Critical Fluctuations in Renewal Models of Statistical Mechanics

Marco Zamparo*

Dipartimento Scienza Applicata e Tecnologia, Politecnico di Torino, Italy

Abstract

We study precise large deviations for cumulative rewards in renewal models of Statistical Mechanics, with deterministic rewards and regularly varying waiting times, at criticality. Renewal models of Statistical Mechanics share a common mathematical skeleton that amounts to a Gibbs change of measure of a classical renewal process, and can be identified with a constrained pinning model of polymers. Important examples are the Poland-Scheraga model of DNA denaturation, the Fisher-Felderhof model of fluids, the Wako-Saitô-Muñoz-Eaton model of protein folding, and the Tokar-Dreyssé model of strained epitaxy. The extensive observables that enter the thermodynamic description of these systems are cumulative rewards corresponding to deterministic rewards that are uniquely determined by, and at most of the order of magnitude of, the waiting time between consecutive renewals. The probability decay with the system size of the fluctuations of such cumulative rewards switches from exponential to subexponential at criticality, which is the regime corresponding to the pinning-depinning transition of polymers.

Keywords: renewal processes; polymer pinning models; critical phenomena; renewalreward processes; precise large deviations; regular varying tails.

1 Introduction

In Ref. [1] the author has established sharp large deviation principles for cumulative rewards associated with a discrete-time renewal model, supposing that each renewal involves a broad-sense reward taking values in a separable Banach space. The renewal model has been there identified with constrained and non-constrained pinning models of polymers, which amount to Gibbs changes of measure of a classical discrete-time renewal process. In Ref. [2] the author has then specialized such large deviation principles to the constrained pinning model with multivariate deterministic rewards that are uniquely determined by, and at most of the order of magnitude of, the time elapsed between consecutive renewals. In particular, an analytical characterization of rate functions has been provided and a critical regime, corresponding to the pinning-depinning transition of polymers, has been identified as necessary condition for rate functions to display a wide region of zeros. The constrained pinning model plays a special role in Statistical Mechanics [2], as it represents the common mathematical skeleton to the Poland-Scheraga model of DNA denaturation, the Fisher-Felderhof model of fluids, the Wako-Saitô-Muñoz-Eaton model of protein folding, and the Tokar-Dreyssé model of strained epitaxy. Also cumulative rewards associated with deterministic rewards play a special role in Statistical Mechanics [2], as they correspond to the extensive observables that enter the thermodynamic description of the system. For instance, the number of renewals, which is one of these observables, turns out to be the commonly adopted order parameter for renewal models of Statistical Mechanics.

^{*}E-mail: marco.zamparo@polito.it

Persistent fluctuations of extensive observables at criticality lead to subexponential decays of probabilities that cannot be captured by a large deviation principle due to the many zeros of rate functions. This paper aims to describe such fluctuations by proposing a precise large deviation principle under the assumption of regularly varying waiting times. Section 1 introduces the problem and some notation. Section 2 presents and discusses the desired precise large deviation principle. The proof of this result is reported in section 3.

1.1 Pinning models

Let on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be given independent and identically distributed random variables S_1, S_2, \ldots taking values in $\{1, 2, \ldots\} \cup \{\infty\}$. The variable S_i can be regarded as the *waiting time* for the *i*th occurrence at the *renewal time* $T_i := S_1 + \cdots + S_i$ of some event that is continuously renewed over time. The pinning model considered in Ref. [1] and [2] makes use of this formalism to describe a polymer that is pinned by a substrate at the monomers T_1, T_2, \ldots . The polymer is supposed to consist of $t \ge 1$ monomers so that the monomer T_i contributes an energy $-v(S_i)$ provided that $T_i \le t$, the real function v being called the *potential*. The state of the polymer is defined by the law \mathbb{P}_t on the measurable space (Ω, \mathcal{F}) given by the Gibbs change of measure

$$\frac{d\mathbb{P}_t}{d\mathbb{P}} := \frac{e^{H_t}}{Z_t},$$

where $H_t := \sum_{i \ge 1} v(S_i) \mathbb{1}_{\{T_i \le t\}}$ is the Hamiltonian and $Z_t := \mathbb{E}[e^{H_t}]$ is the partition function ensuring normalization. The pinning model is the probabilistic model $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}_t)$ supplied with the hypotheses of aperiodicity and extensivity. We say that the waiting time distribution $p := \mathbb{P}[S_1 = \cdot]$ is aperiodic if its support $S := \{s \ge 1 : p(s) > 0\}$ is nonempty and there does not exist an integer $\tau > 1$ with the property that S includes only some multiples of τ . It is worth observing that aperiodicity of p can be obtained by simply changing the time unit whenever $\mathbb{P}[S_1 < \infty] > 0$.

Assumption 1. The waiting time distribution p is aperiodic.

We say that the potential v is extensive if $\limsup_{s\uparrow\infty}(1/s)\ln e^{v(s)}p(s) < \infty$. Extensivity is necessary to make the thermodynamic limit of the pinning model meaningful since $Z_t \geq \mathbb{E}[e^{H_t}\mathbb{1}_{\{S_1=t\}}] = e^{v(t)}p(t).$

Assumption 2. The potential v is extensive.

The constrained pinning model where the last monomer is forced to be always pinned by the substrate is the prototype of renewal models of Statistical Mechanics [2]. According to Ref. [1] and [2], it corresponds to the law \mathbb{P}_t^c on the measurable space (Ω, \mathcal{F}) defined through the change of measure

$$\frac{d\mathbb{P}_t^c}{d\mathbb{P}} := \frac{U_t e^{H_t}}{Z_t^c},$$

where $U_t := \sum_{i\geq 1} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_i=t\}}$ is the renewal indicator taking value 1 if and only if t is a renewal and $Z_t^c := \mathbb{E}[U_t e^{H_t}]$ is the partition function. Aperiodicity of the waiting time distribution gives $Z_t^c > 0$ for all sufficiently large t [1], thus ensuring that the constrained pinning model is well-defined at least for such t.

1.2 Deterministic rewards and critical systems

Let us suppose that the *i*th renewal involves a *deterministic reward* $f(S_i)$, where f is a function that maps $\{1, 2, \ldots\} \cup \{\infty\}$ in the Euclidean *d*-space \mathbb{R}^d . The extensive observables of renewal models of Statistical Mechanics are *cumulative reward* by the time t of the form $W_t := \sum_{i\geq 1} f(S_i) \mathbb{1}_{\{T_i\leq t\}}$ with f(s) at most of the order of magnitude of s [2]. For instance, the number $N_t := \sum_{i\geq 1} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_i\leq t\}}$ of renewals by t is the cumulative reward associated with a function f identically equal to 1. The thermodynamic description of these models is made complete by the study of the large fluctuations of W_t , and we aim to characterize such fluctuations under the following hypothesis inherited from Ref. [2].

Assumption 3. If the support S of the waiting time distribution is infinite, then f(s)/s has a limit $r \in \mathbb{R}^d$ when s goes to infinity through S.

