(h_t)), x), \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

since $\tilde{m}_{i+1}^* = \tilde{m}_{i+1} \leq \tilde{\tau}_{i+1}(h_t) = \tilde{\tau}_{i+1}^*(h_t)$ on \mathcal{A}_5 . Now, notice that the right hand side of (3.11) is the supremum of the local times of $X_i^* - \tilde{L}_i^*$, up to its first hitting time of $\tilde{\tau}_{i+1}^*(h_t) - \tilde{L}_i^*$, over all locations in $[0, \tilde{m}_{i+1}^* - \tilde{L}_i^*]$. Since $X_i^* - \tilde{L}_i^*$ is a diffusion in the potential $(W_\kappa(\tilde{L}_i^* + x) - W_\kappa(\tilde{L}_i^*), x \in \mathbb{R})$, which has on $[0, +\infty)$ the same law as $(W_\kappa(x), x \geq 0)$ because \tilde{L}_i^* is a stopping time for W_κ , the right hand side of (3.11) has the same law, under the annealed probability \mathbb{P} , as $\sup_{x \in [0, m_1^*(h_t)]} \mathcal{L}[H(\tau_1^*(h_t)), x]$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{n_t-1} \left\{ \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left(\mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{m}_{i+1}), x) - \mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{L}_i), x) \right) > te^{[\kappa(1+3\delta)-1]\phi(t)} \right\} \right) \\ &\leq n_t \left[\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{x \in [0, m_1^*(h_t)]} \mathcal{L}[H(\tau_1^*(h_t)), x] > te^{[\kappa(1+3\delta)-1]\phi(t)} \right) + \mathbb{P}(\overline{\mathcal{A}}_5) + \mathbb{P}(\overline{\mathcal{A}}_6) \right] \\ &\leq C_+ e^{-\kappa\delta\phi(t)} \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

by Lemma 3.3, since $\mathbb{P}(\overline{\mathcal{A}}_5) \leq C_+ n_t h_t e^{-\kappa h_t}$ by (6.9), $\mathbb{P}(\overline{\mathcal{A}}_6) \leq \mathbb{P}(\overline{\mathcal{B}}_2(n_t)) \leq C_3 n_t e^{-\delta\kappa h_t}$ by (3.2) and since $\phi(t) = o(\log t)$. Notice that, as before, $\tilde{m}_1 = m_1 = m_1^*(h_t)$ on $\mathcal{V}_t \cap \{M_0 \leq 0\}$. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{x \in [0, \tilde{m}_1]} \mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{m}_1), x) > te^{[\kappa(1+3\delta)-1]\phi(t)} \right) &\leq \frac{C_+}{e^{\kappa\delta\phi(t)}} + P(\overline{\mathcal{V}}_t) + P(0 < M_0 < m_1) \\ &\leq \frac{C_+}{e^{\kappa\delta\phi(t)}} \end{aligned}$$

also by Lemma 3.3, Lemma 2.2, and since $P(0 < M_0 < m_1) \leq C_+ h_t e^{-\kappa h_t}$ due to (6.8). This and (3.12) prove the lemma. \square

3.2.2. *Local time inside the valley $[\tilde{L}_j^-, \tilde{L}_j]$ but far from \tilde{m}_j .*

We introduce for $t > 0$ and $j \geq 1$,

$$r_t := C_0 \phi(t), \quad \mathcal{D}_j := [\tilde{m}_j - r_t, \tilde{m}_j + r_t], \quad (3.13)$$

where $C_0 > 0$ is a constant that can be chosen as large as needed. We also define

$$\mathcal{B}_4(m) := \bigcap_{j=1}^m \left\{ \sup_{x \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_j \cap [\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t^+), \tilde{L}_j]} \left(\mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{L}_j), x) - \mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{m}_j), x) \right) < te^{-2\phi(t)} \right\}$$

for $m \geq 1$, where $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_j$ is the complementary of \mathcal{D}_j .

Lemma 3.4. *There exists $C_6 > 0$ such that for large t ,*

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{B}_4(n_t)] \geq 1 - C_6 n_t e^{-2\phi(t)},$$

Proof: Let $j \in [1, n_t]$. Throughout the rest of the paper, for $y \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $\mathbb{P}_y^{W_\kappa}$ the law of X starting from y instead of 0, conditionally on W_κ . As we are interested in the local time at x after X reaches \tilde{m}_j we work under $\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{m}_j}^{W_\kappa}$. So first, thanks to (1.10) and (1.11), under $\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{m}_j}^{W_\kappa}$, there exists a Brownian motion $(B(s), s \geq 0)$, independent of $\tilde{V}^{(j)}$, such that

$$\mathcal{L}[H(\tilde{L}_j), x] = e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(x)} \mathcal{L}_B[\tau^B(A^j(\tilde{L}_j)), A^j(x)], \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

where $A^j(x) := \int_{\tilde{m}_j}^x e^{\tilde{V}^{(j)}(s)} ds$. Let $\tilde{B}^j(\cdot) := B^j((A^j(\tilde{L}_j))^2)/A^j(\tilde{L}_j)$. By scaling, we notice that conditionally to W_κ , \tilde{B}^j is a standard Brownian motion. Therefore, even if W_κ appears in the expression of \tilde{B}^j , \tilde{B}^j is probabilistically independent of W_κ . We still denote it by B in the sequel to simplify the notation. With this notation, we have

$$\mathcal{L}[H(\tilde{L}_j), x] = e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(x)} A^j(\tilde{L}_j) \mathcal{L}_B[\tau^B(1), A^j(x)/A^j(\tilde{L}_j)], \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (3.14)$$

In order to bound the factors $\mathcal{L}_B[\tau^B(1), \cdot]$ and $A^j(\tilde{L}_j)$ in (3.14), we first introduce

$$\mathcal{A}_1 := \left\{ \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}} \mathcal{L}_B[\tau^B(1), u] \leq e^{2\phi(t)} \right\}, \quad \mathcal{A}_2 := \left\{ A^j(\tilde{L}_j) \leq 2e^{h_t + 2\phi(t)/\kappa} \right\}. \quad (3.15)$$

We have $\mathbb{P}(\overline{\mathcal{A}}_1) \leq 5e^{-2\phi(t)}$ for large t by Lemma 7.4 eq. (7.12) and (7.13). Moreover on \mathcal{V}_t , we have by Remark 2.3 and Fact 2.1 (ii) and (iii),

$$\begin{aligned} A^j(\tilde{L}_j) &\leq [\tilde{\tau}_j(h_t) - \tilde{m}_j] e^{h_t} + \int_{\tilde{\tau}_j(h_t)}^{\tilde{L}_j} e^{\tilde{V}^{(j)}(s)} ds \\ &= [\tau_j(h_t) - m_j] e^{h_t} + \int_{\tau_j(h_t)}^{L_j} e^{V^{(j)}(s)} ds \\ &\stackrel{\mathfrak{A}}{=} e^{h_t} \tau^{W_\kappa^\uparrow}(h_t) + G^+(h_t/2, h_t), \end{aligned}$$

where W_κ^\uparrow has law $BES(3, \kappa/2)$ and is independent of $G^+(h_t/2, h_t)$, which is defined in (1.8), and with $\tilde{L}_j = \inf\{s > \tilde{\tau}_j(h_t), \tilde{V}^{(j)}(s) = h_t/2\}$ as defined in (2.4). Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} P(\overline{\mathcal{A}}_2) &\leq P(\tau^{W_\kappa^\uparrow}(h_t) > e^{2\phi(t)/\kappa}) + P(G^+(h_t/2, h_t) > e^{h_t + 2\phi(t)/\kappa}) + P(\overline{\mathcal{V}}_t) \\ &\leq C_+ e^{-2\phi(t)} \end{aligned}$$

for large t by eq. (7.5), Lemma 7.3 eq. (7.10) and Lemma 2.2, and since $\phi(t) = o(\log t)$ and $\log \log t = o(\phi(t))$.

Now, we would like to bound the factor $e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(x)}$ that appears in (3.14). To this aim, let

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_3 &:= \{\tilde{\tau}_j[\kappa C_0\phi(t)/8] \leq \tilde{m}_j + C_0\phi(t)\}, \\ \mathcal{A}_4 &:= \left\{ \inf_{[\tau_j[\kappa C_0\phi(t)/8], \tau_j(h_t)]} \tilde{V}^{(j)} \geq \kappa C_0\phi(t)/16 \right\},\end{aligned}$$

with $\tilde{\tau}_j$ and $\tilde{\tau}_j^-$ defined in (2.5) and (2.6), and τ_j and τ_j^- in (2.1) and (2.2). First, using (6.12) $P(\overline{\mathcal{A}}_3) \leq C_+ e^{-[\kappa^2 C_0\phi(t)]/(16\sqrt{2})} \leq e^{-2\phi(t)}$ if we choose C_0 large enough. Moreover Fact 2.1 together with (7.3) (applied with $h = C_0\phi(t)$, $\alpha = \kappa/8$, $\gamma = \kappa/16$ and $\omega = h_t/(C_0\phi(t))$) gives $P(\overline{\mathcal{A}}_4) \leq e^{-\kappa^2 C_0\phi(t)/16} \leq e^{-2\phi(t)}$ for large t .

We notice that $\inf_{[\tilde{m}_j + C_0\phi(t), \tilde{\tau}_j(h_t)]} \tilde{V}^{(j)} \geq \kappa C_0\phi(t)/16$ on $\mathcal{A}_3 \cap \mathcal{A}_4 \cap \mathcal{V}_t$, since $\tau_j = \tilde{\tau}_j$ on \mathcal{V}_t thanks to Remark 2.3. We prove similarly that $P(\overline{\mathcal{A}}_5) \leq C_+ e^{-\kappa^2 C_0\phi(t)/(16\sqrt{2})} + P(\overline{\mathcal{V}}_t) \leq 2e^{-2\phi(t)}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_5 &:= \left\{ \inf_{[\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t), \tilde{m}_j - C_0\phi(t)]} \tilde{V}^{(j)} \geq \kappa C_0\phi(t)/16 \right\}, \\ \mathcal{A}_6 &:= \left\{ \inf_{[\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t^+), \tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t)]} \tilde{V}^{(j)} \geq h_t/2 \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Also by (6.10), $P(\overline{\mathcal{A}}_6) \leq e^{-\kappa h_t/8}$. We also know that $\tilde{V}^{(j)}(x) \geq h_t/2$ for all $\tilde{\tau}_j(h_t) \leq x \leq \tilde{L}_j$ by definition of \tilde{L}_j . Consequently on $\cap_{i=3}^6 \mathcal{A}_i \cap \mathcal{V}_t$, for all $x \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_j \cap [\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t^+), \tilde{L}_j]$, we have $e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(x)} \leq e^{-\kappa C_0\phi(t)/16}$.

Hence on $\cap_{i=1}^6 \mathcal{A}_i \cap \mathcal{V}_t$, we have under $\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{m}_j}^{W_\kappa}$, by (3.14) and (3.15),

$$\sup_{x \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_j \cap [\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t^+), \tilde{L}_j]} \mathcal{L}[H(\tilde{L}_j), x] \leq 2te^{(1+2/\kappa)\phi(t)} e^{-\kappa C_0\phi(t)/16} \leq te^{-2\phi(t)},$$

if we choose C_0 large enough. So, conditioning by W_κ and applying the strong Markov property at time $H(\tilde{m}_j)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}& \mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{x \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_j \cap [\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t^+), \tilde{L}_j]} (\mathcal{L}[H(\tilde{L}_j), x] - \mathcal{L}[H(\tilde{m}_j), x]) \leq te^{-2\phi(t)} \right] \\ & \geq \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{m}_j}^{W_\kappa}(\cap_{i=1}^6 \mathcal{A}_i \cap \mathcal{V}_t)) \geq 1 - C_+ e^{-2\phi(t)}\end{aligned}$$

uniformly for large t due to the previous estimates and thanks to Lemma 2.2. This proves the lemma. \square

3.3. Approximation of the main contributions.

In this section we give an approximation of the exit time of each h_t -valley $[\tilde{L}_j^-, \tilde{L}_j]$ and of the local time at the bottom \tilde{m}_j of this h_t -valley for every $1 \leq j \leq n_t$. More precisely, we make a link between the families $((U_j := H(\tilde{L}_j) - H(\tilde{m}_j), \mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{L}_j), \tilde{m}_j)), 1 \leq j \leq n_t)$, and the i.i.d. sequence $((\mathcal{H}_j, \ell_j), 1 \leq j \leq n_t)$ described in the introduction.

In the following, $F_1^+(h_t)$, $G^+(h_t/2, h_t)$, $F_2^-(h_t/2)$ and $F_3^-(h_t/2)$ denote independent r.v. with law respectively $F^+(h_t)$, $G^+(h_t/2, h_t)$, $F^-(h_t/2)$ and $F^-(h_t/2)$, defined in (1.7) and (1.8).

Proposition 3.5. *For $\delta > 0$ small enough (recall that δ appears in the definitions of n_t and h_t^+), there exist $d_1 = d_1(\delta, \kappa) > 0$ and $D_1(d_1) > 0$ such that for large t ,*

possibly on an enlarged probability space, there exists a sequence $((S_j, R_j, \mathbf{e}_j), 1 \leq j \leq n_t)$ of i.i.d. random variables depending on t , with S_j , R_j and \mathbf{e}_j independent for every j and $S_j \stackrel{\mathfrak{A}}{=} F_1^+(h_t) + G^+(h_t/2, h_t)$, $R_j \stackrel{\mathfrak{A}}{=} F_2^-(h_t/2) + F_3^-(h_t/2)$ and $\mathbf{e}_j \stackrel{\mathfrak{A}}{=} \mathcal{E}(1/2)$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{n_t} \left\{ |U_j - \mathcal{H}_j| \leq \varepsilon_t \mathcal{H}_j, |\mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{L}_j), \tilde{m}_j) - \ell_j| \leq \varepsilon_t \ell_j \right\}\right) \geq 1 - e^{-D_1 h_t}, \quad (3.16)$$

where $\ell_j := S_j \mathbf{e}_j$, $\mathcal{H}_j := R_j \ell_j$ and $\varepsilon_t := e^{-d_1 h_t}$.

The proof of the above proposition, which is in the spirit of the proofs of Propositions 3.4 and 4.4 in [Androletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#), makes use of the following lemma:

Lemma 3.6. *For $\delta > 0$ small enough, there exist constants $d_- > 0$ and $D_- > 0$, possibly depending on κ and δ , such that the two following statements are true for $t > 0$ large enough.*

(i) *There exists a sequence $(\mathbf{e}_j, 1 \leq j \leq n_t)$ of i.i.d. random variables with exponential law of mean 2 and independent of W_κ , such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{n_t} \left\{ |U_j - \tilde{\mathbb{H}}_j| \leq e^{-(d_-)h_t} \tilde{\mathbb{H}}_j, \mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{L}_j), \tilde{m}_j) = \mathbb{L}_j \right\}\right) \geq 1 - e^{-(D_-)h_t}, \quad (3.17)$$

where $\mathbb{L}_j := \mathbf{e}_j \int_{\tilde{m}_j}^{\tilde{L}_j} e^{\tilde{V}^{(j)}(x)} dx$, $\tilde{R}_j := \int_{\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t/2)}^{\tilde{\tau}_j^+(h_t/2)} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(x)} dx$ and $\tilde{\mathbb{H}}_j := \mathbb{L}_j \tilde{R}_j$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n_t$. Moreover the random variables $(\mathbb{L}_j, \tilde{\mathbb{H}}_j)$, $1 \leq j \leq n_t$, are i.i.d.

(ii) *Possibly on an enlarged probability space, there exist random variables R_j and S_j , $1 \leq j \leq n_t$, such that all the random variables R_j , S_j , \mathbf{e}_j , $1 \leq j \leq n_t$ are independent, with $S_j \stackrel{\mathfrak{A}}{=} F_1^+(h_t) + G^+(h_t/2, h_t)$, and $R_j \stackrel{\mathfrak{A}}{=} F_2^-(h_t/2) + F_3^-(h_t/2)$ for every $1 \leq j \leq n_t$, such that*

$$P\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{n_t} \left\{ \left| \int_{\tilde{m}_j}^{\tilde{L}_j} e^{\tilde{V}^{(j)}(x)} dx - S_j \right| \leq e^{-(d_-)h_t} S_j, \tilde{R}_j = R_j \right\}\right) \geq 1 - e^{-(D_-)h_t}, \quad (3.18)$$

Proof of Lemma 3.6: We start with (i). Recall that $\tilde{m}_j < \tilde{L}_j < \tilde{m}_{j+1}$ for every $j \geq 1$, e.g. by (2.7). By the strong Markov property applied under \mathbb{P}^{W_κ} at stopping times $H(\tilde{m}_j)$, the random variables $(U_j, \mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{L}_j), \tilde{m}_j))$, $1 \leq j \leq n_t$, are independent under \mathbb{P}^{W_κ} . By the same Markov property and formulas (1.10) and (1.11), the sequence $(U_j, \mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{L}_j), \tilde{m}_j))$, $1 \leq j \leq n_t$ is equal to the sequence $(H_j(\tilde{L}_j), \mathcal{L}_j(H_j(\tilde{L}_j), \tilde{m}_j))$, $1 \leq j \leq n_t$), where

$$\begin{aligned} H_j(\tilde{L}_j) &:= \int_{-\infty}^{\tilde{L}_j} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)} \mathcal{L}_{B^j}[\tau^{B^j}(A^j(\tilde{L}_j)), A^j(u)] du, \\ \mathcal{L}_j(H_j(\tilde{L}_j), \tilde{m}_j) &= \mathcal{L}_{B^j}[\tau^{B^j}(A^j(\tilde{L}_j)), 0], \quad A^j(u) := \int_{\tilde{m}_j}^u e^{\tilde{V}^{(j)}(x)} dx, \quad u \in \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

with $(B^j, 1 \leq j \leq n_t)$ a sequence of independent standard Brownian motions independent of W_κ , such that B^j starts at $A^j(\tilde{m}_j) = 0$ and is killed when it first hits $A^j(\tilde{L}_j)$. Recall that \mathcal{L}_{B^j} denotes the local time of B^j . Define $\mathcal{A}_j :=$

$\{\max_{u < \tilde{L}_j^-} \mathcal{L}_{B^j}[\tau^{B^j}(A^j(\tilde{L}_j)), A^j(u)] = 0\}$, $1 \leq j \leq n_t$. By (6.6), there exists $c_- > 0$ (possibly depending on κ and δ) such that $\mathbb{P}(\cap_{j=1}^{n_t} \mathcal{A}_j) \geq 1 - e^{-(c_-)h_t}$ for large t . So for large t ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{n_t} \{H_j(\tilde{L}_j) = \tilde{h}_j\}\right) \geq 1 - e^{-(c_-)h_t}, \quad (3.20)$$

where

$$\tilde{h}_j := \int_{\tilde{L}_j^-}^{\tilde{L}_j} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)} \mathcal{L}_{B^j}[\tau^{B^j}(A^j(\tilde{L}_j)), A^j(u)] du, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n_t.$$

We also notice that for every $1 \leq j \leq n_t$, $(\tilde{h}_j, \mathcal{L}_j(H_j(\tilde{L}_j), \tilde{m}_j))$ is measurable with respect to the σ -field generated by $(\tilde{V}^{(j)}(x + \tilde{L}_{j-1}^+), 0 \leq x < \tilde{L}_j^+ - \tilde{L}_{j-1}^+)$ and B^j , where by construction $\tilde{L}_{j-1}^+ < \tilde{L}_j^- < \tilde{L}_j < \tilde{L}_j^+$. Hence, the random variables $(\tilde{h}_j, \mathcal{L}_j(H_j(\tilde{L}_j), \tilde{m}_j))$, $1 \leq j \leq n_t$ are i.i.d under \mathbb{P} by the second fact of Lemma 2.2. For the same reason, $(\tilde{R}_j, A^j(\tilde{L}_j))$, $1 \leq j \leq n_t$ are also i.i.d.

For $1 \leq j \leq n_t$, let $\tilde{B}^j(\cdot) := B^j((A^j(\tilde{L}_j))^2)/A^j(\tilde{L}_j)$. Notice that

$$\mathcal{L}_{B^j}[\tau^{B^j}(A^j(\tilde{L}_j)), A^j(u)] = A^j(\tilde{L}_j) \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{B}^j}[\tau^{\tilde{B}^j}(1), A^j(u)/A^j(\tilde{L}_j)], \quad \tilde{L}_j^- \leq u \leq \tilde{L}_j. \quad (3.21)$$

Moreover by scaling, \tilde{B}^j is, conditionally to W_κ , a standard Brownian motion, starting from 0 and killed when it first hits 1. Furthermore, even if W_κ appears in the expression of \tilde{B}^j , \tilde{B}^j is independent of W_κ . Then, let

$$\mathbf{e}_j := \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{B}^j}(\tau^{\tilde{B}^j}(1), 0) = \mathcal{L}_{B^j}[\tau^{B^j}(A^j(\tilde{L}_j)), 0]/A^j(\tilde{L}_j).$$

Notice that by the first Ray Knight theorem, \mathbf{e}_j is exponentially distributed with mean 2. Since B^j is independent of W_κ , \mathbf{e}_j is also independent of W_κ . Also, the sequence \mathbf{e}_j , $1 \leq j \leq n_t$ is i.i.d. because the B^j are independent and the $(\tilde{R}_j, A^j(\tilde{L}_j))$ are i.i.d., so $(\mathbb{L}_j, \tilde{\mathbb{H}}_j)$, $1 \leq j \leq n_t$, are also i.i.d. Moreover, (3.21) leads to

$$\mathcal{L}_j(H_j(\tilde{L}_j), \tilde{m}_j) = A^j(\tilde{L}_j) \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{B}^j}(\tau^{\tilde{B}^j}(1), 0) = A^j(\tilde{L}_j) \mathbf{e}_j = \mathbb{L}_j. \quad (3.22)$$

Now, for small $\varepsilon > 0$, thanks to Lemma 6.3, we have for large t ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{n_t} \left\{ \left| \tilde{h}_j - A^j(\tilde{L}_j) \mathbf{e}_j \tilde{R}_j \right| \leq 2e^{-(1-3\varepsilon)h_t/6} A^j(\tilde{L}_j) \mathbf{e}_j \tilde{R}_j \right\}\right) &\geq 1 - \frac{C_+ n_t}{e^{(c_-)\varepsilon h_t}} \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{C_+}{e^{(c_-/2)\varepsilon h_t}}, \end{aligned}$$

since $n_t = e^{o(1)h_t}$. Finally, this, together with (3.20), (3.22) and the equality of sequences at the start of this proof show (3.17) for some $D_- > 0$ and $d_- > 0$. So (i) is proved.

We now prove (ii). The r.v. $\tilde{A}_j(\tilde{L}_j) = \int_{\tilde{m}_j}^{\tilde{L}_j} e^{\tilde{V}^{(j)}(x)} dx$ and \tilde{R}_j are not independent, so we want to replace them by r.v. having better independence properties. Applying Lemma 6.4 with subscript 2 replaced by j for $1 \leq j \leq n_t$ gives the existence of R_j and S_j , independent and independent of \mathbf{e}_j , having the law claimed in (ii) and satisfying (6.5) with 2 replaced by j . This gives (3.18) since $n_t = e^{o(1)h_t}$. The fact that we can build these R_j and S_j with the claimed independence properties follows from the fact that $(\mathbf{e}_j, \tilde{R}_j, \tilde{A}_j(\tilde{L}_j))$, $1 \leq j \leq n_t$ are i.i.d. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.5: The existence and the law of the \mathbf{e}_j come from Lemma 3.6 (i). The existence and the law of the R_j and S_j , and the independence of R_j , S_j , \mathbf{e}_j , $1 \leq j \leq n_t$ come from Lemma 3.6 (ii). Moreover, by Lemma 3.6 (ii),

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{n_t} \left\{ |U_j - \mathbf{e}_j S_j R_j| \leq \varepsilon_t \mathbf{e}_j S_j R_j, \quad |\mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{L}_j), \tilde{m}_j) - \mathbf{e}_j S_j| \leq \varepsilon_t \mathbf{e}_j S_j \right\} \right) \\ & \geq 1 - e^{-D_1 h_t}, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (3.16). So Proposition 3.5 is proved. \square

4. Convergence toward the Lévy process $(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)$ and Continuity

4.1. *Preliminaries.* We begin this section by the convergence of certain repartition functions. These key results are essentially improvements of the second part of Lemma 5.1 in Androletti and Devulder (2015).

