THE EYRING-KRAMERS LAW FOR EXTINCTION TIME OF CONTACT PROCESS ON STARS

YOUNGHUN JO

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we derive a precise estimate of the mean of the extinction time of the contact process on star graphs with a fixed infection rate. Specifically, we obtain not only the exponential main factor but also the sharp sub-exponential prefactor of the mean extinction time. To that end, we first provide an accurate estimation of the quasi-stationary distribution on non-extinction of the contact process, utilizing special function theory and quantitative Laplace's method. Subsequently, we employ the recently developed potential theoretic approach to metastability of non-reversible Markov processes, enabling us to deduce these results.

1. INTRODUCTION

The contact process is a class of interacting particle systems introduced by Harris [15] in 1974, which models the spread of an infection in a population. It is also referred to as the susceptible-infected-susceptible (SIS) model by mathematical epidemiologists. In a contact process on a graph G, infected sites recover with rate 1, and transmit the infection to each adjacent site with rate λ . For a comprehensive introduction to the contact process, we refer the reader to [19, Part I] and references therein.

A critical feature of the contact process on finite graphs is that the infection eventually ceases almost surely. This extinction of infection occurs when all vertices are healthy at some point in time, a state maintained forever once reached. Consequently, on finite graphs, the study focuses on estimating the hitting time τ_G of this all-healthy state, termed the *extinction time*. The initial configuration typically considered is the all-infected state. The rate λ influences the extinction time; higher rates lead to prolonged durations before the process reaches the healthy state, due to more frequent transmission of the infection by each infected node. Accordingly, characterizing the quantitative relation between the extinction time τ_G and rate λ is the main agenda in the study of the contact process.

For large enough λ , the infection may persist for an exceedingly long period. To be more precise, consider a family of finite graphs $(G_N)_{N\geq 1}$ with increasing size and fixed $\lambda > 0$. Then, for sufficiently large λ , the extinction time possesses an exponential growth, that is, there exists $c_{\lambda} > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}[\tau_{G_N} \ge \exp(c_\lambda |G_N|)] \xrightarrow{N \to \infty} 1,$$

where for any graph G we denote its number of vertices by |G|. This behavior has been demonstrated across various types of graphs, including boxes of \mathbb{Z}^d [7, 31, 10, 11, 12, 21, 22], general finite graphs [24, 29], and random graphs [9, 23, 20, 30].

The exponential growth of the extinction time can be interpreted as an instance of metastability, a widespread phenomenon characterized by prolonged persistence in transient states within stochastic systems. Metastability often indicates a system undergoing a first-order phase transition, where the transition times between metastable states grows exponentially as $N \to \infty$, where N stands for the

²⁰²⁰ Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 60J28; Secondary 60K35 82C22.

YOUNGHUN JO

system size or resolution. This behavior is prevalent across a wide class of models, including condensing interacting particle systems, low-temperature spin systems, and stochastic partial differential equations. We refer to the monographs [6, 25] for a detailed discussion on recent developments on this topic.

The metastable dynamics of the contact process has been extensively analyzed for a large class of graphs. Mountford, Mourrat, Valesin, and Yao [24] proved that if $\lambda > \lambda_c(\mathbb{Z})$, there exists $c_{\lambda} > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}\tau_{G_N} \ge \exp(c_\lambda |G_N|)$$

for connected graphs G_N of uniformly bounded degree, where $\lambda_c(\mathbb{Z})$ denotes [19] the critical infection rate for the phase transition of the contact process on \mathbb{Z} , defined as the infimum rate at which an infection started from a single node survives forever almost surely. Schapira and Valesin [29] dropped the bounded degree condition and established a slightly weaker result. If we shift our focus to more concrete families, something more is known. A series of works [7, 31, 11, 21, 22] showed that if λ is sufficiently large, then there exists a sharp exponent for the extinction time on boxes of \mathbb{Z}^d , that is, there exists $c_{\lambda} > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{|B_N|} \log \tau_{B_N} \xrightarrow{N \to \infty} c_\lambda \text{ in probability,}$$
(1.1)

where B_N is a box of \mathbb{Z}^d with side length N. Schapira and Valesin [30] proved the analogous result for a variety of random graph models. It is worth pointing out that the restriction that λ sufficiently large is essential: for certain graphs, including boxes of \mathbb{Z}^d [10], the extinction time grows logarithmically in the number of vertices for sufficiently small λ . We also mention that the logarithmic estimate (1.1) is hard to obtain unless we are able to exploit a specific geometric feature of the underlying graph. For instance, when we consider the periodic lattice \mathbb{Z}_N^d , instead of the open boundary condition, the logarithmic estimate of the form (1.1) is not available.

We next turn our concern to the precise asymptotics of the extinction time $\mathbb{E}\tau_G$, instead of the logarithmic estimate. For a process possessing metastable behavior, a sharp asymptotic formula for the mean hitting time $\mathbb{E}\tau$ from one metastable set to another is often referred to as the Eyring–Kramers law [13, 17]. The Eyring–Kramers law for the extinction time of the contact process is known to be a very difficult problem, and is known only for complete graph thanks to its simple geometric structure. As a complete graph has very strong spatial symmetry, we can reduce the contact process on complete graph down to a one-dimensional nearest neighbor random walk, on which we can readily compute explicit hitting times. Yet, even a little bit of asymmetry of the underlying graph (e.g., one-dimensional cycle \mathbb{Z}_N) introduce significant complicatedness into the contact process, complicating quantitative analysis.

Historically, studies of the extinction time often employed coarse methodologies such as percolation theory and coupling methods, which have yet to yield sharp estimates due to their reliance on less precise formulas for the mean extinction time. Meanwhile, a significant advancement in metastability theory for proving the Eyring–Kramers law was achieved in the impressive works of Bovier, Eckhoff, Gayrard, and Klein [4, 5]. They developed a precise framework for quantifying key metastability metrics like transition time and hitting probability using potential theoretic terms such as equilibrium potential and capacity. As a result, they were able to develop a robust methodology for analyzing metastable behavior of reversible dynamics, now known as the potential theoretic approach. This framework has been extended to nonreversible settings very recently in [14, 18, 32, 34]. We refer to [6, 33] for a detailed description on this scheme.



FIGURE 1. Two modes of the contact process on a star, contingent on the status of the hub.

The main focus of this article is contact process on star graphs. We refer to Figure 1 for examples of configurations of the contact process on a star. A star graph, characterized by a central node connected directly to all other nodes, is a graph with one discernible asymmetry and serves as a natural model for studying epidemic hubs. The contact process on stars was initially investigated by Pemantle [28] within his study on contact process on trees. Recently, Durrett and Huang [16] provided upper and lower bounds for the exponent of the extinction time. More recently, Wang [35] observed from the perspective of large deviation theory that the explicit exponent of the mean extinction time must equal

$$c_{\lambda} = 2\log(1+\lambda) - \log(1+2\lambda)$$

so that the mean extinction time is $e^{c_{\lambda}N}$ up to a subexponential prefactor on a star with N leaves. The significance of stars in contact process studies stems from their role as building blocks or long-time infection reservoirs within larger graph structures. This theme appears in studies involving a varity of underlying graph types, especially random graph models, including preferential attachment models [3], power law random graphs [9, 23], Galton–Watson trees [16], and random hyperbolic graphs [20].

In this study, we establish the Eyring–Kramers law for the extinction time of the contact process on star graphs through the innovative application of the potential theoretic approach for non-reversible systems. This marks the first nontrivial example of sharp estimates for the mean extinction time and the inaugural application of potential theoretic principles to the study of the contact process. The main result is stated in Theorem 2.1.

Let us make some remarks on our proof methodology now. One obstacle in application of potential theory is that potential theory traditionally requires the dynamics to be irreducible while the contact process is not. We bypass this through a novel use of quasi-stationary distribution, allowing the potential theoretic framework to be applied to systems with absorbing states. We employ techniques such as special function theory and refined Laplace's method to compute the precise estimate of the quasi-stationary distribution. Additionally, the non-reversibility of the contact process poses substantial difficulty in applying the potential theoretic framework, which we overcome using recent developments in the analysis of non-reversible dynamics based on the flow structure.

2. Model and Main Result

Throughout this article, we set a fixed value $\lambda > 0$. Let G = (V, E) be an undirected simple graph of bounded degree, and write $x \sim y$ when vertices x and y are adjacent. The contact process on G with infection rate λ is a continuous time Markov process $(\eta_t)_{t\geq 0}$ on $\{0,1\}^V$. When identifying η_t with the subset $\{x \in V : \eta_t(x) = 1\}$ of V, the transition rate of the process is described by

$$\begin{cases} \eta_t \to \eta_t \setminus \{x\} \text{ for each } x \in \eta_t \text{ with rate } 1, \\ \eta_t \to \eta_t \cup \{x\} \text{ for each } x \notin \eta_t \text{ with rate } \lambda \cdot |\{y \in \eta_t : x \sim y\}|, \end{cases}$$

where |A| is the cardinality of a set A. At time t, we say that a vertex x is healthy if $\eta_t(x) = 0$, and infected if $\eta_t(x) = 1$. Note that the all-healthy state $\eta_t \equiv 0$ is an absorbing state of the process.

Let S_N be the star graph with a hub and N leaves. Since all N leaves are homogeneous, the contact process on a star can be faithfully described by a new Markov process $(o_t, n_t)_{t\geq 0}$ on $\{0, 1\} \times [0, N]$ where o_t is the status of the hub, healthy or infected, and n_t is the number of infected leaves.¹ This process, in essence, behaves as a continuous time random walk on a ladder graph, whose transition rates defined as:

$$\begin{cases} (1,n) \to (1,n+1) & \text{with rate } \lambda(N-n) \\ (1,n) \to (1,n-1) & \text{with rate } n, \\ (1,n) \to (0,n) & \text{with rate } 1, \\ (0,n) \to (0,n-1) & \text{with rate } n, \\ (0,n) \to (1,n) & \text{with rate } \lambda n. \end{cases}$$

The dynamics of this process is significantly influenced by the status of the hub. Specifically, when the hub is healthy ($o_t = 0$), the number of infected leaves cannot increase until the hub becomes reinfected. This dependency introduces a critical asymmetry affecting the overall behavior of the infection spread within the graph. We refer to Figure 2 for an illustration.

Our main result is the Eyring–Kramers law for the extinction time of the contact process on stars.

Theorem 2.1 (Eyring–Kramers law). Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. Then, for $x \in \{0,1\} \times [\varepsilon N,N]$, we have²

$$\mathbb{E}_{x}\tau_{(0,0)} = \kappa_{\lambda} N^{-\frac{1}{1+2\lambda}} \left(\frac{(1+\lambda)^{2}}{1+2\lambda}\right)^{N} (1+o(1))$$
(2.1)

as $N \to \infty$, where the error term o(1) is uniform in x and the constant κ_{λ} can be explicitly written as

$$\kappa_{\lambda} = \left(\frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{2}{1+2\lambda}} \Gamma\left(\frac{2(1+\lambda)}{1+2\lambda}\right)$$

Here, $\Gamma(a)$ is the gamma function. In particular,

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \sup_{x \in \{0,1\} \times [\varepsilon N,N]} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{E}_x \tau_{(0,0)} = 2 \log(1+\lambda) - \log(1+2\lambda).$$
(2.2)

The exact exponent of the mean extinction time, as specified on the right-hand side of (2.2), aligns with the observation made by Wang [35].

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 3, we explore the behavior of the quasi-stationary distribution on non-extinction of the process and establish its sharp asymptotic formula as $N \to \infty$. In Section 4, we introduce the potential theoretic framework for non-reversible dynamics. Finally, in

 $|f_N(n)| \leq C|g_N(n)|$ for all $N \geq 1$ and n.

We write $f_N = o(g_N)$ or $f_N \ll g_N$ if

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \sup_{n} \frac{f_N(n)}{g_N(n)} = 0.$$

. . .

In particular, $f_N = o(1)$ if $\sup_n f_N(n) \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$. We write $f_N \simeq g_N$ if $f_N = g_N(1 + o(1))$.

¹In this article, we let [a, b] stand for the intersection of the closed interval [a, b] with \mathbb{Z} where $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$.

²Let $(f_N)_{N\geq 1} = (f_N(n))_{N\geq 1}$ and $(g_N)_{N\geq 1} = (g_N(n))_{N\geq 1}$ be collections of real functions in n. We write $f_N = O(g_N)$, $g_N = \Omega(f_N)$, or $f_N \leq g_N$ if there exists some C > 0 such that



FIGURE 2. The transition rates for the contact process on a star.

Section 5, we prove our main theorem by representing the mean extinction time in terms of capacity and equilibrium potential, and by estimating the capacity using variational principles.

3. Energy Landscape

We begin by examining the quasi-stationary distribution of the contact process on a star graph S_N with fixed infection rate $\lambda > 0$. In Subsection 3.1, we interpret the quasi-stationary distribution as the stationary distribution of a modified process, and establish its representation in an explicit form. In Subsection 3.2, we obtain the sharp asymptotic behavior of the quasi-stationary distribution, using techniques such as special function theory and refined Laplace's method. Some direct consequences of the asymptotics are given in Subsection 3.3.

3.1. Quasi-stationary Distribution. Recall that a contact process is not irreducible in general, as it exhibits a unique absorbing state, the all-healthy state. Therefore, we cannot directly apply potential theory because the stationary distribution is the Dirac mass on the absorbing state. To address this, we slightly modify the process by adding supplementary transition rates from the absorbing state to other states, so that the modified process becomes irreducible. Importantly, this type of modification does not affect the extinction time.