In Ref. [2] it has been proved that the scaled cumulative reward W_t/t converges in probability to a constant vector $\rho \in \mathbb{R}^d$ under assumptions 1, 2, and 3, which are tacitly supposed to be satisfied in the sequel. In order to define ρ , let us set $\ell :=$ $\limsup_{s\uparrow\infty}(1/s)\ln e^{v(s)}p(s)$, which fulfills $-\infty \leq \ell < \infty$ by assumption 2, and $p_o(s) :=$ $e^{v(s)-\ell s}p(s)$ for all s when $\ell > -\infty$. If $\ell = -\infty$ or $\ell > -\infty$ and $\sum_{s\geq 1} p_o(s) > 1$, then let ζ denote that unique real number larger than ℓ satisfying $\sum_{s\geq 1} e^{v(s)-\zeta s}p(s) = 1$. Bearing in mind that S is necessarily infinite when $\ell > -\infty$ and letting r be given by assumption 3, the vector ρ turns out to be

$$\rho := \begin{cases} \frac{\sum_{s\geq 1} f(s) e^{v(s)-\zeta s} p(s)}{\sum_{s\geq 1} s e^{v(s)-\zeta s} p(s)} & \text{if } \ell = -\infty \text{ or } \ell > -\infty \text{ and } \sum_{s\geq 1} p_o(s) > 1;\\ \frac{\sum_{s\geq 1} f(s) p_o(s)}{\sum_{s\geq 1} s p_o(s)} & \text{if } \ell > -\infty, \ \sum_{s\geq 1} p_o(s) = 1, \text{ and } \sum_{s\geq 1} s p_o(s) < \infty;\\ r & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We stress that $\sum_{s\geq 1} s e^{v(s)-\zeta s} p(s)$ is finite and $\sum_{s\geq 1} f(s) e^{v(s)-\zeta s} p(s)$ exists due to assumption 3 whenever ζ is a real number larger than ℓ . The following proposition states formally the mentioned convergence in probability (see [2], theorem 4). From now on, $u \cdot v$ denotes the usual dot product between u and v in \mathbb{R}^d and $||u|| := \sqrt{u \cdot u}$ is the Euclidean norm of u.

Proposition 1. $\lim_{t\uparrow\infty} \mathbb{P}^c_t[||W_t/t - \rho|| \ge \delta] = 0$ for any $\delta > 0$.

According to Ellis [3], we say that W_t/t converges exponentially to ρ if for any $\delta > 0$ there exists a real number $\lambda > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}_t^c[||W_t/t - \rho|| \ge \delta] \le e^{-\lambda t}$ for all sufficiently large t. The following result improves proposition 1 by identifying exponential convergence (see [2], theorem 4).

Proposition 2. W_t/t converges exponentially to ρ if and only if the conditions $\ell > -\infty$, $\sum_{s>1} p_o(s) = 1$, $\sum_{s>1} s p_o(s) < \infty$, and $\rho \neq r$ are not simultaneously satisfied.

Proposition 2 tells us that the convergence in probability to ρ of the scaled cumulative reward W_t/t is slower than exponential if $\ell > -\infty$, $\sum_{s \ge 1} p_o(s) = 1$, $\sum_{s \ge 1} s p_o(s) < \infty$, and $\rho \ne r$. The facts that only the condition $\rho \ne r$ involves the function \overline{f} and that such condition is verified by most of f justify the following definition taken from Ref. [2].

Definition 1. The constrained pinning model is critical if $\ell > -\infty$, $\sum_{s \ge 1} p_o(s) = 1$, and $\sum_{s \ge 1} s p_o(s) < \infty$.

Precise exponential rates for probability decays are provided by large deviation principles. In Ref. [2] it has been shown that W_t satisfies a *large deviation principle* with good rate function, indeed it has been proved the following result (see [2], theorem 1).

Theorem 1. There exists a proper convex lower semicontinuous function I from \mathbb{R}^d to $[0,\infty]$ such that

- (a) I has compact level sets;
- (b) $\lim_{t\uparrow\infty}\frac{1}{t}\ln\mathbb{P}_t^c\left[\frac{W_t}{t}\in G\right] = -\inf_{w\in G}\{I(w)\}$ for each open convex set $G\subseteq\mathbb{R}^d$;
- (c) $\liminf_{t\uparrow\infty} \frac{1}{t} \ln \mathbb{P}_t^c \Big[\frac{W_t}{t} \in G \Big] \ge -\inf_{w\in G} \{I(w)\}$ for each open set $G \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$;
- (d) $\limsup_{t\uparrow\infty} \frac{1}{t} \ln \mathbb{P}_t^c \left[\frac{W_t}{t} \in F \right] \leq -\inf_{w \in F} \{I(w)\} \text{ for each closed set } F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d.$

The function I is the rate function and the compactness of its level sets entails that $\inf_{w \in F} \{I(w)\} > 0$ whenever F is a closed set that does not contain a zero of I [2]. The explicit expression of I as the convex conjugate of the limiting scaled cumulant generating function is given in Ref. [2], where it is in particular shown that I vanishes only at ρ if the constrained pinning model is not critical, whereas I takes value zero at all points of the closed line segment connecting r to ρ if the model is critical. According to the literature on large deviation principles in Statistical Mechanics [4,5], we call the closed line segment $\{(1 - \alpha)r + \alpha\rho : \alpha \in [0, 1]\}$ the *phase transition segment*. Thus, whatever f is, W_t converges exponentially to ρ in the non-critical scenario with exponential rate $\inf_{w \in F} \{I(w)\} > 0$ for the probability that W_t/t fluctuates over a closed set F that does not contain ρ . On the contrary, convergence in probability of W_t/t to ρ is slower than exponential in the critical constrained pinning model provided that f obeys $\rho \neq r$. In this case, the large deviation principle tells us that the probability that W_t/t fluctuates over a closed set F that does not intersect the phase transition segment decays exponentially with rate $\inf_{w \in F} \{I(w)\} > 0$, whereas it says nothing about the fluctuations that reach the phase transition segment and that prevent exponential convergence. The situation $\rho = r$ constitutes an exception because convergence is exponential even in the critical scenario.

2 Main results and discussion

The present paper completes the above large deviation principle by describing, in a critical scenario with regularly varying waiting times, the fluctuations of the scaled cumulative reward W_t/t that reach the phase transition segment. Let us suppose that the constrained pinning model is critical and that $\rho \neq r$. A way to tackle the issue consists in studying fluctuations in the closed half-space $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha} := \{w \in \mathbb{R}^d : [\rho - r] \cdot [w - (1 - \alpha)r - \alpha\rho] \leq 0\}$ that contains the fraction $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ starting from r of the phase transition segment and that is delimited by the hyperplane normal to it. Indeed, at large t, the probability $\mathbb{P}_t^c[W_t/t \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha}]$ is dominated by the fluctuations of W_t/t over the phase transition segment because we know that $\mathbb{P}_t^c[W_t/t \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha} \cap F]$ decays exponentially fast for every closed set F that does not contain this segment. We are going to determine the large-t behavior of the probability $\mathbb{P}_t^c[W_t/t \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha}]$ under the following assumption on the positive measurable function ψ that maps $x \in \mathbb{R}$ in $\psi(x) := \sum_{s \geq 1} \mathbb{1}_{\{s > x\}} p_o(s)$.

Assumption 4. The function ψ varies regularly with index $-\kappa$, i.e. for all $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$

$$\lim_{x \uparrow \infty} \frac{\psi(\gamma x)}{\psi(x)} = \gamma^{-\kappa}$$

We refer to [6] for the theory of regular variation. The function ψ can be written for all x > 1 as $\psi(x) = x^{-\kappa} \mathcal{L}(x)$ with \mathcal{L} slowly varying, i.e. regularly varying with index zero. Trivially, a positive measurable function \mathcal{L} with a positive limit at infinity is slowly varying. The simplest non-trivial example is represented by $\mathcal{L}(x) = \ln x$. The condition $\int_0^\infty \psi(x) dx = \sum_{s \ge 1} s p_o(s) < \infty$ satisfied by the critical pinning model implies $\kappa \ge 1$ since $\mathcal{L}(x) \ge x^{-\delta}$ for any fixed $\delta > 0$ and all sufficiently large x (see [6], proposition 1.3.6). The following theorem is the main result of the paper.