Lemma 4.1. *Recall from Proposition 3.5 that $\ell_1 := \mathbf{e}_1 S_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_1 := \mathbf{e}_1 S_1 R_1$. Then for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/3)$,*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{x \in [e^{-(1-2\varepsilon)\phi(t)}, +\infty[} \left| x^\kappa e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(\ell_1/t > x) - \mathcal{C}_2 \right| = 0, \quad (4.1)$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{y \in [e^{-(1-3\varepsilon)\phi(t)}, +\infty[} \left| y^\kappa e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}_1/t > y) - \mathcal{C}_2 \mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{R}_\kappa)^\kappa] \right| = 0, \quad (4.2)$$

with \mathcal{C}_2 a positive constant (see below (4.9)).

For any $\alpha > 0$, $e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(\ell_1/t \geq x, \mathcal{H}_1/t \geq y)$ converges uniformly when t goes to infinity on $[\alpha, +\infty[\times [\alpha, +\infty[$ to $\nu([\alpha, +\infty[\times [y, +\infty[)$, where ν is defined in (1.4).

Proof:

Proof of (4.1)

We first prove that, as $t \rightarrow +\infty$, $x^\kappa e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(S_1/t > x)$ converges uniformly in $x \in [e^{-(1-\varepsilon)\phi(t)}, +\infty[$ to a constant c , that is, we prove that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{x \in [e^{-(1-\varepsilon)\phi(t)}, +\infty[} \left| x^\kappa e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(S_1/t > x) - c \right| = 0. \quad (4.3)$$

For that, let $y = e^{(1-\varepsilon)\phi(t)} x$, we have to prove that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{y \in [1, +\infty[} \left| y^\kappa e^{\kappa\varepsilon\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(S_1/e^{h_t + \varepsilon\phi(t)} > y) - c \right| = 0, \quad (4.4)$$

but this is equivalent to prove that for any function $f :]0, +\infty[\rightarrow [1, +\infty[$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} (f(t))^\kappa e^{\kappa\varepsilon\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(S_1/e^{h_t + \varepsilon\phi(t)} > f(t)) = c. \quad (4.5)$$

First by definition (see Proposition 3.5), S_1 can be written as a sum of two independent functionals, that we denote, for simplicity, as the sum of two generic functionals

$$S_1/t = (F_1^+(h_t) + G^+(h_t/2, h_t)) / t = e^{-\phi(t)} (e^{-h_t} F_1^+(h_t) + e^{-h_t} G^+(h_t/2, h_t)) \quad (4.6)$$

Since we know the asymptotic behavior of the Laplace transforms of $F^+(h_t)/e^{h_t}$ and $G^+(h_t/2, h_t)$, the proof of (4.5) is similar to the proof of a Tauberian theorem. First by (7.1) and (7.2) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \gamma > 0, \quad \omega_{f,t}(\gamma) &:= \left(1 - \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\gamma S_1 / (f(t) e^{h_t + \varepsilon \phi(t)})} \right]\right) (\gamma)^{-1} \\ &\underset{t \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} c' \gamma^{\kappa-1} (f(t))^{-\kappa} e^{-\kappa \varepsilon \phi(t)}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

where c' is a positive constant. Note that $\omega_{f,t}$ is the Laplace transform of the measure $U_{f,t} := \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(z) \mathbb{P}(S_1 / (f(t) e^{h_t + \varepsilon \phi(t)}) > z) dz$. From (4.7), we have

$$\forall \gamma > 0, \quad \frac{\omega_{f,t}(\gamma)}{\omega_{f,t}(1)} \underset{t \rightarrow +\infty}{\longrightarrow} \gamma^{\kappa-1}.$$

We can now follow the same line as in the proof of a classical Tauberian theorem, making the link between a Laplace transform and the repartition function, (see for example Feller (1971) volume 2, section XIII.5, Theorem 1, page 442), we can deduce that

$$\forall z > 0, \quad \frac{U_{f,t}([0, z])}{\omega_{f,t}(1)} \underset{t \rightarrow +\infty}{\longrightarrow} \frac{z^{1-\kappa}}{\Gamma(2-\kappa)}.$$

Then as in the proof of Theorem 4 of the same reference page 446, we deduce from the monotony of the densities of measures $U_{f,t}$ that

$$\forall z > 0, \quad \frac{\mathbb{P}(S_1 / (f(t) e^{h_t + \varepsilon \phi(t)}) > z)}{\omega_{f,t}(1)} \underset{t \rightarrow +\infty}{\longrightarrow} z^{-\kappa} \frac{1-\kappa}{\Gamma(2-\kappa)}.$$

Considering this convergence with $z = 1$ we get exactly (4.5) for $c = c'(1-\kappa)/\Gamma(2-\kappa)$, so (4.3) follows. Let $a_t := e^{\varepsilon \phi(t)}$, for any $x > 0$

$$x^\kappa e^{\kappa \phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{e}_1 S_1 / t > x, \mathbf{e}_1 < a_t) = 2^{-1} \int_0^{a_t} (x/u)^\kappa e^{\kappa \phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(S_1 / t > x/u) u^\kappa e^{-u/2} du,$$

because \mathbf{e}_1 has law $\mathcal{E}(1/2)$.

Taking x arbitrary in $[e^{-(1-2\varepsilon)\phi(t)}, +\infty[$, we have $x/u \in [e^{-(1-\varepsilon)\phi(t)}, +\infty[$, $\forall u \in]0, a_t]$, so thanks to (4.3) we get

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{x \in [e^{-(1-2\varepsilon)\phi(t)}, +\infty[} \left| x^\kappa e^{\kappa \phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{e}_1 S_1 / t > x, \mathbf{e}_1 < a_t) - \frac{c}{2} \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{u^\kappa}{e^{u/2}} du \right| = 0. \quad (4.8)$$

Now for any $x > 0$ and t large enough such that $\forall y \geq 1, y^\kappa e^{\kappa \phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(S_1 / t > y) < 2c$, we have

$$\left| x^\kappa e^{\kappa \phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{e}_1 S_1 / t > x, \mathbf{e}_1 < a_t) - x^\kappa e^{\kappa \phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{e}_1 S_1 / t > x) \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= x^\kappa e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{e}_1 S_1/t > x, \mathbf{e}_1 \geq a_t) \\
&= 2^{-1} \int_{a_t}^{+\infty} x^\kappa e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(S_1/t > x/u) e^{-u/2} du \\
&= 2^{-1} \int_{a_t}^{+\infty} u^\kappa (x/u)^\kappa e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(S_1/t > x/u) \mathbb{1}_{x \leq u} e^{-u/2} du \\
&\quad + 2^{-1} \int_{a_t}^{+\infty} u^\kappa (x/u)^\kappa e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(S_1/t > x/u) \mathbb{1}_{x > u} e^{-u/2} du \\
&\leq 2^{-1} e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \int_{a_t}^{+\infty} u^\kappa e^{-u/2} du + c \int_{a_t}^{+\infty} u^\kappa e^{-u/2} du.
\end{aligned}$$

For the second term in the inequality we used the fact that

$$(x/u)^\kappa e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(S_1/t > x/u) < 2c$$

when $x \geq u$. Since $a_t = e^{\varepsilon\phi(t)}$, the last quantities converges to 0 when t goes to infinity. Combining this with (4.8) we get

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{x \in [e^{-(1-2\varepsilon)\phi(t)}, +\infty[} \left| x^\kappa e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{e}_1 S_1/t > x) - 2^{-1} c \int_0^{+\infty} u^\kappa e^{-u/2} du \right| = 0, \quad (4.9)$$

and this is exactly (4.1) with $\mathcal{C}_2 := 2^{-1} c \int_0^{+\infty} u^\kappa e^{-u/2} du$.

Proof of (4.2)

Let μ_{R_1} be the distribution of R_1 . For any $y, a > 0$ and $t > 0$ by independence of $\mathbf{e}_1 S_1$ and R_1 ,

$$y^\kappa e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{e}_1 S_1 R_1/t > y, R_1 < a) = \int_0^a (y/u)^\kappa e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{e}_1 S_1/t > y/u) u^\kappa \mu_{R_1}(du).$$

Taking $a = a_t = e^{\varepsilon\phi(t)}$ and y arbitrary in $[e^{-(1-3\varepsilon)\phi(t)}, +\infty[$, we have $y/u \in [e^{-(1-2\varepsilon)\phi(t)}, +\infty[$, for all $u \in]0, a_t]$, so thanks to (4.9), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{y \in [e^{-(1-3\varepsilon)\phi(t)}, +\infty[} \left| y^\kappa e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{e}_1 S_1 R_1/t > y, R_1 < a_t) - \mathcal{C}_2 \int_0^{a_t} u^\kappa \mu_{R_1}(du) \right| \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

According to Fact 2.1, R_1 is the sum of two independent random variables, each one having the same law as $\int_0^{\tau_{W_\kappa^\uparrow}(h_t/2)} e^{-W_\kappa^\uparrow(x)} dx$. In particular, R_1 converges to \mathcal{R}_κ when t goes to infinity and for each t , R_1 is stochastically inferior to \mathcal{R}_κ which admits finite moments of any positive order. In particular the family $(R_1)_{t>0}$ is bounded in all L^p spaces. This proves the convergence of $\int_0^{+\infty} u^\kappa \mu_{R_1}(du)$ to $\mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{R}_\kappa)^\kappa]$, when t goes to infinity, so

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{y \in [e^{-(1-3\varepsilon)\phi(t)}, +\infty[} \left| y^\kappa e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{e}_1 S_1 R_1/t > y, R_1 < a_t) - \mathcal{C}_2 \mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{R}_\kappa)^\kappa] \right| = 0.$$

Finally, as the family $(R_1)_{t>0}$ is bounded in all L^p spaces, we can proceed as before to remove the event $R_1 < a_t$ and we thus get

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{y \in [e^{-(1-3\varepsilon)\phi(t)}, +\infty[} \left| y^\kappa e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{e}_1 S_1 R_1/t > y) - \mathcal{C}_2 \mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{R}_\kappa)^\kappa] \right| = 0, \quad (4.10)$$

which is (4.2).

We now prove the last assertion. For any x, y, a and $t > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{e}_1 S_1/t > x, \mathbf{e}_1 S_1 R_1/t > y, R_1 < a) \\
&= \int_0^a e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{e}_1 S_1/t > x, \mathbf{e}_1 S_1/t > y/u) \mu_{R_1}(du), \\
&= \int_0^{a \wedge (y/x)} e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{e}_1 S_1/t > y/u) \mu_{R_1}(du) + \int_{a \wedge (y/x)}^a e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{e}_1 S_1/t > x) \mu_{R_1}(du), \\
&= \frac{1}{y^\kappa} \int_0^{a \wedge (y/x)} e^{\kappa\phi(t)} (y/u)^\kappa \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{e}_1 S_1/t > y/u) u^\kappa \mu_{R_1}(du) \\
&+ \frac{1}{x^\kappa} \int_{a \wedge (y/x)}^a e^{\kappa\phi(t)} x^\kappa \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{e}_1 S_1/t > x) \mu_{R_1}(du).
\end{aligned}$$

Taking $a = a_t = e^{\varepsilon\phi(t)}$ and x, y arbitrary in $[\alpha, +\infty[$ (for some $\alpha > 0$), we have $y/u \in [e^{-(1-2\varepsilon)\phi(t)}, +\infty[, \forall u \in]0, a_t]$ whenever t is large enough, so, thanks to (4.9) we get that $e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{e}_1 S_1/t > x, \mathbf{e}_1 S_1 R_1/t > y, R_1 < a_t)$ converges uniformly in $(x, y) \in [\alpha, +\infty[\times [\alpha, +\infty[$ toward

$$C_2 x^{-\kappa} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_\kappa > y/x) + C_2 y^{-\kappa} \mathbb{E}((\mathcal{R}_\kappa)^\kappa \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}_\kappa \leq y/x}).$$

Then as before we can remove the event $\{R_1 < a_t\}$ and we get the last assertion. \square

4.2. Proof of Proposition 1.4.

We start with the finite dimensional convergence

Lemma 4.2. *For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s_i > 0, i \leq k$, $((Y_1, Y_2)_{s_i}^t, i \leq k)$ converge in law as t goes to infinity to $((\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)_{s_i}, i \leq k)$.*

Proof: Proof is basic here, however we give some details as we deal with a two dimensional walk which increments depend on t itself. As $Y_1^t(s)$ and $Y_2^t(s)$ are sums of i.i.d sequence we only have to prove the convergence in law for the couple $(Y_1, Y_2)_s^t$ for any $s > 0$. Define $(Y_1^{>b}, Y_2^{>b})$ obtained from $(Y_1, Y_2)^t$ keeping the increments larger than b , $Y_1^{>b}(s) := \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor s e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \rfloor} \ell_j \mathbf{1}_{\ell_j/t > b}$, and $Y_2^{>b}(s) := \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor s e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \rfloor} \mathcal{H}_j \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_j/t > b}$. Also let $Y_i^{\leq b} := Y_i - Y_i^{>b}$. We first prove that for any $s > 0$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P}(\|(Y_1^{\leq \varepsilon}, Y_2^{\leq \varepsilon})_s^t\| > \varepsilon^{1-\kappa(2-\kappa)}) = 0, \quad (4.11)$$

where for any $a \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $\|a\| := \max_{i \leq 2} |a_i|$, and $1 - \kappa(2 - \kappa) > 0$ as $\kappa < 1$.

We compute the first moment of $Y_1^{\leq \varepsilon}(s)$ and $Y_2^{\leq \varepsilon}(s)$. Let $\eta > 0$ be such that $\kappa - (1 - 3\eta) < 0$, applying Fubini we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\ell_1}{t} \mathbf{1}_{\ell_1/t \leq \varepsilon} \right) \\
&= e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{e}_1 S_1}{t} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{e}_1 S_1/t \leq \varepsilon} \right] \\
&\leq \int_0^\varepsilon e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{e}_1 S_1/t > x) dx \\
&= \int_0^{e^{-(1-2\eta)\phi(t)}} e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{e}_1 S_1/t > x) dx + \int_{e^{-(1-2\eta)\phi(t)}}^\varepsilon e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{e}_1 S_1/t > x) dx \\
&\leq e^{(\kappa - (1-2\eta))\phi(t)} + \int_{e^{-(1-2\eta)\phi(t)}}^\varepsilon x^{-\kappa} x^\kappa e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{e}_1 S_1/t > x) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

The first term converges to 0 when t goes to infinity because $\kappa - (1 - 2\eta) < 0$ and, according to (4.1), for t large enough, we have

$$x^\kappa e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{e}_1 S_1/t > x) \leq 2\mathcal{C}_2, \quad \forall x \geq e^{-(1-2\eta)\phi(t)}.$$

For such t , the second term is less than

$$2\mathcal{C}_2 \int_0^\varepsilon x^{-\kappa} dx = 2\mathcal{C}_2 \frac{\varepsilon^{1-\kappa}}{1-\kappa},$$

so we get that

$$\forall t \geq 1, \forall \varepsilon \in]0, 1], \quad e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\ell_1}{t} \mathbf{1}_{\ell_1/t \leq \varepsilon} \right) \leq e^{(\kappa - (1-2\eta))\phi(t)} + C_+ \varepsilon^{1-\kappa}. \quad (4.12)$$

Using the same method and applying this time (4.2), we get that

$$\forall t \geq 1, \forall \varepsilon \in]0, 1], \quad e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\mathcal{H}_1}{t} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{H}_1/t \leq \varepsilon} \right) \leq e^{(\kappa - (1-3\eta))\phi(t)} + C_+ \varepsilon^{1-\kappa}. \quad (4.13)$$

We thus obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left(Y_1^{\leq \varepsilon}(s) \right) \leq s e^{(\kappa - (1-2\eta))\phi(t)} + C_+ s \varepsilon^{1-\kappa}, \quad (4.14)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left(Y_2^{\leq \varepsilon}(s) \right) \leq s e^{(\kappa - (1-3\eta))\phi(t)} + C_+ s \varepsilon^{1-\kappa}, \quad (4.15)$$

then a Markov inequality yields (4.11).

The next step is to prove that $(Y_1^{> \varepsilon}, Y_2^{> \varepsilon})_s^t$ can be written as the integral of a point process which converge to the desired limit. We have

$$(Y_1^{> \varepsilon}, Y_2^{> \varepsilon})_s^t = \left(\int_{x>\varepsilon} \int_0^s x \mathcal{P}_t^1(dx, dv), \int_{x>\varepsilon} \int_0^s x \mathcal{P}_t^2(dx, dv) \right)$$

where the measures \mathcal{P}_t^1 and \mathcal{P}_t^2 are defined by $\mathcal{P}_t^1 := \sum_{i=1}^{+\infty} \delta_{t^{-1}\ell_i, e^{-\kappa\phi(t)}i}$, and the same for \mathcal{P}_t^2 replacing ℓ by \mathcal{H} . Recall that \mathcal{P}_t^1 and \mathcal{P}_t^2 are dependent, we now prove that $(\mathcal{P}_t^1, \mathcal{P}_t^2)$ converge to a Poisson point measure. For that just use Lemma 4.1 together with Proposition 3.1 in Resnick (1986) after discretization, it implies that $(\mathcal{P}_t^1, \mathcal{P}_t^2)$ converge weakly to the Poisson random measure denoted by $(\mathcal{P}^1, \mathcal{P}^2)$ with intensity measure given by $ds \times \nu$.

Then using that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, and $T < +\infty$, on $[0, T] \times (\varepsilon, +\infty) \times (\varepsilon, +\infty)$ $ds \times \nu$ is finite, we have that $(Y_1^{>\varepsilon}, Y_2^{>\varepsilon})_s^t$ converge weakly to

$$(\mathcal{Y}_1^{>\varepsilon}, \mathcal{Y}_2^{>\varepsilon})_s := \left(\int_{x>\varepsilon} \int_0^s x \mathcal{P}^1(dx, dv), \int_{x>\varepsilon} \int_0^s x \mathcal{P}^2(dx, dv) \right).$$

We are left to prove that $(\mathcal{Y}_1^{>\varepsilon}, \mathcal{Y}_2^{>\varepsilon})$ converge to $(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)$ when $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. This is a straightforward computation, that we detail for completeness. Let $\nu_1([x, +\infty[) := \nu([x, +\infty[\times \mathbb{R}_+) = C_2/x^\kappa$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\int_{x \leq \varepsilon} \int_0^s x \mathcal{P}^1(dx, dv) \right) = s \int_{x \leq \varepsilon} x \nu_1(dx) = C\varepsilon^{1-\kappa},$$

Then a Markov inequality proves that for any $s > 0$, the process $\int_{x \leq \varepsilon} \int_0^s x \mathcal{P}^1(dx, dv)$ converges to zero (when ε goes to zero) in probability. The same is true for $\int_{x \leq \varepsilon} \int_0^s x \mathcal{P}^2(dx, dv)$, so we obtain that $(\mathcal{Y}_1^{>\varepsilon}, \mathcal{Y}_2^{>\varepsilon})_s$ converges in probability to $(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)_s$ when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. \square

We now prove tightness of $(\mathcal{D}(Y_1, Y_2)^t)_t$, the family of measures induced by processes $(Y_1, Y_2)^t$.

Lemma 4.3. *The family of laws $(\mathcal{D}(Y_1, Y_2)^t)_t$ is tight on $(D([0, +\infty), \mathbb{R}^2), J_1)$.*

Proof: We only have to prove that the family law of the restriction of the process to the interval $[0, T]$, $((Y_1, Y_2)^t|_{[0, T]})_t$ is tight. To prove this we use the following restatement of Theorem 1.8 in Billingsley (1999) using Aldous's tightness criterion (see Condition 1, and equation (16.22) page 176 in Billingsley (1999)) also used in Bovier (2010) page 100. We have to check the two following statements:

1) for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a such that for any t large enough,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|(Y_1, Y_2)_s^t\| \geq a \right) \leq \varepsilon.$$

2) for any $\varepsilon > 0$, and $\eta > 0$ there exists δ , $0 < \delta < T$ and $t_0 > 0$ such that for $t > t_0$,

$$\mathbb{P}[\omega((Y_1, Y_2)^t, \delta, T) \geq \eta] \leq \varepsilon,$$

with $\omega((Y_1, Y_2)^t, \delta, T) := \sup_{0 \leq r \leq T} \omega((Y_1, Y_2)^t, \delta, T, r)$, and $\omega((Y_1, Y_2)^t, \delta, T, r)$ is defined by

$$\sup_{0 \vee (r-\delta) \leq u_1 < u < u_2 \leq (r+\delta) \wedge T} \{\min(\|(Y_1, Y_2)_{u_2}^t - (Y_1, Y_2)_u^t\|, \|(Y_1, Y_2)_u^t - (Y_1, Y_2)_{u_1}^t\|)\}.$$

Also

$$\mathbb{P}(v((Y_1, Y_2)^t, 0, \delta, T) \geq \eta) \leq \varepsilon, \text{ and } \mathbb{P}(v((Y_1, Y_2)^t, T, \delta, T) \geq \eta) \leq \varepsilon,$$

where $v((Y_1, Y_2)^t, u, \delta, T) := \sup_{(u-\delta) \vee 0 \leq u_1 \leq u_2 \leq (u+\delta) \wedge T} \{\|(Y_1, Y_2)_{u_1}^t - (Y_1, Y_2)_{u_2}^t\|\}$.

We first check 1) since the process is monotone increasing,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{s \in [0, T]} \|(Y_1, Y_2)_s^t\| \geq a \right) = \mathbb{P}(\|(Y_1, Y_2)_T^t\| \geq a) \leq \mathbb{P}(Y_1(T) \geq a) + \mathbb{P}(Y_2(T) \geq a). \quad (4.16)$$

Recall that $Y_1^{>b}$ is obtained from Y_1 where we remove the increments ℓ_j/t smaller than b and $Y_1^{\leq b} = Y_1 - Y_1^{>b}$. Define $N_u^{>b} := \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor ue^{\kappa\phi(t)} \rfloor} \mathbb{1}_{\ell_j/t > b}$. Let $0 < \delta_1 < 1$. A

Markov inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(Y_1^t(T) \geq a) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(Y_1^{\leq 1}(T) \geq \frac{a}{2}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(Y_1^{> 1}(T) \geq \frac{a}{2}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{a} \mathbb{E}\left[Y_1^{\leq 1}(T)\right] + \frac{1}{a^{\delta_1}} \mathbb{E}(N_T^{\geq 1}) + \mathbb{P}\left(Y_1^{> 1}(T) \geq \frac{a}{2}, N_T^{\geq 1} \leq a^{\delta_1}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

On $\{N_T^{\geq 1} \leq a^{\delta_1}\}$ there is at most a^{δ_1} terms in the sum $Y_1^{> 1}(T)$ so

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(Y_1^{> 1}(T) > a/2, N_T^{\geq 1} \leq a^{\delta_1}\right) &\leq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq a^{\delta_1}} \mathbb{P}\left(\ell_i/t \geq (a^{1-\delta_1}/2) | \ell_i/t \geq 1\right) \\ &\leq a^{\delta_1} \mathbb{P}\left(\ell_1/t \geq (a^{1-\delta_1}/2) | \ell_1/t \geq 1\right) \\ &\leq a^{\delta_1} 2 \frac{\mathcal{C}_2 e^{-\kappa\phi(t)} a^{-\kappa(1-\delta_1)} 2^\kappa}{\mathcal{C}_2 e^{-\kappa\phi(t)}} \\ &= 2^{1+\kappa} a^{\delta_1 - \kappa(1-\delta_1)}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

for all t large enough thanks to (4.1) and δ_1 such that $\delta_1 - \kappa(1 - \delta_1) < 0$.