A natural choice for these supplementary transition rates, which does not depend on the underlying graph structure, would be rates proportional to the quasi-stationary distribution of the process. In this case, the stationary distribution of the resulting process would be a convex combination of the quasi-stationary distribution and the Dirac mass on the absorbing state. Meanwhile, for the contact process on stars, due to its structural simplicity, it sufficies to introduce only a single transition rate:

$$(0,0) \rightarrow (1,0)$$
 with rate α

for $\alpha > 0$. We will refer to this modified process as the *regenerative process*. Denote the stationary distribution of the regenerative process by $\nu = \nu_{N,\lambda,\alpha}$. It will turn out that ν can actually be represented as a convex combination of the Dirac mass on the absorbing state (0,0), the states (1,0) and

(0,1), and the quasi-stationary distribution on $(\{0,1\} \times [0,N]) \setminus \{(0,0)\}$ with respect to the contact process. Note that the selection of α is not relevant in subsequent analyses as thus.

For simplicity of computation, we define a scaled measure $\mu = \mu_{N,\lambda,\alpha}$ given by $\nu = \frac{1}{Z_{N,\lambda}}\mu$ for a scaling constant $Z_{N,\lambda} = \nu(1,N)^{-1}$, setting its value at the all-infected state to be $\mu(1,N) = 1$. We write:

$$u_n = \mu(0, n), \qquad v_n = \mu(1, n)$$

for $0 \le n \le N$, indicating the quasi-stationary measures for the process when the hub is healthy and infected, respectively.

The stationary measure for modified contact process has previously been considered by Cator and Mieghem [8]. Indeed, their setting involves a different version of modification; instead of adding supplementary rates, they removed every transition into the all-healthy state and considered the trace process (cf. Subsection 4.3) restricted to the states with infected hub. The stationary distribution of such a process, denoted by $\pi_n = \pi(1, n)$, is basically a restriction of the quasi-stationary distribution of the contact process.

By examining the stationary condition, we can readily derive the following 3-term recurrence relations for the sequences $(u_n)_{0 \le n \le N}$ and $(v_n)_{0 \le n \le N}$ in a manner similar to that described in [8, Section III].

Proposition 3.1 (3-term recurrence relation for quasi-stationary distribution). Let the sequences $(u_n)_{0 \le n \le N}$ and $(v_n)_{0 \le n \le N}$ be as above. Then, for all $0 \le n \le N$, it holds that

$$v_{n} = (1 + \lambda)a_{n} - a_{n+1},$$

$$a_{n+1} = \lambda(N - n)v_{n} - (n+1)v_{n+1},$$

$$(n+1)a_{n+2} - (n+2 + \lambda(N+1))a_{n+1} + \lambda(1 + \lambda)(N - n)a_{n} = 0,$$

$$(n+2)v_{n+2} - (n+2 + \lambda N)v_{n+1} + \lambda(1 + \lambda)(N - n)v_{n} = 0,$$
(3.1)

where $u_{N+2} = u_{N+1} = v_{N+2} = v_{N+1} = 0$ and

$$a_n = \begin{cases} nu_n & \text{if } n \neq 0, \\ \frac{\alpha}{1+\lambda}u_0 & \text{if } n = 0. \end{cases}$$

By [8, Equation (12)], the recurrence relation for $(v_n)_{0 \le n \le N}$ stated in the last line of (3.1) similarly applies to the quasi-stationary distribution $(\pi_n)_{0 \le n \le N}$ with the exception at n = 0. Therefore, $(v_n)_{0 \le n \le N}$ is a constant multiple of $(\pi_n)_{0 \le n \le N}$, only except at n = 0. From now on, with slight abuse of notation, we will regard ν and μ as the quasi-stationary distribution and the quasi-stationary measure of the contact process, respectively.

In the same paper, Cator and Mieghem also established the exact solution of the recurrence relation for the quasi-stationary distribution. For the sake of completeness, we briefly reformulate their computation and result here.

Proposition 3.2. Let $(\pi_n)_{0 \le n \le N}$ be the sequence satisfying $\pi_1 = \lambda N \pi_0$, $\sum_{n=0}^N \pi_n = 1$, and $(n+2)\pi_{n+2} - (n+2+\lambda N)\pi_{n+1} + \lambda(1+\lambda)(N-n)\pi_n = 0$

for $1 \le n \le N-1$ where $\pi_{N+1} = 0$. Then, we have³

$$\pi_{n} = -\frac{b}{\lambda(1+2\lambda)} \left[\sum_{j=n}^{N-1} (-1)^{j-n} \binom{N-1}{j} \binom{j}{n} B\left(\frac{1}{1+2\lambda}, j+1\right) \left(\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}\right)^{j} \right] (1+\lambda)^{n} \\ -\frac{b}{1+2\lambda} \left[\sum_{j=n-1}^{N-1} (-1)^{j-n+1} \binom{N-1}{j} \binom{j}{n-1} B\left(\frac{1}{1+2\lambda}, j+1\right) \left(\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}\right)^{j} \right] (1+\lambda)^{n-1} \\ -\frac{c-\frac{b}{\lambda}}{1+2\lambda} \left[\sum_{j=n}^{N} (-1)^{j-n} \binom{N}{j} \binom{j}{n} B\left(\frac{1}{1+2\lambda}, j+1\right) \left(\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}\right)^{j} \right] (1+\lambda)^{n}$$
(3.2)

for $1 \leq n \leq N$, and

$$\pi_0 = -\frac{b}{\lambda(1+2\lambda)} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} (-1)^j \binom{N-1}{j} B\left(\frac{1}{1+2\lambda}, j+1\right) \left(\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}\right)^j -\frac{c-\frac{b}{\lambda}}{1+2\lambda} \sum_{j=0}^N (-1)^j \binom{N}{j} B\left(\frac{1}{1+2\lambda}, j+1\right) \left(\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}\right)^j,$$
(3.3)

where B(a,b) is a beta function. Here, $b = 2\pi_2 - \lambda N(\lambda N + 1 - \lambda)\pi_0$ and $c = -\pi_0$ and they also satisfy

$$1 = \frac{c}{1+2\lambda} \sum_{j=0}^{N} {N \choose j} B\left(\frac{1}{1+2\lambda}, j+1\right) \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{1+2\lambda}\right)^j + \frac{(1+\lambda)b}{\lambda(1+2\lambda)} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} {N-1 \choose j} B\left(\frac{1}{1+2\lambda}, j+1\right) \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{1+2\lambda}\right)^j - \frac{b}{\lambda(1+2\lambda)} \sum_{j=0}^{N} {N \choose j} B\left(\frac{1}{1+2\lambda}, j+1\right) \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{1+2\lambda}\right)^j.$$
(3.4)

Remark 3.3. The first summation in the expression (3.2) can be transformed as follows.

$$\begin{split} \sum_{j=n}^{N-1} (-1)^{j-n} \binom{N-1}{j} \binom{j}{n} B \left(\frac{1}{1+2\lambda}, j+1\right) \left(\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}\right)^j \\ &= \binom{N-1}{n} \left(\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}\right)^n \int_0^1 \sum_{l=0}^{N-n-1} (-1)^l \binom{N-n-1}{l} \left(\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}\right)^l t^{l+n} (1-t)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} dt \\ &= \binom{N-1}{n} \left(\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}\right)^n \int_0^1 t^n \left(1-\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}t\right)^{N-n-1} (1-t)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} dt \\ &= \frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda} \binom{N-1}{n} \int_0^{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} u^n (1-u)^{N-n-1} \left(1-\frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda}u\right)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} du. \end{split}$$

 $^{^{3}}$ We note that the solution presented here slightly differs from that in the original paper. By carefully following the computations line-by-line, we can verify that our solution is consistent with the recurrence relation.

By performing the similar transformation for the other two lines, we obtain an alternative integral expression for the solution:

$$\pi_{n} = -\frac{b}{\lambda^{2}} \binom{N-1}{n} (1+\lambda)^{n} \int_{0}^{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} u^{n} (1-u)^{N-n-1} \left(1-\frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda}u\right)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} du$$
$$-\frac{b}{\lambda} \binom{N-1}{n-1} (1+\lambda)^{n-1} \int_{0}^{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} u^{n-1} (1-u)^{N-n-1} \left(1-\frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda}u\right)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} du \qquad (3.5)$$
$$-\frac{c-\frac{b}{\lambda}}{\lambda} \binom{N}{n} (1+\lambda)^{n} \int_{0}^{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} u^{n} (1-u)^{N-n} \left(1-\frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda}u\right)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} du.$$

Similarly, from equation (3.3), we obtain

$$\pi_{0} = -\frac{b}{\lambda(1+2\lambda)} \int_{0}^{1} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}t\right)^{N-1} (1-t)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} dt -\frac{c - \frac{b}{\lambda}}{1+2\lambda} \int_{0}^{1} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}t\right)^{N} (1-t)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} dt.$$
(3.6)

Proof of Proposition 3.2. Define the generating function

$$G(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{N} \pi_n z^n$$

so that G(1) = 1. The recurrence relation for $(\pi_n)_{0 \le n \le N}$ yields the differential equation

$$(1-z-\lambda(1+\lambda)z^2)G'(z) + (\lambda(1+\lambda)Nz - (1+\lambda N))G(z) = bz + c,$$

where $b = 2\pi_2 - \lambda N(\lambda N + 1 - \lambda)\pi_0$ and $c = -\pi_0$.

The homogeneous solution of the equation

$$(1 - z - \lambda(1 + \lambda)z^2)G'_h(z) + (\lambda(1 + \lambda)Nz - (1 + \lambda N))G_h(z) = 0,$$

which can be found by separating variables, is

$$G_h(z) = C(z - r_1)^{c_1}(z - r_2)^{c_2},$$

where ${\cal C}$ is a constant and

$$\begin{cases} r_1 = \frac{1}{1+\lambda}, \\ r_2 = -\frac{1}{\lambda}, \end{cases} \qquad \begin{cases} c_1 = -\frac{1}{1+2\lambda}, \\ c_2 = N + \frac{1}{1+2\lambda} \end{cases}$$

Now we variate the constant so that we express $G(z) = C(z)G_h(z)$. Note that

$$C(1) = \left(\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}\right)^{N+\frac{2}{1+2\lambda}}.$$

Putting into the primary differential equation gives

$$C'(z) = -\frac{bz+c}{\lambda(1+\lambda)(z-r_1)^{c_1+1}(z-r_2)^{c_2+1}}.$$

We may now integrate both sides from 1 to z to obtain

$$C(z) = \left(\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}\right)^{N+\frac{2}{1+2\lambda}} - \frac{1}{\lambda(1+\lambda)} \int_{1}^{z} \frac{bu+c}{(u-r_{1})^{c_{1}+1}(u-r_{2})^{c_{2}+1}} du.$$

By changing variables with $t = \frac{1+2\lambda}{1+\lambda} \frac{1}{1+\lambda u}$, we obtain

$$C(z) = \left(\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}\right)^{N+\frac{2}{1+2\lambda}} - \frac{b}{\lambda(1+\lambda)} \left(\frac{\lambda(1+\lambda)}{1+2\lambda}\right)^{N} \left[B\left(\frac{1+2\lambda}{(1+\lambda)(1+\lambda z)};\frac{1}{1+2\lambda},N\right) - B\left(\frac{1+2\lambda}{(1+\lambda)^{2}};\frac{1}{1+2\lambda},N\right)\right]$$
(3.7)
$$- \frac{c-\frac{b}{\lambda}}{1+2\lambda} \left(\frac{\lambda(1+\lambda)}{1+2\lambda}\right)^{N} \left[B\left(\frac{1+2\lambda}{(1+\lambda)(1+\lambda z)};\frac{1}{1+2\lambda},N+1\right) - B\left(\frac{1+2\lambda}{(1+\lambda)^{2}};\frac{1}{1+2\lambda},N+1\right)\right],$$

where B(x; a, b) is the incomplete beta function. Note that for a nonnegative integer k, the identity

$$B(k,b) - B(x;k,b) = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \binom{k-1}{j} B(j+1,b)x^{k-1-j}(1-x)^{j+b}$$

holds, and this can be readily shown by induction on k. After we apply this identity to (3.7), we obtain the solution (3.2) by expanding. The relation (3.4) follows from checking analyticity of G(z).

3.2. Asymptotic Analysis.

Theorem 3.4 (Asymptotic behavior of quasi-stationary measure, high infection regime). Let

$$v_n^{\text{high}} = \binom{N}{n} \lambda^{n-N} f_{N,\lambda}(n),$$

where

$$f_{N,\lambda}(n) = \prod_{k=n}^{N-1} \Big[1 + \frac{1}{(1+2\lambda)(k+1) - \lambda N} \Big].$$

Then, the scaled quasi-stationary measure $v_n = \mu(1, n)$ with infected hub satisfies the following.

(1) Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given, and let $\delta = \varepsilon N$. Then, for $n \in [\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}N + \delta, N]$, we have

$$v_n = v_n^{\text{high}} (1 + O(N^{-1}))$$

as $N \to \infty$, where the error term is uniform in n.

(2) Let $0 < a < \frac{1}{2}$ be given, and let $\delta = N^{\frac{1}{2}+a}$. Then, for $n \in [\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}N + \delta, N]$, we have

$$v_n = v_n^{\text{high}} (1 + O(N^{-2a}))$$

as $N \to \infty$, where the error term is uniform in n.

Theorem 3.5 (Asymptotic behavior of quasi-stationary measure, low infection regime). Let

$$v_n^{\text{low}} = C_{N,\lambda} (1+\lambda)^n g_{N,\lambda}(n)$$

where

$$g_{N,\lambda}(n) = \left(1 - \frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda}\frac{n}{N}\right)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}}$$

and

$$C_{N,\lambda}^{-1} = \frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda} NB\left(\frac{1}{1+2\lambda}, N\right) \left(\frac{\lambda(1+\lambda)}{1+2\lambda}\right)^N.$$

Then, the scaled quasi-stationary measure $v_n = \mu(1, n)$ with infected hub satisfies the following.