Theorem 2. Suppose that assumptions 1, 2, 3, and 4 are fulfilled and that the model is critical. If $\rho \neq r$, then the following limit holds for every $\alpha \in [0,1)$:

$$\lim_{t\uparrow\infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}_t^c[W_t/t\in\mathcal{H}_\alpha]}{t\,\psi(t)} = \frac{1}{\sum_{s\geq 1}s\,p_o(s)} \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} + \ln(1-\alpha) & \text{if }\kappa=1;\\ \frac{1+(\alpha\kappa-1)(1-\alpha)^{-\kappa}}{\kappa-1} & \text{if }\kappa>1. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 2 states a precise large deviation principle for the cumulative reward W_t . The cumulative reward is a random sum of random variables, which can be written down explicitly by introducing the number N_t of renewals by t as $W_t = \sum_{i=1}^{N_t} X_i$ with $X_i := f(S_i)$ for any i. We stress that precise large deviations for random sums of random variables with several types of subexponential distributions have been investigated by many researchers [7–13]. However, their work does not cover our case in two respects. First, the hypothesis they have made is that the random variables X_1, X_2, \ldots are independent of the counting process N_t , but this hypothesis is not satisfied by our problem. Second, we

had to implement the constraint that t is a renewal in order to deal with renewal models of Statistical Mechanics, whereas they did not have such a special need. For these reasons, Theorem 2 is a new result that requires a new proof, which is guided by the general principle that the large fluctuations of W_t at criticality are due to large values of a single waiting time. Regarding previous works on pinning models of polymers, researchers have investigated the sharp asymptotic behavior of the partition functions Z_t and Z_t^c by means of the methods from Renewal Theory [14, 15], but no sharp result concerning the fluctuations of extensive observables has been supplied to the best of our knowledge.

The general analytical large deviation theory developed in Ref. [2] for deterministic rewards was used there to explicitly determine exponential rates for N_t in a constrained pinning model where $v(s) = \beta$ for every s, β being a control parameter that can drive a phase transition. Within this setting, criticality corresponds to the conditions $\ell := \limsup_{s\uparrow\infty} (1/s) \ln p(s) > -\infty$, $\beta = -\ln \sum_{s\geq 1} e^{-\ell s} p(s)$, and $\sum_{s\geq 1} s e^{-\ell s} p(s) < \infty$. The function f(s) := 1 for all s, whose associated cumulative reward is N_t , satisfies assumption 3 with r = 0 and the corresponding phase transition segment is $[0, \rho]$ with $1/\rho = \sum_{s\geq 1} s e^{\beta-\ell s} p(s)$. Then, theorem 2 completes the study of the large fluctuations of N_t by resolving, for every $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, the subexponential decay of $\mathbb{P}_t^c[N_t \leq \alpha \rho t]$ when the function mapping $x \in \mathbb{R}$ in $\sum_{s\geq 1} \mathbbm{1}_{\{s>x\}} e^{-\ell s} p(s)$ varies regularly with index $-\kappa$:

$$\lim_{t\uparrow\infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}_t^c[N_t \le \alpha\rho t]}{t\sum_{s>t} e^{-\ell s} p(s)} = \rho e^{\beta} \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} + \ln(1-\alpha) & \text{if } \kappa = 1;\\ \frac{1+(\alpha\kappa-1)(1-\alpha)^{-\kappa}}{\kappa-1} & \text{if } \kappa > 1. \end{cases}$$

3 Proof of theorem 2

In this section we report the proof of theorem 2, which is facilitated by a natural change of measure. Regarding p_o as a new waiting time distribution, which is non-defective because $\sum_{s\geq 1} p_o(s) = 1$ by the hypothesis of criticality, let us consider a new probability space $(\Omega_o, \mathcal{F}_o, \mathbb{P}_o)$ where a sequence $\{S_i\}_{i\geq 1}$ of independent waiting times distributed according to p_o is given. Denoting by \mathbb{E}_o the expectation under \mathbb{P}_o , we have $\mathbb{E}_o[S_1] = \sum_{s\geq 1} s p_o(s) < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}_o[f(S_1)] = \rho \mathbb{E}_o[S_1]$. Importantly, since p_o is non-defective, the renewal theorem (see [16], theorem 1 in chapter XIII.10) can be applied to the renewal equation $\mathbb{E}_o[U_t] = \sum_{s=1}^t p_o(s) \mathbb{E}_o[U_{t-s}]$ valid for every $t \geq 1$ to get $\lim_{t\uparrow\infty} \mathbb{E}_o[U_t] = 1/\mathbb{E}_o[S_1]$. The renewal equation is deduced by conditioning on $T_1 = S_1$ and then by using the fact that a renewal process starts over at every renewal.

The transition from $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ to $(\Omega_o, \mathcal{F}_o, \mathbb{P}_o)$ proceeds as follows. Observing that $\prod_{i=1}^n e^{v(s_i)} p(s_i) = e^{\ell t} \prod_{i=1}^n p_o(s_i)$ whenever $s_1 + \cdots + s_n = t$, for every integer $t \ge 1$ and Borel set $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$Z_{t}^{c} \cdot \mathbb{P}_{t}^{c} \left[\frac{W_{t}}{t} \in \mathcal{B} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbbm{1}_{\left\{ \frac{W_{t}}{t} \in \mathcal{B} \right\}} U_{t} e^{H_{t}} \right]$$

$$= \sum_{n \ge 1} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbbm{1}_{\left\{ \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f(S_{i}) \in \mathcal{B} \right\}} \mathbbm{1}_{\{T_{n}=t\}} e^{\sum_{i=1}^{n} v(S_{i})} \right]$$

$$= \sum_{n \ge 1} \sum_{s_{1} \ge 1} \cdots \sum_{s_{n} \ge 1} \mathbbm{1}_{\left\{ \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f(s_{i}) \in \mathcal{B} \right\}} \mathbbm{1}_{\{s_{1}+\dots+s_{n}=t\}} \prod_{i=1}^{n} e^{v(s_{i})} p(s_{i})$$

$$= e^{\ell t} \sum_{n \ge 1} \sum_{s_{1} \ge 1} \cdots \sum_{s_{n} \ge 1} \mathbbm{1}_{\left\{ \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f(s_{i}) \in \mathcal{B} \right\}} \mathbbm{1}_{\{s_{1}+\dots+s_{n}=t\}} \prod_{i=1}^{n} p_{o}(s_{i})$$

$$= e^{\ell t} \mathbbm{1}_{o} \left[\mathbbm{1}_{\left\{ \frac{W_{t}}{t} \in \mathcal{B} \right\}} U_{t} \right].$$
(1)

This identity with $\mathcal{B} = \mathbb{R}^d$ yields $Z_t^c = e^{\ell t} \mathbb{E}_o[U_t]$, which allows us to recast (1) as

$$\mathbb{E}_{o}[U_{t}] \cdot \mathbb{P}_{t}^{c} \left[\frac{W_{t}}{t} \in \mathcal{B} \right] = \mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\left\{ \frac{W_{t}}{t} \in \mathcal{B} \right\}} U_{t} \right].$$

$$(2)$$

Formula (2) is precisely the bridge between constrained pinning models with respect to $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and $(\Omega_o, \mathcal{F}_o, \mathbb{P}_o)$. Fix any $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ and set $g(s) := [\rho - r] \cdot [f(s) - rs]/\|\rho - r\|^2$ for all s. Since $\sum_{i\geq 1} f(S_i)\mathbb{1}_{\{T_i\leq t\}} - rt = \sum_{i\geq 1} [f(S_i) - rS_i]\mathbb{1}_{\{T_i\leq t\}}$ when t is a renewal, the condition $W_t/t \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha$ is tantamount to $\sum_{i\geq 1} g(S_i)\mathbb{1}_{\{T_i\leq t\}} \leq \alpha t$ when $U_t = 1$. By combining this remark with (2) we find for each t

$$\mathbb{E}_{o}[U_{t}] \cdot \mathbb{P}_{t}^{c} \left[\frac{W_{t}}{t} \in \mathcal{H}_{\alpha} \right] = \mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\left\{ \sum_{i \geq 1} g(S_{i}) \mathbb{1}_{\left\{ T_{i} \leq t \right\}} \leq \alpha t \right\}} U_{t} \right].$$