Also, notice that for any $b > 0$, $N_T^{\geq b}$ follows a binomial law with parameters $(\lfloor T e^{\kappa\Phi(t)} \rfloor, \mathbb{P}(\ell_1/t > b))$. So, using (4.1) again and (4.14), we obtain for t large enough,

$$\mathbb{E}(N_T^{\geq b}) \leq 2\mathcal{C}_2 T b^{-\kappa}, \quad \mathbb{E}\left[Y_1^{\leq b}(T)\right] \leq 2\mathcal{C}_2 T b^{1-\kappa}. \quad (4.19)$$

Collecting (4.18), (4.19) and (4.17), we get the existence of $t_1 > 0$ such that

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{t \geq t_1} \mathbb{P}(Y_1(T) \geq a) = 0. \quad (4.20)$$

The same arguments holds for Y_2 (using (4.2) instead of (4.1) and (4.15) instead of (4.14)) so (4.20) also holds for Y_2 instead of Y_1 . We conclude the proof of 1) by putting (4.20) and its analogous for Y_2 in (4.16).

We now check 2) We first write, as usual,

$$\begin{aligned} &\{\omega((Y_1, Y_2)^t, \delta, T) \geq \eta\} \\ &\subset \{\omega((Y_1^{\leq b}, Y_2^{\leq b})^t, \delta, T) \geq \eta/2\} \cup \{\omega((Y_1^{> b}, Y_2^{> b})^t, \delta, T) \geq \eta/2\}. \end{aligned}$$

For $Y_1^{\leq b}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}[\omega((Y_1^{\leq b}, Y_2^{\leq b})^t, \delta, T) \geq \eta/2] \leq \mathbb{P}[\omega(Y_1^{\leq b}, \delta, T) \geq \eta/2] + \mathbb{P}[\omega(Y_2^{\leq b}, \delta, T) \geq \eta/2].$$

Moreover, by positivity of the increments,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\omega(Y_1^{\leq b}, \delta, T) \geq \eta/2\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\cup_{k \leq \lfloor T/2\delta \rfloor} \left\{Y_1^{\leq b}((k+1)2\delta) - Y_1^{\leq b}(k2\delta) \geq \eta/4\right\}\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{k \leq \lfloor T/\delta \rfloor} \mathbb{P}\left(Y_1^{\leq b}((k+1)2\delta) - Y_1^{\leq b}(k2\delta) \geq \eta/4\right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

For any k , $Y_1^{\leq b}((k+1)2\delta) - Y_1^{\leq b}(k2\delta)$ is the sum of at most $\lfloor 2\delta e^{\kappa\Phi(t)} \rfloor + 1$ i.i.d. random variables having the same law as ℓ_1/t . We get that for any integer k

$$\mathbb{P}\left(Y_1^{\leq b}((k+1)2\delta) - Y_1^{\leq b}(k2\delta) \geq \eta/4\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(Y_1^{\leq b}(3\delta) \geq \eta/4\right) \leq 8C_2\delta b^{1-\kappa}/\eta,$$

where the first inequality holds for t large enough so that $2\delta e^{\kappa\Phi(t)} \geq 1$ and the second from the second expression in (4.19) (replacing T by 2δ). Combining with (4.21) we get for large t

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\omega(Y_1^{\leq b}, \delta, T) \geq \eta/2\right) \leq 24C_2T(1+2\delta)b^{1-\kappa}/\eta, \quad (4.22)$$

[note that δ will be chosen later (and will be less than 1)]. T and η are fixed so we choose b small enough so that the right hand side of (4.21) is less than $\varepsilon/4$. A similar estimate can be proved for $\mathbb{P}(\omega(Y_2^{\leq b}, \delta, T) \geq \eta/2)$.

For $Y^{>b}$, we have again

$$\mathbb{P}(\omega((Y_1^{>b}, Y_2^{>b})^t, \delta, T) \geq \eta/2) \leq \mathbb{P}(\omega(Y_1^{>b}, \delta, T) \geq \eta/2) + \mathbb{P}(\omega(Y_2^{>b}, \delta, T) \geq \eta/2).$$

Since $Y_1^{>b}$ is piecewise constant with jumps larger than b , $\{\omega(Y_1^{>b}, \delta, T) > \eta/2\}$ implies that two jumps larger than b for Y_1^t occur in an interval smaller than 2δ . That is $\{\omega(Y_1^{>b}, \delta, T) > \eta/2\} \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{\lfloor Te^{\kappa\phi(t)} \rfloor} \bigcup_{i>j, (i-j)/e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \leq 2\delta} \{\ell_j \wedge \ell_i/t > b\}$. Applying (4.1) for t large enough,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{\lfloor Te^{\kappa\phi(t)} \rfloor} \bigcup_{i>j, (i-j)/e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \leq 2\delta} \{\ell_j \wedge \ell_i/t > b\}\right) \leq 8C_2^2\delta T b^{-2\kappa},$$

which can be small choosing this time $\delta = \delta(b)$ properly. Again the same argument can be used for $\omega(Y_2^{>b}, \delta, T)$. To finish the proof, we have to deal with $v()$, as again our processes are increasing,

$$\mathbb{P}(v((Y_1, Y_2)^t, 0, \delta, T) \geq \eta) \leq \mathbb{P}(\|(Y_1, Y_2)_\delta^t\| \geq \eta)$$

we can then proceed as for 1) decreasing the value of δ if needed, this also applies to $\mathbb{P}(v((Y_1, Y_2)^t, T, \delta, T) \geq \eta)$. \square

Putting together the two preceding lemmata we obtain Proposition 1.4.

4.3. *Continuity of some functionals of $(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)$, in J_1 .* In this section, we study the continuity of functionals of the Lévy processes $(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)$.

For our purpose we are interested in the following mappings, first the two we have already mentioned in the introduction which are the basics

$$\begin{array}{ccc} J : D(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}) & \longrightarrow & D(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}) & I : (D(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}), J_1) & \longrightarrow & (D(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}), U) \\ f & \longmapsto & f^\natural & f & \longmapsto & f^{-1} \end{array}$$

Then we also need the compositions of these two: for any positive a let

$$\begin{array}{ccc} J_{I,a} : D(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}^2) & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{R} & J_{I,a}^- : D(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}^2) & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{R} \\ f = (f_1, f_2) & \longmapsto & f_1^\natural(f_2^{-1}(a)), & f = (f_1, f_2) & \longmapsto & f_1^\natural(f_2^{-1}(a)^-), \end{array}$$

$J_{I,a}$ (respectively $J_{I,a}^-$) produces the largest jump of f_1 , just after (respectively before) f_2 reach 1. Also define $K_{I,a}$, $K_{I,a}^-$, $\tilde{K}_{I,a}$ and $\tilde{K}_{I,a}^-$,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K_{I,a} : D(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}^2) & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{R} & K_{I,a}^- : D(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}^2) & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{R} \\ f = (f_1, f_2) & \longmapsto & f_1(f_2^{-1}(a)), & f = (f_1, f_2) & \longmapsto & f_1(f_2^{-1}(a)^-), \end{array} \quad (4.23)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{K}_{I,a}^+ : D(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}^2) &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} & \tilde{K}_{I,a}^- : D(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}^2) &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ f = (f_1, f_2) &\longmapsto f_2(f_2^{-1}(a)), & f = (f_1, f_2) &\longmapsto f_2(f_2^{-1}(a)^-). \end{aligned}$$

Finally let F^* define by

$$\begin{aligned} F^* : D(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}^2) &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ f = (f_1, f_2) &\longmapsto \inf \left\{ s \in [0, f_2^{-1}(1)), \Delta f_1(s) = f_1^\sharp(f_2^{-1}(1)^-) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

we need this variable for the characterization of the favorite site.

Lemma 4.4. *J is continuous in the J_1 topology.*

Proof: This fact is basic. However, we have not found a proof in the literature, so we give some details. To prove the continuity on $D(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R})$, we only have to prove it for every compact subset of \mathbb{R}_+ , (see [Whitt \(1989\)](#) Theorem 12.9.1). So let $f \in D(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R})$ and $T > 0$ at which f is continuous, let us prove that J_T defined by

$$\begin{aligned} J_T : D([0, T], \mathbb{R}) &\longrightarrow D([0, T], \mathbb{R}) \\ g &\longmapsto g^\sharp \end{aligned}$$

is continuous at the restriction $f|_{[0, T]}$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $g \in D([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ such that $d_T(f|_{[0, T]}, g) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. d_T is the usual metric d of the J_1 -topology restricted to the interval $[0, T]$. By definition of d_T there exists a strictly increasing continuous mapping of $[0, T]$ onto itself, $e : [0, T] \longrightarrow [0, T]$ such that

$$\sup_{s \in [0, T]} |e(s) - s| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{s \in [0, T]} |g(e(s)) - f|_{[0, T]}(s)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

So for every $s \in [0, T]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta g(e(s)) - \Delta f|_{[0, T]}(s)| &= |(g(e(s)) - g(e(s)^-)) - (f|_{[0, T]}(s) - f|_{[0, T]}(s^-))| \\ &\leq |g(e(s)) - f|_{[0, T]}(s)| + |g(e(s)^-) - f|_{[0, T]}(s^-)| \\ &\leq 2\frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta h(s) = h(s) - h(s^-)$. This implies $d_T(J_T(f|_{[0, T]}), J_T(g)) \leq \varepsilon$. \square

Lemma 4.5. *Fix $a > 0$. The mappings $J_{I,a}^-$, $J_{I,a}$, $K_{I,a}^-$, $K_{I,a}$, $\tilde{K}_{I,a}^-$ and $\tilde{K}_{I,a}$ are continuous for J_1 -topology at every couple $(f^1, f^2) \in D(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}^2)$ such that*

- (1) *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, f^1 and f^2 have a finite number of jumps greater than ε on every compact subset of \mathbb{R}_+^* ,*
- (2) *f^2 is strictly increasing, with a limit equal to $+\infty$,*
- (3) *$f^2(0) = 0$,*
- (4) *f^2 has a jump at $I(f^2)(a)$ and $f^2(I(f^2)(a)^-) < a < f^2(I(f^2)(a))$.*

Proof: This fact may also be known as we are looking at randomly stopped process, but once again we did not find what we need in the literature ([Silverstrov \(2000\)](#), [Whitt \(1989\)](#)).

Let $(f_n^1, f_n^2)_n$ be a sequence of elements of $D(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R})$ which converges to (f^1, f^2) for the J_1 topology. To prove continuity, we prove that the sequence $(J_{I,a}^-(f_n^1, f_n^2))_n$

converges to $J_{I,a}^-(f^1, f^2)$, and the equivalent for $J_{I,a}$.

The first hypothesis guaranties that there exist neighborhoods of $I(f^2)(a)$ for which f^1 makes no jump greater than $1/4$ times its higher previous jump, that is to say there exists $\delta \in]0, I(f^2)(a)[$ (notice that $I(f^2)(a)$ exists thanks to (2) and is positive thanks to (3)) such that f^1 makes no jump greater than $J(f^1)(I(f^2)(a) - \delta)/4$ on $[I(f^2)(a) - \delta, I(f^2)(a)[$ and on $]I(f^2)(a), I(f^2)(a) + \delta]$. Note also that $J(f^1)$ is constant on $[I(f^2)(a) - \delta, I(f^2)(a)[$ and on $]I(f^2)(a), I(f^2)(a) + \delta]$.

Also δ can be made smaller (if needed) in such a way that $I(f^2)(a) + \delta$ is a point of continuity of (f^1, f^2) and $(f_n^1, f_n^2)_n$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By hypothesis $d((f_n^1, f_n^2), (f^1, f^2)) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} 0$ so

$$d_n := d_{[0, I(f^2)(a) + \delta]}((f_n^1, f_n^2)|_{[0, I(f^2)(a) + \delta]}, (f^1, f^2)|_{[0, I(f^2)(a) + \delta]}) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} 0,$$

where $|[0, I(f^2)(a) + \delta]$ in index means restriction to $[0, I(f^2)(a) + \delta]$. Also by continuity of J (see Lemma 4.4) we also have $d(J(f_n^1), J(f^1)) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} 0$ and therefore

$$d'_n := d_{[0, I(f^2)(a) + \delta]}((J(f_n^1))|_{[0, I(f^2)(a) + \delta]}, (J(f^1))|_{[0, I(f^2)(a) + \delta]}) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} 0.$$

Let h^- (respectively h^+) be the largest jump of f^1 just before (resp. just after) $I(f^2)(a)$. By definition of δ we have

$$h^- = J(f^1)(I(f^2)(a) - \delta), h^+ = J(f^1)(I(f^2)(a) + \delta).$$

We have two cases, either $J(f^1)$ is continuous at $I(f^2)(a)$ or it makes a jump.

Case $J(f^1)$ makes a jump, in this case the size of the jump is $h^+ - h^- > 0$.

Let $\alpha = 8^{-1} \min(h^-, \delta, 1 - f^2(I(f^2)(a)^-), f^2(I(f^2)(a) - 1))$, and $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that for any $n \geq n_0$, $d_n < \alpha$ and $d'_n < \alpha$. $T = I(f^2)(a) + \delta$, there exist two homeomorphisms $e_n, e'_n : [0, T] \rightarrow [0, T]$ such that:

- $\sup_{s \in [0, T]} |e_n(s) - s| \leq d_n$,
- $\sup_{s \in [0, T]} \left\| \left((f_n^1(e_n(s)), f_n^2(e_n(s)))|_{[0, I(f^2)(a) + \delta]} - (f^1(s), f^2(s))|_{[0, I(f^2)(a) + \delta]} \right) \right\|_\infty \leq d_n$.
- $\sup_{s \in [0, T]} |e'_n(s) - s| \leq d'_n$,
- $\sup_{s \in [0, T]} \left| (J(f_n^1))|_{[0, I(f^2)(a) + \delta]}(e'_n(s)) - (J(f^1))|_{[0, I(f^2)(a) + \delta]}(s) \right| \leq d'_n$.

The second inequality implies that for any $n \geq n_0$,

$$f_n^2(e_n(I(f^2)(a)^-)) < a < f_n^2(e_n(I(f^2)(a))),$$

so as we also have $f_n^2(I(f_n^2)(a)^-) \leq a \leq f_n^2(I(f_n^2)(a))$ we get

$$I(f_n^2)(a) = e_n(I(f^2)(a)). \quad (4.24)$$

The fourth point implies that for any $n \geq n_0$,

$$J(f_n^1) \left(e'_n \left(I(f^2)(a) - \frac{1}{2}\delta \right) \right) \geq J(f^1) \left(I(f^2)(a) - \frac{1}{2}\delta \right) - \alpha = h^- - \alpha > \frac{1}{2}h^-. \quad (4.25)$$

The second point and the argument of the previous proof imply that for $n \geq n_0$, each jump of f_n^1 on $[e_n(I(f^2)(a) - \delta), e_n(I(f^2)(a))]$ is 2α -close to a jump of f^1 on $[I(f^2)(a) - \delta, I(f^2)(a)[$, but such jumps are less than $h^-/4$ because of the definition

of δ . Thus, f_n^1 makes no jump larger than $h^-/2$ on $[e_n(I(f^2)(a) - \delta), e_n(I(f^2)(a))]$. Moreover, the increases of e'_n and the first and third points imply that

$$e_n(I(f^2)(a) - \delta) \leq e'_n(I(f^2)(a) - \delta/2) \leq e_n(I(f^2)(a)).$$

So, combining this with (4.25), we get that $J(f_n^1)$ is constant on the interval $[e'_n(I(f^2)(a) - \delta/2), e_n(I(f^2)(a))]$.

Now by definition of $J_{I,a}^-$, with (4.24) and then collecting what have just done above yields

$$\begin{aligned} \forall n \geq n_0, \quad J_{I,a}^-((f_n^1, f_n^2)) &= J(f_n^1)(I(f_n^2)(a)^-) = J(f_n^1)(e_n(I(f^2)(a))^-) \\ &= J(f_n^1)(e'_n(I(f^2)(a) - \delta/2)). \end{aligned} \quad (4.26)$$

From definition of $J_{I,a}^-$ and the constantness of $J(f^1)$ on $[I(f^2)(a) - \delta, I(f^2)(a)[$ we also have

$$J_{I,a}^-(f^1, f^2) := J(f^1)(I(f^2)(a)^-) = J(f^1)(I(f^2)(a) - \delta/2). \quad (4.27)$$

Combining (4.26), (4.27) and the fourth point gives that, as n goes to infinity, $J_{I,a}^-((f_n^1, f_n^2))$ converges to $J_{I,a}^-((f^1, f^2))$.

For $J_{I,a}$, we prove in a similar way as above that $J(f_n^1)$ is constant on $[e_n(I(f^2)(a)), e'_n(I(f^2)(a) + \delta/2)]$ so, as in (4.26) we have for n large enough

$$J_{I,a}((f_n^1, f_n^2)) = J(f_n^1)(e'_n(I(f^2)(a) + \delta/2)),$$

which, combined with the analogous of (4.27)

$$J_{I,a}(f^1, f^2) = J(f^1)(I(f^2)(a) + \delta/2)$$

allows us to conclude, using the fourth point, that $J_{I,a}((f_n^1, f_n^2))$ converges to $J_{I,a}((f^1, f^2))$ as n goes to infinity. Therefore, both $J_{I,a}^-$ and $J_{I,a}$ are continue at (f^1, f^2) . The continuity of the other functionals are proved similarly. \square

Lemma 4.6. *For any (f^1, f^2) in $D(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}^2)$ that satisfy the hypothesis of lemma 4.5 and such that the sizes of the jumps of f^1 are all distinct, F^* is continuous at (f^1, f^2) in the J_1 topology.*

Proof: The proof follows mainly the steps of Lemma 4.5, we keep the same notation. The jump which takes place at the instant $F^*(f^1, f^2)$ has value h^- . With the additional hypothesis that the values of the jumps for f^1 are all different we have unicity for the value h^- . Let us define h' , the second highest jump f^1 before instant $I(f^2)(1)$. With the additional condition that $\alpha < \frac{1}{8}(h^- - h')$ we have with the same arguments than in the proof of the continuity of J that for any $n \geq n_0$, f_n^1 effectuates at $e_n(F^*(f^1, f^2))$ a jump larger than $h^- - 2\alpha$, and larger than all the other jumps of f_n^1 before $e_n(I(f^2)(1)^-) = I(f_n^2)(1)$ which are smaller than $h' + 2\alpha$. So for $n \geq n_0$, the largest jump of f^1 before $I(f_n^2)(1)$ is obtained for $e_n(F^*(f^1, f^2))$, that is to say for any $n \geq n_0$,

$$F^*((f_n^1, f_n^2)) = e_n(F^*(f^1, f^2)),$$

this implies $F^*((f_n^1, f_n^2)) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} F^*(f^1, f^2)$. \square

5. Supremum of the Local time - and other functionals

5.1. *Supremum of the local time (proof of Theorem 1.3).*

First notice that as the diffusion X is transient to the right, almost surely the random variable $\sup_{x < 0} \mathcal{L}(+\infty, x)$ is finite, so almost surely

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{x < 0} \mathcal{L}(+\infty, x)/t = 0.$$

As a consequence, we only have to study the asymptotic in t of $\sup_{x \geq 0} \mathcal{L}(t, x)/t$. We start with the proof of the following proposition which makes a link between the supremum of the local time and the process $(Y_1, Y_2)^t$.

Proposition 5.1. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$ and large t ,*

$$\mathcal{P}_1^- - v(\varepsilon, t) \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{x \geq 0} \mathcal{L}(t, x)/t \leq \alpha \right) \leq \mathcal{P}_1^+ + v(\varepsilon, t),$$

where

$$\mathcal{P}_1^\pm := \mathbb{P} \left[\left(1 - \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon}} \right) \frac{\bar{\ell}_{\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon}} - \bar{\ell}_{\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon} - 1}}{(\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon}} - \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon} - 1})} \leq \alpha_t^\pm, \max_{1 \leq j \leq \mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon} - 1} \frac{\ell_j}{t} \leq \alpha_t^\pm \right],$$

and with $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_k := Y_2(ke^{-\kappa\phi(t)}) = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^k \mathcal{H}_i$, $\bar{\ell}_k := Y_1(ke^{-\kappa\phi(t)}) = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^k \ell_i$, $\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon} := \inf \{m \geq 1, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_m > 1 - 2\varepsilon\}$, $\alpha_t^\pm := \alpha(1 \pm (\log \log t)^{-1/2})$, and v is a positive function such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} v(\varepsilon, t) \leq \text{const} \times \varepsilon^{\kappa \wedge (1-\kappa)}$.

The proof of this proposition needs the three following lemmata, the first one deals with the local time at the h_t -minima for which the diffusion X already escaped before time t . The second deals with the local time at the last h_t -minimum m_{N_t} in the remaining time before the instant t . Finally the last one is a technical point.

Lemma 5.2. *For any large $t > 0$, $2 \leq k \leq n_t$, any $0 < x \leq 1$ and $\gamma > 0$ possibly depending on t , define the repartition function*

$$F_\gamma(x) := \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq k-1} \mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{L}_j), \tilde{m}_j) \leq \gamma t, \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \leq xt \right).$$

Then,

$$F_\gamma^-(x) - e^{-D_1 h_t} \leq F_\gamma(x) \leq F_\gamma^+(x) + e^{-D_1 h_t},$$

where $F_\gamma^\pm(x) := \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq k-1} \ell_j \leq \gamma_t^\pm t, \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mathcal{H}_i \leq x_t^\pm t \right)$ with $\gamma_t^\pm := \gamma(1 \pm 2\varepsilon_t)$, $x_t^\pm := x(1 \pm 2\varepsilon_t)$, ε_t and D_1 are given in Proposition 3.5.

Lemma 5.3. *For any $t > 0$, define for every $\gamma > 0$ and $0 < x < 1$ possibly depending on t ,*

$$f_\gamma(x) := E \left[\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{m}_1}^{W_\kappa} (\mathcal{L}_{X'}(t(1-x), \tilde{m}_1) \leq \gamma t, H'(\tilde{L}_1) > t(1-x), H'(\tilde{L}_1) < H'(\tilde{L}_1^-)) \right],$$

there exist $c_2 > 0$ such that

$$f_\gamma^-(x) - o(n_t^{-1}) \leq f_\gamma(x) \leq f_\gamma^+(x) + o(n_t^{-1}) \quad (5.1)$$

with $f_\gamma^\pm(x) := \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{R_1} \leq \frac{\gamma}{1-x}(1 \pm \varepsilon'_t), \mathcal{H}_1 > t(1-x)(1 \mp \varepsilon'_t)\right)$ and $\varepsilon'_t = e^{-c_2 h_t}$. For any $t > 0$, define also

$$\tilde{f}_\gamma(x) := E\left(\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{m}_1}^{W_\kappa}\left(\sup_{y \in \mathcal{D}_1} \mathcal{L}_{X'}[t(1-x), y] \leq \gamma t, H'(\tilde{L}_1) > t(1-x), H'(\tilde{L}_1) < H'(\tilde{L}_1^-)\right)\right),$$

with \mathcal{D}_1 defined in (3.13), then $\tilde{f}_\gamma(x)$ satisfies also (5.1). Here X' is an independent copy of X starting at \tilde{m}_1 , and the definition of H' for X' is the same as the definition of H for X .