(1) Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given, and let $\delta = \varepsilon N$. Then, for $n \in [0, \frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}N - \delta]$, we have

$$v_n = v_n^{\text{low}} (1 + O(N^{-1}))$$

as $N \to \infty$, where the error term is uniform in n.

(2) Let $0 < a < \frac{1}{2}$ be given, and let $\delta = N^{\frac{1}{2}+a}$. Then, for $n \in [0, \frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}N - \delta]$, we have

$$v_n = v_n^{\text{low}} (1 + O(N^{-2a}))$$

as $N \to \infty$, where the error term is uniform in n.

(3) Let $0 < a < \frac{1}{2}$ be given, and let $\delta = N^{\frac{1}{2}+a}$. Then, for $n \in [\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}N - \delta, \frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}N + \delta]$, we have $C_{N,\lambda}(1+\lambda)^n e^{-2\delta} \ll v_n \lesssim C_{N,\lambda}(1+\lambda)^n \max\left\{N^{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}}, N^{\frac{1}{2}} \left|\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda} - \frac{n}{N}\right|^{\frac{1}{1+2\lambda}}\right\}$

as $N \to \infty$, where the error term is uniform in n.

Remark 3.6. By applying Theorem 3.5 to the recurrence relation (3.1), we obtain

$$\alpha \mu(0,0) = \lambda N C_{N,\lambda} (1 + O(N^{-1})).$$
(3.8)

Remark 3.7. The theorem highlights a marked difference in the asymptotic behavior of v_n between two distinct regimes: one characterized by a large number of infected leaves, and the other by a smaller number. The prefactors $f_{N,\lambda}(n)$ and $g_{N,\lambda}(n)$ exhibit subexponential growth in N. Consequently, in the high infection regime, the dominant exponential factor of v_n is $\binom{N}{n}\lambda^{n-N}$, whereas in the low infection regime, it is dominated by $C_{N,\lambda}(1+\lambda)^n$.

To understand the rationale behind these exponentially dominating factors in v_n , consider the dual modes of the dynamics, contingent on the status of the hub. When n is sufficiently large, the infection rate of the hub, proportional to n, significantly outweight its cure rate of 1. This allows us to approximate that the hub remains perpetually infected. Under this assumption, the leaves evolve independently, each following a Markov chain with an infected rate of λ and a cure rate of 1. Consequently, the distribution of n rapidly converges to a binomial distribution $\operatorname{Binom}(N, \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda})$, elucidating the $\binom{N}{n}\lambda^{n-N}$ factor.

Conversely, in scenarios where *n* is small, the mode with a healthy hub predominantly influences the energy landscape despite its brief temporal occurrence. In such cases, when the hub is healthy, the next transition in the process could either be the reinfection of the hub, with a probability of $\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}$, or the healing of an infected leaf, with a probability of $\frac{1}{1+\lambda}$. Thus, once the hub is cured, the number of subsequently cured leaves before the hub is reinfected follows a (truncated) geometric distribution with a success probability of $\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}$, which accounts for the $(1 + \lambda)^n$ factor.

The transition between these regimes occurs at a point where the influences of both modes are comparably significant. A pathwise approach, grounded in large deviation theory, reveals that this transitional state corresponds to when the proportion of infected leaves approximates $\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}$.

Remark 3.8. The sequence $(v_n)_{0 \le n \le N}$ attains its global maximum at $n \simeq \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}N$, and its global minimum at n = 0. The former is the metastable state of the process, which is defined to be a state with maximal stability level, while the latter is the saddle point of the process. Hence, the exact exponent of the potential barrier is

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log(v_{\lfloor \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}N \rfloor}/v_0) = 2\log(1+\lambda) - \log(1+2\lambda).$$

This suggests the large deviation principle

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{E}\tau = 2\log(1+\lambda) - \log(1+2\lambda),$$

which was observed by Wang [35].

To outline the proof of the asymptotic behavior of v_n , we first address the high infection regime. Our primary focus is on demonstrating that the deviation between v_n and v_n^{high} remains controlled as n descends from N. This is established inductively by leveraging the recurrence relation outlined in (3.1). Moving to the low infection regime, we initiate our analysis by deriving the explicit representation of $C_{N,\lambda}$. Subsequently, we segment the low infection regime into three distinct sections. The initial section concerns those values of n that are neither close to 0 nor near $\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}N$. For these, we apply Laplace's method to the integral formula in (3.5) for v_n in a more refined manner. The second section addresses values of n proximal to 0, where our approach mirrors that used in the high infection regime, albeit initiated from the outcomes of Laplace's method applied previously. The final section deals with values of n near the transitional point $\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}N$. Here, we once again utilize the integral expression (3.5) to derive reasonable asymptotic bounds for v_n .

Proof of Theorem 3.4. Define $x_n = v_n/v_n^{\text{high}}$ and $y_n = x_n/x_{n+1}$. Then $x_N = x_{N-1} = 1$, $y_{N-1} = 1$, and the sequence $(y_n)_{0 \le n \le N-1}$ has a recurrence relation

$$(1+\lambda)(n+1)\left(1+\frac{1}{(1+2\lambda)(n+2)-\lambda N}\right)\left(1+\frac{1}{(1+2\lambda)(n+1)-\lambda N}\right)(y_n-1) =\frac{2(1+\lambda)((1+\lambda)(n+1)-\lambda N)}{((1+2\lambda)(n+2)-\lambda N)((1+2\lambda)(n+1)-\lambda N)} +\lambda(N-n-1)\frac{y_{n+1}-1}{y_{n+1}},$$
(3.9)

which can be directly obtained from (3.1).

Now we prove the theorem in two steps.

Step 1. $n \in [\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}N + \varepsilon N, N]$, where $\varepsilon > 0$.

By the relation (3.9), it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} y_n - 1 &| \le \frac{2 \left| (1 + \lambda)(n + 1) - \lambda N \right|}{(n + 1)((1 + 2\lambda)(n + 2) - \lambda N)((1 + 2\lambda)(n + 1) - \lambda N)} \\ &+ \frac{\lambda(N - n - 1)}{(1 + \lambda)(n + 1)} \frac{|y_{n+1} - 1|}{y_{n+1}} \\ &\le \frac{A}{N^2} + (1 - r) \frac{|y_{n+1} - 1|}{y_{n+1}} \end{aligned}$$
(3.10)

with constants A > 0 and 0 < r < 1 that only depend on λ and ε . Choose a constant B > 0 that only depend on λ and ε so that the inequality

$$\frac{A}{N^2} + (1-r)\frac{B/N^2}{1-B/N^2} \le \frac{B}{N^2}$$

holds for all sufficiently large N. For instance, $B = \frac{2A}{r}$ works. Since

$$|y_{N-1} - 1| = 0 \le \frac{B}{N^2}$$

we can inductively show that $|y_n - 1| \leq \frac{B}{N^2}$ for all $n \in [\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}N + \varepsilon N, N]$. Thus, we obtain

$$\left|\log x_n\right| = \sum_{k=n}^{N-1} \left|\log y_k\right| \le N \left|\log\left(1 - \frac{B}{N^2}\right)\right| = O(N^{-1}),$$

so $|x_n - 1| = O(N^{-1})$ for all $n \in \left[\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}N + \varepsilon N, N\right]$.

Step 2. $n \in [\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}N + \delta, N]$, where $\delta = N^{\frac{1}{2}+a}$, $0 < a < \frac{1}{2}$. We mimic the proof in the previous step. Write $n = \frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}N + d$. We claim that

$$|y_n - 1| = O(Nd^{-3})$$

Similarly as in (3.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |y_n - 1| &\leq \frac{2 \left| (1 + \lambda)(n + 1) - \lambda N \right|}{(n + 1)((1 + 2\lambda)(n + 2) - \lambda N)((1 + 2\lambda)(n + 1) - \lambda N)} \\ &+ \frac{\lambda(N - n - 1)}{(1 + \lambda)(n + 1)} \frac{|y_{n+1} - 1|}{y_{n+1}} \\ &\leq \frac{A}{d^2} + \left(1 - r\frac{d}{N} \right) \frac{|y_{n+1} - 1|}{y_{n+1}} \end{aligned}$$

with constants A > 0 and 0 < r < 1 that only depend on λ and ε . Put $B = \frac{2A}{r}$, then it holds that

$$\frac{A}{d^2} + \left(1 - r\frac{d}{N}\right)\frac{BN(d+1)^{-3}}{1 - BN(d+1)^{-3}} \le \frac{BN}{d^3}$$

for all sufficiently large N. Hence, we can inductively show that $|y_n - 1| \leq BNd^{-3}$ for all $n \in [\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}N + \delta, N]$. Thus, we obtain

$$|\log x_n| = \sum_{k=n}^{N-1} |\log y_k| \le \sum_{k=n}^{N-1} \log \left(1 + B \frac{N}{(k - \frac{\lambda}{1 + 2\lambda}N)^3} \right) \lesssim \frac{1}{N} \int_{\frac{\delta}{N}}^{\frac{1}{1 + 2\lambda}} \frac{dt}{d^3} = O(N^{-2a}),$$

and the proof is complete.

Lemma 3.9. Let -1 < a < 0 and $0 be given. Then, for each <math>m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$,

$$\int_0^1 (1-pt)^N (1-t)^a \, dt = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} (-1)^k \binom{a}{k} p^{-k-1} B(k+1,N+1) + O(N^{-m})$$

as $N \to \infty$, where B(a, b) is the beta function.

Proof. Denote the integral on the left-hand side by I_N . The term $(1 - pt)^N$ exponentially decays as $N \to \infty$ for $t \in [0, 1]$ bounded away from 0, while $(1 - t)^a$ has a unique algebraic pole at 1. Hence, we may replace the integration range by [0, 1/2] without affecting the asymptotic behavior, so that the range does not contain 1.

Now, by Taylor's theorem,

$$I_N = \int_0^{1/2} (1 - pt)^N (1 - t)^a dt + O(N^{-m})$$

= $\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} (-1)^k {a \choose k} \int_0^{1/2} (1 - pt)^N t^k dt + \int_0^{1/2} (1 - pt)^N O(t^m) dt + O(N^{-m}).$

Note that

$$\int_0^{1/2} t^k (1-pt)^N \, dt = p^{-k-1} B(p/2; k+1, N+1),$$

where B(x; a, b) is the incomplete beta function. By the asymptotic expansion [27, Equation (8.18.1)] of incomplete beta functions, the error between B(p/2; k+1, N+1) and B(k+1, N+1) is exponentially small in N. Thus,

$$I_N = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} (-1)^k \binom{a}{k} \int_0^{1/2} (1-pt)^N t^k \, dt + \int_0^{1/2} (1-pt)^N O(t^m) \, dt + O(N^{-m})$$
$$= \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} (-1)^k \binom{a}{k} p^{-k-1} B(k+1,N+1) + O(N^{-m})$$
$$N+1) = O(N^{-m})$$

since $B(m, N + 1) = O(N^{-m})$.

Proposition 3.10 (Initial value condition). As $N \to \infty$,

$$\frac{v_1}{v_N} = C_{N,\lambda} (1+\lambda) (1+O(N^{-1})),$$

where $C_{N,\lambda}$ is as in Theorem 3.5.

Proof. We claim that

$$\frac{b}{\pi_0} = -\lambda^2 N^2 + \lambda (1+3\lambda)N + O(1),$$
(3.11)

where b and π_0 are as in Proposition 3.2.

Put

$$I_N = \int_0^1 \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}t\right)^N (1-t)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} dt.$$

Then from (3.6), we obtain the relation

$$\frac{b}{\pi_0} = \frac{\lambda(1+2\lambda-I_N)}{I_N - I_{N-1}}.$$

We may deduce the asymptotic expansion (3.11) by applying Lemma 3.9 and performing long division.

By putting n = N in the solution (3.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\pi_N}{\pi_0} &= -\frac{b}{(1+2\lambda)\pi_0} B\Big(\frac{1}{1+2\lambda}, N\Big) \Big(\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}\Big)^{N-1} (1+\lambda)^{N-1} \\ &- \frac{c-\frac{b}{\lambda}}{(1+2\lambda)\pi_0} B\Big(\frac{1}{1+2\lambda}, N+1\Big) \Big(\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}\Big)^N (1+\lambda)^N \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda(1+2\lambda)} B\Big(\frac{1}{1+2\lambda}, N+1\Big) \Big(\frac{\lambda(1+\lambda)}{1+2\lambda}\Big)^N \Big[\lambda + \Big(1-\frac{N+\frac{1}{1+2\lambda}}{N}\frac{1+2\lambda}{1+\lambda}\Big)\frac{b}{\pi_0}\Big] \\ &= \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda} N \frac{1}{C_{N,\lambda}} (1+O(N^{-1})). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can conclude that

$$\frac{v_1}{v_N} = \frac{\pi_1}{\pi_N} = \frac{\lambda N \pi_0}{\pi_N} = C_{N,\lambda} (1+\lambda)(1+O(N^{-1})),$$

and this is precisely the assertion of the proposition.

Proof of Theorem 3.5. The proof will be divided into three steps.