This way, since $\lim_{t\uparrow\infty} \mathbb{E}_o[U_t] = 1/\mathbb{E}_o[S_1]$, in order to prove theorem 2 it suffices to demonstrate that

$$\lim_{t\uparrow\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_o\left[\mathbbm{1}_{\{\sum_{i\geq 1}g(S_i)\mathbbm{1}_{\{T_i\leq t\}}\leq\alpha t\}}U_t\right]}{t\,\psi(t)} = \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}_o[S_1]^2} \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} + \ln(1-\alpha) & \text{if }\kappa=1;\\ \frac{1+(\alpha\kappa-1)(1-\alpha)^{-\kappa}}{\kappa-1} & \text{if }\kappa>1 \end{cases}$$
$$= \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}_o[S_1]^2} \left[\alpha(1-\alpha)^{-\kappa} - \int_{1-\alpha}^1 \frac{dx}{x^{\kappa}}\right]. \tag{3}$$

We shall demonstrate (3) by verifying a lower bound first and an upper bound later. The features of the function g we will use to this aim are the immediate equality $\mathbb{E}_o[g(S_1)] = \mathbb{E}_o[S_1]$ and the fact that g(s)/s goes to zero when s is sent to infinity through S, which is the support of both p and p_o . Since the values g(s) when $s \notin S$ do not affect the problem, in order to simplify the notations we redefine the function g by setting g(s) := 0 for all $s \notin S$ so that the limit $\lim_{s\uparrow\infty} g(s)/s = 0$ is valid. We will also need the following lemma about the number N_t of renewal by t, which is the cumulative reward corresponding to f(s) := 1 for all s as we already know. Since $0 \leq N_t/t \leq 1$ and $0 < 1/\mathbb{E}_o[S_1] < 1$, for any $t \geq 1$ and $\delta > 0$ we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E}_o \left[\left(\frac{N_t}{t} - \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}_o[S_1]} \right) U_t \right] \right| &\leq \delta \, \mathbb{E}_o \left[\mathbbm{1}_{\left\{ \left| \frac{N_t}{t} - \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}_o[S_1]} \right| < \delta \right\}} U_t \right] + 2 \, \mathbb{E}_o \left[\mathbbm{1}_{\left\{ \left| \frac{N_t}{t} - \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}_o[S_1]} \right| \ge \delta \right\}} U_t \right] \\ &\leq \delta + 2 \, \mathbb{P}_t^c \left[\left| \frac{N_t}{t} - \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}_o[S_1]} \right| \ge \delta \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the second bound is obtained by applying (2) to N_t . From here, we get at the following result by combining the limit $\lim_{t\uparrow\infty} \mathbb{E}_o[U_t] = 1/\mathbb{E}_o[S_1]$ with the convergence in probability stated by Proposition 1.

Lemma 1. $\lim_{t\uparrow\infty} \mathbb{E}_o[(N_t/t)U_t] = 1/\mathbb{E}_o[S_1]^2$.

3.1 A lower bound

In order to prove (3) we show at first that

$$\liminf_{t\uparrow\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_o\left[\mathbbm{1}_{\{\sum_{i\geq 1}g(S_i)\mathbbm{1}_{\{T_i\leq t\}}\leq\alpha t\}}U_t\right]}{t\,\psi(t)} \geq \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}_o[S_1]^2} \left[\alpha(1-\alpha)^{-\kappa} - \int_{1-\alpha}^1 \frac{dx}{x^{\kappa}}\right].$$
(4)

This bound is trivial if $\alpha = 0$ since the l.h.s. of (4) is not negative. In the case $\alpha > 0$, it follows if we demonstrate that for all real numbers γ , η , and ϵ such that $1 - \alpha < \gamma < \eta < 1$ and $\epsilon > 0$

$$\liminf_{t\uparrow\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_o\left[\mathbbm{1}_{\{\sum_{i\geq 1}g(S_i)\mathbbm{1}_{\{T_i\leq t\}}\leq\alpha t\}}U_t\right]}{t\,\psi(t)} \geq \frac{1-2\epsilon}{\mathbb{E}_o[S_1]^2}\left[(1-\gamma)\gamma^{-\kappa} - (1-\eta)\eta^{-\kappa} - \int_{\gamma}^{\eta} \frac{dx}{x^{\kappa}}\right].$$
 (5)

Indeed, (5) gives (4) when γ is sent to $1 - \alpha$, η is sent to 1, and ϵ is sent to 0.

Let us assume $\alpha > 0$ and let us pick γ , η , and ϵ such that $1 - \alpha < \gamma < \eta < 1$ and $\epsilon > 0$. To get at a proof of (5) we observe that $3y/2 - y^2/2 \le 1$ for any integer $y \in \mathbb{Z}$, so that for each $n \ge 2$ we find

$$1 \ge \frac{3}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{S_{j} > \gamma t\}} - \frac{1}{2} \left[\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{S_{j} > \gamma t\}} \right]^{2} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{S_{j} > \gamma t\}} - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \sum_{k=j+1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{S_{j} > \gamma t\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{S_{k} > \gamma t\}}.$$

It follows that for all $t\geq 2$

$$\mathbb{E}_{o}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\left\{\sum_{i\geq 1}g(S_{i})\mathbb{1}_{\{T_{i}\leq t\}}\leq\alpha t\right\}}U_{t}\right] \\
= \sum_{n=1}^{t}\mathbb{E}_{o}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{n}g(S_{i})\leq\alpha t\right\}}\mathbb{1}_{\{T_{n}=t\}}\right] \\
\geq \sum_{n=1}^{t}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}_{o}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{n}g(S_{i})\leq\alpha t\right\}}\mathbb{1}_{\left\{S_{j}>\gamma t\right\}}\mathbb{1}_{\left\{S_{1}+\dots+S_{n}=t\right\}}\right] + \\
- \sum_{n=2}^{t}\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\sum_{k=j+1}^{n}\mathbb{E}_{o}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{n}g(S_{i})\leq\alpha t\right\}}\mathbb{1}_{\left\{S_{j}>\gamma t\right\}}\mathbb{1}_{\left\{S_{k}>\gamma t\right\}}\mathbb{1}_{\left\{S_{1}+\dots+S_{n}=t\right\}}\right] \\
\geq \sum_{n=1}^{t}n\mathbb{E}_{o}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{n}g(S_{i})\leq\alpha t\right\}}\mathbb{1}_{\left\{S_{n}>\gamma t\right\}}\mathbb{1}_{\left\{T_{n}=t\right\}}\right] + \\
- t^{2}\sum_{n=2}^{t}\mathbb{E}_{o}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\left\{S_{1}>\gamma t\right\}}\mathbb{1}_{\left\{S_{2}>\gamma t\right\}}\mathbb{1}_{\left\{T_{n}=t\right\}}\right].$$
(6)

A convenient lower bound of the second term in the r.h.s. of (6) is reached through the following chain of inequalities, the last of which being the Markov's inequality:

$$\sum_{n=2}^{t} \mathbb{E}_{o} \Big[\mathbb{1}_{\{S_{1} > \gamma t\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{S_{2} > \gamma t\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_{n} = t\}} \Big] \leq \mathbb{E}_{o} \Big[\mathbb{1}_{\{S_{1} > \gamma t\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{S_{2} > \gamma t\}} U_{t} \Big] \leq \mathbb{E}_{o} \Big[\mathbb{1}_{\{S_{1} > \gamma t\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{S_{2} > \gamma t\}} \Big]$$
$$\leq (1/\gamma t) \mathbb{E}_{o} \Big[S_{1} \mathbb{1}_{\{S_{1} > \gamma t\}} \Big] \psi(\gamma t).$$
(7)