Lemma 5.4. For any $0 < a < 1$, we have for any $t > 0$

$$\sum_{k \leq n_t} \mathbb{P}[\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_k > 1 - a/2, 1 - 2a < \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{k-1} \leq 1 - a] \leq s(a, t), \quad (5.2)$$

with $s(a, t)$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} s(a, t) = \text{const} \times a^\kappa$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $t > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}(\varepsilon t \leq H(m_{N_t}) \leq (1 - \varepsilon)t) \geq 1 - \tilde{s}(\varepsilon, t). \quad (5.3)$$

with $\tilde{s}(\varepsilon, t)$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \tilde{s}(\varepsilon, t) = \text{const} \times \varepsilon^{(1-\kappa) \wedge \kappa}$.

We postpone the proof of these lemmata after the proof of Proposition 5.1.

Proof of Proposition 5.1: Recall from (1.3) that N_t is the largest index such that $\sup_{s \leq t} X(s) \geq m_{N_t}$. The main idea is to use the fact that the supremum of the local time until the instant t is achieved in the neighborhood of the h_t -valleys.

Starting with the upper bound using (3.1), (3.2), (3.3), (5.3) and Lemma 2.2 we have for t large enough

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \mathcal{L}(t, x) \leq \alpha t\right) \leq E\left[\mathbb{P}^{W_\kappa}\left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq N_t} \mathcal{L}(t, m_j) \leq \alpha t\right)\right] \\ & \leq E\left[\mathbb{P}^{W_\kappa}\left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq N_t-1} \mathcal{L}(H(L_j), m_j) \leq \alpha t, \mathcal{L}(t, m_{N_t}) \leq \alpha t, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{B}_1(n_t), \mathcal{B}_2(n_t), \mathcal{V}_t\right)\right] \\ & \quad + \bar{s}(\varepsilon, t). \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

with $\mathcal{Q} := \{\varepsilon t \leq H(m_{N_t}) \leq (1 - \varepsilon)t, N_t \leq n_t\}$ and \bar{s} satisfying $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \bar{s}(\varepsilon, t) \leq C_+ \varepsilon^{(1-\kappa) \wedge \kappa}$. Define, for every $0 < y < 1$ measures $\nu_1^{W_\kappa}$ and $\nu_2^{W_\kappa}$ as:

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_1^{W_\kappa}(y) & := \nu_1^{W_\kappa}([0, y]) \\ & := \mathbb{P}^{W_\kappa}\left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq k-1} \mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{L}_j), \tilde{m}_j) \leq \alpha t, H(\tilde{m}_k) - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i < \tilde{v}_t, H(\tilde{m}_k) \leq yt\right), \\ \nu_2^{W_\kappa}(y) & := \nu_2^{W_\kappa}([0, y]) \\ & := \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{m}_k}^{W_\kappa}\left(\mathcal{L}_{X'}[t(1-y), \tilde{m}_k] \leq \alpha t, H'(\tilde{m}_{k+1}) > t(1-y), \right. \\ & \quad \left. H'(\tilde{m}_{k+1}) < H'(\tilde{L}_k^-), H'(\tilde{m}_{k+1}) - H'(\tilde{L}_k) \leq \tilde{v}_t\right), \end{aligned}$$

with X' the diffusion starting from \tilde{m}_k independent of X (conditionally on W_κ), and H' has the same definition than H (see (1.1)) but for X' . Also all measures ν above and in the sequel depend on k but we do not make appear this dependence

for notational simplicity. Partitioning on the values of N_t , and $H(\tilde{m}_k)$, we obtain by the strong markov property (under \mathbb{P}^{W_κ}), that probability below (5.4), is smaller than

$$\sum_{k \leq n_t} \int_\varepsilon^{1-\varepsilon} E \left(\nu_2^{W_\kappa}(x) d\nu_1^{W_\kappa}(x) \right) = \sum_{k \leq n_t} E \left[\int_\varepsilon^{1-\varepsilon} \nu_2^{W_\kappa}(x) d\nu_1^{W_\kappa}(x) \right]. \quad (5.5)$$

The next step is to prove that the previous expectation can be approximated by a product of expectations. First notice that both $y \rightarrow \nu_1^{W_\kappa}(y)$ and $y \rightarrow \nu_2^{W_\kappa}(y)$ are positive increasing. So integrating by parts

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\varepsilon^{1-\varepsilon} \nu_2^{W_\kappa}(x) d\nu_1^{W_\kappa}(x) &= \left[\nu_2^{W_\kappa}(x) \nu_1^{W_\kappa}(x) \right]_\varepsilon^{1-\varepsilon} - \int_\varepsilon^{1-\varepsilon} \nu_1^{W_\kappa}(x) d\nu_2^{W_\kappa}(x) \\ &\leq \left[\nu_2^{W_\kappa}(x) \nu_1^{W_\kappa}(x) \right]_\varepsilon^{1-\varepsilon} - \int_\varepsilon^{1-\varepsilon} \tilde{\nu}_1^{W_\kappa}(x) d\nu_2^{W_\kappa}(x) \\ &= \left[\nu_2^{W_\kappa}(x) (\nu_1^{W_\kappa}(x) - \tilde{\nu}_1^{W_\kappa}(x)) \right]_\varepsilon^{1-\varepsilon} + \mathcal{I}_1 \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

with $\tilde{\nu}_1^{W_\kappa}(x) := \mathbb{P}^{W_\kappa} \left(\mathcal{G}_1, H(\tilde{m}_k) - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i < \tilde{v}_t, \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i + \tilde{v}_t \leq x \right)$, $\mathcal{G}_1 := \{ \max_{1 \leq j \leq k-1} \mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{L}_j), \tilde{m}_j) \leq \alpha t \}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_1 &:= \int_\varepsilon^{1-\varepsilon} \nu_2^{W_\kappa}(x) d\tilde{\nu}_1(x) \leq \int_\varepsilon^{1-\varepsilon} \nu_2^{W_\kappa}(x) d\nu_3^{W_\kappa}(x) =: \mathcal{I}'_1, \\ \nu_3^{W_\kappa}(x) &:= \mathbb{P}^{W_\kappa} \left(\mathcal{G}_1, \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i + \tilde{v}_t \leq xt \right). \end{aligned}$$

First we deal with what is going to be a negligible part, that is to say the first term in (5.6). As $\nu_1^{W_\kappa}(x) \leq \mathbb{P}^{W_\kappa} \left(\mathcal{G}_1, H(\tilde{m}_k) - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i < \tilde{v}_t, \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \leq x \right)$,

$$|\nu_1^{W_\kappa}(x) - \tilde{\nu}_1^{W_\kappa}(x)| \leq \mathbb{P}^{W_\kappa} \left(xt - \tilde{v}_t < \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \leq xt \right) =: h(x).$$

so $[\nu_2^{W_\kappa}(x) (\nu_1^{W_\kappa}(x) - \tilde{\nu}_1^{W_\kappa}(x))]_\varepsilon^{1-\varepsilon} \leq \nu_2^{W_\kappa}(1-\varepsilon) h(1-\varepsilon) + \nu_2^{W_\kappa}(\varepsilon) h(\varepsilon)$. Notice that $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i$ is measurable with respect to $\sigma(X(s), 0 \leq s \leq H(\tilde{L}_{k-1}); W_\kappa(x), x \leq \tilde{L}_{k-1})$, whereas the event in the definition of $\nu_2^{W_\kappa}$ belongs to

$$\sigma(X'(s), 0 \leq s \leq \min(H'(\tilde{L}_k^-), H'(\tilde{L}_k)); W_\kappa(x) - W_\kappa(\tilde{m}_k), \tilde{L}_k^- \leq x \leq \tilde{L}_k),$$

with X' an independent copy of X starting at \tilde{m}_k .

So independence of X and X' , and independence of the two portions of the environment involved (see Lemma 2.2) imply independence between $\nu_2^{W_\kappa}$ and h . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} E[\nu_2^{W_\kappa}(x) (\nu_1^{W_\kappa}(x) - \tilde{\nu}_1^{W_\kappa}(x))]_\varepsilon^{1-\varepsilon} &= E \left[[\tilde{\nu}_2^{W_\kappa}(x) (\nu_1^{W_\kappa}(x) - \tilde{\nu}_1^{W_\kappa}(x))]_\varepsilon^{1-\varepsilon} \right] \\ &\leq E[\tilde{\nu}_2^{W_\kappa}(1-\varepsilon)] E[h(1-\varepsilon)] + E[\tilde{\nu}_2^{W_\kappa}(\varepsilon)] E[h(\varepsilon)]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

with for any x ,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\nu}_2^{W_\kappa}(x) &:= \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{m}_1}^{W_\kappa} [\mathcal{L}_{X'}[t(1-x), \tilde{m}_1] \leq \alpha t, H'(\tilde{m}_2) > t(1-x), \\ &\quad H'(\tilde{m}_2) < H'(\tilde{L}_1^-), H'(\tilde{m}_2) - H'(\tilde{L}_1) \leq \tilde{v}_t]. \end{aligned}$$

As $E(\tilde{\nu}_2^{W_\kappa}(x)) \leq \mathbb{P}[U_1 > t(1-x) - \tilde{v}_t]$ and for every small $\varepsilon > 0$ and t large enough $h(x) \leq \mathbb{P}^{W_\kappa}\left((x-\varepsilon)t < \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i \leq xt\right)$ we can apply Proposition 3.5, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & E[\tilde{\nu}_2^{W_\kappa}(1-\varepsilon)]E[h(1-\varepsilon)] \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}\left((1-\varepsilon)/(1+\varepsilon_t) < \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mathcal{H}_i/t \leq (1-\varepsilon)/(1-\varepsilon_t)\right) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}_1 > (t\varepsilon - \tilde{v}_t)/(1+\varepsilon_t)) \\ & \quad + e^{-D_1 h_t}. \end{aligned}$$

By (4.2) and the first part of Lemma 6.2, for any $0 < a < 1$ and $b > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \sum_{k \leq n_t} \mathbb{P}\left((1-a) < \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mathcal{H}_i/t \leq 1\right) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}_1 > tb) \\ & = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\kappa)\Gamma(1-\kappa)} b^{-\kappa} \int_{1-a}^1 y^{\kappa-1} dy \\ & \leq \text{const.} b^{-\kappa} (1 - (1-a)^\kappa). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we obtain that

$$\sum_{k \leq n_t} E\left[\tilde{\nu}_2^{W_\kappa}(1-\varepsilon)\right]E[h(1-\varepsilon)] \leq C_+ \cdot u(t, \varepsilon)$$

with u a positive function such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} u(t, \varepsilon) = \varepsilon^{1-\kappa}$. A similar argument also works for the second term in (5.7), which yields

$$\sum_{k \leq n_t} E\left[\left[\nu_2^{W_\kappa}(x)(\nu_1^{W_\kappa}(x) - \tilde{\nu}_1^{W_\kappa}(x))\right]_\varepsilon^{1-\varepsilon}\right] \leq 2C_+ \cdot u(t, \varepsilon). \quad (5.8)$$

We now deal with \mathcal{I}'_1 , by independence between X and X' , and the independent parts of the potential W_κ involved in $\nu_2^{W_\kappa}(x)$ and $\nu_3^{W_\kappa}(x)$,

$$E(\mathcal{I}'_1) = \int_\varepsilon^{1-\varepsilon} \nu_2(x) d\nu_3(x), \quad (5.9)$$

with $\nu_2(x) := E(\tilde{\nu}_2^{W_\kappa}(x))$, and $\nu_3(x) := E(\nu_3^{W_\kappa}(x))$.

Again as $y \rightarrow \nu_2(y)$ is positive increasing and ν_3 is a repartition function, integrating by parts together with the upper bound in Lemma 5.2 with $F_\alpha(x - \tilde{v}_t/t) = \nu_3(x)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_\varepsilon^{1-\varepsilon} \nu_2(x) d\nu_3(x) \\ & \leq \int_{\varepsilon - \tilde{v}_t/t}^{1-\varepsilon - \tilde{v}_t/t} \nu_2(x) dF_\alpha^-(x) + [(\nu_3(x) - F_\alpha^-(x))\nu_2(x)]_{\varepsilon - \tilde{v}_t/t}^{1-\varepsilon - \tilde{v}_t/t} + e^{-D_1 h_t}, \quad (5.10) \end{aligned}$$

recall that $\tilde{v}_t/t = 2/\log(h_t)$ which is negligible comparing to ε and $1 - \varepsilon$ for large t . Then we can prove in a similar way we have obtained (5.8) that:

$$\sum_{k \leq n_t} [(\nu_3(x) - F_\alpha^-(x))\nu_2(x)]_{\varepsilon - \tilde{v}_t/t}^{1-\varepsilon - \tilde{v}_t/t} \leq C_+ \cdot u(t, \varepsilon),$$

with as usual a possibly enlarged C_+ . So the important term in (5.10) comes from the integral. We now have to work on $\nu_2(x)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_2(x) &\leq E(\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{m}_1}^{W_\kappa}[\mathcal{L}_{X'}(t(1-x), \tilde{m}_1) \leq \alpha t, H'(\tilde{L}_1) > t(1-x) - \tilde{v}_t, H'(\tilde{L}_1) < H'(\tilde{L}_1^-)]) \\ &\leq E(\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{m}_1}^{W_\kappa}[\mathcal{L}_{X'}(t(1-x) - \tilde{v}_t, \tilde{m}_1) \leq \alpha t, \\ &\quad H'(\tilde{L}_1) > t(1-x) - \tilde{v}_t, H'(\tilde{L}_1) < H'(\tilde{L}_1^-)]) \end{aligned}$$

Then, as $F_\alpha^-(x)$ is positive and increasing in x , using Lemma 5.3 with $\gamma = \alpha$ and $f_\gamma(x - \tilde{v}_t/t) = \nu_2(x)$, we obtain

$$\int_{\varepsilon - \tilde{v}_t/t}^{1 - \varepsilon - \tilde{v}_t/t} \nu_2(x) dF_\alpha^-(x) \leq \int_{\varepsilon - \tilde{v}_t/t}^{1 - \varepsilon - \tilde{v}_t/t} f_\alpha^+(x - \tilde{v}_t/t) dF_\alpha^-(x) + o(n_t^{-1}). \quad (5.11)$$

Now, as $f_\alpha^+(x - \tilde{v}_t/t)$ can be written

$$f_\alpha^+(x - \tilde{v}_t/t) = \mathbb{P}\left(\left(1 - x - \tilde{v}_t/t\right) \frac{\ell_k}{\mathcal{H}_k} \leq \alpha(1 + \varepsilon_t), \mathcal{H}_k > t(1 - x - \tilde{v}_t/t)(1 - \varepsilon'_t)\right),$$

by independence of the variables $\{(\ell_j, \mathcal{H}_j), j \leq n_t\}$

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\varepsilon - \tilde{v}_t/t}^{1 - \varepsilon - \tilde{v}_t/t} f_\alpha^+(x - \tilde{v}_t/t) dF_\alpha^-(x) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left[\left(1 - \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{k-1}\right) \frac{\bar{\ell}_k - \bar{\ell}_{k-1}}{\bar{\mathcal{H}}_k - \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{k-1}} \leq \alpha(1 + \tilde{\varepsilon}_t(k)), \bar{\mathcal{H}}_k \geq 1 - \delta'_t, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \max_{1 \leq j \leq k-1} \frac{\ell_j}{t} \leq \alpha_t^-, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{k-1} \leq 1 - \varepsilon + \delta'_t\right], \end{aligned}$$

with $\delta'_t = 2\tilde{v}_t/t$, and $\tilde{\varepsilon}_t(k) = \delta'_t(\alpha + \frac{\ell_k}{\bar{\mathcal{H}}_k})$.

The idea now is to make appear the event $\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon} = k$ in the above probability (recall the definition of \mathcal{N} given in Proposition 5.1) and sum over k .

We first prove that the sum over $k \leq n_t$, of the above probability is small if we intersect its event with the event $\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon} \neq k$. In other word, let us prove that

$$\sum_1 := \sum_{k \leq n_t} \mathbb{P}[\bar{\mathcal{H}}_k \geq 1 - \delta'_t, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{k-1} \leq 1 - \varepsilon + \delta'_t, \mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon} \neq k] \quad (5.12)$$

is small. As $\{\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon} \neq k\} = \{\bar{\mathcal{H}}_k < 1 - 2\varepsilon\} \cup \{\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{k-1} \geq 1 - 2\varepsilon\}$, and that for t large enough, $\{\bar{\mathcal{H}}_k \geq 1 - \delta'_t\} \cap \{\bar{\mathcal{H}}_k < 1 - 2\varepsilon\} = \emptyset$, we have that

$$\sum_1 \leq \sum_{k \leq n_t} \mathbb{P}[\bar{\mathcal{H}}_k \geq 1 - \delta'_t, 1 - 2\varepsilon \leq \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{k-1} \leq 1 - \varepsilon + \delta'_t],$$

and therefore for t large enough

$$\sum_1 \leq \sum_{k \leq n_t} \mathbb{P}[\bar{\mathcal{H}}_k \geq 1 - \varepsilon/2, 1 - 2\varepsilon \leq \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{k-1} \leq 1 - \varepsilon] \leq s(\varepsilon, t)$$

by (5.2). Finally collecting all we know,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \leq n_t} E(\mathcal{I}'_1) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left[\left(1 - \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon-1}} \right) \frac{\bar{\ell}_{\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon}} - \bar{\ell}_{\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon-1}}}{\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon}} - \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon-1}}} \leq \alpha(1 + \tilde{\varepsilon}_t(\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon})), \max_{1 \leq j \leq \mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon-1}} \frac{\ell_j}{t} \leq \alpha_t^- \right] \\ & \quad + s(\varepsilon, t). \end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

To finish we have to deal with $\tilde{\varepsilon}_t(\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon})$, a basic computation partitioning on the values of $\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon}$, shows that $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_t(\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon})) \geq \sqrt{\delta'_t} \leq C_+ \mathbb{P}(R_1 \leq \sqrt{\delta'_t}) = o(1)$ as R_1 converges in distribution to \mathcal{R}_κ which is almost surely positive. Collecting this last fact, (5.13), (5.8), (5.5) and (5.4) finish the proof of the upper bound.

The lower bound

The proof here follows the same line than the upper bound. The main difference comes from the fact that we can no longer use the obvious inequality $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \mathcal{L}(t, x) \geq \sup_{1 \leq j \leq N_t} \mathcal{L}(t, m_j)$. So for this part of the proof we stress on what is different here and refer to the previous computations when very few changes occur.

Assume for the moment that $\mathbb{P}(\{\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \mathcal{L}(t, x) \geq 2\tilde{w}_t\} =: \mathcal{E}_2) \geq 1 - o(1)$, with $\tilde{w}_t := te^{(\kappa(1+3\delta)-1)\Phi(t)}$, and recall that δ is chosen small enough in such a way that $\kappa(1+3\delta) < 1$ (see Lemma 3.2). This fact is a direct consequence of the upper-bound of $\mathbb{P}(\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \mathcal{L}(t, x) \leq \alpha t)$ [see the end of this section for the proof]. Recall (3.13), define for any $l \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_3(l) & := \mathcal{E}_3^1(l) \cap \mathcal{E}_3^2(l), \text{ with} \\ \mathcal{E}_3^1(l) & := \bigcap_{j=1}^{l-1} \left\{ \sup_{x \in \mathcal{D}_j} [\mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{L}_j), x) - \mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{m}_j), x)] \leq t\tilde{\alpha}_t \right\}, \\ \mathcal{E}_3^2(l) & := \left\{ \sup_{x \in \mathcal{D}_l} [\mathcal{L}(t, x) - \mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{m}_l), x)] \leq t\tilde{\alpha}_t \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

with $\tilde{\alpha}_t := (\alpha t - 2\tilde{w}_t)/t$. Recall the definitions of the events \mathcal{B} in Sections 3.1 and 3.2, we have that $\{\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \mathcal{L}(t, x) \leq \alpha t\} \cap \{\mathcal{V}_t \cap \mathcal{E}_2 \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^4 \mathcal{B}_i(n_t), N_t \leq n_t\}$ contains $\mathcal{E}_3(N_t) \cap \{\mathcal{V}_t \cap \mathcal{E}_2 \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^4 \mathcal{B}_i(n_t), N_t \leq n_t\}$. Notice that by Lemmata 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4 and the above assumption $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{V}_t \cap \mathcal{E}_2 \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^4 \mathcal{B}_i(n_t), N_t \leq n_t) \geq 1 - o(1)$. We now deal with $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_3(N_t) \cap \mathcal{B}_1(N_t) \cap \mathcal{B}_2(n_t) \cap \mathcal{V}_t, N_t \leq n_t)$, using Lemma 2.2, the fact that $H(\tilde{L}_k) \leq H(\tilde{m}_{k+1})$ and the strong Markov property with respect to \mathbb{P}^{W_κ} we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_3(N_t) \cap \mathcal{B}_1(N_t) \cap \mathcal{B}_2(n_t) \cap \mathcal{V}_t, \mathcal{Q}) \\ & \geq \sum_{k=1}^{n_t} \int_{\varepsilon}^{1-\varepsilon} E \left(\nu_4^{W_\kappa}(y) d\mathbb{P}^{W_\kappa}(\mathcal{E}_3^1(k), \mathcal{B}_1(k), \mathcal{B}_2(k-1), H(\tilde{m}_k)/t \leq y) \right) - o(1) \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu_4^{W_\kappa}(y) \\ & := \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{m}_k}^{W_\kappa} \left(\sup_{x \in \mathcal{D}_k} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{X}'}(t(1-y), x) \leq t\tilde{\alpha}_t, H'(\tilde{L}_k) > t(1-y), H'(\tilde{L}_k) < H'(\tilde{L}_k^-) \right), \end{aligned}$$

Now by similar computations than for the upper bound in particular what yields (5.8) and (5.9) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_3(N_t) \cap \mathcal{B}_1(N_t) \cap \mathcal{B}_2(n_t) \cap \mathcal{V}_t, \mathcal{Q}) \\ & \geq \sum_{k=1}^{n_t} \int_{\varepsilon}^{1-\varepsilon} E \left(\nu_4^{W_\kappa}(y) d\nu_5^{W_\kappa}(y) \right) - o(1) = \sum_{k=1}^{n_t} \int_{\varepsilon}^{1-\varepsilon} \nu_4(y) d\nu_5(y) - o(1). \end{aligned}$$

with $\nu_5^{W_\kappa}(y) := \mathbb{P}^{W_\kappa} \left(\mathcal{E}_3^1(k), \mathcal{B}_1(k), \mathcal{B}_2(k-1), \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i/t \leq y \right)$, $\nu_4 := E(\nu_4^{W_\kappa})$, $\nu_5 := E(\nu_5^{W_\kappa})$. The next step, is to remove $\mathcal{B}_1(k)$ in the above expression, for that we only have to prove that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n_t} \int_{\varepsilon}^{1-\varepsilon} E \left(\nu_4^{W_\kappa}(y) d\mathbb{P}^{W_\kappa} \left(\mathcal{E}_3^1(k), \bar{\mathcal{B}}_1(k), \mathcal{B}_2(k-1), \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i/t \leq y \right) \right)$$

is negligible, one can check that this quantity is smaller than

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=1}^{n_t} \int_{\varepsilon}^{1-\varepsilon} E \left[\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{m}_k}^{W_\kappa} (H(\tilde{L}_k) < H(\tilde{L}_k^-), H(\tilde{L}_k) > t(1-y)) \right] \\ & \quad d\mathbb{P} \left(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_1(k), \mathcal{B}_2(k-1), \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i/t \leq y \right) \\ & \leq \sum_{k=1}^{n_t} \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i/t \leq 1, \sum_{i=1}^k U_i/t > 1, \bar{\mathcal{B}}_1(k) \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathcal{B}}_1(n_t)) \leq C_2 v_t = o(1), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality comes from (3.1). Therefore collecting the above computations yields

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \mathcal{L}(t, x) \leq \alpha \right) \geq \sum_{k=1}^{n_t} \int_{\varepsilon}^{1-\varepsilon} \nu_4(y) d\tilde{\nu}_5(y) - o(1)$$

with $\tilde{\nu}_5(y) := e^{-\kappa\phi(t)} \sum_{k \leq n_t} \mathbb{P} \left(\mathcal{E}_3^1(k), \mathcal{B}_2(k-1), \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U_i/t \leq y \right)$.