Step 1. $n \in [\varepsilon N, \frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda} - \delta]$, where $\varepsilon > 0, 0 < a < \frac{1}{2}$, and $\delta = \varepsilon N$ or $\delta = N^{\frac{1}{2}+a}$. We abbreviate $n/N = \beta$ and $\min\{\beta, \frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda} - \beta\} = \gamma$. Recall from (3.5):

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_n &= -\frac{b}{\lambda^2} \binom{N-1}{n} (1+\lambda)^n \int_0^{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} u^n (1-u)^{N-n-1} \left(1 - \frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda}u\right)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} du \\ &- \frac{b}{\lambda} \binom{N-1}{n-1} (1+\lambda)^{n-1} \int_0^{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} u^{n-1} (1-u)^{N-n-1} \left(1 - \frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda}u\right)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} du \\ &- \frac{c-\frac{b}{\lambda}}{\lambda} \binom{N}{n} (1+\lambda)^n \int_0^{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} u^n (1-u)^{N-n} \left(1 - \frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda}u\right)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} du \\ &= \left[\frac{-b}{\lambda} \beta^n (1-\beta)^{N-n} \binom{N}{n}\right] (1+\lambda)^{n-1} \left(1 - \frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda}\beta\right)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} \int_0^{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} e^{-NP_n(t)} Q_n(t) dt, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$P_n(t) = -\beta \log \frac{t}{\beta} - (1 - \beta) \log \frac{1 - t}{1 - \beta},$$

$$Q_n(t) = \left(\frac{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda} - t}{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda} - \beta}\right)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} \left[\frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda}\frac{1-\beta}{1-t} + \frac{\beta}{t} - \frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda}\right].$$

For ease of computation, we have omitted a term with c from $Q_n(t)$ here. This can be justified by performing the same method of computation below on the term with c separately, while noting that $c/b = O(N^{-2})$ by (3.11).

By Stirling's series [27, Equation (5.11.3)], we obtain

$$\binom{N}{n} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi N}\beta^{n+1/2}(1-\beta)^{N-n+1/2}} \Big[1 + \frac{1}{12} \Big(1 - \frac{1}{\beta} - \frac{1}{1-\beta} \Big) \frac{1}{N} + O(N^{-2}) \Big].$$

Hence,

$$\pi_n = \frac{-b}{\lambda} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi N\beta (1-\beta)}} \Big[1 + \frac{1}{12} \Big(1 - \frac{1}{\beta} - \frac{1}{1-\beta} \Big) \frac{1}{N} + O(N^{-2}) \Big] \\ \times (1+\lambda)^{n-1} \Big(1 - \frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda} \beta \Big)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} \int_0^{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} e^{-NP_n(t)} Q_n(t) \, dt.$$

The function $P_n(t)$ attains a unique minimum 0 at $t = \beta$ on (0, 1), and we have

$$P'_{n}(t) = -\frac{\beta}{t} + \frac{1-\beta}{1-t}, \qquad P''_{n}(t) = \frac{\beta}{t^{2}} + \frac{1-\beta}{(1-t)^{2}}, P^{(3)}_{n}(t) = -2\left[\frac{\beta}{t^{3}} - \frac{1-\beta}{(1-t)^{3}}\right], \qquad P^{(4)}_{n}(t) = 6\left[\frac{\beta}{t^{4}} + \frac{1-\beta}{(1-t)^{4}}\right].$$

and

$$Q'_n(t) = Q_n(t)A_n(t),$$
 $Q''_n(t) = Q_n(t)[A_n(t)^2 + A'_n(t)],$

where

$$A_n(t) = \frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda} \frac{1}{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}-t} + \frac{\frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda}\frac{1-\beta}{(1-t)^2} - \frac{\beta}{t^2}}{\frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda}\frac{1-\beta}{1-t} + \frac{\beta}{t} - \frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda}}$$

We have assumed that $\gamma = \Omega(N^{-\frac{1}{2}+a})$, so outside the interval $(\beta - \gamma/3, \beta + \gamma/3)$, the exponential term in the integral vanishes rapidly as $N \to \infty$ while $Q_n(t)$ has only algebraic poles of order less than 1. Hence, we may replace the integration range by $(\beta - \gamma_1, \beta + \gamma_2)$ without affecting the asymptotic behavior, where:

• $\gamma/3 < \gamma_i < \gamma/2$,

•
$$P_n(\beta - \gamma_1) = P_n(\beta + \gamma_2) = \kappa.$$

Note that $P_n(t)$ and $Q_n(t)$ are smooth on the interval $(\beta - \gamma_1, \beta + \gamma_2)$.

Now we apply Laplace's method for approximating integrals. Theoretical background can be found in various textbooks, for instance, [26, Section 3.7–9]. Write $p_{n,s}(t) = \frac{1}{(s+2)!} P_n^{(s+2)}(t)$ and $q_{n,s}(t) = \frac{1}{s!} Q_n^{(s)}(t)$ so that we have Taylor expansions

$$P_n(t) = p_0(t-\beta)^2 + p_1(t-\beta)^3 + p_2(t-\beta)^4 + \dots$$

$$Q_n(t) = q_0 + q_1(t-\beta) + q_2(t-\beta)^2 + \dots,$$

where $p_{n,s}(\beta) = p_s$ and $q_{n,s}(\beta) = q_s$. Substitute $v = P_n(t)$ for $t \ge \beta$ sufficiently close to β , then we have

$$\int_{\beta}^{\beta+\gamma_2} e^{-NP_n(t)} Q_n(t) dt = \int_0^{\kappa} e^{-Nv} f(v) dv,$$

where

$$f(v) = \frac{Q_n(t)}{P'_n(t)} = a_{n,0}(\beta)v^{-1/2} + a_{n,1}(\beta) + a_{n,2}(\beta)v^{1/2} + a_{n,3}(\beta)v + \dots$$

Here, $a_{n,s}$ is a polynomial in $p_{n,i}$'s and $q_{n,i}$'s divided by some power of $p_{n,0}^{1/2}$, which can be explicitly computed by series reversion. The first few terms can be given as follows.

$$a_{n,0} = \frac{q_{n,0}}{2p_{n,0}^{1/2}}, \qquad a_{n,1} = \frac{1}{2p_{n,0}^2} [p_{n,0}q_{n,1} - p_{n,1}q_{n,0}],$$

$$a_{n,2} = \frac{1}{16p_{n,0}^{7/2}} [8p_{n,0}^2q_{n,2} - 12p_{n,0}p_{n,1}q_{n,1} + 3(5p_{n,1}^2 - 4p_{n,0}p_{n,2})q_{n,0}].$$
(3.12)

Similarly as before, we write $a_{n,s}(\beta) = a_s$ for brevity. We also have

$$\int_{\beta-\gamma_1}^{\beta} e^{-NP_n(t)} Q_n(t) \, dt = \int_0^{\kappa} e^{-Nv} \widetilde{f}(v) \, dv$$

where

$$\widetilde{f}(v) = a_0 v^{-1/2} - a_1 + a_2 v^{1/2} - a_3 v + \dots$$

Thus, the integral to estimate becomes

$$\int_{\beta - \gamma_1}^{\beta + \gamma_2} e^{-NP_n(t)} Q_n(t) \, dt = 2 \int_0^\kappa e^{-Nv} F_n(v) \, dv,$$

where

$$F_n(v) = a_0 v^{-1/2} + a_2 v^{1/2} + a_4 v^{3/2} + \dots$$

For a fixed $s \ge 1$, the above integral can be expressed as

$$\int_{0}^{\kappa} e^{-Nv} F_{n}(v) dv$$

$$= \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-Nv} \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} a_{2i} v^{i-1/2} dv - \int_{\kappa}^{\infty} e^{-Nv} \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} a_{2i} v^{i-1/2} dv + \int_{0}^{\kappa} e^{-Nv} R_{n,s}(v) dv \qquad (3.13)$$

$$= \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} \Gamma\left(i + \frac{1}{2}\right) \frac{a_{2i}}{N^{i+1/2}} - \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} \Gamma\left(i + \frac{1}{2}, N\kappa\right) \frac{a_{2i}}{N^{i+1/2}} + \int_{0}^{\kappa} e^{-Nv} R_{n,s}(v) dv,$$

where $\Gamma(a, x)$ is the incomplete gamma function and

$$R_{n,s}(v) = F_n(v) - \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} a_{2i}v^{i-1/2}.$$

Note that the incomplete Gamma function can be bounded with

$$\Gamma(r,x) \le \frac{e^{-x}x^r}{x - \max\{r - 1, 0\}} \qquad (x > \max\{r - 1, 0\}).$$

See [27, Equation (8.10.1)] and [26, Chapter 3, Equation (2.14)]. Since $N\kappa = \Omega(N^a)$ and a_{2i} grows algebraically as $N \to \infty$, we may neglect the second term of the last line in (3.13) without affecting the asymptotic behavior.

Now, we will show that the third term is also sufficiently small for some s. By Taylor's theorem, there exists some t_* lying between β and t such that

$$R_{n,s}(v) = a_{n,2s}(t_*)v^{s-1/2}.$$

First, we consider the *n*'s with $\gamma \geq \varepsilon > 0$. For $t \in [\beta - \gamma/2, \beta + \gamma/2]$, each of $p_{n,i}$'s and $q_{n,i}$'s is uniformly bounded in *n*, and $p_{n,0}$ is uniformly bounded away from 0 in *n*. Hence, each of $a_{n,s}$'s is uniformly bounded in n, so

$$\left| \int_0^{\kappa} e^{-Nv} R_{n,s}(v) \, dv \right| \le \int_0^{\kappa} e^{-Nv} |a_{n,2s}(t_*)| v^{s-1/2} \, dv = O\left(\frac{1}{N^{s+1/2}}\right).$$

This yields that

$$\int_0^{\kappa} e^{-Nv} F_n(v) \, dv = \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} \Gamma\left(i + \frac{1}{2}\right) \frac{a_{2i}}{N^{i+1/2}} + O\left(\frac{1}{N^{s+1/2}}\right),$$

 \mathbf{SO}

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_n &= \frac{-b}{\lambda} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi N\beta(1-\beta)}} \Big[1 + \frac{1}{12} \Big(1 - \frac{1}{\beta} - \frac{1}{1-\beta} \Big) \frac{1}{N} + O(N^{-2}) \Big] \\ &\times (1+\lambda)^{n-1} \Big(1 - \frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda} \beta \Big)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} \cdot 2 \int_0^\kappa e^{-Nv} F_n(v) \, dv \\ &= \frac{-b}{\lambda} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi N\beta(1-\beta)}} \Big[1 + \frac{1}{12} \Big(1 - \frac{1}{\beta} - \frac{1}{1-\beta} \Big) \frac{1}{N} + O(N^{-2}) \Big] \\ &\times (1+\lambda)^{n-1} \Big(1 - \frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda} \beta \Big)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} \Big[\sum_{i=0}^{s-1} 2\Gamma \Big(i + \frac{1}{2} \Big) \frac{a_{2i}}{N^{i+1/2}} + O\Big(\frac{1}{N^{s+1/2}} \Big) \Big] \end{aligned}$$

Putting s = 2 gives

$$\pi_n = \frac{-b}{\lambda} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi N\beta(1-\beta)}} \Big[1 + \frac{1}{12} \Big(1 - \frac{1}{\beta} - \frac{1}{1-\beta} \Big) \frac{1}{N} + O(N^{-2}) \Big] \\ \times (1+\lambda)^{n-1} \Big(1 - \frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda} \beta \Big)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} \Big[2\sqrt{\pi} \frac{a_0}{N^{1/2}} + \sqrt{\pi} \frac{a_2}{N^{3/2}} + O\Big(\frac{1}{N^{5/2}}\Big) \Big].$$

Since $p_0 = \frac{1}{2\beta(1-\beta)}$ and $q_0 = 1$, we have

$$a_0 = \frac{q_0}{2p_0^{1/2}} = \sqrt{\frac{\beta(1-\beta)}{2}}.$$

Recall from (3.11):

$$\frac{b}{\pi_1} = -\lambda N + (1+3\lambda) + O(N^{-1}),$$

so we obtain

$$\pi_{n} = \frac{-b}{\lambda N} \left[1 + \frac{1}{12} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\beta} - \frac{1}{1-\beta} \right) \frac{1}{N} + O(N^{-2}) \right] \\ \times (1+\lambda)^{n-1} \left(1 - \frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda} \beta \right)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} \left[1 + \frac{a_{2}}{\sqrt{2\beta(1-\beta)}} \frac{1}{N} + O\left(\frac{1}{N^{2}}\right) \right] \\ = \pi_{1} (1+\lambda)^{n-1} \left(1 - \frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda} \beta \right)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} \\ \times \left[1 + \left[-\frac{1+3\lambda}{\lambda} + \frac{1}{12} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\beta} - \frac{1}{1-\beta} \right) + \frac{a_{2}}{\sqrt{2\beta(1-\beta)}} \right] \frac{1}{N} + O\left(\frac{1}{N^{2}}\right) \right].$$
(3.14)

Next, we deal with the case when $\gamma \leq \varepsilon$ and $\gamma = \Omega(N^{-\frac{1}{2}+a})$. For $t \in [\beta - \gamma/2, \beta + \gamma/2]$, each of $p_{n,i}$'s is uniformly bounded, and

$$\begin{aligned} q_{n,0}(t) &= O(1), \\ q_{n,1}(t) &= O(\gamma^{-1}) = O(N^{\frac{1}{2}(1-2a)}), \\ q_{n,2}(t) &= O(\gamma^{-2}) = O(N^{1-2a}), \end{aligned}$$

 \mathbf{SO}

$$a_{n,2}(t) = \frac{1}{16p_{n,0}^{7/2}} [8p_{n,0}^2 q_{n,2} - 12p_{n,0}p_{n,1}q_{n,1} + 3(5p_{n,1}^2 - 4p_{n,0}p_{n,2})q_{n,0}] = O(N^{1-2a}).$$

Now we put s = 1 and proceed similarly as before. Since we have

$$\left| \int_0^{\kappa} e^{-Nv} R_{n,1}(v) \, dv \right| \le \int_0^{\kappa} e^{-Nv} |a_{n,2}(t_*)| v^{1/2} \, dv = O(N^{-\frac{1}{2}-2a}),$$

the integral to estimate has an asymptotic expression

$$\int_0^{\kappa} e^{-Nv} F_n(v) \, dv = \sqrt{\pi} \frac{a_0}{N^{1/2}} + O(N^{-\frac{1}{2}-2a}).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{split} \pi_n &= \frac{-b}{\lambda} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi N\beta(1-\beta)}} \Big[1 + \frac{1}{12} \Big(1 - \frac{1}{\beta} - \frac{1}{1-\beta} \Big) \frac{1}{N} + O(N^{-2}) \Big] \\ &\times (1+\lambda)^{n-1} \Big(1 - \frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda} \beta \Big)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} \Big[2\sqrt{\pi} \frac{a_0}{N^{1/2}} + O(N^{-\frac{1}{2}-2a}) \Big] \\ &= \pi_1 (1+\lambda)^{n-1} \Big(1 - \frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda} \beta \Big)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} \Big[1 + O(N^{-2a}) \Big]. \end{split}$$

Step 2. $n \in [0, \varepsilon N]$, where $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}$. On this regime, we may replace $g_{N,\lambda}(n)$ by

$$\widetilde{g}_{N,\lambda}(n) = \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \left[1 + \frac{2\lambda}{\lambda N - (1+2\lambda)(k+1) - 1} \right],$$

since

$$\widetilde{g}_{N,\lambda}(n) = \exp\left[\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \log\left(1 + \frac{2\lambda}{\lambda N - (1+2\lambda)(k+1) - 1}\right)\right]$$

$$= \exp\left[\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(\frac{2\lambda}{\lambda N - (1+2\lambda)(k+1) - 1} + O(N^{-2})\right)\right]$$

$$= \left(1 - \frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda} \frac{n}{N}\right)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} (1 + O(nN^{-2}))$$

$$= g_{N,\lambda}(n)(1 + O(N^{-1}))$$
(3.15)

by Taylor's theorem. We also replace $v_n^{\rm low}$ by $\widetilde{v}_n^{\rm low}$ accordingly.

