

Stable Systems with Power Law Conditions for Poisson Hail

Thomas Mountford* Zhe Wang†

December 16, 2022

Abstract

We consider Poisson hail models and characterize up to boundaries the collection of critical moments which guarantee stability. In particular, we treat the case of infinite speed of propagation.

1 Introduction

1.1 Model and dynamics

In this article we treat the Poisson hail model introduced in [BF11]. This can be viewed as a system of interacting queues. In this system \mathbb{Z}^d represents a collection of servers. As with a classical system, jobs arrive at random times requiring a random amount of service. The “interacting” part is that in the Poisson hail system the arriving job requires simultaneous service from a random *team* of servers, that is a finite subset of \mathbb{Z}^d . Each individual server operates a first come first served (FCFS) policy, which in this context means that server $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ only works on a job once all previously arrived jobs that required service from x have been completed. Once a team has begun a job they work continuously on the job until completion. The FCFS condition implies, for example, that x may be unable to work on any job at a given moment due to the prior arrival of a job requiring a large team of servers (among them x) on which no work is possible until a yet earlier job requiring the work of some server y (also in this big team) is completed. We now define our model more precisely.

Let $\Phi = (\Phi_x)_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ be a collection of independent identically distributed marked Poisson processes on \mathbb{R}_+ with marks in $\mathbb{R}_+ \times 2^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ where the second coordinate is stipulated to be a finite subset of \mathbb{Z}^d . Each point in Φ_x is denoted by (t, τ, B) , and the triple corresponds to a job “centered” at x . The t stands for the arrival time of the job, while the pair (τ, B) stands for the service time τ and the team of servers $x + B$ required for the job. Here “centered” has no geometrical meaning beyond requiring B to contain the origin $\mathbf{0}$. The collection of points $N_x = \{t : \exists (t, \tau, B) \in \Phi_x\}$ is a Poisson process with rate λ for each x , and the pairs (τ, B) are assumed to be i.i.d. over jobs arriving. Thus in our article, the model is translation invariant. We make the simplifying assumption that B is a.s. always a cube, as in [BF11], with a center at the origin and a radius R (in l_∞ -norm, $|x| = \max_{i=1}^d |x_i|$). As we are to give a sufficient condition for stability (which is to be defined in subsection 1.3 below), this is not a very restrictive assumption. We also discuss general shapes for jobs at the end of subsection 1.3, see Remark 1. Thus a job arriving at server x at time t can be thought of as a couple (τ, R) , rather than a couple (τ, B) . (τ, R) are the *sizes* of the job: τ the temporal size and R the spatial. As stated these “marks” are i.i.d. over arrival points and servers. When we write $P((\tau, R) \in A)$ or $P(R \in B)$ we are referring to the underlying probability distribution for the marks. We write \tilde{P} for the law of couple (τ, R) ($(\tau, R) \sim \tilde{P}$) so $\tilde{P}(A) = P((\tau, R) \in A)$. Throughout the paper we assume that the system is nontrivial in the sense that there is interaction between the servers, that is $\tilde{P}(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \{0\}) < 1$. (t, τ, R) in Φ_x signifies that at time t a job arrived needing τ units of service from the team $x + [-R, R]^d$ (or a job

*École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne

†École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne

(τ, R) arrived at time t). It should not be clear that such a system defines a queuing process since in general it does not.

We now describe how a queuing system that respects the FCFC stipulation and corresponds to the given job arrivals may be constructed. We do not claim that this is the only means of constructing a queuing system that corresponds to job arrivals $\{\Phi_x\}_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$. We first need to assume that for a single site x (and therefore for all sites by translation invariance) the arrival rate of jobs requiring service from x is finite, i.e.,

$$\lambda \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d} P(\mathbf{0} \in B + y) < \infty. \quad (1.1)$$

Under the assumption of nontriviality, this rate is strictly above λ . We take a non random sequence of finite subsets of \mathbb{Z}^d that increase up to \mathbb{Z}^d , $\Xi_n, n = 1, 2, \dots$. We have by our finite rate assumption that on time interval $[0, n]$, there are only a finite number, N_n , of jobs arriving that require service from some server $x \in \Xi_n$. For fixed n , the arrival times are a.s. distinct and ordered

$$0 < t_1^n < t_2^n < \dots < t_{N_n}^n < n.$$

The t_i^n and N_n correspond to Ξ_n and not to a particular x in it. We construct a (stage n) FCFS queueing system based on this finite set of jobs in a straightforward way: the job (τ_r^n, R_r^n) arriving at x_r^n at time t_r^n will be served on time interval $[\sigma_r^n, \sigma_r^n + \tau_r^n)$ by the serving team $x_r^n + [-R_r^n, R_r^n]^d$ where the σ_r^n are recursively defined (for n fixed) by $\sigma_1^n = t_1^n$ and for $1 < r \leq N_n$,

$$\sigma_r^n = \max \left\{ \max_{x \in x_r^n + [-R_r^n, R_r^n]^d} \left(\max_{j < r: x \in x_j^n + [-R_j^n, R_j^n]^d} \sigma_j^n + \tau_j^n \right), t_r^n \right\}.$$