The first term in the r.h.s. of (6) can be treated as follows. Since $\alpha + \gamma - 1 > 0$ by hypothesis, the limit $\lim_{s\uparrow\infty} g(s)/s = 0$ entails that there exists an integer $t_1 > 2$ such that $g(s) \leq (\alpha + \gamma - 1)s$ whenever $s > \gamma t_1$. If $t > t_1$, then the conditions $s > \gamma t$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n g(S_i) < (\alpha + \gamma)(t - s)$ imply

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} g(S_i) + g(s) \le (\alpha + \gamma)(t - s) + (\alpha + \gamma - 1)s = (\alpha + \gamma)t - s \le \alpha t.$$

This way, for every $t > t_1$ we get

$$\sum_{n=1}^{t} n \mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\mathbbm{1}_{\{\sum_{i=1}^{n} g(S_{i}) \leq \alpha t\}} \mathbbm{1}_{\{S_{n} > \gamma t\}} \mathbbm{1}_{\{T_{n} = t\}} \right]$$

$$\geq \sum_{n=2}^{t} \sum_{s=1}^{t-n+1} n \mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\mathbbm{1}_{\{\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} g(S_{i}) + g(s) \leq \alpha t\}} \mathbbm{1}_{\{T_{n-1} = t-s\}} \right] \mathbbm{1}_{\{s > \gamma t\}} p_{o}(s)$$

$$\geq \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \sum_{n=1}^{t-s} n \mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\mathbbm{1}_{\{\sum_{i=1}^{n} g(S_{i}) + g(s) \leq \alpha t\}} \mathbbm{1}_{\{T_{n} = t-s\}} \right] \mathbbm{1}_{\{s > \gamma t\}} p_{o}(s)$$

$$\geq \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \sum_{n=1}^{t-s} n \mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\mathbbm{1}_{\{\sum_{i=1}^{n} g(S_{i}) < (\alpha+\gamma)(t-s)\}} \mathbbm{1}_{\{T_{n} = t-s\}} \right] \mathbbm{1}_{\{s > \gamma t\}} p_{o}(s)$$

$$= \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \mathbb{E}_{o} \left[N_{t-s} \mathbbm{1}_{\{\sum_{i\geq 1}^{s} g(S_{i}) \mathbbm{1}_{\{T_{i} \leq t-s\}} < (\alpha+\gamma)(t-s)\}} \mathbbm{1}_{\{s>\gamma t\}} p_{o}(s) \right]$$

By introducing the restriction $s < \eta t$, for any $t > t_1$ we obtain the further lower bound

$$\sum_{n=1}^{5} n \mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\mathbbm{1}_{\{\sum_{i=1}^{n} g(S_{i}) \leq \alpha t\}} \mathbbm{1}_{\{S_{n} > \gamma t\}} \mathbbm{1}_{\{T_{n} = t\}} \right]$$

$$\geq \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \mathbb{E}_{o} \left[N_{t-s} \mathbbm{1}_{\{\sum_{i\geq 1} g(S_{i})\mathbbm{1}_{\{T_{i} \leq t-s\}} < (\alpha+\gamma)(t-s)\}} U_{t-s} \right] \mathbbm{1}_{\{s>\gamma t\}} p_{o}(s)$$

$$\geq \sum_{s\geq 1} \mathbb{E}_{o} \left[N_{t-s} \mathbbm{1}_{\{\sum_{i\geq 1} g(S_{i})\mathbbm{1}_{\{T_{i} \leq t-s\}} < (\alpha+\gamma)(t-s)\}} U_{t-s} \right] \mathbbm{1}_{\{\gamma t < s \leq \eta t\}} p_{o}(s)$$

$$\geq \sum_{s\geq 1} \mathbb{E}_{o} \left[N_{t-s} U_{t-s} \right] \mathbbm{1}_{\{\gamma t < s \leq \eta t\}} p_{o}(s) +$$

$$- \sum_{s\geq 1} (t-s) \mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\mathbbm{1}_{\{\sum_{i\geq 1} g(S_{i})\mathbbm{1}_{\{T_{i} \leq t-s\}} \geq (\alpha+\gamma)(t-s)\}} U_{t-s} \right] \mathbbm{1}_{\{\gamma t < s \leq \eta t\}} p_{o}(s), \quad (8)$$

where the fact that $N_{t-s} \leq t-s$ has been used in the last equality. At this point, we recall that $\lim_{\tau\uparrow\infty} \mathbb{E}_o[(N_\tau/\tau)U_\tau] = 1/\mathbb{E}_o[S_1]^2$ by lemma 1. Moreover, we observe that formula (2) and proposition 1 with g in place of f yield respectively the bound $\mathbb{E}_o[\mathbbm{1}_{\{\sum_{i\geq 1}g(S_i)\mathbbm{1}_{\{T_i\leq \tau\}}\geq (\alpha+\gamma)\tau\}}U_\tau] \leq \mathbb{P}_\tau^c[\sum_{i\geq 1}g(S_i)\mathbbm{1}_{\{T_i\leq \tau\}}\geq (\alpha+\gamma)\tau]$ and the limit $\lim_{\tau\uparrow\infty}\mathbb{P}_\tau^c[\sum_{i\geq 1}g(S_i)\mathbbm{1}_{\{T_i\leq \tau\}}\geq (\alpha+\gamma)\tau] = 0$ because $\mathbb{E}_o[g(S_1)]/\mathbb{E}_o[S_1] = 1$ and $\alpha+\gamma>1$. This way, we deduce that there exists $t_2 \geq t_1$ such that $\tau > (1-\eta)t_2$ implies both $\mathbb{E}_o[N_\tau U_\tau] \geq (1-\epsilon)\tau/\mathbb{E}_o[S_1]^2$ and $\mathbb{E}_o[\mathbbm{1}_{\{\sum_{i\geq 1}g(S_i)\mathbbm{1}_{\{T_i\leq \tau\}}\geq (\alpha+\gamma)\tau\}}U_\tau] \leq \epsilon/\mathbb{E}_o[S_1]^2$. If $t>t_2$, then the condition $s \leq \eta t$ giving $t-s > (1-\eta)t_2$ allows us to replace (8) with

$$\sum_{n=1}^{t} n \mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\sum_{i=1}^{n} g(S_{i}) \leq \alpha t\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{S_{n} > \gamma t\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_{n} = t\}} \right]$$

$$\geq \frac{1 - 2\epsilon}{\mathbb{E}_{o}[S_{1}]^{2}} \sum_{s \geq 1} (t - s) \mathbb{1}_{\{\gamma t < s \leq \eta t\}} p_{o}(s)$$

$$= \frac{1 - 2\epsilon}{\mathbb{E}_{o}[S_{1}]^{2}} \left[(1 - \gamma) t \psi(\gamma t) - (1 - \eta) t \psi(\eta t) - t \int_{\gamma}^{\eta} \psi(xt) dx \right]. \tag{9}$$

In conclusion, (6) shows thanks to (9) and (7) that for all $t > t_2$

$$\begin{split} & \mathbb{E}_o \left\lfloor \mathbbm{1}_{\left\{\sum_{i \ge 1} g(S_i) \mathbbm{1}_{\left\{T_i \le t\right\}} \le \alpha t\right\}} U_t \right\rfloor \\ & \ge \frac{1 - 2\epsilon}{\mathbb{E}_o[S_1]^2} \left[(1 - \gamma) t \, \psi(\gamma t) - (1 - \eta) t \, \psi(\eta t) - t \int_{\gamma}^{\eta} \psi(x t) dx \right] + \\ & - (1/\gamma) \, \mathbb{E}_o[S_1 \mathbbm{1}_{\left\{S_1 > \gamma t\right\}}] t \, \psi(\gamma t). \end{split}$$

From here, we obtain (5) by dividing by $t \psi(t)$ first and by sending t to infinity later because the limit $\lim_{t\uparrow\infty} \psi(xt)/\psi(t) = x^{-\kappa}$ is uniform with respect to x in the finite interval $[\gamma, \eta]$ (see [6], theorem 1.5.2).