Define $x_n = v_n / \tilde{v}_n^{\text{low}}$ and $y_n = x_n / x_{n+1}$. Pick $n_0 = \lfloor \varepsilon N \rfloor$. We will show that $x_{n_0} = 1 + O(N^{-1})$ and $y_{n_0} = 1 + O(N^{-2})$. Recall from (3.14) in the previous step: for n's sufficiently close to n_0 , we have

$$\frac{v_n}{v_n^{\text{low}}} = \frac{v_1}{C_{N,\lambda}} \times \left[1 + \left[-\frac{1+3\lambda}{\lambda} + \frac{1}{12} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\beta} - \frac{1}{1-\beta} \right) + \frac{a_{n,2}(\beta)}{\sqrt{2\beta(1-\beta)}} \right] \frac{1}{N} + O\left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right) \right], \quad (3.16)$$

where $\beta = n/N$ and $a_{n,2}$ is defined as in (3.12). For such n, we have

$$\frac{g_{N,\lambda}(n+1)}{g_{N,\lambda}(n)} = \left(1 - \frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda N - (1+2\lambda)n}\right)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} = \frac{\widetilde{g}_{N,\lambda}(n+1)}{\widetilde{g}_{N,\lambda}(n)}(1+O(N^{-2})),$$

so we may replace the left-hand side of (3.16) by x_n . Write

$$D(n) = -\frac{1+3\lambda}{\lambda} + \frac{1}{12} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\beta} - \frac{1}{1-\beta} \right) + \frac{a_{n,2}(\beta)}{\sqrt{2\beta(1-\beta)}}$$

Then we have

$$x_n = \frac{v_1}{C_{N,\lambda}} \times \left[1 + D(n)\frac{1}{N} + O\left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right)\right],$$

 \mathbf{SO}

$$y_n = \frac{x_n}{x_{n+1}} = 1 + (D(n) - D(n+1))\frac{1}{N} + O(N^{-2}).$$

Hence, it sufficies to show that

$$D(n_0 + 1) - D(n_0) = O(N^{-1}).$$

This follows immediately from the observation that D(n) is a differentiable function in β with uniformly bounded differential in a neighborhood of $\beta = n_0/N$.

The sequence $(y_n)_{0 \le n \le N-1}$ has a recurrence relation

$$(1+\lambda)(n+2)\Big(1+\frac{2\lambda}{\lambda N-(1+2\lambda)(n+1)-1}\Big)\Big(1+\frac{2\lambda}{\lambda N-(1+2\lambda)n-1}\Big)\frac{1-y_{n+1}}{y_{n+1}} = -\frac{2\lambda^2(1+4\lambda)(N-n)}{(\lambda N-(1+2\lambda)(n+1)-1)(\lambda N-(1+2\lambda)n-1)} + \lambda(N-n)(1-y_n),$$

which can be directly obtained from (3.1). Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} |y_n - 1| &\leq \frac{2\lambda(1+4\lambda)}{(\lambda N - (1+2\lambda)(n+1) - 1)(\lambda N - (1+2\lambda)n - 1)} \\ &+ \frac{(1+\lambda)(n+2)}{\lambda(N-n)} \Big(1 + \frac{2\lambda}{\lambda N - (1+2\lambda)(n+1) - 1} \Big) \Big(1 + \frac{2\lambda}{\lambda N - (1+2\lambda)n - 1} \Big) \\ &\times \frac{|y_{n+1} - 1|}{y_{n+1}} \\ &\leq \frac{A}{N^2} + (1-r) \frac{|y_{n+1} - 1|}{y_{n+1}} \end{aligned}$$

with constants A > 0 and 0 < r < 1 that only depend on λ and ε . Choose a constant B > 0 that only depend on λ and ε so that the inequality

$$\frac{A}{N^2} + (1-r)\frac{B/N^2}{1-B/N^2} \le \frac{B}{N^2}$$

holds for all sufficiently large N. For instance, $B = \frac{2A}{r}$ works. Since

$$|y_{n_0}-1| \le \frac{B}{N^2},$$

if we pick A sufficiently large, we can inductively show that $|y_n - 1| \leq \frac{B}{N^2}$ for all $n \in [1, \varepsilon N]$. Thus, we obtain

$$\left|\log x_{n}\right| = \sum_{k=n}^{n_{0}-1} \left|\log y_{k}\right| + \left|\log x_{n_{0}}\right| \le N \left|\log\left(1 - \frac{B}{N^{2}}\right)\right| + \left|\log x_{n_{0}}\right| = O(N^{-1}),$$

so $|x_n - 1| = O(N^{-1})$ for all $n \in [1, \varepsilon N]$.

Step 3. $n \in [\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}N - \delta, \frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}N + \delta]$, where $\delta = N^{\frac{1}{2}+a}, 0 < a < \frac{1}{2}$. We abbreviate $n/N = \beta$, and denote $n = (\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda} - \gamma)N$. Here, we allow γ to be negative. Recall from (3.5):

$$\pi_n = -\frac{b}{\lambda^2} \binom{N-1}{n} (1+\lambda)^n \int_0^{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} u^n (1-u)^{N-n-1} \left(1 - \frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda}u\right)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} du$$

18

$$-\frac{b}{\lambda} \binom{N-1}{n-1} (1+\lambda)^{n-1} \int_0^{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} u^{n-1} (1-u)^{N-n-1} \left(1-\frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda}u\right)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} du$$
$$-\frac{c-\frac{b}{\lambda}}{\lambda} \binom{N}{n} (1+\lambda)^n \int_0^{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} u^n (1-u)^{N-n} \left(1-\frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda}u\right)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} du$$
$$=\frac{-b}{\lambda} (1+\lambda)^{n-1} \int_0^{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} \binom{N}{n} t^n (1-t)^{N-n} S_n(t) \left(1-\frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda}t\right)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} dt,$$

where

$$S_n(t) = \frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda} \frac{1-\beta}{1-t} + \frac{\beta}{t} - \frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda}.$$

Then, we shrink the integration range to $(\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda} - \gamma_1, \frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda})$ where $\gamma_1 = N^{-\frac{1}{2}+a}$. Note that this does not affect our argument; we are all clear with the lower bound, and observe that the integrand in the above expression is condensed around $t = \frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda} - \gamma$ as in previous steps for the upper bound. In this interval, $S_n(t)$ is uniformly bounded and uniformly bounded away from 0, so we may replace $S_n(t)$ by 1. We will show that

$$e^{-2N\gamma_1} \ll \int_{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}-\gamma_1}^{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} {N \choose n} t^n (1-t)^{N-n} \left(1 - \frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda}t\right)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} dt$$
(3.17)

and

$$\int_{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}-\gamma_1}^{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} \binom{N}{n} t^n (1-t)^{N-n} \left(1 - \frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda}t\right)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} dt \lesssim \max\{N^{-1+\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}}, N^{-\frac{1}{2}}|\gamma|^{\frac{1}{1+2\lambda}}\}.$$
 (3.18)

This together with (3.11) concludes our proof since

$$\frac{-b}{\lambda} = \pi_1 N(1 + o(1)).$$

Let us prove the inequality of (3.17). Denote the above integral by $I_{N,n}$, then

$$I_{N,n} \ge \gamma_1 \binom{N}{n} \left(\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda} - \gamma_1\right)^n \left(\frac{1}{1+2\lambda}\right)^{N-n}.$$
(3.19)

By Stirling's formula [27, Equation (5.11.1)], we obtain

$$\log \binom{N}{n} = -n \log \frac{n}{N} - (N-n) \log \frac{N-n}{N} + O(\log N).$$

Hence, by taking log of each sides of (3.19) and expanding into Taylor series at $\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}$, we obtain

$$\log I_{N,n} \ge -\gamma_1 N + O(N\gamma_1^2),$$

which establishes our conclusion.

For the inequality (3.18), we begin with the following quantitative local limit theorem for i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables:

$$\left| \binom{N}{n} t^n (1-t)^{N-n} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi N t (1-t)}} e^{-\frac{(n-Nt)^2}{2N t (1-t)}} \right| \le \frac{0.516}{N t (1-t)}.$$

This can be found in Zolotukhin, Nagaev, and Chebotarev [36, Lemma 5]. The error on the right-hand side can be neglected since

$$\int_{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}-\gamma_1}^{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} \frac{0.516}{Nt(1-t)} \left(1 - \frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda}t\right)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} dt = O(N^{-1}) \int_{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}-\gamma_1}^{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} \left(1 - \frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda}t\right)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} dt$$
$$= o(N^{-1+\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}}).$$

Hence, it sufficies to show that

$$\int_{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}-\gamma_{1}}^{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi N t(1-t)}} e^{-\frac{(n-Nt)^{2}}{2N t(1-t)}} \left(1-\frac{1+2\lambda}{\lambda}t\right)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} dt \lesssim \max\{N^{-1+\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}}, N^{-\frac{1}{2}}|\gamma|^{\frac{1}{1+2\lambda}}\},$$

or,

$$\int_{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}-\gamma_1}^{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} e^{-N(\beta-t)^2} \left(\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}-t\right)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} dt \lesssim \max\{N^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}}, |\gamma|^{\frac{1}{1+2\lambda}}\}.$$

Note that $\frac{1}{2t(1-t)}$ in the exponent is replaced by a smaller constant 1. By substituting $\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda} - t = u$, we obtain

$$\int_{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}-\gamma_1}^{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} e^{-N(\beta-t)^2} \left(\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}-t\right)^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} dt = \int_0^{\gamma_1} e^{-N(\gamma-u)^2} u^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} du$$

We divide the integration range into two parts:

$$\int_{0}^{\gamma_{1}} e^{-N(\gamma-u)^{2}} u^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} du = \int_{0}^{\gamma_{2}} e^{-N(\gamma-u)^{2}} u^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} du + \int_{\gamma_{2}}^{\gamma_{1}} e^{-N(\gamma-u)^{2}} u^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} du,$$

where $\gamma_2 = \max\{N^{-\frac{1}{2}}, |\gamma|\}$. For the first integral, observe that

$$\int_{0}^{\gamma_{2}} e^{-N(\gamma-u)^{2}} u^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} \, du \le \int_{0}^{\gamma_{2}} u^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} \, du \lesssim \max\{N^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}}, |\gamma|^{\frac{1}{1+2\lambda}}\}$$

For the second integral, we can assert that

$$\int_{\gamma_2}^{\gamma_1} e^{-N(\gamma-u)^2} u^{-\frac{2\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} \, du \le N^{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} \int_{\gamma_2}^{\infty} e^{-N(\gamma-u)^2} \, du \le N^{\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-Nu^2} \, du \lesssim N^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}},$$
 he proof is complete.

and the proof is complete.

3.3. Basic Properties of Energy Landscape. In this subsection, we establish some basic properties of the quasi-stationary measure of the contact process on stars. These properties are crucial for subsequent computation within the potential theoretic framework.

Lemma 3.11. Let $v_n = \mu(1, n)$ be the scaled quasi-stationary measure with infected hub. Put m = $\lfloor \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}N \rfloor$, the number of infected leaves at the metastable state. Then, as $N \to \infty$, the mass at the metastable state is

$$v_m \simeq \frac{1+\lambda}{\sqrt{2\pi\lambda N}} \left(\frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda}\right)^{N+\frac{2}{1+2\lambda}}$$

Proof. By the asymptotic formulas for v_n in Theorem 3.4, it sufficies to show that

$$v_m^{\text{high}} = \binom{N}{m} \lambda^{m-N} f_{N,\lambda}(m) = \frac{1+\lambda}{\sqrt{2\pi\lambda N}} \left(\frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda}\right)^{N+\frac{2}{1+2\lambda}} (1+o(1)).$$
(3.20)

By Stirling's formula [27, Equation (5.11.1)], we obtain

$$\binom{N}{m} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\lambda N}} \frac{(1+\lambda)^{N+1}}{\lambda^m} (1+o(1)).$$

Also, a computation analogous to (3.15) reveals that for $n \in [\frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}N + \varepsilon N, N]$ where $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$f_{N,\lambda}(n) = \left(\frac{1+2\lambda}{1+\lambda}\frac{n}{N} - \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}\right)^{-\frac{1}{1+2\lambda}} (1+O(N^{-1})).$$

Summing up, we may conclude that (3.20) holds.