We start with an estimation of the repartition function $\tilde{\nu}_5(y)$. Recall that like in the proof of Lemma 3.6, by the strong Markov property, the occupation time formula (1.10) and (1.11) the sequence $(U_j, \{\mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{L}_j), x) - \mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{m}_j), x), x \in \mathcal{D}_j\}, j \leq n_t)$ under $\mathcal{B}_2(n_t)$ is equal to a sequence $(H_j(\tilde{L}_j), \{\mathcal{L}_j(H_j(\tilde{L}_j), x), x \in \mathcal{D}_j\}, j \leq n_t)$, with this time

$$\begin{aligned} H_j(\tilde{L}_j) & := A^j(\tilde{L}_j) \int_{\tilde{L}_j^-}^{\tilde{L}_j} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)} \mathcal{L}_{B^j}[\tau^{B^j}(1), A^j(u)/A^j(\tilde{L}_j)] du, \\ \mathcal{L}_j(H_j(\tilde{L}_j), x) & := A^j(\tilde{L}_j) e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(x)} \mathcal{L}_{B^j}[\tau^{B^j}(1), A^j(x)/A^j(\tilde{L}_j)], \end{aligned}$$

where $A^j(u) = \int_{\tilde{m}_j}^u e^{\tilde{V}^{(j)}(x)} dx$. Using the fact that the sequence (\tilde{m}_j, j) is a subsequence of (m_j, j) , Fact 2.1 and then (7.5) for any j ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\inf\{s > \tilde{m}_j, \tilde{V}^{(j)}(s) > \kappa r_t/8\} > \tilde{m}_j + r_t) \leq C_+ e^{-c-r_t}, \text{ and} \\ & \mathbb{P}(\sup\{s < \tilde{m}_j, \tilde{V}^{(j)}(s) > \kappa r_t/8\} < \tilde{m}_j - r_t) \leq C_+ e^{-c-r_t}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

with $c_- > 0$. Therefore for any j , $P(\mathcal{D}_j \subset [\tilde{\tau}_j^-(\kappa r_t/8), \tilde{\tau}_j(\kappa r_t/8)]) \geq 1 - 2c_+ e^{-c_- r_t}$. Then on $\{\mathcal{D}_j \subset [\tilde{\tau}_j^-(\kappa r_t/8), \tilde{\tau}_j(\kappa r_t/8)]\}$, for any $x \in \mathcal{D}_j$,

$$\mathcal{L}_j(H_j(\tilde{L}_j), x) \leq A^j(\tilde{L}_j) \mathcal{L}_{B^j}[\tau^{B^j}(1), A^j(x)/A^j(\tilde{L}_j)].$$

Also on $\{\mathcal{D}_j \subset [\tilde{\tau}_j^-(\kappa r_t/8), \tilde{\tau}_j(\kappa r_t/8)]\}$, for any $x \in \mathcal{D}_j$,

$$A^j(\tilde{\tau}_j^-(\kappa r_t/8)) \leq A^j(x) \leq A^j(\tilde{\tau}_j(\kappa r_t/8)). \quad (5.15)$$

With Fact 2.1 and Lemma 7.3, we obtain with a probability larger than $1 - e^{-c_- r_t}$

$$\begin{aligned} -e^{-h_t/4} &\leq -e^{\kappa r_t/7} e^{-(1-1/2)h_t} \leq \frac{A^j(\tilde{\tau}_j^-(\kappa r_t/8))}{A^j(\tilde{L}_j)} \leq \frac{A^j(\tilde{\tau}_j(\kappa r_t/8))}{A^j(\tilde{L}_j)} \\ &\leq e^{\kappa r_t/7} e^{-(1-1/2)h_t} \leq e^{-h_t/4}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.16)$$

Therefore taking $\delta = e^{-h_t/4}$ and $\varepsilon = \delta^{1/3}$ in (7.11) we obtain with a probability larger than $1 - e^{-c_- r_t}$

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{D}_j} A^j(\tilde{L}_j) \mathcal{L}_{B^j}(\tau^{B^j}(1), A^j(x)/A^j(\tilde{L}_j)) \leq A^j(\tilde{L}_j) \mathcal{L}_{B^j}(\tau^{B^j}(1), 0)(1 + e^{-h_t/12}). \quad (5.17)$$

Collecting the different estimates we then obtain,

$$\tilde{\nu}_5(y) \geq \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq k-1} \mathcal{L}_j(H_j(\tilde{L}_j), \tilde{m}_j) \leq t\bar{\alpha}_t, \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} H_j(\tilde{L}_j)/t \leq y \right) - C_+ e^{-c_- r_t},$$

with $\bar{\alpha}_t := \tilde{\alpha}_t(1 + e^{-h_t/12})^{-1}$. We can then inverse the equality in law we have used above, and then obtain

$$\tilde{\nu}_5(y) \geq F_{\bar{\alpha}_t}(y) - C_+ e^{-c_- r_t},$$

with $F_{\bar{\alpha}_t}$ defined in Lemma 5.2. Then we can follow the same lines than for the upper bound (especially computations after (5.8)), and obtain via Lemma 5.2 and by choosing C_0 large enough in such a way that $c_- r_t / \phi(t) = c_- C_0 > \kappa(1 + \delta)$:

$$\int_{\varepsilon}^{1-\varepsilon} \nu_4(y) d\tilde{\nu}_5(y) \geq \int_{\varepsilon}^{1-\varepsilon} \nu_4(y) dF_{\bar{\alpha}_t}^+(y) - o(n_t^{-1}).$$

Remark also that (5.17) implies the concentration of the local time at the h_t -minima: with probability larger than $1 - C_+ e^{-c_- r_t}$

$$\left| \sup_{y \in \mathcal{D}_j} \mathcal{L}_j(H_j(\tilde{L}_j), y) - \mathcal{L}_j(H_j(\tilde{L}_j), \tilde{m}_j) \right| \leq e^{-h_t/12} \mathcal{L}_j(H_j(\tilde{L}_j), \tilde{m}_j). \quad (5.18)$$

We now work on $\nu_4(y)$, by the second part of Lemma 2.2 it is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} &E \left(\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{m}_1}^{W_\kappa} \left(\sup_{z \in \mathcal{D}_1} \mathcal{L}_{X'}(t(1-y), z) \leq t\tilde{\alpha}_t, H'(\tilde{L}_1) > t(1-y), H'(\tilde{L}_1) < H'(\tilde{L}_1^-) \right) \right) \\ &=: \tilde{\nu}_4(y), \end{aligned}$$

and by Lemma 5.3, $\tilde{\nu}_4(y) \geq f_{\bar{\alpha}_t}^-(y) - o(n_t^{-1})$. Therefore

$$\int_{\varepsilon}^{1-\varepsilon} \nu_4(y) d\tilde{\nu}_5(y) \geq \int_{\varepsilon}^{1-\varepsilon} f_{\bar{\alpha}_t}^-(y) dF_{\bar{\alpha}_t}^+(y) - o(n_t^{-1}).$$

From now on, the computations are very close from that of the upper bound (see (5.11) and below) and we do not give more details. \square

Proof of the Lemmata

Proof of Lemma 5.2: This is a direct consequence of Proposition 3.5. \square

Proof of Lemma 5.3: To obtain the result we use a similar method than in [Andreolletti and Diel \(2011\)](#). That is to say we study the inverse of the local time at \tilde{m}_1 , and use our knowledge about $H(\tilde{L}_1)$. From the definitions of f_γ and \tilde{f}_γ we have easily $\tilde{f}_\gamma(x) \leq f_\gamma(x)$ for all x so we only need to prove the upper bound of f_γ and the lower bound of \tilde{f}_γ .

• For f_γ , recall that $\sigma(u, \tilde{m}_1) = \inf\{s > 0, \mathcal{L}(s, \tilde{m}_1) > u\}$, just notice that

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left[\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{m}_1}^{W_\kappa}(\mathcal{L}(t(1-x), \tilde{m}_1) \leq \gamma t, H(\tilde{L}_1) > t(1-x), H(\tilde{L}_1) < H(\tilde{L}_1^-)) \right] \\ &= E \left[\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{m}_1}^{W_\kappa}(\sigma(\gamma t, \tilde{m}_1) \geq t(1-x), H(\tilde{L}_1) > t(1-x), H(\tilde{L}_1) < H(\tilde{L}_1^-)) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (5.19)$$

$$= E \left[\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{m}_1}^{W_\kappa}(H(\tilde{L}_1) > \sigma(\gamma t, \tilde{m}_1) \geq t(1-x), H(\tilde{L}_1) < H(\tilde{L}_1^-)) \right] \quad (5.20)$$

$$+ E \left[\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{m}_1}^{W_\kappa}(\sigma(\gamma t, \tilde{m}_1) > H(\tilde{L}_1) > t(1-x), H(\tilde{L}_1) < H(\tilde{L}_1^-)) \right] \quad (5.21)$$

Let us first study the expectation in (5.20). On $\{H(\tilde{L}_1) > \sigma(\gamma t, \tilde{m}_1) \geq t(1-x), H(\tilde{L}_1) < H(\tilde{L}_1^-)\}$, X remains between \tilde{L}_1^- and \tilde{L}_1 until the instant $\sigma(\gamma t, \tilde{m}_1)$ which is finite. On this event considering (1.10) and (1.11), the inverse of the local time can be written for X starting at \tilde{m}_1 as

$$\sigma(\gamma t, \tilde{m}_1) = \int_{\tilde{L}_1^-}^{\tilde{L}_1} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(1)}(x)} \mathcal{L}_B(\sigma_B(\gamma t, 0), A^1(x)) dx =: I,$$

where $A^1(x) = \int_{\tilde{m}_1}^x e^{\tilde{V}^{(1)}(y)} dy$ and B is a standard Brownian motion independent of W_κ , such that B starts at $A^1(\tilde{m}_1) = 0$ and is killed when it first hits $A^1(\tilde{L}_1)$. We have

$$I = \gamma t \int_{\tilde{L}_1^-}^{\tilde{L}_1} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(1)}(x)} \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{B}}(\sigma_{\tilde{B}}(1, 0), \tilde{a}(x)) dx$$

with $\tilde{a}(x) := (\gamma t)^{-1} A^1(x) = (\gamma t)^{-1} \int_{\tilde{m}_1}^x e^{\tilde{V}^{(1)}(y)} dy$ and where $\tilde{B} := B((\gamma t)^2)/(\gamma t)$. By scale invariance \tilde{B} is also a standard Brownian motion that we still denote by B in the sequel. Also $\sigma_U(r, y) := \inf\{s > 0, \mathcal{L}_U(s, y) > r\}$ for $r > 0, y \in \mathbb{R}$ is the inverse of the local time of the process U . Since X is starting at \tilde{m}_1 , we have $H(\tilde{L}_1) = H(\tilde{L}_1) - H(\tilde{m}_1)$ for which Proposition 3.5 gives

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\{ |H(\tilde{L}_1) - H(\tilde{m}_1) - \mathbf{e}_1 S_1 R_1| \leq \varepsilon_t \mathbf{e}_1 S_1 R_1 \right\} =: \mathcal{G}_1 \right) \geq 1 - e^{-D_1 h_t}, \quad (5.22)$$

with $\varepsilon_t := e^{-d_1 h_t}$. So, we only deal with I . $(\gamma t)^{-1} I$ can be split into two terms $(\gamma t)^{-1} I := I_1 + I_2$ with

$$I_1 := \int_{\tilde{\tau}_1^-(h_t/2)}^{\tilde{\tau}_1(h_t/2)} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(1)}(x)} \mathcal{L}_B(\sigma_B(1, 0), \tilde{a}(x)) dx.$$

We now prove that the main contribution in $(\gamma t)^{-1} I$ is given by I_1 and obtain its approximation in probability. First using Fact 2.1, (7.8) and (7.8) we have for any $\hat{\tau} \in \{\tilde{\tau}_1^-(h_t/2), \tilde{\tau}_1(h_t/2)\}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$P(|A^1(\hat{\tau})| \leq e^{h_t(1+\varepsilon)/2}) \geq 1 - C_+ e^{-\kappa \varepsilon h_t/2}.$$

Therefore by monotony of $\tilde{a}(\cdot)$ (depending on whether its argument is larger or smaller than \tilde{m}_1)

$$P(\forall x \in [\tilde{\tau}_1^-(h_t/2), \tilde{\tau}_1(h_t/2)], |\tilde{a}(x)| \leq e^{-(\log t)(1-3\varepsilon)/2}) \geq 1 - C_+ e^{-\kappa\varepsilon h_t/2}.$$

Also, using (7.15) we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq y \leq e^{-(\log t)(1-3\varepsilon)/2}} |\mathcal{L}_B(\sigma_B(1,0), y) - 1| \geq \hat{\varepsilon}_t\right) \leq e^{-e^\varepsilon(\log t)/20}. \quad (5.23)$$

with $\hat{\varepsilon}_t := e^{-(\log t)(1-\varepsilon)}$. So we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|I_1 - \mathbb{R}_1| \leq e^{-(\log t)(1-\varepsilon)} \mathbb{R}_1\right) \geq 1 - C_+ e^{-\kappa\varepsilon h_t/2},$$

with $\mathbb{R}_1 := \int_{\tilde{\tau}_1^-(h_t/2)}^{\tilde{\tau}_1(h_t/2)} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(1)}(x)} dx$. Then we prove that I_2 is negligible compared to the integral in the previous equation. First thanks to (7.16), we have

$$P\left(\sup_{x \in [\tilde{L}_1^-, \tilde{L}_1]} \mathcal{L}_B[\sigma_B(1,0), \tilde{a}(x)] > e^\varepsilon \log t\right) \leq 2e^{-\varepsilon \log t}.$$

So with probability larger than $1 - 2e^{-\varepsilon \log t}$, we have

$$I_2 \leq e^\varepsilon \log t \left(\int_{\tilde{L}_1^-}^{\tilde{\tau}_1^-(h_t/2)} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(1)}(x)} dx + \int_{\tilde{\tau}_1(h_t/2)}^{\tilde{L}_1} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(1)}(x)} dx \right) =: e^\varepsilon \log t I_3.$$

By Lemma 6.8, with a probability larger than $1 - 2e^{-(c_-)\varepsilon h_t}$,

$$I_3 \leq C_+ h_t^2 e^{-(1-\varepsilon)h_t/2}.$$

Also, by Lemma 3.6, with probability larger $1 - e^{-D_1 h_t}$, $\mathbb{R}_1 = R_1$ (which is the same R_1 than in 5.22), which law is given by the sum of two independent copies of $F^-(h_t/2)$. So using (7.9), with a probability larger than $1 - 2e^{-D_1 h_t}$

$$\mathbb{R}_1 = R_1 \geq e^{-\varepsilon h_t}.$$

We deduce from the last two inequalities that with a probability larger than $1 - e^{-c_- \varepsilon h_t}$,

$$I_2 \leq R_1 e^{-(1-5\varepsilon)h_t/2}.$$

Finally collecting what we have done for I :

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left[\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{m}_1}^{W_\kappa} \left(|I - \gamma t R_1| \geq 2e^{-(1-5\varepsilon)h_t/2} (\gamma t) R_1, \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. H(\tilde{L}_1) > \sigma(\gamma t, \tilde{m}_1) \geq t(1-x), H(\tilde{L}_1) < H(\tilde{L}_1^-) \right) \right] \\ & \leq C_+ e^{-\varepsilon c_- h_t}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.24)$$

and we recall that $\sigma(\gamma t, \tilde{m}_1) = I$ on $\{H(\tilde{L}_1) > \sigma(\gamma t, \tilde{m}_1) \geq t(1-x), H(\tilde{L}_1) < H(\tilde{L}_1^-)\}$. Combining (5.24) with (5.22) we thus get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ H(\tilde{L}_1) > \sigma(\gamma t, \tilde{m}_1) \geq t(1-x), H(\tilde{L}_1) < H(\tilde{L}_1^-) \right\} \\ & \subset \left\{ \frac{1}{R_1} \leq \frac{\gamma}{1-x} (1 + \varepsilon'_t), \mathcal{H}_1 > t(1-x)(1 - \varepsilon'_t) \right\} \cup \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^1, \end{aligned} \quad (5.25)$$

where $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^1$ is such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^1) \leq C_+ e^{-\varepsilon c_- h_t} + e^{-D_1 h_t}$ and where, as defined in the statement of the lemma, $\varepsilon'_t = e^{-c_2 h_t}$ with c_2 chosen small enough.

Now, let us study (5.21). On the event inside the probability $\sigma(\gamma t, \tilde{m}_1)$ may be infinite. According to (1.10) and the fact that $H(\tilde{L}_1) = T(\tau^B(A^1(\tilde{L}_1)))$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(\gamma t, \tilde{m}_1) > H(\tilde{L}_1) &\Leftrightarrow \sigma_B(\gamma t, 0) > \tau^B(A^1(\tilde{L}_1)) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \mathcal{L}_B[\sigma_B(\gamma t, 0), 0] = \gamma t > \mathcal{L}_B[\tau^B(A^1(\tilde{L}_1)), 0]; \end{aligned}$$

Now, note that, as in the proof of Lemma 3.6, we have $\mathcal{L}_B(\tau^B(A^1(\tilde{L}_1)), 0) = A^1(\tilde{L}_1)\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{B}}(\tau^{\tilde{B}}(1), 0)$, where $\tilde{B} := B((A^1(\tilde{L}_1))^2)/A^1(\tilde{L}_1)$. Also, by definition of \mathbf{e}_1 given in the proof of Lemma 3.6, we have $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{B}}(\tau^{\tilde{B}}(1), 0) = \mathbf{e}_1$. As a consequence,

$$\sigma(\gamma t, \tilde{m}_1) > H(\tilde{L}_1) \Leftrightarrow \gamma t > A^1(\tilde{L}_1)\mathbf{e}_1 \Leftrightarrow \gamma t R_1 > A^1(\tilde{L}_1)\mathbf{e}_1 R_1.$$

Then, according to (3.18), we have $A^1(\tilde{L}_1) \geq (1 - e^{-d-h_t})S_1$ with probability greater than $1 - e^{-D-h_t}$ and according to (5.22) and the fact that the diffusion is here starting at \tilde{m}_1 , we have $\mathbf{e}_1 S_1 R_1 \geq (1 + \varepsilon_t)^{-1} H(\tilde{L}_1)$ with probability greater than $1 - e^{-D-h_t}$. As a consequence,

$$\sigma(\gamma t, \tilde{m}_1) > H(\tilde{L}_1) \Rightarrow \gamma t R_1 > (1 - e^{-d-h_t})(1 + \varepsilon_t)^{-1} H(\tilde{L}_1), \quad (5.26)$$

except on an event which probability is less than $2e^{-d-h_t}$. Combining this with (5.22) we get that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\{ \sigma(\gamma t, \tilde{m}_1) > H(\tilde{L}_1) > t(1-x), H(\tilde{L}_1) < H(\tilde{L}_1^-) \right\} \\ &\subset \left\{ \frac{1}{R_1} \leq \frac{\gamma}{1-x}(1 + \varepsilon'_t), \mathcal{H}_1 > t(1-x)(1 - \varepsilon'_t) \right\} \cup \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.27)$$

where $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^2$ is such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^2) \leq 2e^{-d-h_t} + e^{-D_1 h_t}$ and where, as before, $\varepsilon'_t = e^{-c_2 h_t}$ with c_2 a possibly smaller than before.

Combining (5.25) and (5.27) we get, for any $0 < x < 1$ and t large enough,

$$f_\gamma(x) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{R_1} \leq \frac{\gamma}{1-x}(1 + \varepsilon'_t), \mathcal{H}_1 > t(1-x)(1 - \varepsilon'_t)\right) + o(n_t^{-1}).$$

• For \tilde{f}_γ , let $\tilde{\gamma} := \gamma(1 + e^{-h_t/12})^{-1}$ and $y := (1-x)/(R_1(1 - \tilde{\varepsilon}_t))$. We have to distinguish the cases $H(\tilde{L}_1) > \sigma(\tilde{\gamma}t, \tilde{m}_1)$ and $\sigma(\tilde{\gamma}t, \tilde{m}_1) > H(\tilde{L}_1)$. On $\{y \leq \tilde{\gamma}, H(\tilde{L}_1) > \sigma(\tilde{\gamma}t, \tilde{m}_1) \geq t(1-x), H(\tilde{L}_1) < H(\tilde{L}_1^-)\}$ we can express the local time at the inverse of the local time at y in term of the standard Brownian motion driving the diffusion and use scale invariance: for any $z \in \mathcal{D}_1$,

$$\mathcal{L}(\sigma(yt, \tilde{m}_1), z) = (yt)e^{-\tilde{V}^{(1)}(z)} \mathcal{L}_B(\sigma_B(1, 0), \tilde{a}(z)) \quad (5.28)$$

with $\tilde{a}(z) = (yt)^{-1} \int_{\tilde{m}_1}^z e^{\tilde{V}^{(1)}(u)} du$. Remember also that thanks to Fact 2.1 and (5.14), we can obtain an upper bound of $\int_{\tilde{m}_1}^z e^{\tilde{V}^{(1)}(y)} dy$ for $z \in \mathcal{D}_1$ by estimating $\int_0^z e^{W_\kappa^\uparrow(s)} ds$ for $z \in [0, \tau_R(r_t)]$. Also as by (7.8) $P(\int_0^{\tau_R(r_t)} e^{W_\kappa^\uparrow(s)} ds \geq e^{\varepsilon h_t}) \leq e^{-c-\varepsilon h_t}$, with the same probability $\tilde{a}(z) \leq (yt)^{-1} e^{\varepsilon h_t}$ and with the same method we have obtained (5.23),

$$E\left(\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{m}_1}^{W_\kappa}\left(\sup_{z \in \mathcal{D}_1} |\mathcal{L}_B(\sigma_B(1, 0), \tilde{a}(z)) - 1| \leq \hat{\varepsilon}_t\right)\right) \geq 1 - 2e^{-c-\varepsilon h_t}.$$

(5.28) together with the above estimate imply

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left(\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{m}_1}^{W_\kappa} \left(\left\{ \exists z \in \mathcal{D}_1, \left| \mathcal{L}(\sigma(yt, \tilde{m}_1), z) - yte^{-\tilde{V}^{(1)}(z)} \right| \geq 2yte^{-\tilde{V}^{(1)}(z)}\hat{\varepsilon}_t, \right. \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. \left. y \leq \tilde{\gamma}, H(\tilde{L}_1) > \sigma(\tilde{\gamma}t, \tilde{m}_1) \geq t(1-x), H(\tilde{L}_1) < H(\tilde{L}_1^-) \right\} \right) \right) \\ & \leq 2e^{-c-\varepsilon h_t}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.29)$$

Then, using (5.24) with $\gamma = y$ implies that, on $\{y \leq \tilde{\gamma}, H(\tilde{L}_1) > \sigma(\tilde{\gamma}t, \tilde{m}_1) \geq t(1-x), H(\tilde{L}_1) < H(\tilde{L}_1^-)\}$, we have $t(1-x) \leq \sigma(yt, \tilde{m}_1)$, except on a sub event of probability smaller than $C_+e^{-\varepsilon c-h_t}$. Then since the local time is increasing in time, and according to (5.29) we get for any $z \in \mathcal{D}_1$, $\mathcal{L}(t(1-x), z) \leq \mathcal{L}(\sigma(yt, \tilde{m}_1), z) \leq yte^{-\tilde{V}^{(1)}(z)}(1+\hat{\varepsilon}_t) \leq yt(1+\hat{\varepsilon}_t)$. Collecting all this gives

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left(\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{m}_1}^{W_\kappa} \left(\left\{ \frac{\sup_{z \in \mathcal{D}_1} \mathcal{L}(t(1-x), z)}{t} > \frac{(1-x)(1+\hat{\varepsilon}_t)}{R_1(1-\tilde{\varepsilon}_t)} \right\} =: \overline{\mathcal{G}}_2 \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. \cap \left\{ y \leq \tilde{\gamma}, H(\tilde{L}_1) > \sigma(\tilde{\gamma}t, \tilde{m}_1) \geq t(1-x), H(\tilde{L}_1) < H(\tilde{L}_1^-) \right\} \right) \right) \\ & \leq (2+C_+)e^{-\varepsilon c-h_t}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.30)$$

As a consequence, for t large enough so that $(1+\hat{\varepsilon}_t)(1+e^{-h_t/12})^{-1} \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ y \leq \tilde{\gamma}, H(\tilde{L}_1) > \sigma(\tilde{\gamma}t, \tilde{m}_1) \geq t(1-x), H(\tilde{L}_1) < H(\tilde{L}_1^-) \right\} \\ & \subset \left\{ \sup_{z \in \mathcal{D}_1} \mathcal{L}(t(1-x), z) \leq \gamma t \right\} \cup \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^3 \end{aligned} \quad (5.31)$$

where $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^3$ is such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^3) \leq (2+C_+)e^{-\varepsilon c-h_t}$.