3.2 An upper bound

Now we show that for all real numbers γ , η , and ϵ such that $0 < \gamma < 1 - \alpha$, $\gamma < \eta < 1$, and $\epsilon > 0$

$$\limsup_{t\uparrow\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_o\left[\mathbbm{1}_{\{\sum_{i\geq 1}g(S_i)\mathbbm{1}_{\{T_i\leq t\}}\leq\alpha t\}}U_t\right]}{t\,\psi(t)} \leq \frac{1+\epsilon}{\mathbb{E}_o[S_1]^2} \left[(1-\gamma)\gamma^{-\kappa} - (1-\eta)\eta^{-\kappa} - \int_{\gamma}^{\eta} \frac{dx}{x^{\kappa}}\right] + \eta^{-\kappa} - 1.$$
(10)

In the light of (4), this bound leads us to prove (3) because sending γ to $1 - \alpha$, η to 1, and ϵ to 0 we find

$$\limsup_{t\uparrow\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_o\left[\mathbbm{1}_{\{\sum_{i\geq 1}g(S_i)\mathbbm{1}_{\{T_i\leq t\}}\leq\alpha t\}}U_t\right]}{t\,\psi(t)} \leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}_o[S_1]^2}\left[\alpha(1-\alpha)^{-\kappa} - \int_{1-\alpha}^1 \frac{dx}{x^{\kappa}}\right]$$

Pick γ , η , and ϵ such that $0 < \gamma < 1 - \alpha$, $\gamma < \eta < 1$, and $\epsilon > 0$. Obviously, for every $n \ge 1$ and $t \ge 1$ we have

$$1 \le \prod_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{S_j \le \gamma t\}} + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{S_j > \gamma t\}}$$

since either $S_j \leq \gamma t$ for all $j \leq n$ or $S_j > \gamma t$ for at least one $j \leq n$. It follows that

$$\mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\left\{ \sum_{i \geq 1} g(S_{i})\mathbb{1}_{\left\{T_{i} \leq t\right\}} \leq \alpha t \right\}} U_{t} \right] \\
= \sum_{n=1}^{t} \mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} g(S_{i}) \leq \alpha t \right\}} \mathbb{1}_{\left\{T_{n} = t\right\}} \right] \\
\leq \sum_{n=1}^{t} \mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} g(S_{i}) \leq \alpha t \right\}} \prod_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\left\{S_{j} \leq \gamma t\right\}} \mathbb{1}_{\left\{T_{n} = t\right\}} \right] \\
+ \sum_{n=1}^{t} n \mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} g(S_{i}) \leq \alpha t \right\}} \mathbb{1}_{\left\{S_{n} > \gamma t\right\}} \mathbb{1}_{\left\{T_{n} = t\right\}} \right] \\
\leq \sum_{n=1}^{t} \mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} g(S_{i}) \leq \alpha t \right\}} \prod_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\left\{S_{j} \leq \gamma t\right\}} \mathbb{1}_{\left\{T_{n} = t\right\}} \right] \\
+ \sum_{n=1}^{t} n \mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\left\{S_{n} > \gamma t\right\}} \mathbb{1}_{\left\{T_{n} = t\right\}} \right].$$
(11)

The first term in the r.h.s. of (11) can be estimated by means of the following lemma which is proved at the end. Set $\xi_t := -\ln t \,\psi(\gamma t)$ for all t and notice that $\lim_{t\uparrow\infty} \xi_t = \infty$ because $x\psi(x) \leq \mathbb{E}_o[S_1\mathbb{1}_{\{S_1>x\}}]$ by Markov's inequality.

Lemma 2. For all sufficiently large t there exist two real numbers z_t and $\lambda_t \geq 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}_o[\mathbb{1}_{\{S_1 \leq \gamma t\}} e^{z_t S_1 - \lambda_t g(S_1)}] \leq 1$ and $(z_t - \alpha \lambda_t) t \geq \xi_t + \ln |\xi_t|.$

Let z_t and $\lambda_t \geq 0$ be the numbers introduced by lemma 2, so that the inequalities $0 < \mathbb{E}_o[\mathbbm{1}_{\{S_1 \leq \gamma t\}} e^{z_t S_1 - \lambda_t g(S_1)}] \leq 1$ and $(z_t - \alpha \lambda_t)t \geq \xi_t + \ln |\xi_t|$ are valid for all $t > t_1$ with some $t_1 > 0$. The fact that $\lambda_t \geq 0$ allows us to invoke the Chernoff bound to obtain

$$\sum_{n=1}^{t} \mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\sum_{i=1}^{n} g(S_{i}) \leq \alpha t\}} \prod_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{S_{j} \leq \gamma t\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_{n}=t\}} \right]$$

$$\leq e^{\alpha t \lambda_{t}} \sum_{n=1}^{t} \mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\prod_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{S_{j} \leq \gamma t\}} e^{-\lambda_{t} g(S_{j})} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_{n}=t\}} \right]$$

$$= e^{(\alpha \lambda_{t}-z_{t})t} \sum_{n=1}^{t} \mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\prod_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{S_{j} \leq \gamma t\}} e^{z_{t}S_{j}-\lambda_{t}g(S_{j})} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_{n}=t\}} \right]$$

$$= e^{(\alpha \lambda_{t}-z_{t})t} \sum_{n=1}^{t} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\prod_{j=1}^{t} \mathbb{1}_{\{S_{j} \leq \gamma t\}} e^{z_{t}S_{j}-\lambda_{t}g(S_{j})} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_{n}=t\}} \right]}{\mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\{S_{1} \leq \gamma t\}} e^{z_{t}S_{1}-\lambda_{t}g(S_{1})} \right]^{t-n}}.$$

At this point, we make use of $\mathbb{E}_o[\mathbbm{1}_{\{S_1 \leq \gamma t\}} e^{z_t S_1 - \lambda_t g(S_1)}] \leq 1$ and $(z_t - \alpha \lambda_t)t \geq \xi_t + \ln |\xi_t|$

to get for any $t > t_1$ at the upper bound

$$\sum_{n=1}^{t} \mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\sum_{i=1}^{n} g(S_{i}) \leq \alpha t\}} \prod_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{S_{j} \leq \gamma t\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_{n}=t\}} \right]$$

$$\leq e^{(\alpha\lambda_{t}-z_{t})t} \sum_{n=1}^{t} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\prod_{j=1}^{t} \mathbb{1}_{\{S_{j} \leq \gamma t\}} e^{z_{t}S_{j}-\lambda_{t}g(S_{j})} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_{n}=t\}} \right]}{\mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\{S_{1} \leq \gamma t\}} e^{z_{t}S_{j}-\lambda_{t}g(S_{1})} \right]^{t-n}}$$

$$\leq e^{-\xi_{t}-\ln|\xi_{t}|} \sum_{n=1}^{t} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\prod_{j=1}^{t} \mathbb{1}_{\{S_{j} \leq \gamma t\}} e^{z_{t}S_{j}-\lambda_{t}g(S_{j})} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_{n}=t\}} \right]}{\mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\{S_{1} \leq \gamma t\}} e^{z_{t}S_{1}-\lambda_{t}g(S_{1})} \right]^{t}}$$

$$= \frac{t \psi(\gamma t)}{|\xi_{t}|} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\prod_{j=1}^{t} \mathbb{1}_{\{S_{j} \leq \gamma t\}} e^{z_{t}S_{j}-\lambda_{t}g(S_{j})} U_{t} \right]}{\mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\{S_{1} \leq \gamma t\}} e^{z_{t}S_{1}-\lambda_{t}g(S_{1})} \right]^{t}}$$

$$\leq \frac{t \psi(\gamma t)}{|\xi_{t}|} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\prod_{j=1}^{t} \mathbb{1}_{\{S_{j} \leq \gamma t\}} e^{z_{t}S_{1}-\lambda_{t}g(S_{1})} \right]^{t}}{\mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\{S_{1} \leq \gamma t\}} e^{z_{t}S_{1}-\lambda_{t}g(S_{1})} \right]^{t}} = \frac{t \psi(\gamma t)}{|\xi_{t}|}.$$
(12)