Lemma 3.12. Let $u_n = \mu(0,n)$ and $v_n = \mu(1,n)$ be the scaled quasi-stationary measure. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. Put $m = \lfloor \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda} N \rfloor$, the number of infected leaves at the metastable state, and $R = N^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}$. Then,

 \Box

as $N \to \infty$, the total mass of the process is

$$Z_{N,\lambda} = \sum_{n=0}^{N} (u_n + v_n) \simeq \sum_{|n-m| < R} v_n \simeq \left(\frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda}\right)^{N+\frac{2}{1+2\lambda}},\tag{3.21}$$

where the second summation is taken over n's that satisfy |n - m| < R.

Proof. We begin by proving

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N} v_n \simeq \sum_{|n-m| < R} v_n \simeq \frac{\sqrt{2\pi\lambda N}}{1+\lambda} v_m.$$

The right-hand side of the above equality agrees with the right-hand side of (3.21) by Lemma 3.11. Write n = m + k. By the asymptotic formulas for v_n in Theorems 3.4 and 3.5, v_n/v_m rapidly decays as $N \to \infty$ if $k \ge R$. Hence, we may neglect n's such that $|n - m| \ge R$, and suppose that k < R. Similarly as in the proof of Lemma 3.11, we obtain

$$v_n = v_n^{\text{high}}(1+o(1))$$

= $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi N}} \frac{1}{(\frac{n}{N})^{n+\frac{1}{2}}(\frac{N-n}{N})^{N-n+\frac{1}{2}}} \lambda^{n-N} \left(\frac{1+2\lambda}{1+\lambda}\frac{n}{N} - \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}\right)^{-\frac{1}{1+2\lambda}} (1+o(1))$
= $v_m \frac{1}{(1+\frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda}\frac{k}{N})^n (1-(1+\lambda)\frac{k}{N})^{N-n}} (1+o(1)).$

Also, it is easy to check that

$$\frac{1}{(1+\frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda}\frac{k}{N})^n(1-(1+\lambda)\frac{k}{N})^{N-n}} = \exp\left[-\frac{(1+\lambda)^2}{2\lambda}\frac{k^2}{N}\right]\left[1+O\left(\frac{k}{N}\right)\right]$$

by taking log of each sides and expanding into Taylor series. Thus, it follows that

$$\sum_{|n-m|$$

where $\operatorname{erf}(x)$ is the error function.

It remains to prove that the sum of u_n 's is negligible with respect to the sum of v_n 's. By the relations between u_n 's and v_n 's in Proposition 3.1,

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N} u_n = u_0 + \lambda (N-1)v_1 + \sum_{n=2}^{N} \left(\lambda \frac{N-n}{n} - \frac{n}{n-1}\right) v_n$$
$$= \sum_{|n-m| < R} \left(\lambda \frac{N-n}{n} - \frac{n}{n-1}\right) v_n (1+o(1)) = O(N^{-1}) \sum_{|n-m| < R} v_n,$$
aim.

which is our claim.

Lemma 3.13. Let $v_n = \mu(1, n)$ be the scaled quasi-stationary measure with infected hub. Then, as $N \to \infty$,

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N} \frac{v_n}{(1+\lambda)^n} = \lambda N C_{N,\lambda} (1+O(N^{-1})).$$
(3.22)

The proof of Lemma 3.13 is given in Section 5.

YOUNGHUN JO

4. POTENTIAL THEORY FOR NON-REVERSIBLE MARKOV CHAINS

In this section, we introduce basic terminologies and review the potential theoretic approach for estimating the mean extinction time. These concepts and methods are employed in subsequent analyses in the next section. We refer to [33] for more details.

Throughout this section, let $(X(t))_{t\geq 0}$ be an irreducible continuous-time Markov process on a finite set \mathcal{H} , with jump rate $r: \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H} \to [0, \infty)$ and stationary distribution μ .

4.1. **Basic Terminology.** Since \mathcal{H} is a finite set, the space $L^2(\mu)$ consists of all real functions on \mathcal{H} . The generator \mathcal{L} is an operator acting on $f \in L^2(\mu)$ by

$$(\mathcal{L}f)(x) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{H}} r(x, y)(f(y) - f(x)), \qquad x \in \mathcal{H}$$

Then \mathcal{L} defines a positive semi-definite quadratic form on $L^2(\mu)$ given by

$$\mathcal{D}(f) = \langle f, -\mathcal{L}f \rangle_{\mu} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{H}} \mu(x) r(x, y) [f(y) - f(x)]^2$$

where $f \in L^2(\mu)$, called the *Dirichlet form*.

The time-reversed process of $(X(t))_{t\geq 0}$, called the *adjoint process*, is the continuous-time Markov process $(X^{\dagger}(t))_{t\geq 0}$ on \mathcal{H} with rate

$$r^{\dagger}(x,y) = rac{\mu(y)r(y,x)}{\mu(x)}, \qquad x,y \in \mathcal{H}.$$

The generator \mathcal{L}^{\dagger} of the adjoint process given by

$$(\mathcal{L}^{\dagger}f)(x) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{H}} r^{\dagger}(x, y)(f(y) - f(x)), \qquad x \in \mathcal{H}$$

for $f \in L^2(\mu)$ is indeed the adjoint operator to \mathcal{L} , that is,

$$\langle f, \mathcal{L}g \rangle_{\mu} = \langle \mathcal{L}^{\dagger}f, g \rangle_{\mu}$$

for $f, g \in L^2(\mu)$. The process is called *reversible* if $\mathcal{L}^{\dagger} = \mathcal{L}$.

Define the symmetrized process of $(X(t))_{t\geq 0}$ as a continuous-time Markov process $(X^s(t))_{t\geq 0}$ on \mathcal{H} with rate

$$r^{s}(x,y) = \frac{1}{2\mu(x)}[\mu(x)r(x,y) + \mu(y)r(y,x)], \qquad x, y \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Note that μ is the stationary distribution for the reversible process $(X^s(t))_{t\geq 0}$.

For nonempty disjoint subsets A and B of \mathcal{H} , define the *equilibrium potential* between A and B with respect to the process $(X(t))_{t>0}$ as the function $h_{A,B} : \mathcal{H} \to [0,1]$ given by

$$h_{A,B}(x) = \mathbb{P}_x[\tau_A < \tau_B], \qquad x \in \mathcal{H}$$

where \mathbb{P}_x denotes the law of the process $(X(t))_{t\geq 0}$ starting from x. It can be immediately checked that

$$h_{B,A} = 1 - h_{A,B},$$

and

$$\begin{cases} h_{A,B} \equiv 1 & \text{on } A, \\ h_{A,B} \equiv 0 & \text{on } B, \text{ and} \\ \mathcal{L}h_{A,B} \equiv 0 & \text{on } (A \cup B)^c. \end{cases}$$

The equilibrium potential with respect to the adjoint process $(X^{\dagger}(t))_{t\geq 0}$ will be denoted by $h_{A,B}^{\dagger}$. The *capacity* between A and B with respect to the process $(X(t))_{t\geq 0}$ is defined as

$$\operatorname{cap}(A,B) = \mathcal{D}(h_{A,B})$$

Note that

$$\operatorname{cap}(A,B) = \mathcal{D}(h_{A,B}) = \mathcal{D}(h_{B,A}) = \operatorname{cap}(B,A)$$

The capacity endows two important basic properties.

Proposition 4.1. Let A and B be two nonempty disjoint subsets of \mathcal{H} . Then,

$$\operatorname{cap}(A, B) = \operatorname{cap}^{\dagger}(A, B),$$

where cap^{\dagger} denotes the capacity with respect to the adjoint process.

Proposition 4.2. Let A' and B' be two nonempty disjoint subsets of \mathcal{H} , and A and B be nonempty subsets of A and B, respectively. Then,

$$\operatorname{cap}(A, B) \le \operatorname{cap}(A', B').$$

Given a process, we can represent its mean hitting times in terms of capacities, equilibrium potential, and stationary distribution.

Proposition 4.3 (Mean hitting time formula). Let $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$ be two distinct states. Then,

$$\mathbb{E}_x[\tau_y] = \frac{1}{\operatorname{cap}(x,y)} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{H}} h_{x,y}^{\dagger}(z) \mu(z)$$

In general, it is difficult to compute the precise equilibrium potential $h_{A,B}$. Hence, the following rough estimate for $h_{A,B}$ can be useful.

Proposition 4.4. Let $(X(t))_{t\geq 0}$ be a continuous-time Markov process on a finite set \mathcal{H} , and $A, B \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ be nonempty and disjoint. Then,

$$1 - \frac{\operatorname{cap}(x, B)}{\operatorname{cap}(x, A \cup B)} \le h_{A,B}(x) \le \frac{\operatorname{cap}(x, A)}{\operatorname{cap}(x, A \cup B)} \text{ for all } x \in (A \cup B)^c.$$

Now we introduce the flow structure associated to the Markov process. For two sites x and y in \mathcal{H} , we say that $x \sim y$ if r(x, y) + r(y, x) > 0. Note that $x \sim y$ if and only if $y \sim x$. Define the set of directed edges by

$$\mathfrak{E} = \{ (x, y) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H} : x \sim y \}.$$

A flow on \mathcal{H} is a function $\phi : \mathfrak{E} \to \mathbb{R}$ that is anti-symmetric, in the sense that

$$\phi(x,y) = -\phi(y,x)$$
 for all $(x,y) \in \mathfrak{E}$.

We denote the space of flows by \mathfrak{F} . Define the *conductance* between sites as

$$c(x,y) = \mu(x)r(x,y), \qquad x, y \in \mathcal{H},$$

and consider the symmetrized conductance

$$c^{s}(x,y) = \frac{1}{2}[c(x,y) + c(y,x)], \qquad x, y \in \mathcal{H}$$

so that $c^{s}(x,y) = c^{s}(y,x)$. Then, we define an L^{2} -structure on the flow space by

$$\langle \phi, \psi \rangle_{\mathfrak{F}} = rac{1}{2} \sum_{(x,y) \in \mathfrak{E}} rac{\phi(x,y)\psi(x,y)}{c^s(x,y)}, \qquad \phi, \psi \in \mathfrak{F}.$$

The flow norm is defined as $\|\phi\|_{\mathfrak{F}} = \langle \phi, \phi \rangle_{\mathfrak{F}}^{1/2}$.

For a flow ϕ , the *divergence* of ϕ at a site $x \in \mathcal{H}$ is defined by

$$(\operatorname{div} \phi)(x) = \sum_{y:x \sim y} \phi(x, y)$$

For $A \subseteq \mathcal{H}$, define

$$(\operatorname{div} \phi)(A) = \sum_{x \in A} (\operatorname{div} \phi)(x)$$

The flow ϕ is called *divergence-free* at $x \in \mathcal{H}$ if $(\operatorname{div} \phi)(x) = 0$, and divergence-free on $A \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ if it is divergence-free at all $x \in A$.

Given a function $f : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{R}$, we define three associated flows as follows.

$$\begin{split} \Phi_f(x,y) &= f(y)c(y,x) - f(x)c(x,y), \\ \Phi_f^*(x,y) &= f(y)c(x,y) - f(x)c(y,x), \\ \Psi_f(x,y) &= c^s(x,y)[f(y) - f(x)] = (1/2)(\Phi_f + \Phi_f^*)(x,y). \end{split}$$

Then, it holds that

$$(\operatorname{div}\Phi_f)(x) = \mu(x)(\mathcal{L}^{\dagger}f)(x) \quad \text{and} \quad (\operatorname{div}\Phi_f^*)(x) = \mu(x)(\mathcal{L}f)(x)$$

$$(4.1)$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{H}$.

4.2. **Dirichlet and Thomson Principles.** Variational principles are useful tool for estimating the capacity of a process. In this subsection, we introduce two variational principles: the Dirichlet principle and the Thomson principle, which give upper and lower bounds for capacity, respectively.

For nonempty and disjoint subsets A and B of \mathcal{H} , and real numbers a and b, let $\mathfrak{C}_{a,b}(A, B)$ be the set of all real-valued functions f on \mathcal{H} such that $f|_A \equiv a$ and $f|_B \equiv b$.

Theorem 4.5 (Dirichlet principle). Let $(X(t))_{t\geq 0}$ be a continuous-time Markov process on a finite set \mathcal{H} , and $A, B \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ be nonempty and disjoint. Then,

$$\operatorname{cap}(A,B) = \inf_{f \in \mathfrak{C}_{1,0}(A,B), \phi \in \mathfrak{F}} \bigg\{ \|\Phi_f - \phi\|^2 - 2\sum_{x \in \mathcal{H}} h_{A,B}(x) (\operatorname{div} \phi)(x) \bigg\},\$$

and

$$(f,\phi) = \left(\frac{1}{2}(h_{A,B} + h_{A,B}^{\dagger}), \frac{1}{2}(\Phi_{h_{A,B}^{\dagger}} - \Phi_{h_{A,B}}^{*})\right)$$

is the unique minimizer.