From the definition of $\sigma(\cdot, \tilde{m}_1)$, (5.18) and the definition of $\tilde{\gamma}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ y \leq \tilde{\gamma}, \sigma(\tilde{\gamma}t, \tilde{m}_1) > H(\tilde{L}_1) > t(1-x), H(\tilde{L}_1) < H(\tilde{L}_1^-) \right\} \\ & \subset \left\{ \mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{L}_1), \tilde{m}_1) \leq \tilde{\gamma}t, H(\tilde{L}_1) > t(1-x), H(\tilde{L}_1) < H(\tilde{L}_1^-) \right\} \\ & \subset \left\{ \sup_{z \in \mathcal{D}_1} \mathcal{L}(H(\tilde{L}_1), z) \leq \gamma t, H(\tilde{L}_1) > t(1-x), H(\tilde{L}_1) < H(\tilde{L}_1^-) \right\} \cup \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^4 \\ & \subset \left\{ \sup_{z \in \mathcal{D}_1} \mathcal{L}(t(1-x), z) \leq \gamma t \right\} \cup \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^4, \end{aligned} \quad (5.32)$$

where $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^4$ is the event where (5.18) fails, it is such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^4) \leq C_+e^{-c-r_t}$.

Combining (5.31) and (5.32) we get

$$\left\{ y \leq \tilde{\gamma}, H(\tilde{L}_1) > t(1-x), H(\tilde{L}_1) < H(\tilde{L}_1^-) \right\} \subset \left\{ \sup_{z \in \mathcal{D}_1} \mathcal{L}(t(1-x), z) \leq \gamma t \right\} \cup \mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^5,$$

where $\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^5$ is such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon^5) \leq C_+e^{-c-r_t}$. Combining with (5.22) and (3.2) we obtain

$$\tilde{f}_\gamma(x) \geq \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{(1-x)}{R_1} \leq \gamma(1-\varepsilon'_t), \mathbf{e}_1 S_1 R_1 > t(1-x)(1+\varepsilon'_t) \right) - o(n_t^{-1}),$$

where the constant c_2 in the definition of ε'_t has been decreased if necessary. This finishes the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 5.4: For (5.2), independence between $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_k$ and $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_k - \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{k-1}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \leq n_t} \mathbb{P} [\bar{\mathcal{H}}_k > 1 - a/2, 1 - 2a < \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{k-1} \leq 1 - a] \\ &= \int_{1-2a}^{1-a} d\mu_t(x) e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P} [\bar{\mathcal{H}}_k - \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{k-1} > 1 - x - a/2] \end{aligned} \quad (5.33)$$

where measure μ_t is defined as $\int_0^x d\mu_t(y) = e^{-\kappa\phi(t)} \sum_{k \leq n_t} \mathbb{P} [\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{k-1} \leq x]$, and we know that μ_t converge vaguely to the measure μ which has a density with respect to the Lebesgue measure equal to $(\Gamma(\kappa)\mathcal{C}_\kappa)^{-1} x^{\kappa-1} \mathbf{1}_{x>0}$, with $\mathcal{C}_\kappa > 0$ (see Lemma 6.2). Also we know from Lemma 4.1 that $e^{\kappa\phi(t)} P[(\mathcal{H}_k - \mathcal{H}_{k-1})/t > x]$ converge uniformly on every compact subset of $(0, +\infty)$ to $\mathcal{C}_\kappa x^{-\kappa}/\Gamma(1-\kappa)$, therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \sum_{k \leq n_t} \mathbb{P} [\bar{\mathcal{H}}_k > 1 - a/2, 1 - 2a < \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{k-1} \leq 1 - a] \\ &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(\kappa)\Gamma(1-\kappa)} \int_{1-2a}^{1-a} x^{\kappa-1} (1-x-a/2)^{-\kappa} dx \\ &\leq \text{const} \times a^{1-\kappa}. \end{aligned}$$

For (5.3) we applied (6.2) with $s = 1 - \varepsilon$ and $r = \varepsilon$

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P}(\varepsilon t \leq H(m_{N_t}) \leq (1-\varepsilon)t) \\ &= 1 - \frac{\sin(\pi\kappa)}{\pi} \left(\int_0^\varepsilon x^{\kappa-1} (1-x)^{-\kappa} dx + \int_{1-\varepsilon}^1 x^{\kappa-1} (1-x)^{-\kappa} dx \right) \\ &\leq 1 - \frac{\sin(\pi\kappa)}{\pi} \left(\frac{(1-\varepsilon)^{-\kappa}}{\kappa} \varepsilon^\kappa + \frac{(1-\varepsilon)^{\kappa-1}}{1-\kappa} \varepsilon^{1-\kappa} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which implies the result. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3: The proof of this theorem is a direct consequence of Propositions 5.1, 1.4 and Lemmata 4.4 and 4.5. Notice that the proof of the upper bound is independent of the proof of the lower bound, but we use the upper bound for the proof of the lower bound, in particular from the upper bound we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L}^*(t) \leq 2\tilde{w}_t/t) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Y}_1^{\natural}(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)^-) \leq \varepsilon)$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$ as $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \tilde{w}_t/t = 0$. From that as $\mathcal{Y}_1^{\natural}(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)^-)$ is positive we obtain $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L}^*(t) \leq 2\tilde{w}_t) = 0$, which proves the assertion at the beginning of the proof of the lower bound in Proposition 5.1.

Thanks to Propositions 5.1, we only need to study the convergence of \mathcal{P}_1^\pm (the limit when t goes to infinity and then the limit when ε goes to 0). The latter can be written in term of functionals of $(Y_1, Y_2)^t$, let $\mathbb{Y} := Y_2^{t,-1}(1-\varepsilon)$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_1^\pm &= P \left[(1 - Y_2^t(\mathbb{Y}^-)) \frac{Y_1^t(\mathbb{Y}) - Y_1^t(\mathbb{Y}^-)}{Y_2^t(\mathbb{Y}) - Y_2^t(\mathbb{Y}^-)} \leq \alpha_t^\pm, Y_1^{t,\natural}(\mathbb{Y}^-) \leq \alpha_t^\pm \right], \\ &= P \left[(1 - \tilde{K}_{I,1-\varepsilon}^-((Y_1, Y_2)^t)) \frac{K_{I,1-\varepsilon}((Y_1, Y_2)^t) - K_{I,1-\varepsilon}^-((Y_1, Y_2)^t)}{\tilde{K}_{I,1-\varepsilon}((Y_1, Y_2)^t) - \tilde{K}_{I,1-\varepsilon}^-((Y_1, Y_2)^t)} \leq \alpha_t^\pm, \right. \\ &\quad \left. J_{I,1-\varepsilon}^-((Y_1, Y_2)^t) \leq \alpha_t^\pm \right], \end{aligned}$$

recall the definition of K and \tilde{K} in (4.23) and below. The hypothesis of Lemma 4.5 are: finite number of large jumps on compact intervals, strictly increasing, starting at 0, and jumping over 1 without reaching it. These properties are naturally almost surely satisfied by a κ -stable subordinator so, almost surely, paths of $(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)$ satisfy the hypothesis of Lemma 4.5. Therefore they are points of continuity for $J_{I,1-\varepsilon}^-$, $K_{I,1-\varepsilon}^-$, $\tilde{K}_{I,1-\varepsilon}^-$ and $\tilde{K}_{I,1-\varepsilon}$. Combining this continuity with Proposition 1.4, continuous mapping theorem, and replacing the functionals by their expressions, we obtain, when t goes to infinity, the convergence of \mathcal{P}_1^\pm to

$$P \left[(1 - \mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1 - \varepsilon)-)) \frac{\mathcal{Y}_1(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1 - \varepsilon)) - \mathcal{Y}_1(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1 - \varepsilon)-)}{\mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1 - \varepsilon)) - \mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1 - \varepsilon)-)} \leq \alpha, \right. \\ \left. \mathcal{Y}_1^\sharp(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1 - \varepsilon)-) \leq \alpha \right].$$

Then, note that almost surely $\mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1 - \varepsilon)-) < 1$ so we have a.s. $\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1 - \varepsilon) = \mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)$ for all ε small enough. We deduce that the above expression converges to the repartition function of $\max(\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2)$ (see (1.6) for definitions of \mathcal{I}_1 and \mathcal{I}_2) when ε goes to 0, and this yields Theorem 1.3. \square

5.2. Favorite site (proof of Theorem 1.5).

Thanks to Section 3 we know precisely the nature of the contribution of each h_t -valley to the local time. The difficulty in proving Theorem 1.3 was the need to consider only a part of the contribution of the last h_t -valley. The proofs of the first two points of Theorem 1.5 are thus easier to obtain, since they do not require to "cut" the contribution of any valley. Let us give some details for the proof of the first point (the second is obtained similarly). We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L}^*(H(m_{N_t+1})) \leq \alpha t) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{L}^*(H(\tilde{L}_{N_t})) \leq (\alpha - e^{[\kappa(1+3\delta)-1]\phi(t)})t, \mathcal{Q}\right) + \mathbb{P}(\overline{\mathcal{Q}}) + P(\overline{\mathcal{V}_t}) + \mathbb{P}(\overline{\mathcal{B}_3(n_t)}) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{1 \leq j \leq N_t} l_j/t \leq (1 - \varepsilon_t)^{-1}(\alpha - e^{[\kappa(1+3\delta)-1]\phi(t)}), \mathcal{Q}\right) + \mathbb{P}(\overline{\mathcal{Q}}) + o(1) \end{aligned}$$

where we fixed some $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\mathcal{Q} := \{\varepsilon t \leq H(m_{N_t}) \leq (1 - \varepsilon)t, N_t \leq n_t\}$ as in the proof of Proposition 5.1 (from there we see that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P}(\overline{\mathcal{Q}}) = 0$). In the last inequality we used Proposition 3.5, Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 3.2. To lighten notation, let $\tilde{\alpha}_t := (1 - \varepsilon_t)^{-1}(\alpha - e^{[\kappa(1+3\delta)-1]\phi(t)})$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{1 \leq j \leq N_t} l_j/t \leq \tilde{\alpha}_t, \mathcal{Q}\right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{1 \leq j \leq N_t} l_j/t \leq \tilde{\alpha}_t, \mathcal{B}_1(n_t), \mathcal{Q}\right) + \mathbb{P}(\overline{\mathcal{B}_1(n_t)}) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{1 \leq j \leq N_t} l_j/t \leq \tilde{\alpha}_t, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{N_t} \geq 1 - \delta'_t, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{N_t-1} \leq 1 - \varepsilon + \delta'_t, \mathcal{Q}\right) + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

with $\delta'_t = 2\tilde{v}_t/t$ and where we used (3.1) together with Proposition 3.5. Partitioning on the values of N_t we get that the above is less than

$$\sum_{k \leq n_t} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{1 \leq j \leq k} l_j/t \leq \tilde{\alpha}_t, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_k \geq 1 - \delta'_t, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{k-1} \leq 1 - \varepsilon + \delta'_t, \mathcal{Q}\right) + o(1).$$

Since the sum \sum_1 defined in the proof of the upper bound of Proposition 5.1 (see (5.12) and below) is smaller than $s(\varepsilon, t)$ satisfying $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} s(\varepsilon, t) = 0$ we can intersect the event on the above probability with $\{k = \mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon}\}$ and get

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L}^*(H(m_{N_t+1})) \leq \alpha t) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{1 \leq j \leq \mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon}} \ell_j/t \leq \tilde{\alpha}_t\right) + \mathbb{P}(\overline{\mathcal{Q}}) + s(\varepsilon, t) + o(1).$$

Then, as in the proof of Theorem 1.3 we have that $(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)$ almost surely satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma 4.5, and is therefore almost surely a point of continuity for $J_{I,1-\varepsilon}$ defined just above (4.23). From this continuity, Proposition 1.4 and the continuous mapping theorem we get

$$\sup_{1 \leq j \leq \mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon}} \ell_j/t = J_{I,1-\varepsilon}((Y_1, Y_2)^t) \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow +\infty]{\mathfrak{A}} J_{I,1-\varepsilon}(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2) = \mathcal{Y}_1^{\sharp}(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1-\varepsilon)).$$

Then, as in the proof of Theorem 1.3 we have almost surely $\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1-\varepsilon) = \mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)$ for all ε small enough so $\mathcal{Y}_1^{\sharp}(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1-\varepsilon))$ converges almost surely to $\mathcal{Y}_1^{\sharp}(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1))$ when ε goes to 0. We thus get

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L}^*(H(m_{N_t+1})) \leq \alpha t) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{Y}_1^{\sharp}(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)) \leq \alpha\right).$$

A lower bound is proved similarly so we get

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L}^*(H(m_{N_t+1})) \leq \alpha t) = \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{Y}_1^{\sharp}(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)) \leq \alpha\right).$$

To obtain the result for the favorite site, we first argue that we essentially need to obtain the asymptotic behavior of N_t^*/N_t , where $N_t^* := \min\{j \geq 1, \mathcal{L}(m_j, t) = \max_{k \leq N_t} \mathcal{L}(m_k, t)\}$. Indeed, define for any $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_1 &:= \{m_{N_t}(1-\varepsilon) \leq X(t) \leq m_{N_t}(1+\varepsilon)\}, \\ \mathcal{K}_2 &:= \{m_{N_t^*}(1-\varepsilon) \leq F_t^* \leq m_{N_t^*}(1+\varepsilon)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we have, by the localization result Theorem 1.2, $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{K}_1) = 1$. Let us now justify that $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{K}_2) = 1$. According to the proof of Theorem 1.3, Lemma 3.4 and (3.3) we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \mathcal{L}(t, x) \geq 2\tilde{w}_t, \mathcal{B}_4(n_t), N_t \leq n_t\right) \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow +\infty]{} 1$$

and on the above event, for t large enough so that $2\tilde{w}_t \geq te^{-2\phi(t)}$, we have $F_t^* \in \mathcal{D}_{N_t^*}$ (recall the definition of \mathcal{D} in (3.13)). Since $\mathcal{D}_{N_t^*}$ is centered at $m_{N_t^*}$ and its half-length is deterministic and equal to $r_t = C_0\phi(t)$ we only need to justify that

$$\mathbb{P}(\varepsilon m_{N_t^*} \geq C_0\phi(t)) \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow +\infty]{} 1.$$

We have $m_{N_t^*} \geq m_1$ and $\mathbb{P}(m_1 \geq C_0\phi(t)/\varepsilon) \geq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{m}_1 \geq C_0\phi(t)/\varepsilon) - o(1)$ by Lemma 2.2. So using (6.13), we thus deduce that $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{K}_2) = 1$.

We can now write

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\frac{F_t^*}{X(t)} \leq x\right] = \mathbb{P}\left[\frac{F_t^*}{X(t)} \leq x, \mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2\right] + v(\varepsilon, t) \leq \mathbb{P}\left[\frac{m_{N_t^*}}{m_{N_t}} \leq x \frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}\right] + v(\varepsilon, t),$$

where $v(\varepsilon, t) \geq 0$, satisfies $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} v(\varepsilon, t) = 0$. Similarly, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\frac{F_t^*}{X(t)} \leq x\right] \geq \mathbb{P}\left[\frac{m_{N_t^*}}{m_{N_t}} \leq x \frac{1-\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}\right] - v(\varepsilon, t).$$

So, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{m_{N_t^*}}{m_{N_t}} \leq x \frac{1-\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon} \right] - v(\varepsilon, t) \leq \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{F_t^*}{X(t)} \leq x \right] \leq \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{m_{N_t^*}}{m_{N_t}} \leq x \frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} \right] + v(\varepsilon, t). \quad (5.34)$$

So we observe that we only have to study the random variable $\frac{m_{N_t^*}}{m_{N_t}}$. For that we first remark that N_t^* and N_t diverge when t goes to infinity: by Lemma 6.1, the correct normalisation for the convergence in law of N_t is $e^{\kappa\phi(t)}$, so $\mathbb{P}(N_t \geq e^{(1-\varepsilon)\kappa\phi(t)}) = 1 - o(1)$. For N_t^* , we first notice that the result for N_t , also gives for t large, $\mathbb{P}(N_t^* \geq e^{(1-\varepsilon/2)\kappa\phi(t)}) = 1 - o(1)$. Therefore

$$\mathbb{P} \left(N_t^* \leq e^{(1-\varepsilon)\kappa\phi(t)} \right) \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{k \leq e^{(1-\varepsilon)\kappa\phi(t)}} \mathcal{L}(m_k, t) \geq \max_{k \leq e^{(1-\varepsilon/2)\kappa\phi(t)}} \mathcal{L}(m_k, t) \right) + o(1).$$

Now, thanks to (3.2) and Proposition 3.5,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{k \leq e^{(1-\varepsilon)\kappa\phi(t)}} \mathcal{L}(m_k, t) \geq \max_{k \leq e^{(1-\varepsilon/2)\kappa\phi(t)}} \mathcal{L}(m_k, t) \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{k \leq e^{(1-\varepsilon)\kappa\phi(t)}} \ell_k \geq \max_{k \leq e^{(1-\varepsilon/2)\kappa\phi(t)}} \ell_k \right) + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

with $(\ell_k, k \leq e^{(1-\varepsilon/2)\kappa\phi(t)})$ i.i.d. random variables with queue distributions given by (4.1).

It is then clear that for large t , $\mathbb{P}(\max_{k \leq e^{(1-\varepsilon)\kappa\phi(t)}} \ell_k \geq \max_{k \leq e^{(1-\varepsilon/2)\kappa\phi(t)}} \ell_k) = o(1)$, and we therefore obtain that $\mathbb{P}(N_t^* \geq e^{(1-\varepsilon)\kappa\phi(t)}) = 1 - o(1)$.

Then, following the work of Faggionato (2009), we know that $(m_i - m_{i-1}, i \geq 2)$ are i.i.d. random variables with a known Laplace transform (given by (2.19) in Faggionato (2009)), this allows to compute the first and fourth moments of $\Delta m_1 := m_2 - m_1$ and therefore obtain after an elementary but tedious computation that for large t , $\mathbb{E}(\Delta m_1) \sim C_7 e^{\kappa h t}$ ($C_7 > 0$) and $\mathbb{E}((\Delta m_1 - \mathbb{E}(\Delta m_1))^4) \sim C_8 e^{4\kappa h t}$ ($C_8 > 0$), which yields for t large

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(m_k/k - \mathbb{E}(\Delta m_1))^4 \right] \sim C_8 e^{4\kappa h t} / k^2.$$

These facts allow us to write by a Markov inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} [|m_{N_t} - \mathbb{E}(\Delta m_1)N_t| > \varepsilon \mathbb{E}(\Delta m_1)N_t] \\ & \leq \sum_{j \geq e^{(1-\varepsilon)\kappa\phi(t)}} \mathbb{P} [|m_j - \mathbb{E}(\Delta m_1)j| > \varepsilon \mathbb{E}(\Delta m_1)j] + o(1) \\ & \leq \sum_{j \geq e^{(1-\varepsilon)\kappa\phi(t)}} \frac{C_8 (C_7)^{-4}}{\varepsilon^4 j^2} + o(1) \\ & \leq C_+ \varepsilon^{-4} e^{-(1-\varepsilon)\kappa\phi(t)} + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

This yields that $\{|m_{N_t} - \mathbb{E}(\Delta m_1)N_t| \leq \varepsilon \mathbb{E}(\Delta m_1)N_t\}$ as well as (with a similar computation) $\{|m_{N_t^*} - \mathbb{E}(\Delta m_1)N_t^*| \leq \varepsilon \mathbb{E}(\Delta m_1)N_t^*\}$ are realized with a probability close to one.