As far as the second term in the r.h.s. of (11) is concerned, we let the restriction $S_n \leq \eta t$ to appear in order to write for all $t \geq 2$

$$\begin{split} \sum_{n=1}^{t} n \, \mathbb{E}_{o} \Big[\mathbbm{1}_{\{S_{n} > \gamma t\}} \mathbbm{1}_{\{T_{n} = t\}} \Big] \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{t} n \, \mathbb{E}_{o} \Big[\mathbbm{1}_{\{\gamma t < S_{n} \le \eta t\}} \mathbbm{1}_{\{T_{n} = t\}} \Big] + \sum_{n=1}^{t} n \, \mathbb{E}_{o} \Big[\mathbbm{1}_{\{S_{n} > \eta t\}} \mathbbm{1}_{\{T_{n} = t\}} \Big] \\ &= \sum_{n=2}^{t} (n-1) \, \mathbb{E}_{o} \Big[\mathbbm{1}_{\{\gamma t < S_{n} \le \eta t\}} \mathbbm{1}_{\{T_{n-1} + S_{n} = t\}} \Big] + \mathbb{E}_{o} \Big[\mathbbm{1}_{\{\gamma t < S_{1} \le \eta t\}} U_{t} \Big] + \mathbb{E}_{o} \Big[\mathbbm{1}_{\{S_{1} > \eta t\}} N_{t} U_{t} \Big] \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \sum_{n=1}^{t-s} n \, \mathbb{E}_{o} \Big[\mathbbm{1}_{\{T_{n} = t-s\}} \Big] \, \mathbbm{1}_{\{\gamma t < s \le \eta t\}} \, p_{o}(s) + \mathbb{E}_{o} \big[\mathbbm{1}_{\{\gamma t < S_{1} \le \eta t\}} U_{t} \Big] + \mathbb{E}_{o} \big[\mathbbm{1}_{\{S_{1} > \eta t\}} N_{t} U_{t} \Big] \\ &= \sum_{s \ge 1} \mathbb{E}_{o} \Big[N_{t-s} U_{t-s} \Big] \, \mathbbm{1}_{\{\gamma t < s \le \eta t\}} \, p_{o}(s) + \mathbb{E}_{o} \big[\mathbbm{1}_{\{\gamma t < S_{1} \le \eta t\}} U_{t} \Big] + \mathbb{E}_{o} \big[\mathbbm{1}_{\{S_{1} > \eta t\}} N_{t} U_{t} \Big]. \end{split}$$

We notice that $\mathbb{E}_o[\mathbbm{1}_{\{\gamma t < S_1 \leq \eta t\}}U_t] \leq \mathbb{E}_o[\mathbbm{1}_{\{S_1 > \gamma t\}}] = \psi(\gamma t)$. We also observe that the condition $U_t = 1$ implies $S_1 \leq t$, so that $\mathbb{E}_o[\mathbbm{1}_{\{S_1 > \eta t\}}N_tU_t] = \mathbb{E}_o[\mathbbm{1}_{\{\eta t < S_1 \leq t\}}N_tU_t]$ and hence $\mathbb{E}_o[\mathbbm{1}_{\{S_1 > \eta t\}}N_tU_t] \leq t \mathbb{E}_o[\mathbbm{1}_{\{\eta t < S_1 \leq t\}}] = t \psi(\eta t) - t \psi(t)$. Finally, we recall that $\lim_{\tau \uparrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_o[(N_\tau/\tau)U_\tau] = 1/\mathbb{E}_o[S_1]^2$ by lemma 1, which entails that there exists $t_2 \geq t_1$ with the property that $\mathbb{E}_o[N_\tau U_\tau] \leq (1+\epsilon)\tau/\mathbb{E}_o[S_1]^2$ for all $\tau > (1-\eta)t_2$. This way, since $t - s \geq (1-\eta)t$ when $s \leq \eta t$, for every $t > t_2$ we get the bound

$$\sum_{n=1}^{t} n \mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\mathbbm{1}_{\{S_{n} > \gamma t\}} \mathbbm{1}_{\{T_{n} = t\}} \right]$$

$$= \sum_{s \ge 1} \mathbb{E}_{o} \left[N_{t-s} U_{t-s} \right] \mathbbm{1}_{\{\gamma t < s \le \eta t\}} p_{o}(s) + \mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\mathbbm{1}_{\{\gamma t < S_{1} \le \eta t\}} U_{t} \right] + \mathbb{E}_{o} \left[\mathbbm{1}_{\{S_{1} > \eta t\}} N_{t} U_{t} \right]$$

$$\leq \frac{1+\epsilon}{\mathbb{E}_{o}[S_{1}]^{2}} \sum_{s \ge 1} (t-s) \mathbbm{1}_{\{\gamma t < s \le \eta t\}} p_{o}(s) + \psi(\gamma t) + t \psi(\eta t) - t \psi(t)$$

$$= \frac{1+\epsilon}{\mathbb{E}_{o}[S_{1}]^{2}} \left[(1-\gamma) t \psi(\gamma t) - (1-\eta) t \psi(\eta t) - t \int_{\gamma}^{\eta} \psi(xt) dx \right]$$

$$+ \psi(\gamma t) + t \psi(\eta t) - t \psi(t). \tag{13}$$

In conclusion, by combining (11) with (12) and (13) we obtain

$$\begin{split} \mathbb{E}_o \Big[\mathbbm{1}_{\left\{ \sum_{i \ge 1} g(S_i) \mathbbm{1}_{\left\{ T_i \le t \right\}} \le \alpha t} \Big\} U_t \Big] \\ & \le \frac{1 + \epsilon}{\mathbb{E}_o[S_1]^2} \Big[(1 - \gamma) t \, \psi(\gamma t) - (1 - \eta) t \, \psi(\eta t) - t \int_{\gamma}^{\eta} \psi(x t) dx \Big] \\ & + \psi(\gamma t) + \frac{t \, \psi(\gamma t)}{|\xi_t|} + t \, \psi(\eta t) - t \, \psi(t) \end{split}$$

for all $t > t_2$. The limit (10) follows from here dividing by $t \psi(t)$ first and sending t to infinity later. The last task is to prove lemma 2.

Proof of Lemma 2. For every $t \ge 1$ set

$$\lambda_t := \frac{(1-\gamma)\xi_t - 4\kappa \ln |\xi_t|}{\gamma(1-\gamma) t}$$

and

$$z_t := \alpha \lambda_t + \frac{\xi_t + \ln |\xi_t|}{t}.$$

It is manifest that $(z_t - \alpha \lambda_t)t \ge \xi_t + \ln |\xi_t|$ for each t and, since ξ_t goes to infinity when t is sent to infinity, $\xi_t > 1$ and the real numbers λ_t and z_t are positive for any $t > \tau_1$ with some $\tau_1 > 0$. We prove the lemma by showing that for all sufficiently large $t > \tau_1$

$$\sum_{s\geq 1} \mathbb{1}_{\{s\leq \gamma t/\xi_t^2\}} e^{z_t s - \lambda_t g(s)} p_o(s) \leq 1 - \frac{2}{t}$$
(14)

and

$$\sum_{s\geq 1} \mathbb{1}_{\{\gamma t/\xi_t^2 < s \leq \gamma t\}} e^{z_t s - \lambda_t g(s)} p_o(s) \leq \frac{2}{t}.$$
(15)

We point out that $\lim_{t\uparrow\infty} \gamma t/\xi_t^2 = \infty$ since $\psi(x) = x^{-\kappa} \mathcal{L}(x) \ge x^{-\kappa-\delta}$ for any fixed $\delta > 0$ and all sufficiently large x (see [6], proposition 1.3.6), giving $\xi_t \le (\kappa + \delta - 1) \ln t$ for all sufficiently large t.