Theorem 4.6 (Thomson principle). Let $(X(t))_{t\geq 0}$ be a continuous-time Markov process on a finite set \mathcal{H} , and $A, B \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ be nonempty and disjoint. Then,

$$\operatorname{cap}(A,B) = \sup_{g \in \mathfrak{C}_{0,0}(A,B), \psi \in \mathfrak{F} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{\|\Phi_g - \psi\|^2} \left[\sum_{x \in \mathcal{H}} h_{A,B}(x) (\operatorname{div} \psi)(x) \right]^2,$$

and constant multiples of

$$(g,\psi) = \left(\frac{1}{2\operatorname{cap}(A,B)}(h_{A,B}^{\dagger} - h_{A,B}), \frac{1}{2\operatorname{cap}(A,B)}(\Phi_{h_{A,B}^{\dagger}} + \Phi_{h_{A,B}}^{*})\right)$$

 $are\ maximizers.$

Remark 4.7. Both formulas in the principles involve the term

$$\sum_{x \in \mathcal{H}} h_{A,B}(x) (\operatorname{div} \phi)(x)$$

which can be decomposed into

$$(\operatorname{div} \phi)(A) + \sum_{x \in (A \cup B)^c} h_{A,B}(x)(\operatorname{div} \phi)(x).$$

Note that if we take the test function and flow as the given minimizer or maximizer, then the second term vanishes, and the first term is equal to 0 for the Dirichlet principle while equal to 1 for the Thomson principle. In practice, to find good test function and flow, we may divide $(A \cup B)^c$ into two components C_1 and C_2 so that the test flow is approximately divergence-free on C_1 and $h_{A,B}$ is small on C_2 .

4.3. **Trace Process.** In this subsection, we briefly introduce the notion of trace process. For a deeper discussion of the theory, we refer the reader to [2].

Let F be a proper subset of \mathcal{H} . The *trace process* of $(X(t))_{t\geq 0}$ on F is the process obtained by ignoring the time spent by the process outside the set F. More precisely, let $(\mathcal{T}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be the time $(X(t))_{t\geq 0}$ spent on the set F in the time interval [0,t], and $(\mathcal{S}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be the generalized inverse of $(\mathcal{T}_t)_{t\geq 0}$. The trace process $(X^F(t))_{t\geq 0}$ is defined by $X^F(t) = X(\mathcal{S}_t)$, which is well-defined and takes value in F, almost surely.

The stationary distribution for the trace process is μ restricted to F, that is,

$$\mu_F = \frac{1}{\mu(F)} \mu|_F.$$

Denote the capacity with respect to the trace process by cap_F , then we have

$$\mu(F)\operatorname{cap}_F(A,B) = \operatorname{cap}(A,B) \tag{4.2}$$

for all nonempty disjoint subsets A and B of F.

5. Proof of Eyring–Kramers Law

In this section, we prove the Eyring–Kramers law for the mean extinction time of contact process on star graphs by estimating the capacity of the process.

Following methodologies similar to those in [8] and [9], we consider the trace process of the regenerative process $(o_t, n_t)_{t\geq 0}$, restricted to the set

$$F = \{(0,0)\} \cup \{(1,n) : 0 \le n \le N\},\$$

that is, we ignore the time spent by the process when the hub is healthy, except at the stable state (0,0). It turns out that the jump rate of the trace process can be easily determined. When there are n > 0 infected leaves and the hub is healthy, the next transition of the contact process is either to (1,n) with a probability of $\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}$, or to (0, n-1) with a probability of $\frac{1}{1+\lambda}$. Hence, once the hub becomes healthy, the number H of leaves that are cured before the hub is reinfected follows a (truncated) geometric distribution, specifically:

$$\mathbb{P}[H=j] = \begin{cases} \frac{\lambda}{(1+\lambda)^{j+1}} & \text{for } 0 \le j \le n-1, \\ \frac{1}{(1+\lambda)^n} & \text{for } j=n. \end{cases}$$

Consequently, the jump rate $r_F(x, y)$ of the trace process on F is given by

$$\begin{cases} r_F((1,n),(1,n+1)) = \lambda(N-n) & \text{for } 0 \le n \le N, \\ r_F((1,n),(1,n-1)) = n + \frac{\lambda}{(1+\lambda)^2} & \text{for } 1 \le n \le N, \\ r_F((1,n),(1,n-j)) = \frac{\lambda}{(1+\lambda)^{j+1}} & \text{for } 1 \le n \le N \text{ and } 2 \le j \le n-1, \\ r_F((1,n),(0,0)) = \frac{1}{(1+\lambda)^n} & \text{for } 0 \le n \le N, \\ r_F((0,0),(1,0)) = \alpha. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 3.13 immediately follows from the notion of the trace process.

Proof of Lemma 3.13. By the stationary condition at the state (0,0) for the trace process on the set F,

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N} \frac{\mu(1,n)}{(1+\lambda)^n} = \alpha \mu(0,0),$$

so the lemma follows from (3.8).

Recall that the mass of the set F converges to 1 as $N \to \infty$ by Lemma 3.12. For simplicity, throughout this section, we will treat the quasi-stationary distribution ν as though it were the stationary distribution of the trace process. It is also important to note that a sharp estimate of the capacity of the trace process on F serves as an estimate for that of the original process.

5.1. Capacity Estimation. In this subsection, we apply variation principles to obtain a sharp estimate for the capacity of the process.

Theorem 5.1 (Capacity estimate). Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. Then, for $n \in [\varepsilon N, N]$, we have

$$\operatorname{cap}((0,0),(1,n)) = (1+2\lambda) \left(\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}\right)^{\frac{2}{1+2\lambda}} B\left(\frac{1}{1+2\lambda},N\right)^{-1} \left(\frac{1+2\lambda}{(1+\lambda)^2}\right)^N (1+o(1))$$
(5.1)

as $N \to \infty$, where the error term o(1) is uniform in n.

To prove the theorem above, we construct good test functions and flows for use in variational principles for the trace process. Initially, we build two functions h and h^{\dagger} , which are designed to approximate the equilibrium potential of the trace process and its adjoint between the stable state (0,0) and the state (1,n). Next, we establish tentative test functions and flows:

$$(f,\phi) = \left(\frac{1}{2}(h+h^{\dagger}), \frac{1}{2}(\Phi_{h^{\dagger}} - \Phi_{h}^{*})\right) \text{ and } (g,\psi) = \left(\frac{1}{2}(h^{\dagger} - h), \frac{1}{2}(\Phi_{h^{\dagger}} + \Phi_{h}^{*})\right),$$
(5.2)

which are alike the extremizers that appear in Theorems 4.5 and 4.6. Finally, we make a slight modification to these test flows ϕ and ψ so that the resulting flows are divergence-free, except at the states (0,0) and (1,n). Let us now provide some heuristics for our selection of the test function and flows.

For the case of h, since the infected hub spreads the infection to all N leaves, the process is highly unlikely to hit the stable state before the state (1, n). Hence, it is reasonable to set

$$h(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = (0,0), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for $x \in F$.

 \square

Now consider the adjoint $(X_F^{\dagger}(t))_{t\geq 0}$ of the trace process, which has jump rates

$$r_F^{\dagger}(x,y) = \frac{\mu(y)}{\mu(x)} r_F(y,x), \qquad x, y \in F.$$

Assume that x = (1, k), and $1 \ll k \ll N$. By Theorem 3.5, as $N \to \infty$,

$$\begin{split} r_F^{\dagger}((1,k),(1,k-1)) &= \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda} N(1+o(1)), \\ r_F^{\dagger}((1,k),(1,k+1)) &= (1+\lambda)k(1+o(1)) \end{split}$$

Also, for long jumps, if $k + 1 < k + j \le N$, then

$$r_F^{\dagger}((1,k),(1,k+j)) = \frac{\mu(1,k+j)}{\mu(1,k)} \frac{\lambda}{(1+\lambda)^{j+1}}.$$

Recall that from Lemma 3.13, we have

$$\sum_{j=2}^{N-k} \mu(1,k+j)(1+\lambda)^{-(k+j)} = \lambda N C_{N,\lambda}(1+o(1))$$

since

$$\mu(1,k)(1+\lambda)^{-k} = C_{N,\lambda}(1+o(1))$$

if $k \ll N$. Hence, the process performs a long jump at a rate of

$$\sum_{j=2}^{N-k} r_F^{\dagger}((1,k),(1,k+j)) = \sum_{j=2}^{N-k} \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda} \frac{\mu(1,k+j)(1+\lambda)^{-(k+j)}}{\mu(1,k)(1+\lambda)^{-k}} = \frac{\lambda^2}{1+\lambda} N(1+o(1)).$$

So roughly speaking, if the adjoint process is located at (1, k), then k decreases by 1 with approximate rate $\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}N$, while k increases by some large number with approximate rate $\frac{\lambda^2}{1+\lambda}N$. Considering the long jumps as transitions to the state (1, n), each jump of the process either moves the system one step closer the state (0, 0), with a probability of $\frac{1}{1+\lambda}$, or results in a transition to the state (1, n), with a probability of $\frac{1}{1+\lambda}$. Thus, it is plausible to put an approximately geometric h^{\dagger} :

$$h^{\dagger}(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = (0,0), \\ (1+\lambda)^{-k} & \text{if } x = (1,k), \ 0 \le k \le R_1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for some $1 \ll R_1 \ll N$, say $R_1 = \lfloor N^q \rfloor$ for some small q > 0.

The divergence of the associated flows of h and h^{\dagger} can be directly computed from (4.1) by applying (3.8) and Lemma 3.13.

Lemma 5.2. Let 0 < q < 1, $R_1 = \lfloor N^q \rfloor$, and let h and h^{\dagger} be as above. Then for $x \in F$, as $N \to \infty$,

$$(\operatorname{div} \Phi_h^*)(x) = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{Z_{N,\lambda}} \lambda N C_{N,\lambda} (1+o(1)) & \text{if } x = (0,0), \\ \frac{1}{Z_{N,\lambda}} \mu(1,k) (1+\lambda)^{-k} & \text{if } x = (1,k), \ 0 \le k \le N, \end{cases}$$
(5.3)

and

$$(\operatorname{div} \Phi_{h^{\dagger}})(x) = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{Z_{N,\lambda}} \lambda N C_{N,\lambda} (1+o(1)) & \text{if } x = (0,0), \\ \frac{1}{Z_{N,\lambda}} C_{N,\lambda} O(N^{q}) & \text{if } x = (1,k), \ 0 \le k \le R_{1}, \\ \frac{1}{Z_{N,\lambda}} \lambda N C_{N,\lambda} (1+o(1)) & \text{if } x = (1,R_{1}+1), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$
(5.4)

We now modify the test flows ϕ and ψ defined in (5.2) so that the flows become divergence-free, except at the sites (0,0) and (1,n). Heuristically, we anticipate that the equilibrium potential of the trace process rapidly decays for states distant from the stable state (0,0). Thus, to derive good estimates using the variational principles, it is sufficient to modify the flows meticulously only at the sites x = (1,k) with $0 \le k \le R_1$. For other sites, the modifications to the flows are made more crudely.

In the remainder of this subsection, stating $\Phi(x, y) = s$ for a flow Φ implicitly implies that $\Phi(y, x) = -s$.

Lemma 5.3. Let Φ be one of the flows ϕ and ψ , and let $R_2 = \lfloor rN \rfloor$ where $0 < r < \frac{\lambda}{1+2\lambda}$. Then, there exists a flow η satisfying

$$\eta(x,y) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{Z_{N,\lambda}} C_{N,\lambda} O(N^{-1+2q}) & \text{if } x = (1,k), \ y = (1,l), \ k \in [0,R_1], \ l \in [0,R_2], \\ \frac{1}{Z_{N,\lambda}} C_{N,\lambda} O(N^{2+2q}) & \text{if } x = (1,k), \ y = (1,k+1), \ k \in [R_1+1,N], \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

so that the flow $\widehat{\Phi} = \Phi + \eta$ becomes divergence-free, except at the sites (0,0) and (1,n).

Proof. By Lemma 5.2, together with Theorems 3.4 and 3.5,

$$(\operatorname{div} \Phi)(1,k) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{Z_{N,\lambda}} C_{N,\lambda} O(N^q) & \text{if } 0 \le k \le R_1, \\ \frac{1}{Z_{N,\lambda}} C_{N,\lambda} O(N) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let us first inductively modify the flow to be divergence-free at (1, k) for each $0 \le k \le R_1$. Put $\Phi_{-1} = \Phi$. Fix k, and suppose that a flow Φ_{k-1} is divergence-free at (1, j) for all $0 \le j < k$, and $(\operatorname{div} \Phi_{k-1})(1, k) = D_k$. Consider the flow $\Phi_k = \Phi_{k-1} + \eta_k$ where

$$\eta_k(x,y) = \begin{cases} (R_2 - k)^{-1} D_k & \text{if } x = (1,l), \ y = (1,k), \ l \in [k+1,R_2], \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then each term appears in η_k is of $O(N^{-1})D_k$, and the resulting flow Φ_k is divergence-free at (1, j) for all $0 \leq j \leq k$. Repeating this procedure, we obtain a flow Φ_{R_1} that is divergence-free at all (1, k), $0 \leq k \leq R_1$. We can readily observe that Φ_{R_1} possesses divergence of $\frac{1}{Z_{N,\lambda}}C_{N,\lambda}O(N^{1+2q})$ at all other sites. Define

$$\widetilde{\eta}(x,y) = \begin{cases} -\sum_{l=0}^{k} (\operatorname{div} \Phi_{R_{1}})(1,l) & \text{if } x = (1,k), \ y = (1,k+1), \ k \in [R_{1}+1,n-1], \\ \sum_{l=k+1}^{N} (\operatorname{div} \Phi_{R_{1}})(1,l) & \text{if } x = (1,k), \ y = (1,k+1), \ n \neq l \in [n,N-1], \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then the flow $\eta = \sum_{k=1}^{R_1} \eta_k + \tilde{\eta}$ satisfies the requirements of the lemma.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. The proof is straightforward. Let the test functions and flows (f, ϕ) and (g, ψ) be defined as in (5.2), and let $\hat{\phi}$ and $\hat{\psi}$ be the modified flows as described in Lemma 5.3. Employing Theorems 4.5 and 4.6 with the test functions and flows constructed above allows us to establish upper and lower bounds for the capacity, represented by:

$$\|\Phi_f - \widehat{\phi}\|^2$$
 and $\frac{1}{\|\Phi_g - \widehat{\psi}\|^2} |(\operatorname{div} \widehat{\psi})(0, 0)|,$

respectively. We will show that these two bounds coincide at

$$\frac{1}{Z_{N,\lambda}}\lambda NC_{N,\lambda}(1+o(1)),\tag{5.5}$$

which agrees with the right-hand side of (5.1) by Lemma 3.12.