Now including these events in the probability in (5.34), eventually enlarging $v(\varepsilon, t)$ we get

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{N_t^*}{N_t} \leq x \frac{(1-\varepsilon)^2}{(1+\varepsilon)^2} \right] - v(\varepsilon, t) \leq \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{F_t^*}{X(t)} \leq x \right] \leq \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{N_t^*}{N_t} \leq x \frac{(1+\varepsilon)^2}{(1-\varepsilon)^2} \right] + v(\varepsilon, t).$$

Notice that the random variables involved now (N_t^* and N_t) only depends of what happens in the bottom of the h_t -valleys, and we have to deal with

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{N_t^*}{N_t} \leq y \right] = \mathbb{P} [N_t^* = N_t] \mathbb{1}_{y=1} + \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{N_t^*}{N_t} \leq y, N_t^* < N_t \right] \mathbb{1}_{y < 1}, \quad \text{for any } y > 0.$$

We are now interested in the limit when t goes to infinity of the above two probabilities. We first use the same lines than for the proof of Section 5.1, that is to say we give a lower and an upper bound of this probability involving the i.i.d. sequences (ℓ_j, j) and (\mathcal{H}_j, j) . In the same way we have obtained Proposition 5.1, we then have for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and large t ,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}} - v(\varepsilon, t) \leq \mathbb{P} (N_t^* = N_t) \leq \tilde{\mathcal{P}} + v(\varepsilon, t)$$

with

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}} := \mathbb{P} \left[(1 - \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon-1}}) \frac{\bar{\ell}_{\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon}} - \bar{\ell}_{\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon-1}}}{(\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon}} - \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon-1}})} > \max_{1 \leq j \leq \mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon-1}} \frac{\ell_j}{t} \right],$$

recall that $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_k = Y_2(ke^{-\kappa\phi(t)}) = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^k \mathcal{H}_i$, $\bar{\ell}_k = Y_1(ke^{-\kappa\phi(t)}) = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^k \ell_i$, $\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon} := \inf\{m \geq 1, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_m > 1 - 2\varepsilon\}$, v a positive function such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} v(\varepsilon, t) \leq \text{const} \times \varepsilon^{\kappa \wedge (1-\kappa)}$ with an eventually larger const than in Proposition 5.1. In the same way for any $y, \varepsilon > 0$ and t large enough

$$\bar{\mathcal{P}}_1^- - v(\varepsilon, t) \leq \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{N_t^*}{N_t} \leq y, N_t^* < N_t \right] \mathbb{1}_{y < 1} \leq \bar{\mathcal{P}}_1^+ - v(\varepsilon, t),$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_1^\pm$$

$$:= \mathbb{P} \left[\mathcal{N}_t^* / \mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon} \leq y \pm \varepsilon, (1 - \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon-1}}) \frac{\bar{\ell}_{\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon}} - \bar{\ell}_{\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon-1}}}{(\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon}} - \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{\mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon-1}})} \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq \mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon-1}} \frac{\ell_j}{t} \right] \mathbb{1}_{y < 1},$$

with $\mathcal{N}_t^* := \min\{j \geq 1, \ell_j = \max_{k \leq \mathcal{N}_t^{2\varepsilon}} \ell_k\}$. This together with Lemma 4.6 yields

$$\left| \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P} [N_t^* = N_t] - \mathbb{P} [\mathcal{I}_1 < \mathcal{I}_2] \right| \leq \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} v(\varepsilon, t)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{N_t^* e^{-\kappa\phi(t)}}{N_t e^{-\kappa\phi(t)}} \leq y, N_t^* < N_t \right] - \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{F^*(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)}{\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)} \leq y, \mathcal{I}_1 \geq \mathcal{I}_2 \right] \right| \\ & \leq \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} v(\varepsilon, t), \end{aligned}$$

where F^* is defined at the beginning of Section 4.3. Replacing y by $x \frac{(1-\varepsilon)^2}{(1+\varepsilon)^2}$ for the lower bound and by $x \frac{(1+\varepsilon)^2}{(1-\varepsilon)^2}$ for the upper bound and taking the limit when t goes to infinity and then $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ we obtain

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{N_t^*}{N_t} \leq x \right] = \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{F^*(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)}{\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)} \leq y, \mathcal{I}_1 \geq \mathcal{I}_2 \right].$$

To finish the proof of the last result of Theorem 1.5 we finally have to prove Lemma 5.5 below,

Lemma 5.5. *The random variable $\frac{F^*(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)}{\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)}$ follows a uniform law $U_{[0,1]}$ and is independent of the couple $(\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2)$.*

Proof: For any $s > 0$, let $\mathcal{G}_1(s) := \inf\{u \leq s, \mathcal{Y}_1(u) - \mathcal{Y}_1(u-) = \mathcal{Y}_1^\sharp(s)\}$. The fact that for every $s > 0$, $\mathcal{G}_1(s)/s$ follows a uniform distribution is basic. Since the independence that we seek is specific we give some details.

The process of the jumps of $(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)$ in $[0, s]$ is a Poisson point process in $[0, s] \times (\mathbb{R}_+)^2$ (the coordinate in $[0, s]$ for the instant when the jump occurs and the other coordinate for the jump) with intensity measure $\lambda \times \nu$ where λ is the Lebesgue measure on $[0, s]$ and ν , as defined in the introduction, is the Lévy measure of $(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)$. Let us give a particular construction of the process $(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)$ on $[0, s]$:

Let $(P_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a countable partition of $(\mathbb{R}_+)^2$ by Borelian sets such that $\forall n \geq 1$, $0 < \nu(P_n) < +\infty$. For each n we define an *i.i.d.* sequence $(S_k^n)_{k \geq 1}$ of random variables in $(\mathbb{R}_+)^2$, an *i.i.d.* sequence $(U_k^n)_{k \geq 1}$ of random variables in $[0, s]$ and a random variable T_n such that

- $\forall n \geq 1$, $S_1^n \sim \nu(\cdot \cap P_n)/\nu(P_n)$, $U_1^n \sim U_{[0, s]}$, $T_n \sim \mathcal{P}(\nu(P_n))$,
- For any $n \geq 1$, the variables $(S_k^n)_{k \geq 1}$, $(U_k^n)_{k \geq 1}$ and T_n are independent,
- The triplets $((S_k^n)_{k \geq 1}, (U_k^n)_{k \geq 1}, T_n)_{n \geq 1}$ are independent.

We know that the random set

$$\mathcal{S}_n := \{(U_k^n, S_k^n), n \geq 1, 1 \leq k \leq T_n\}$$

is a Poisson point process in $[0, s] \times (\mathbb{R}_+)^2$ with intensity measure $\lambda \times \nu$. Since $(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)$ is pure jump it is equal in law to the process $(\mathcal{Z}_1, \mathcal{Z}_2)$ defined by

$$\forall r \in [0, s], \quad (\mathcal{Z}_1, \mathcal{Z}_2)(r) = \sum_{n \geq 1, 1 \leq k \leq T_n} S_k^n \mathbb{1}_{U_k^n \leq r}.$$

In particular

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}_1^\sharp(s) &= \max\{\pi_1(S_k^n), n \geq 1, 1 \leq k \leq T_n\}, \\ \mathcal{G}_1^\sharp(s) &= \inf \left\{ U_k^n, n \geq 1, 1 \leq k \leq T_n, \pi_1(S_k^n) = \mathcal{Z}_1^\sharp(s) \right\}, \\ \mathcal{Z}_1(s) &= \sum_{n \geq 1, 1 \leq k \leq T_n} \pi_1(S_k^n), \quad \mathcal{Z}_2(s) = \sum_{n \geq 1, 1 \leq k \leq T_n} \pi_2(S_k^n). \end{aligned}$$

We thus have that $\mathcal{G}_1(s)/s \stackrel{\mathfrak{L}}{=} U_{[0, 1]}$ and it is independent from $(\mathcal{Y}_1^\sharp(s), \mathcal{Y}_1(s), \mathcal{Y}_2(s))$ and from the sigma-field $\sigma((\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)(t+s) - (\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)(s), t \geq 0)$.

We now have to replace s by $\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)$. For that we can consider for example the dyadic approximations of $\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)$, that is, $(t_n := \max\{k \in \mathbb{N}, \frac{k}{2^n} < \mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)\}, n)$. Then, partitioning on the values of t_n , using the independence we just proved and the fact that $\mathcal{G}_1(s)/s$ follows a uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$ we get that $\mathcal{G}_1(t_n)/t_n$ follows a uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$ and is independent from

$$((\mathcal{Y}_1^\sharp(t_n), \mathcal{Y}_2(t_n), \mathcal{Y}_1(t_n + 2^{-n}) - \mathcal{Y}_1(t_n), \mathcal{Y}_2(t_n + 2^{-n}) - \mathcal{Y}_2(t_n))). \quad (5.35)$$

We let n goes to infinity, t_n converges almost surely to $\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)$ from below. As a consequence, $\mathcal{G}_1(t_n)/t_n$ converges almost surely to $\frac{F^*(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)}{\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)}$ while the quadruple in (5.35) converges almost surely to

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathcal{Y}_1^\sharp(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)-), \mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)-), \\ &\quad \mathcal{Y}_1(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)) - \mathcal{Y}_1(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)-), \mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)) - \mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)-)). \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, $\frac{F^*(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)}{\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)}$ follows a uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$ and is independent from the above quadruple for which $(\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2)$ is a measurable function, this yields the lemma. \square

6. Results and additional arguments from the paper [Andreoletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#)

6.1. *Some estimates on the diffusion X .* The first lemma below gives the right normalisation in law of the number of h_t -valleys visited by X before time t .

Lemma 6.1 (number of visited h_t -valleys). *Assume that $0 < \kappa < 1$. Then, under the annealed law \mathbb{P} , $N_t e^{-\kappa\phi(t)} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{N}$ in law. The law of \mathcal{N} is determined by its Laplace transform:*

$$\forall u > 0, \quad \mathbb{E}(e^{-u\mathcal{N}}) = \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\Gamma(\kappa j + 1)} \left(\frac{-u}{\mathcal{C}_\kappa}\right)^j, \quad (6.1)$$

where \mathcal{C}_κ is a positive constant. Moreover $\mathbb{P}(N_t > n_t) \leq e^{-\phi(t)}$.

Proof: The convergence in distribution is exactly Proposition 1.6 of [Andreoletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#). For the second fact we have $\mathbb{P}(N_t \geq n_t) \leq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{N}_t \geq n_t) + \mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathcal{V}}_t) \leq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{N}_t \geq n_t) + e^{[-\kappa/2 + o(1)]h_t}$ by Lemma 2.2, with $\tilde{N}_t := \max\{j \geq 1, \tilde{m}_j \leq \sup_{s \leq t} X(s)\}$. Then equation (5.3) in [Andreoletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#) gives $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{N}_t \geq n_t) \leq \exp(-2\phi(t))$, which yields the result. \square

The lemma below deals with the renewal structure we speak about on the introduction, and the consequence on the hitting time $H(m_{N_t})$ of the ultimate h_t -valley visited by X before time t .

Lemma 6.2. *Assume $0 < \kappa < 1$ and $0 < \delta < \inf\{2/27, \kappa^2/2\}$. For $t > 0$, let μ_t be the positive measure on \mathbb{R}_+ such that*

$$\forall x \geq 0, \quad \mu_t([0, x]) := e^{-\kappa\phi(t)} \sum_{j=1}^{n_t} \mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathcal{H}}_j \leq x).$$

Recall that for any k , $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_k := \sum_{j=1}^k \mathcal{H}_j/t$, and $\mathcal{H}_1 = R_1 S_1 \mathbf{e}_1$ is defined in Proposition 3.5. Then, $(\mu_t)_t$ converges vaguely as $t \rightarrow +\infty$ to μ defined by

$$d\mu(x) := (\mathcal{C}_\kappa \Gamma(\kappa))^{-1} x^{\kappa-1} \mathbf{1}_{(0, +\infty)}(x) dx,$$

with \mathcal{C}_κ is the same constant than in Lemma 6.1. For $0 \leq r < s \leq 1$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(1 - s \leq \frac{H(m_{N_t})}{t} \leq 1 - r\right) = \frac{\sin(\pi\kappa)}{\pi} \int_{1-s}^{1-r} x^{\kappa-1} (1-x)^{-\kappa} dx. \quad (6.2)$$

Proof: The first part of the above lemma is very close to Lemma 5.1 of [Andreoletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#), indeed Proposition 3.5 gives the proximity between the random variables $(U_i, i \leq n_t)$ and the random variables $(\mathcal{H}_i, i \leq n_t)$, moreover an important preliminary result in [Andreoletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#) (Proposition 4.1) states that $e^{\kappa\phi(t)}(1 - \mathbb{E}(e^{-\lambda U_1/t})) = \mathcal{C}_\kappa \lambda^\kappa + o(1)$ for large t . So we also know that

$$e^{\kappa\phi(t)}(1 - \mathbb{E}(e^{-\lambda \mathcal{H}_1/t})) = \mathcal{C}_\kappa \lambda^\kappa + o(1), \quad (6.3)$$

notice that this result could also be deduced from (4.2) with the help of a Tauberian theorem. Then by independence of the random variables \mathcal{H}_j and the fact that they are i.d., for any $\lambda > 0$

$$\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} d\mu_t(x) = \frac{1}{e^{\kappa\phi(t)}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_t} \left(\mathbb{E} \left(e^{-\lambda \frac{\mathcal{H}_1}{t}} \right) \right)^j$$

By (6.3) as $n_t e^{-\kappa\phi(t)} \rightarrow_{t \rightarrow +\infty} +\infty$, $[\mathbb{E}(e^{-\lambda \mathcal{H}_1/t})]^{n_t+1} = o(1)$. Hence, we get as $t \rightarrow +\infty$, again by 6.3

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} d\mu_t(x) &= \frac{e^{-\kappa\phi(t)}(1 + o(1))}{1 - \mathbb{E}(e^{-\lambda \mathcal{H}_1/t})} + o(1) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{C}_\kappa \lambda^\kappa} + o(1) \\ &= \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{e^{-\lambda x} x^{\kappa-1}}{\mathcal{C}_\kappa \Gamma(\kappa)} dx + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

which gives the vague convergence of measure $(\mu_t)_t$. Also (6.2) is equation (1.2) of Corollary 1.5 in Androletti and Devulder (2015). \square

In Lemma 6.3 below, we approximate \tilde{h}_j , the exit time of h_t -valley number j (if X leaves it on the right), by a product of 3 simpler random variables. To this aim, we recall that with the notation of Lemma 3.6 and of its proof, for each $1 \leq j \leq n_t$, $\tilde{R}_j = \int_{\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t/2)}^{\tilde{\tau}_j^+(h_t/2)} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(x)} dx$, and $A^j(u) = \int_{\tilde{m}_j}^u e^{\tilde{V}^{(j)}(x)} dx$, $u \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, for some independent Brownian motions B^j , $1 \leq j \leq n_t$, independent of W_κ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{h}_j &= \int_{\tilde{L}_j^-}^{\tilde{L}_j^+} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)} \mathcal{L}_{B^j} [\tau^{B^j}(A^j(\tilde{L}_j)), A^j(u)] du, \\ \mathbf{e}_j &= \mathcal{L}_{B^j} [\tau^{B^j}(A^j(\tilde{L}_j)), 0] / A^j(\tilde{L}_j). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 6.3. *Let $0 < \varepsilon < \inf\{2/27, \kappa^2/2\}$. For large t , we have for every $1 \leq j \leq n_t$,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \tilde{h}_j - A^j(\tilde{L}_j) \mathbf{e}_j \tilde{R}_j \right| > 2e^{-(1-3\varepsilon)h_t/6} A^j(\tilde{L}_j) \mathbf{e}_j \tilde{R}_j \right) \leq C_+ e^{-(c_-)\varepsilon h_t}. \quad (6.4)$$

Proof: We first notice that $(\tilde{h}_j, A^j(\tilde{L}_j), \mathbf{e}_j, \tilde{R}_j)$ is measurable with respect to the σ -field generated by $(\tilde{V}^{(j)}(x + \tilde{L}_{j-1}^+), 0 \leq x \leq \tilde{L}_j^+ - \tilde{L}_{j-1}^+)$ and B^j , so, thanks to the second fact of Lemma 2.2, its law under \mathbb{P} does not depend on j . Thus, the left hand side of (6.4) does not depend on j . Hence we just have to prove (6.4) for $j = 2$.

This is actually already proved in Androletti and Devulder (2015), for which it is an important step. Indeed in this paper Androletti and Devulder (2015), our A^j , \tilde{B}^2 and \tilde{h}_2 are denoted respectively by \tilde{A}_j , B and \tilde{U} , as defined in (Androletti and Devulder (2015), eq. (3.17) and (3.18)), and our \tilde{R}_2 and \mathbf{e}_2 by \mathcal{I}^- and \mathbf{e}_1 , as defined in (Androletti and Devulder (2015), after eq. (4.17)). Hence our (6.4) for $j = 2$ is exactly (Androletti and Devulder (2015), Lemma 4.7), which proves our lemma.

The proof of (Androletti and Devulder (2015), Lemma 4.7) is quite technical, however we can give a simple heuristic in order for the present paper to be more self-contained. The idea of the proof of (Androletti and Devulder (2015), Lemma

4.7) is that, loosely speaking, for u close to \tilde{m}_j , that is for $u \in [\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t/2), \tilde{\tau}_j(h_t/2)]$, $\mathcal{L}_{B^j}[\tau^{B^j}(A^j(\tilde{L}_j)), A^j(u)]$ is nearly $\mathcal{L}_{B^j}[\tau^{B^j}(A^j(\tilde{L}_j)), 0] = A^j(\tilde{L}_j)\mathbf{e}_j$, whereas for u far from \tilde{m}_j , that is for $u \in [\tilde{L}_j^-, \tilde{L}_j]$ but $u \notin [\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t/2), \tilde{\tau}_j(h_t/2)]$, $e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(x)}$ is "nearly" 0, with large probability. Finally, combining these heuristics gives $\tilde{h}_j \approx A^j(\tilde{L}_j)\mathbf{e}_j\tilde{R}_j$. \square

The following lemma is used to prove Lemma 3.6 and uses the notation of this lemma, and where the independent r.v. $G^+(h_t/2, h_t)$, $F_1^+(h_t)$, $F_2^-(h_t/2)$ and $F_3^-(h_t/2)$ defined before Proposition 3.5.

Lemma 6.4. *Assume $0 < \delta < \inf\{2/27, \kappa^2/2\}$. For large t , possibly on an enlarged probability space, there exists $R_2 \stackrel{\mathfrak{I}}{=} F_2^-(h_t/2) + F_3^-(h_t/2)$ and $S_2 \stackrel{\mathfrak{I}}{=} F_1^+(h_t) + G^+(h_t/2, h_t)$, such that R_2 , S_2 and \mathbf{e}_2 are independent and*

$$P\left(\left\{\left|\int_{\tilde{m}_2}^{\tilde{L}_2} e^{\tilde{V}^{(2)}(x)} dx - S_2\right| \leq e^{-(d_-)h_t} S_2, \tilde{R}_2 = R_2\right\}\right) \geq 1 - e^{-(D_-)h_t}, \quad (6.5)$$

where $D_- > 0$.

Proof: Due to (Andreoletti and Devulder (2015) Lemma 4.5) with its notation, we have $\mathcal{I}_0^+ := \int_{m_2}^{\tau_2(h_t)} e^{V^{(2)}(x)} dx \stackrel{\mathfrak{I}}{=} F^+(h_t)$, $\mathcal{I}_2^+ := \int_{\tau_2(h_t)}^{L_2} e^{V^{(2)}(x)} dx \stackrel{\mathfrak{I}}{=} G^+(h_t/2, h_t)$, $\mathcal{I}_1^- := \int_{m_2}^{\tau_2(h_t/2)} e^{-V^{(2)}(x)} dx \stackrel{\mathfrak{I}}{=} F^-(h_t/2)$ and $\mathcal{I}_2^- := \int_{\tau_2^-(h_t/2)}^{m_2} e^{-V^{(2)}(x)} dx \stackrel{\mathfrak{I}}{=} F^-(h_t/2)$ with $L_2 := \inf\{x > \tau_2(h_t), V^{(2)}(x) = h_t/2\}$. The problem is that \mathcal{I}_0^+ is not independent of \mathcal{I}_1^- , so we would like to replace it by some $\mathcal{I}_1^+ \stackrel{\mathfrak{I}}{=} \mathcal{I}_0^+$ of it with better independence properties. It is proved in (Andreoletti and Devulder (2015), at the top of page 32) that for large t , possibly in an enlarged probability space, there exists \mathcal{I}_1^+ such that $|\mathcal{I}_0^+ - \mathcal{I}_1^+| \leq e^{-(1-3\delta)h_t/2} \mathcal{I}_1^+$ with probability greater than $1 - 4e^{-\kappa\delta h_t/2}$ and where $\mathcal{I}_1^+ \stackrel{\mathfrak{I}}{=} F^+(h_t)$ by (Andreoletti and Devulder (2015), eq. (4.35)).

Let $S_2 := \mathcal{I}_1^+ + \mathcal{I}_2^+ \geq \mathcal{I}_1^+$. Notice that on \mathcal{V}_t , by Remark 2.3, $\tilde{R}_2 = \mathcal{I}_1^- + \mathcal{I}_2^- =: R_2$ and $\int_{\tilde{m}_2}^{\tilde{L}_2} e^{\tilde{V}^{(2)}(x)} dx = \int_{m_2}^{L_2} e^{V^{(2)}(x)} dx = \mathcal{I}_0^+ + \mathcal{I}_2^+$. The two previous inequalities give $|\int_{\tilde{m}_2}^{\tilde{L}_2} e^{\tilde{V}^{(2)}(x)} dx - S_2| = |\mathcal{I}_0^+ - \mathcal{I}_1^+| \leq e^{-(1-3\delta)h_t/2} S_2$ and $\tilde{R}_2 = R_2$ with probability at least $1 - 5e^{-\kappa\delta h_t/2}$ thanks to Lemma 2.2. This proves (6.5).

Moreover, by (Andreoletti and Devulder (2015), Prop. 4.4 (i)), \mathcal{I}_1^+ , \mathcal{I}_2^+ , \mathcal{I}_1^- , \mathcal{I}_2^- and \mathbf{e}_2 (which is denoted by \mathbf{e}_1 in Andreoletti and Devulder (2015)) are independent. So, \mathbf{e}_2 , $S_2 = \mathcal{I}_1^+ + \mathcal{I}_2^+$ and $R_2 = \mathcal{I}_1^- + \mathcal{I}_2^-$ are independent, and $R_2 \stackrel{\mathfrak{I}}{=} F_2^-(h_t/2) + F_3^-(h_t/2)$ and $S_2 \stackrel{\mathfrak{I}}{=} F_1^+(h_t) + G^+(h_t/2, h_t)$. \square

The last lemma of this section tells that with large probability, the diffusion X leaves every h_t -valley $[\tilde{L}_j^-, \tilde{L}_j]$, $1 \leq j \leq n_t$ from its right. Recall that B^j is defined after (3.19).

Lemma 6.5. *For large t , there exists $c_- > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\bigcap_{j=1}^{n_t} \left\{ \max_{u < \tilde{L}_j^-} \mathcal{L}_{B^j}[\tau^{B^j}(A^j(\tilde{L}_j)), A^j(u)] = 0 \right\} \right] \geq 1 - e^{-(c_-)h_t}. \quad (6.6)$$

Proof: (6.6) is essentially Lemma 3.2 in [Androletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#):

Indeed, recall the definition of $\mathcal{A}_j := \{\max_{u < \tilde{L}_j^-} \mathcal{L}_{B^j}[\tau^{B^j}(A^j(\tilde{L}_j)), A^j(u)] = 0\}$, we have $\bigcap_{j=1}^{n_t} \mathcal{A}_j = \bigcap_{j=1}^{n_t} \{H_j(\tilde{L}_j) < \{H_j(\tilde{L}_j^-)\}\}$, with, for any $\tilde{L}_j^- \leq x \leq \tilde{L}_j$, $H_j(x) = \inf\{s > 0, B_j(s) = x\}$, with B_j a Brownian motion. Therefore $\mathbb{P}^{W_\kappa}(\mathcal{A}_j)$ is equal to the probability $\mathbb{P}^{W_\kappa}(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_j)$ of Lemma 3.2 in [Androletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#). It is proved in this lemma see (3.10) that for large t , $P(\mathcal{B} := \{\mathbb{P}^{W_\kappa}(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_j) \leq e^{-(\kappa/2)h_t}\}) \geq 1 - 3e^{-\kappa\delta h_t}$, so we obtain (6.6) as $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_j) \leq E(\mathbb{P}^{W_\kappa}(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_j)\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}}) + P(\tilde{\mathcal{B}}) \leq e^{-c_-h_t}/n_t$, for $c_- > 0$ small enough. \square

6.2. *Some estimates on the potential W_κ and its functionals.*

We start this section with the Laplace transform of the important functional \mathcal{R}_κ :

Lemma 6.6. *For any $\gamma > 0$,*

$$E(e^{-\gamma\mathcal{R}_\kappa}) = \left(\frac{(2\gamma)^{\kappa/2}}{\kappa\Gamma(\kappa)I_\kappa(2\sqrt{2\gamma})} \right)^2 \quad \gamma > 0. \quad (6.7)$$

Proof: $\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-W_\kappa^\uparrow(u)} du$ is the limit in law under P of $\int_0^{\tau^{W_\kappa^\uparrow}(x)} e^{-W_\kappa^\uparrow(u)} du$ as $x \rightarrow +\infty$. This limit is given by ([Androletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#), Lemma 4.2), which proves (6.7). Note that in ([Androletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#), Lemma 4.2), W_κ^\uparrow is denoted by R , and $\int_0^{\tau^{W_\kappa^\uparrow}(x)} e^{-W_\kappa^\uparrow(u)} du$ is denoted respectively by $F^-(x)$. Moreover the Laplace transform of \mathcal{R}_κ is of class C^∞ on a neighborhood of 0 since $x \mapsto x^\kappa/I_\kappa(x)$ is C^∞ on such a neighborhood (see e.g. [Borodin and Salminen \(2002\)](#) p. 638). \square

The following Lemma is a series of estimates concerning the different coordinates of valleys.