Let us verify (14) at first. Let M > 0 be a constant such that $|g(s)| \leq Ms$ for all s, which certainly exists because $\lim_{s\uparrow\infty} g(s)/s = 0$. Then, let K > 0 be a constant such that $\gamma(tz_t + Mt\lambda_t)^2 \xi_t^{-2} e^{\gamma(tz_t + Mt\lambda_t)\xi_t^{-2}} \leq K$ for all $t > \tau_1$, which exists because $\lim_{t\uparrow\infty} \gamma(tz_t + Mt\lambda_t)^2 \xi_t^{-2} e^{\gamma(tz_t + Mt\lambda_t)\xi_t^{-2}} = 1 + (\alpha + M)\gamma^{-1}$. Finally, let $\tau_2 > \tau_1$ be an integer such that $z_t/\lambda_t \geq (\alpha + \gamma)/2 \geq g(s)/s$ for all $t > \tau_2$ and $s > \gamma t/\xi_t^2$, which exists because $\lim_{t\uparrow\infty} z_t/\lambda_t = \alpha + \gamma$ and $\lim_{s\uparrow\infty} g(s)/s = 0$. The bound $e^y \leq 1 + y + y^2 e^{|y|}$ valid for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$ yields for any $t > \tau_2$ and $s \leq \gamma t/\xi_t^2$

$$\begin{split} e^{z_t s - \lambda_t g(s)} &\leq 1 + z_t s - \lambda_t g(s) + (z_t + M\lambda_t)^2 s^2 e^{(z_t + M\lambda_t)s} \\ &\leq 1 + z_t s - \lambda_t g(s) + \frac{\gamma}{t} \left(\frac{tz_t + Mt\lambda_t}{\xi_t}\right)^2 s \, e^{\gamma \frac{tz_t + Mt\lambda_t}{\xi_t^2}} \\ &\leq 1 + z_t s - \lambda_t g(s) + \frac{K}{t} s. \end{split}$$

This bound in combination with the inequality $z_t/\lambda_t \ge g(s)/s$, namely $z_ts - \lambda_t g(s) \ge 0$, valid for every $t > \tau_2$ and $s > \gamma t/\xi_t^2$ and the equality $\mathbb{E}_o[g(S_1)] = \mathbb{E}_o[S_1]$ gives

$$\begin{split} \sum_{s\geq 1} & \mathbbm{1}_{\{s\leq \gamma t/\xi_t^2\}} e^{z_t s - \lambda_t g(s)} p_o(s) \\ &\leq \sum_{s\geq 1} \mathbbm{1}_{\{s\leq \gamma t/\xi_t^2\}} p_o(s) + \sum_{s\geq 1} & \mathbbm{1}_{\{s\leq \gamma t/\xi_t^2\}} \left[z_t s - \lambda_t g(s) \right] p_o(s) + \frac{K}{t} \sum_{s\geq 1} & \mathbbm{1}_{\{s\leq \gamma t/\xi_t^2\}} s \, p_o(s) \\ &\leq 1 + & \mathbbm{E}_o[S_1](z_t - \lambda_t) + \frac{K \mathbb{E}_o[S_1]}{t} \\ &= 1 + & \mathbbm{E}_o[S_1] \left\{ \frac{t z_t - t \lambda_t}{\xi_t} + \frac{K}{\xi_t} + \frac{2}{\mathbb{E}_o[S_1]\xi_t} \right\} \frac{\xi_t}{t} - \frac{2}{t}. \end{split}$$

The term between braces goes to $-(1 - \alpha - \gamma)/\gamma < 0$ when t is sent to infinity, so that it is non-positive for all t larger than some $\tau_3 \ge \tau_2$. It follows that (14) holds for all $t > \tau_3$.

Let us now prove (15). To begin with, we observe that for any chosen $\delta > 0$ and K > 1 there exists $x_o > 0$ such that $y^{\kappa+\delta}\psi(y) \leq K x^{\kappa+\delta}\psi(x)$ if $x_o \leq y \leq x$ (see [6], theorem 1.5.6). Thus, setting $\delta := \kappa - \gamma/2$ and K := 2, δ being positive because $\kappa \geq 1$ and $\gamma < 1$, the fact that $\lim_{t\uparrow\infty} \gamma t/\xi_t^2 = \infty$ implies that an integer $\tau_4 \geq \tau_3$ can be found in such a way that $\psi(\gamma t/\xi_t^2) \leq 2\xi_t^{4\kappa-\gamma}\psi(\gamma t)$ for all $t > \tau_4$. Then, since $1 - \alpha - \gamma > 0$ by hypothesis, the limit $\lim_{s\uparrow\infty} g(s)/s = 0$ ensures us that there exists an integer $\tau_5 \geq \tau_4$ with the property that $g(s) \geq -(1 - \alpha - \gamma)s$ for all $s > \gamma t/\xi_t^2$ whenever $t > \tau_5$. This way, for every $t > \tau_5$ we find the bound

$$\sum_{s\geq 1} \mathbb{1}_{\{\gamma t/\xi_t^2 < s\leq \gamma t\}} e^{z_t s - \lambda_t g(s)} p_o(s) \leq e^{[z_t + (1 - \alpha - \gamma)\lambda_t]\gamma t} \psi(\gamma t/\xi_t^2)$$
$$= \xi_t^{\gamma - 4\kappa} e^{\xi_t} \psi(\gamma t/\xi_t^2) = \frac{\xi_t^{\gamma - 4\kappa}}{t} \frac{\psi(\gamma t/\xi_t^2)}{\psi(\gamma t)} \leq \frac{2}{t}$$

In conclusion, we have that both (14) and (15) are satisfied if $t > \tau_5$.

References

- [1] M. Zamparo. Large deviations in discrete-time Renewal Theory. arXiv:1903.03527
- [2] M. Zamparo. Large deviations in renewal models of Statistical Mechanics. Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical 52:495004, 2019
- [3] R.S. Ellis. Entropy, Large Deviations, and Statistical Mechanics. Springer, New York, 1985
- [4] R.S. Ellis. An overview of the theory of large deviations and applications to statistical mechanics. Scandinavian Actuarial Journal 1:97-142, 1995
- [5] H. Touchette. The large deviation approach to statistical mechanics. *Physics Reports* 478:1-69, 2009
- [6] N.H. Bingham, C.M. Goldie, and J.L. Teugels. *Regular Variation*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989
- [7] C. Klüppelberg and T. Mikosch. Large deviations of heavy-tailed random sums with applications in insurance and finance. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 34:293-308, 1997
- [8] T. Mikosch and A.V. Nagaev. Large deviations of heavy-tailed sums with applications in insurance. *Extremes* 1:81-110, 1998
- [9] Q. Tang, C. Su, T. Jiang, and J.S. Zhang. Large deviations for heavy-tailed random sums in compound renewal model. *Statistics & Probability Letters* 52:91-100, 2001
- [10] K.W. Ng, Q. Tang, J. Yan, and H. Yang. Precise large deviations for sums of random variables with consistently varying tails. *Journal of Applied Probability* 41:93-107, 2004
- [11] Y. Chen and W. Zhang. Large deviations for random sums of negatively dependent random variables with consistently varying tails. *Statistics & Probability Letters* 77:530-538, 2007
- [12] Y. Chen, K.C. Yuen, and K.W. Ng. Precise large deviations of random sums in presence of negative dependence and consistent variation. *Methodology and Computing* in Applied Probability 13:821-833, 2011

- [13] S. Wang and X. Wang. Precise large deviations for random sums of END real-valued random variables with consistent variation. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 402:660-667, 2013
- [14] G. Giacomin. Random Polymer Models. Imperial College Press, London, 2007
- [15] F. den Hollander. Random Polymers Springer, Berlin, 2009
- [16] W. Feller. An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications, Volume 1. Wiley, New York, 1966