Note that

$$\Phi_f - \phi = \Phi_g - \psi = \frac{1}{2}(\Phi_h + \Phi_h^*) = \Psi_h.$$

By (3.8) and Lemma 3.13, it holds that

$$\|\Psi_h\|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x,y \in F} c_F^s(x,y) [h(y) - h(x)]^2$$

= $\frac{1}{2Z_{N,\lambda}} \left[\mu(0,0)\alpha + \sum_{k=0}^N \mu(1,k)(1+\lambda)^{-k} \right] = \frac{1}{Z_{N,\lambda}} \lambda N C_{N,\lambda} (1+o(1)).$

Also, Lemma 5.2 implies that

$$(\operatorname{div}\psi)(0,0) = -\frac{1}{Z_{N,\lambda}}\lambda NC_{N,\lambda}(1+o(1)).$$

Hence, the two terms

$$\|\Phi_f - \phi\|^2$$
 and $\frac{1}{\|\Phi_g - \psi\|^2} |(\operatorname{div} \psi)(0, 0)|$

coincide at (5.5).

Let η be the modification flow as outlined in Lemma 5.3. Then Ψ_h is supported on the pairs (x, y) where either x or y equals (0,0), while η is supported on their complement. Consequently, Ψ_h and η are orthogonal with respect to the flow inner product, and η is divergence-free at (0,0).

What is left to show is that the norm of η is negligible in comparison to the norm of Ψ_h . We have

$$c_F^s((1,k),(1,l)) \gtrsim \begin{cases} \frac{1}{Z_{N,\lambda}} C_{N,\lambda} & \text{if } k \in [0,R_1], \ l \in [0,R_2], \\ \frac{1}{Z_{N,\lambda}} C_{N,\lambda} (1+\lambda)^{R_1} & \text{if } k \in [R_1+1,N-1], \ l = k+1 \end{cases}$$

which is clear from Theorems 3.4 and 3.5. Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\eta\|^{2} &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{R_{1}} \sum_{l=1}^{R_{2}} \frac{1}{c_{F}^{s}((1,k),(1,l))} \left[\frac{1}{Z_{N,\lambda}} C_{N,\lambda} O(N^{-1+2q}) \right]^{2} \\ &+ \sum_{k=R_{1}+1}^{N-1} \frac{1}{c_{F}^{s}((1,k),(1,k+1))} \left[\frac{1}{Z_{N,\lambda}} C_{N,\lambda} O(N^{2+2q}) \right]^{2} \\ &= \frac{1}{Z_{N,\lambda}} C_{N,\lambda} \Big[O(N^{-1+5q}) + (1+\lambda)^{-R_{1}} O(N^{5+4q}) \Big] \ll \frac{1}{Z_{N,\lambda}} \lambda N C_{N,\lambda} \end{aligned}$$

when q > 0 is sufficiently small, so the proof is complete.

5.2. Proof of Main Theorem. We prove our main theorem, the Eyring–Kramers law.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given, and let $x \in \{0,1\} \times [\varepsilon N, N]$. What we have to prove is:

$$\mathbb{E}_{x}\tau_{(0,0)} = \frac{1}{1+2\lambda} \Big(\frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda}\Big)^{\frac{2}{1+2\lambda}} B\Big(\frac{1}{1+2\lambda}, N\Big) \Big(\frac{(1+\lambda)^{2}}{1+2\lambda}\Big)^{N} (1+o(1)).$$
(5.6)

Note that this is equivalent to (2.1) because $B(\frac{1}{1+2\lambda}, N) \simeq \Gamma(\frac{1}{1+2\lambda}) N^{-\frac{1}{1+2\lambda}}$ by Stirling's formula [27, Equation (5.11.12)].

YOUNGHUN JO

Suppose that the formula (5.6) holds for states with infected hub, then consider an initial configuration x = (0, n) with healthy hub. By the monotonicity of contact process, the mean extinction time starting from (0, n) is less than or equal to the mean extinction time starting from (1, n). This observation establishes one direction of the inequality for (5.6). For the opposite direction, note that when the hub is healthy, the probability that the next jump of the process results in the reinfection of the hub is $\frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda}$. Hence, the process started from (0, n) reinfects the hub before it reaches the state $(0, \lfloor n/2 \rfloor)$ with high probability, so our assertion readily follows. Now we only need to consider an initial configuration x = (1, n) with infected hub.

We see at once that the right-hand side of (5.6) is the inverse of the capacity between two states (0,0) and (1,n) by Theorem 5.1. By the mean hitting time formula in Proposition 4.3, it sufficies to show that

$$\sum_{z \in \mathcal{H}} h^{\dagger}_{(1,n),(0,0)}(z)\nu(z) = 1 + o(1),$$
(5.7)

where $\mathcal{H} = \{0, 1\} \times [0, N]$, and ν is the quasi-stationary distribution of the process.

Given that $h_{(1,n),(0,0)}^{\dagger}(z) \leq 1$ for all $z \in \mathcal{H}$, our task is to establish a lower bound for the left-hand side of (5.7). Define $m = \lfloor \frac{\lambda}{1+\lambda} N \rfloor$ and $R = N^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}$, and consider z = (1, l) with |l - m| < R and $l \neq n$. Lemma 3.12 indicates that the stationary distribution of the process is concentrated in such z values. By Proposition 4.4, together with Propositions 4.1, 4.2, and (4.2), it holds that

$$1 - \frac{\operatorname{cap}_F((1,l),(0,0))}{\operatorname{cap}_F((1,l),(1,n))} \le h^{\dagger}_{(1,n),(0,0)}(1,l).$$

Hence, if we prove that

$$\operatorname{cap}_F((1,l),(0,0)) \ll \operatorname{cap}_F((1,l),(1,n))$$
(5.8)

uniformly in n and l, the assertion follows.

The left-hand side of (5.8) can be estimated using Theorem 5.1, so the task now is to find a lower bound for the right-hand side. We apply Theorem 4.6, the Thomson principle. Set the test function $g \equiv 0$, and the test flow ψ satisfying⁴

$$\psi(x,y) = \begin{cases} \pm 1 & \text{if } x = (1,j), \ y = (1,k), \ j,k \in [l,n], \ |j-k| = 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

so that ψ is a unit flow from (1, l) to (1, n) that is divergence-free except at (1, l) and (1, n). Then, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{cap}_F((1,l),(1,n)) &\geq \frac{1}{\|\psi\|^2} = \left[\sum_{k,k+1 \in [l,n]} \frac{1}{c_s((1,k),(1,k+1))}\right]^{-1} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{N} \min_{k,k+1 \in [l,n]} c_s((1,k),(1,k+1)), \end{aligned}$$

where the summation and minimum run along k's such that both k and k + 1 lie inside the interval [l, n]. It holds that

$$c_s((1,k),(1,k+1)) = \frac{1}{2Z_{N,\lambda}} \Big[\lambda(N-k)\mu(1,k) + \Big(k+1+\frac{\lambda}{(1+\lambda)^2}\Big)\mu(1,k+1) \Big]$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{Z_{N,\lambda}}\mu(1,k+1).$$

⁴In this proof, if l > n, we regard [l, n] as the interval [n, l].

Hence, it sufficies to show that

$$N^2 C_{N,\lambda} \ll \mu(1,k)$$

uniformly for all $k \in [\varepsilon N, N]$, and this is clear from Theorems 3.4 and 3.5.

Acknowledgment. This research is supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded by the Korea government (MSIT) (No. 2023R1A2C100517311) and 2023 Student-Directed Education research program through Faculty of Liberal Education, Seoul National University. The author expresses gratitude to Insuk Seo for introducing the problem and offering enlightening insights, and to Mouad Ramil and Seonwoo Kim for their fruitful discussions on the problem.

References

- Beltran, J. and Landim, C.: Tunneling and metastability of continuous time Markov chains. J. Statist. Phys. 140, (2010), 1065–1114.
- [2] Beltran, J. and Landim, C.: Tunneling and metastability of continuous time Markov chains II, the nonreversible case. J. Statist. Phys. 149, (2012), 598–618.
- Berger, N., Borgs, C., Chayes, J. T. and Saberi, A.: On the spread of viruses on the internet. XVI ACM-SIAM Symp. Discr. Algorithms, (2005), 301–310.
- [4] Bovier, A., Eckhoff, M. Gayrard, V. and Klein, M.: Metastability in stochastic dynamics of disordered mean-field models. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 119, (2001), 99–161.
- [5] Bovier, A., Eckhoff, M., Gayrard, V. and Klein, M.: Metastability in reversible diffusion processes. I. Sharp asymptotics for capacities and exit times. J. Eur. Math. Soc. 6, (2004), 399–424.
- [6] Bovier, A. and den Hollander, F.: Metastability: a potential-theoretic approach. Springer, Cham, 2015. xxi+581 pp.
- [7] Cassandro, M., Galves, A., Olivieri, E. and Vares, M. E.: Metastable behavior of stochastic dynamics: a pathwise approach. J. Statist. Phys. 35, (1984), 603–634.
- [8] Cator, E. and Van Mieghem, P.: Susceptible-infected-susceptible epidemics on the complete graph and the star graph: Exact analysis. Phys. Rev. E 87, (2013), 012811.
- [9] Chatterjee, S. and Durrett, R.: Contact processes on random graphs with power law degree distributions have critical value 0. Ann. Probab. 37, (2009), 2332–2356.
- [10] Durrett, R. and Liu, X. F.: The contact process on a finite set. Ann. Probab. 16, (1988), 1158-1173.
- [11] Durrett, R. and Schonmann, R. H.: The contact process on a finite set. II. Ann. Probab. 16, (1988), 1570–1583.
- [12] Durrett, R., Schonmann, R. H. and Tanaka, N. I.: The contact process on a finite set. III. The critical case. Ann. Probab. 17, (1989), 1303–1321.
- [13] Eyring, H.: The activated complex and the absolute rate of chemical reactions. Chem. Rev. 17, (1935), 65-77.
- [14] Gaudillière, A. and Landim, C.: A Dirichlet principle for non reversible Markov chains and some recurrence theorems. Probab. Theory Related Fields 158, (2014), 55–89.
- [15] Harris, T. E.: Contact interactions on a lattice. Ann. Probab. 2, (1974), 969–988.
- [16] Huang, X. and Durrett, R.: The contact process on random graphs and Galton Watson trees. ALEA Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat. 17, (2020), 159–182.
- [17] Kramers, H. A.: Brownian motion in a field of force and the diffusion model of chemical reactions. *Physica* 7, (1940), 284–304.
- [18] Landim, C., Mariani, M. and Seo, I.: Dirichlet's and Thomson's principles for non-selfadjoint elliptic operators with application to non-reversible metastable diffusion processes. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 231, (2019), 887–938.
- [19] Liggett T. M.: Stochastic interacting systems: contact, voter and exclusion processes. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.
 xii+332 pp.
- [20] Linker, A., Mitsche, D., Schapira, B. and Valesin, D.: The contact process on random hyperbolic graphs: metastability and critical exponents. Ann. Probab. 49, (2021), 1480–1514.
- [21] Mountford, T. S.: A metastable result for the finite multidimensional contact process. Canad. Math. Bull. 36, (1993), 216–226.
- [22] Mountford, T. S.: Existence of a constant for finite system extinction. J. Statist. Phys. 96, (1999), 1331–1341.
- [23] Mountford, T., Valesin, D. and Yao, Q.: Metastable densities for the contact process on power law random graphs. *Electron. J. Probab.* 18, (2013), 36 pp.

YOUNGHUN JO

- [24] Mountford, T., Mourrat, J., Valesin, D. and Yao, Q.: Exponential extinction time of the contact process on finite graphs. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **126**, (2016), 1974–2013.
- [25] Olivieri, E. and Vares, M. E.: Large deviations and metastability. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications, vol. 100. *Cambridge University Press*, Cambridge, 2005. xvi+512 pp.
- [26] Olver, F. W. J.: Asymptotics and special functions. Academic Press, New York-London, 1974. xvi+572 pp.
- [27] Olver, F. W. J., Lozier, D. W., Boisvert, R. F. and Clark., C. W. (Ed.): NIST handbook of mathematical functions. *Cambridge University Press*, Cambridge, 2010. xvi+951 pp.
- [28] Pemantle, R.: The contact process on trees. Ann. Probab. 20, (1992), 2089–2116.
- [29] Schapira, B. and Valesin, D.: Extinction time for the contact process on general graphs. Probab. Theory Related Fields 169, (2017), 871–899.
- [30] Schapira, B. and Valesin, D.: Exponential rate for the contact process extinction time. Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. 30, (2021), 503–526.
- [31] Schonmann, R. H.: Metastability for the contact process. J. Statist. Phys. 41, (1985), 445-464.
- [32] Seo, I.: Condensation of non-reversible zero-range processes. Comm. Math. Phys. 366, (2019), 781–839.
- [33] Seo, I.: Generalized Dirichlet and Thomson Principles and Their Applications, arXiv:2102.05538
- [34] Slowik, M.: A note on variational representations of capacities for reversible and nonreversible Markov chains. Unpublished, Technische Universität Berlin, (2013).
- [35] Wang, Z.: Personal Communication. (2024).
- [36] Zolotukhin, A., Nagaev, S. and Chebotarev, V.: On a bound of the absolute constant in the Berry-Esseen inequality for i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables. *Mod. Stoch. Theory Appl.* 5, (2018), 385–410.

Y. JO. DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, SEOUL NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, REPUBLIC OF KOREA. *Email address:* starrysky4220snu.ac.kr