Lemma 6.7. *For t large enough, for every $1 \leq i \leq n_t$,*

$$P(0 < M_0 < m_1) \leq C_+ h_t e^{-\kappa h_t}, \quad (6.8)$$

$$P(\tilde{\tau}_{i+1}^*(h_t) \neq \tilde{\tau}_{i+1}(h_t)) \leq C_+ h_t e^{-\kappa h_t}, \quad (6.9)$$

$$P\left(\inf_{[\tilde{\tau}_i^-(h_t^+), \tilde{\tau}_i^-(h_t)]} \tilde{V}^{(i)} < h_t/2\right) \leq e^{-\kappa h_t/8}, \quad (6.10)$$

$$P(\tilde{L}_i^+ - \tilde{L}_i^- \geq 40h_t^+/\kappa) \leq e^{-\kappa h_t/8}, \quad (6.11)$$

$$P(\tilde{\tau}_i(h) - \tilde{m}_i \geq 8h/\kappa) \leq C_+ e^{-\kappa h/(2\sqrt{2})}, \quad 0 \leq h \leq h_t, \quad (6.12)$$

$$P(\tilde{m}_1 \leq r) \leq e^r \exp\left((\kappa/2 - \sqrt{2 + \kappa^2/4})h_t^+\right) = o(1), \quad \forall r = o(h_t^+). \quad (6.13)$$

Proof: (6.8) follows from eq. (2.8) of [Androletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#); (6.9) is eq. (3.41) of [Androletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#). (6.10) and (6.11) are respectively eq. (2.34) and (2.32) of Lemma 2.7 of [Androletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#). Moreover,

(6.12) is eq. (2.22) of the same reference. For (6.13), we know from definitions in (2.3) that $\tilde{m}_1 \geq \tilde{L}_1^\sharp = \tau^{W_\kappa}(-h_t^+)$, where $\tau^{W_\kappa}(-h_t^+)$ is the first positive time the drifted Brownian motion W_κ reaches $-h_t$. Using a Markov inequality together with (2.0.1) page 295 of [Borodin and Salminen \(2002\)](#) we obtain $P(\tau^{W_\kappa}(-h_t^+) \leq r) = P(e^{-\tau^{W_\kappa}(-h_t^+)} \geq e^{-r}) \leq e^r e^{(\kappa/2 - \sqrt{2+\kappa^2/4})h_t^+}$, which is exactly (6.13). \square

The lemma below deals with two functionals involving coordinates far from the bottom \tilde{m}_1 of the first visited h_t -valley $[\tilde{L}_1^-, \tilde{L}_1]$.

Lemma 6.8. *There exists $c_- > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and t large enough,*

$$P\left(\int_{\tilde{\tau}_1(h_t/2)}^{\tilde{L}_1} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(1)}(x)} dx \leq C_+ h_t^2 e^{-(1-\varepsilon)h_t/2}\right) \geq 1 - e^{-(c_-)\varepsilon h_t},$$

$$P\left(\int_{\tilde{L}_1^-}^{\tilde{\tau}_1^-(h_t/2)} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(1)}(x)} dx \leq C_+ h_t^2 e^{-(1-\varepsilon)h_t/2}\right) \geq 1 - e^{-(c_-)\varepsilon h_t}.$$

Proof: The proof is inspired from steps 1 and 2 of Lemma 4.7 of [Andreoletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#). For the first integral, let

$$\mathcal{A}_1 := \{\inf_{[\tilde{\tau}_1(h_t/2), \tilde{\tau}_1(h_t)]} \tilde{V}^{(1)} > (1-\varepsilon)h_t/2\}, \quad \mathcal{A}_2 := \{\tilde{L}_1^+ - \tilde{L}_1^- \leq 40h_t^+/\kappa\}.$$

We have on $\mathcal{A}_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_2$,

$$\int_{\tilde{\tau}_1(h_t/2)}^{\tilde{L}_1} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(1)}(u)} du \leq e^{-(1-\varepsilon)h_t/2} [\tilde{L}_1 - \tilde{\tau}_1(h_t/2)] \leq \frac{40h_t^+ h_t}{\kappa} e^{-(1-\varepsilon)h_t/2}. \quad (6.14)$$

Now, Fact 2.1, equation (7.3) with $\alpha = 1/2$, $\gamma = (1-\varepsilon)/2$ and $\omega = 1$, and Lemma 2.2 give

$$P(\overline{\mathcal{A}}_1) \leq P[\inf_{[\tau_1(h_t/2), \tau_1(h_t)]} V^{(1)} \leq (1-\varepsilon)h_t/2, \mathcal{V}_t] + P(\overline{\mathcal{V}}_t) \leq 3e^{-\kappa\varepsilon h_t/2}.$$

Moreover, $P(\overline{\mathcal{A}}_2) \leq e^{-\kappa h_t/8} \leq e^{-\kappa\varepsilon h_t/2}$ by (6.11) since we can take $\varepsilon < 1/4$. The second inequality, can be proved similarly. \square

Lemma 6.9. *Recall that for $h > 0$, $\beta_0(h) := E\left(\int_0^{\tau_1^*(h)} e^{W_\kappa(u)} du\right)$, with $\tau_1^*(h) := \inf\{u \geq 0, W_\kappa(u) - \inf_{[0,u]} W_\kappa \geq h\}$. For large h ,*

$$\beta_0(h) \leq C_+ e^{(1-\kappa)h}. \quad (6.15)$$

Proof: (6.15) is ([Andreoletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#), eq. (3.38)), since in [Andreoletti and Devulder \(2015\)](#), $\beta_0(h)$ is defined at the top of page 23 and $\tau_1^*(h)$ in its Lemma 3.6. \square

7. Appendix

7.1. *Some estimates for Brownian motion, Bessel processes, W_κ^\uparrow and their functionals.* We provide in this section some known formulas for some processes that appear in our study. The first lemma is about Laplace transforms of the exponential functionals defined in (1.7) and (1.8). Its proof can be found in (Androletti and Devulder (2015), Lemma 4.2). Recall that C_+ (respectively c_-) is a positive constant that is as large (resp. small) as needed.

Lemma 7.1. *There exist $C_9 > 0$, $M > 0$ and $\eta_1 \in (0, 1)$ such that $\forall y > M, \forall \gamma \in (0, \eta_1]$,*

$$\left| E \left(e^{-\gamma F^+(y)/e^y} \right) - [1 - 2\gamma/(\kappa + 1)] \right| \leq C_9 \max(e^{-\kappa y}, \gamma^{3/2}), \quad (7.1)$$

$$\left| E \left(e^{-\gamma G^+(y/2, y)/e^y} \right) - [1 - \Gamma(1 - \kappa)(2\gamma)^\kappa / \Gamma(1 + \kappa)] \right| \leq C_9 \max(\gamma^\kappa e^{-\kappa y/2}, \gamma). \quad (7.2)$$

Moreover, there exists $C_{10} > 0$ such that for all $y > 0$, $E(F^+(y)/e^y) \leq C_{10}$.

Recall that W_κ^\uparrow is a $(-\kappa/2)$ -drifted Brownian motion W_κ Doob-conditioned to stay positive (see above (1.7)). We have,

Lemma 7.2. *Let $0 < \gamma < \alpha < \omega$. For all h large enough, we have*

$$P^{\alpha h} \left(\tau^{W_\kappa^\uparrow}(\gamma h) < \tau^{W_\kappa^\uparrow}(\omega h) \right) \leq 2e^{-\kappa(\alpha - \gamma)h}, \quad (7.3)$$

$$P \left(\tau^{W_\kappa^\uparrow}(\omega h) - \tau^{W_\kappa^\uparrow}(\alpha h) \leq 1 \right) \leq 4e^{-[(\omega - \alpha)h]^2/3}, \quad (7.4)$$

$$P(\tau^{W_\kappa^\uparrow}(h) > 8h/\kappa) \leq C_+ e^{-\kappa h/(2\sqrt{2})}, \quad (7.5)$$

$$P(\tau^{W_\kappa^\uparrow}(h) \leq h) \leq C_+ e^{-(c_-)h}, \quad (7.6)$$

$$P(\tau^{W_\kappa^\uparrow}(\gamma h) \leq 1) \leq C_+ e^{-(c_-)[\gamma h]^2}, \quad (7.7)$$

where $P^{\alpha h}$ denotes the law of W_κ^\uparrow starting from αh . Moreover the first inequality is still true if ω is a function of h such that $\lim_{h \rightarrow +\infty} \omega(h) = +\infty$.

Proof: The first 3 inequalities come from (Androletti and Devulder (2015), Lemma 2.6). The fact that, in (7.3), ω can actually be taken as a function of h comes directly from eq. (2.31) of Androletti and Devulder (2015). (7.7) is a consequence of (7.4) with $\omega = \gamma$ and $\alpha = \gamma/2$. We turn to (7.6). By (Androletti and Devulder (2015), eq. (2.7) and Fact 2.1, coming from Faggionato (2009)), $E(e^{-\alpha \tau^{W_\kappa^\uparrow}(h)}) \sim_{h \rightarrow +\infty} \text{const.} e^{h(\kappa/2 - \sqrt{2\alpha + \kappa^2/4})}$, in particular for $\alpha = 1 - \kappa$. Then a Markov inequality for $P(e^{-\alpha \tau^{W_\kappa^\uparrow}(h)} > e^{-\alpha h})$ proves (7.6) since $1 - \kappa/2 - \sqrt{2(1 - \kappa) + \kappa^2/4} < 0$. \square

We also need the following lemma, focusing only on some exponential functionals.

Lemma 7.3. *Recall that F^\pm and G^+ are defined in (1.7) and (1.8). For all $0 < \zeta \leq 1$ and $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, for h large enough,*

$$P\left[e^{(1-\varepsilon)\zeta h} \leq F^+(\zeta h) \leq e^{(1+\varepsilon)\zeta h}\right] \geq 1 - 4e^{-\kappa\varepsilon\zeta h/2}, \quad (7.8)$$

$$P[F^-(h) \geq e^{-\varepsilon h}] \geq 1 - e^{-(c_-)\varepsilon^2 h^2}, \quad (7.9)$$

$$P[G^+(\alpha h, h) \leq b(h)e^h] \geq 1 - C_+[b(h)]^{-\kappa}, \quad 0 < \alpha < 1, b(h) > 0. \quad (7.10)$$

Proof: By Markov inequality and the last line of Lemma 7.1, $P[F^+(\zeta h) > e^{(1+\varepsilon)\zeta h}] \leq C_{10}e^{-\varepsilon\zeta h} \leq e^{-\kappa\varepsilon\zeta h/2}$ for large h . For the lower bound, we have by (Andreoletti and Devulder (2015), eq. (2.29)) for large h ,

$$P[F^+(\zeta h) \geq e^{(1-\varepsilon)\zeta h}] \geq 1 - 3e^{-\kappa\varepsilon\zeta h/2}.$$

These two inequalities prove (7.8). For (7.9), first $F^-(h) \geq e^{-\varepsilon h} \tau W_\kappa^\uparrow(\varepsilon h)$, and using (7.7), $\tau W_\kappa^\uparrow(\varepsilon h) \geq 1$ with a probability larger than $1 - e^{-(c_-)\varepsilon^2 h^2}$, which proves (7.9). Finally, notice that in law $G^+(\alpha h, h) \leq e^h \int_0^{+\infty} e^{W_\kappa(x)} dx = e^h A_\infty$. By Dufresne (2000), $2/A_\infty$ is a gamma variable of parameter $(\kappa, 1)$, and so has a density equal to $e^{-x} x^{\kappa-1} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x)/\Gamma(\kappa)$, which leads to (7.10). \square

The following lemma is exactly Lemma 4.3 in Andreoletti and Devulder (2015) which proof can be found in that paper.

Lemma 7.4. *Let $(B(s), s \in \mathbb{R})$ be a standard two-sided Brownian motion. For every $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, $0 < \delta < 1$ and $x > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{u \in [-\delta, \delta]} |\mathcal{L}_B(\tau^B(1), u) - \mathcal{L}_B(\tau^B(1), 0)| > \varepsilon \mathcal{L}_B(\tau^B(1), 0)\right) \leq C_+ \frac{\delta^{1/6}}{\varepsilon^{2/5}}, \quad (7.11)$$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{u \in [0, 1]} \mathcal{L}_B(\tau^B(1), u) \geq x\right) \leq 4e^{-x/2}, \quad (7.12)$$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{u \leq 0} \mathcal{L}_B(\tau^B(1), u) \geq x\right) \leq 4/x. \quad (7.13)$$

The next lemma says that with large probability, a 2-dimensional squared Bessel Process is bounded by some deterministic function. This lemma may be of independent interest.

Lemma 7.5. *Let $(Q_2(u), u \geq 0)$ be a Bessel process of dimension 2, starting from 0, and two functions $a(\cdot)$ and $k(\cdot)$ from $(0, +\infty)$ to $(0, +\infty)$, having limit $+\infty$ on $+\infty$. We have for large t ,*

$$P\left(\forall u \in (0, k(t)), Q_2^2(u) \leq 2e[a(t) + 4 \log \log[ek(t)/u]]u\right) \geq 1 - C_+ \exp[-a(t)/2].$$

Proof: We consider for $t > 0$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathcal{A}_{1,i} := \left\{ \sup_{[k(t)/e^{i+1}, k(t)/e^i]} Q_2^2 \leq 2 \frac{k(t)}{e^i} [a(t) + 4 \log(i+1)] \right\}, \quad \mathcal{A}_2 := \bigcap_{i=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}_{1,i}.$$

We recall that there exist two standard independent Brownian motions $(B_1(u), u \geq 0)$ and $(B_2(u), u \geq 0)$ such that $(Q_2^2(u), u \geq 0)$ is equal in law to $(B_1^2(u) + B_2^2(u), u \geq 0)$. So for $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} P(\overline{\mathcal{A}}_{1,i}) &\leq 2P(\sup_{[k(t)/e^{i+1}, k(t)/e^i]} B_1^2 > k(t)e^{-i}[a(t) + 4\log(i+1)]) \\ &\leq 4P\left(\sup_{[0, k(t)/e^i]} B_1 > \sqrt{k(t)e^{-i}[a(t) + 4\log(i+1)]}\right) \\ &= 4P\left(|B_1(1)| > \sqrt{a(t) + 4\log(i+1)}\right) \\ &\leq 8\exp[-a(t)/2 - 2\log(i+1)] \end{aligned}$$

for large t so that $a(t) \geq 1$, by scaling, and since $B_1 \stackrel{\mathfrak{L}}{=} -B_1$, $\sup_{[0,1]} B_1 \stackrel{\mathfrak{L}}{=} |B_1(1)|$ and $P(B_1(1) \geq x) \leq e^{-x^2/2}$ for $x \geq 1$. Consequently for large t ,

$$P(\overline{\mathcal{A}}_2) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} P(\overline{\mathcal{A}}_{1,i}) \leq 8\exp[-a(t)/2] \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(i+1)^2} = C_+ \exp[-a(t)/2]. \quad (7.14)$$

Now, let $0 < u \leq k(t)$. There exists $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k(t)/e^{i+1} < u \leq k(t)/e^i$. We have, $e^i \leq k(t)/u$, so $e^{i+1} \leq ek(t)/u$ and then $\log(i+1) \leq \log \log[ek(t)/u]$. Consequently on \mathcal{A}_2 ,

$$Q_2^2(u) \leq 2(k(t)/e^i)[a(t) + 4\log(i+1)] \leq 2eu[a(t) + 4\log \log[ek(t)/u]].$$

This, combined with (7.14), proves the lemma. \square

We also need some estimates on the local time of B at a given coordinate $y \in \mathbb{R}$ at the inverse of the local time of B at 0. Recall that $\sigma_B(r, y) = \inf\{s > 0, \mathcal{L}_B(s, y) > r\}$ for $r > 0, y \in \mathbb{R}$. By the second Ray-Knight Theorem, the processes $(\mathcal{L}_B(\sigma_B(r, 0), y), y \in \mathbb{R}_+)$ and $(\mathcal{L}_B(\sigma_B(r, 0), -y), y \in \mathbb{R}_+)$ are two independent squared Bessel processes of dimension 0 starting at r . The following lemma is proved in (Talet (2007), Lemma 3.1; the results are stated for a Bessel process but are actually true for a *squared* Bessel process; see also Diel (2011), Lemma 2.3).

Lemma 7.6. *We denote by $(Q_0(y), y \geq 0)$ the square of a 0-dimensional Bessel process starting at 1. Let $M > 0, u > 0$ and $v > 0$. Then,*

$$P\left(\sup_{0 \leq y \leq v} |Q_0(y) - 1| \geq u\right) \leq 4 \frac{\sqrt{(1+u)v}}{u} \exp[-u^2/(8(1+u)v)], \quad (7.15)$$

$$P\left(\sup_{y \geq 0} Q_0(y) \geq M\right) = 1/M. \quad (7.16)$$

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to an anonymous referee for his or her very careful reading of the paper, and for comments that helped us improve the clarity and the presentation of the paper.

References

- O. Adelman and N. Enriquez. Random walks in random environment: What a single trajectory tells. *Israel J. Math.* **142**, 205–220 (2004).
- P. Andreoletti. On the estimation of the potential of Sinai’s rwre. *Braz. J. Probab. Stat.* **25**, 121–235 (2011).
- P. Andreoletti and A. Devulder. Localization and number of visited valleys for a transient diffusion in random environment. *Electronic Journal of Probability* **20**, 1–58 (2015).
- P. Andreoletti and R. Diel. Limit law of the local time for Brox’s diffusion. *J. Theoretical Probab.* **24**, 634–656 (2011).
- P. Andreoletti and R. Diel. DNA unzipping via stopped birth and death processes with random probability transition. *Appl. Math. Res. Express* **2012**, 184–208 (2012).
- P. Andreoletti, D. Loukianova and C. Matias. Hidden Markov model for parameter estimation of a random walk in a Markov environment. *To appear in ESAIM : Proba. Stat., 29 pages* (2016).
- J. Bertoin. *Lévy Processes*. Tracts in Mathematics, Cambridge (1950).
- P. Billingsley. *Convergence of Probability Measures*. John Wiley Sons, INC (1999).
- A. Borodin and P. Salminen. *Handbook of Brownian Motion-Facts and Formulae*. Birkhäuser (2002). Second Edition, [MR1912205](#).
- A. Bovier. Extremes, sums, Lévy processes, and ageing. *Lecture* (2010). https://wt.iam.uni-bonn.de/fileadmin/WT/Inhalt/people/Anton_Bovier/lecture-notes/levy.pdf.
- T. Brox. A one-dimensional diffusion process in a Wiener medium. *Ann. Probab.* **14** (4), 1206–1218 (1986).
- D. Cheliotis. Localization of favorite points for diffusion in a random environment. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **118** (7), 1159–1189 (2008). [MR2428713](#).
- F. Comets, M. Falconnet, O. Loukianov and D. Loukianova. Maximum likelihood estimator consistency for recurrent random walk in a parametric random environment with finite support. *preprint, arxiv 1404.2551* (2014a).
- F. Comets, M. Falconnet, O. Loukianov, D. Loukianova and C. Matias. Maximum likelihood estimator consistency for ballistic random walk in a parametric random environment. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* **124** (1), 268–288 (2014b).
- A. Dembo, N. Gantert, Y. Peres and Z. Shi. Valleys and the maximal local time for random walk in random environment. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **137**, 443–473 (2007).
- A. Devulder. The maximum of the local time of a diffusion in a drifted Brownian potential. *To appear in Séminaire de Probabilités, 52 pages* (2016).
- R. Diel. Almost sure asymptotics for the local time of a diffusion in Brownian environment. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* **121**, 2303–2330 (2011).
- D. Dufresne. Laguerre series for asian and other options. *Math. Finance* **10** (1), 407–428 (2000).
- N. Enriquez, C. Sabot and O. Zindy. Aging and quenched localization for one dimensional random walks in random environment in the sub-ballistic regime. *Bulletin de la Société Mathématique de France* **137**, 423–452 (2009a).
- N. Enriquez, C. Sabot and O. Zindy. A probabilistic representation of constants in Kesten’s renewal theorem. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **144**, 581–613 (2009b).

- A. Faggionato. The alternating marked point process of h -slopes of drifted Brownian motion. *Stochastic Processes Appl.* **119** (6), 1765–1791 (2009).
- M. Falconnet, D. Loukianova and C. Matias. Asymptotic normality and efficiency of the maximum likelihood estimator for the parameter of a ballistic random walk in a random environment. *Mathematical Methods of Statistics* **23** (1), 1–19 (2014).
- W. Feller. *An Introduction to Probability Theory, Vol. 2*. Wiley, New York, NY (1971). Third edition. [MR0270403](#).
- N. Gantert, Y. Peres and Z. Shi. The infinite valley for a recurrent random walk in random environment. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré* **46**, 525–536 (2010). [MR2667708](#).
- N. Gantert and Z. Shi. Many visits to a single site by a transient random walk in random environment. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* **99**, 159–176 (2002).
- Y. Hu, Z. Shi and M. Yor. Rates of convergence for one-dimensional diffusion in a drifted Brownian potential. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **351**, 3915–3934 (1999). [MR1637078](#).
- K. Kawazu and H. Tanaka. A diffusion process in a Brownian environment with drift. *J. Math. Soc. Japan* **49**, 189–211 (1997).
- H. Kesten, M.V. Kozlov and F. Spitzer. A limit law for random walk in a random environment. *Comp. Math.* **30**, 145–168 (1975).
- J. Neveu and J. Pitman. Renewal property of the extrema and tree property of the excursion of a one-dimensional Brownian motion. séminaire de probabilités xxiii. *Séminaire de Probabilités XXIII, Lecture Notes Math.* **1372**, 239–247 (1989). Springer, Berlin, [MR1022914](#).
- S. I. Resnick. Point processes, regular variation and weak convergence. *Advances in Applied Probability* **18**, 66–138 (1986).
- D. Revuz and M. Yor. *Continuous martingales and Brownian motion*. Springer, Berlin (1999). Third edition. [MR1725357](#).
- S. Schumacher. Diffusions with random coefficients. *Contemp. Math.* **41**, 351–356 (1985). [MR0814724](#).
- Z. Shi. A local time curiosity in random environment. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* **76** (2), 231–250 (1998).
- D. V. Silverstrov. Convergence in Skorohod topology for compositions of stochastic processes. *Skorohods Ideas in Probability Theory* **27** (2), 298–306 (2000).
- A. Singh. Rates of convergence of a transient diffusion in a spectrally negative Lévy potential. *Ann. Probab.* **36** (3), 279–318 (2008). [MR2370605](#).
- M. Talet. Annealed tail estimates for a Brownian motion in a drifted Brownian potential. *Ann. Probab.* **35**, 32–67 (2007). [MR2303943](#).
- H. Tanaka. Limit theorem for a Brownian motion with drift in a white noise environment. *Chaos Solitons Fractals* **11**, 1807–1816 (1997). [MR1477261](#).
- G. Véchambre. Path decomposition of spectrally negative lévy processes, and application to the local time of a diffusion in these environments (2016+).
- W. Whitt. *Stochastic-Process Limits: An Introduction to Stochastic-Process Limits and Their Application to Queues*. Springer (1989).
- O. Zeitouni. Lectures notes on random walks in random environment. *St Flour Summer School* pages 189–312 (2001). [MR2071631](#).