For a fixed job (τ, R) arriving at a (t, x) , then when $t \leq n$ and $x \in \Xi_n$, t is on the above list, i.e., $t = t_{m(n)}^n$ for some $1 \leq m(n) \leq N_n$ for n large. As n increases $m(n)$ and $\sigma_{m(n)}^n$ increase with n once $m(n)$ is well defined. If for each $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and each job (t, τ, R) that arrives at x there exists finite n_0 so that

$$\forall n \geq n_0, \sigma_{m(n)}^n = \sigma_{m(n_0)}^{n_0} = \sigma,$$

then we can define the interacting queuing system where the job is served by the team $x + [-R, R]^d$ on time interval $[\sigma, \sigma + \tau)$. Suppose that jobs (s_1, τ_1, R_1) and (s_2, τ_2, R_2) arrive at x_1 and x_2 respectively, with $s_1 < s_2$ and that $(x_1 + [-R_1, R_1]^d) \cap (x_2 + [-R_2, R_2]^d) \neq \emptyset$. Let the beginning service times for the two jobs at stage n (again for all n sufficiently large) be respectively $\sigma_{m^1(n)}^n$ and $\sigma_{m^2(n)}^n$. Then we have from the FCFS policy applied to each stage n finite queueing system $\sigma_{m^2(n)}^n \geq \sigma_{m^1(n)}^n + \tau_1$. Thus the final queueing system respects FCFS. The choice of $(\Xi_n)_n$ above can be arbitrary. For any two sequences $(\Xi_n)_n$ and $(\tilde{\Xi}_n)_n$, there exists \bar{n} and \underline{n} such that $\Xi_{\underline{n}} \subset \tilde{\Xi}_n \subset \Xi_{\bar{n}}$, and therefore, we get from monotonicity that $\sigma_{m(n)}^n \leq \tilde{\sigma}_{m(n)}^n \leq \sigma_{m(\bar{n})}^{\bar{n}}$.

To see when a finite σ might exist, we fix x and t and consider a dual model $\{\mathcal{G}_s^{x,t}\}_{0 \leq s \leq t} = \{\mathcal{G}_s\}_{0 \leq s \leq t}$. This is defined by the rules

- i $\mathcal{G}_0 = \mathcal{G}'_0 = \{x\}$, $\tau_0 = 0$ (here $(\mathcal{G}'_i)_{i \geq 0}$ is the jump chain for \mathcal{G})
- ii for $i \geq 1$, $T_i = \inf\{s > T_{i-1} : \text{so that a job arrives at } t - s \text{ requiring service from some } y \in \mathcal{G}'_{i-1}\}$.
Let $x_i + [-R_i, R_i]^d$ be the service team for this job. $\mathcal{G}'_i = \mathcal{G}'_{i-1} \cup (x_i + [-R_i, R_i]^d)$.
- iii for $s \in [T_i, T_{i+1})$ $\mathcal{G}_s = \mathcal{G}'_i$; for $T_\infty = \lim_i T_i$, $\mathcal{G}_s = \mathbb{Z}^d$ on $[t \wedge T_\infty, t]$.

If $T_\infty \leq t$, we say the dual explodes. This dual model is a similar object to the duals of interacting particle systems. It is easily seen from (1.1) that for all x, t , if $\mathcal{G}^{x,t}$ does not explode then for every job arriving requiring service from x in time interval $[0, t]$ there exists σ so that for all n large $\sigma_{m(n)}^n = \sigma$ and so the queuing system is defined if $\mathcal{G}^{x,t}$ does not explode for every x and t . In the subsection 1.2 below, we will see the connection between the dual $\mathcal{G}^{x,t}$ and admissible paths.

A central quantity of the model is the workload at site x and time t , and we denote it by $W(t, x)$. We discuss the workload of a system heuristically and will provide a formal definition in subsection 1.2. Intuitively speaking, $W(t, x)$ is the additional time required beyond time t for server x to have serviced all jobs (requiring service from x) arriving on time interval $[0, t]$. We can understand the dynamics of $W(t, x)$ with the following two equations. Suppose job (τ, R) arrives at server y at time t . Then by the FCFS rule,

$$W(t+, x) = \begin{cases} \sup_{|z-y| \leq R} W(t-, z) + \tau, & \text{if } |x-y| \leq R, \\ W(t-, x), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

where $|x-y|$ stands for the l_∞ -norm in \mathbb{Z}^d . By convention, we always assume that $t \rightarrow W(t, x)$ is right continuous: $W(t, x) = W(t+, x)$. Suppose no job requiring service from site x arrives during time $[s, t]$. Then $W(t, x)$ decreases linearly in t at rate 1 until zero:

$$W(t, x) = \max\{(W(s, x) - (t-s)), 0\}, \quad (1.3)$$

see [BCF16, BF11, FKM18]. The following initial condition for $W(t, x)$ is in force throughout the paper: for all x in \mathbb{Z}^d

$$W(0, x) = 0. \quad (1.4)$$

One way to visualize the model and the workload $W(t, x)$ is to think of jobs as hailstones falling randomly on a hot ground, and this model will be similar to the well-known game, Tetris! A job (τ, R) received by a server x can be viewed as a hailstone with a base $x + [-R, R]^d$ and a height τ . The hailstone falls on sites $x + [-R, R]^d$, and the FCFS rule requires the hailstone to fall on top of all previously arrived hailstones that required service from a server in $x + [-R, R]^d$. The hailstone starts to melt at a constant rate 1 once its base touches the hot ground. In this way, $W(t, x)$ can be interpreted as the height function at site x evolving in time t . See Figure 1 for an illustration of how workload changes when a job arrives. In this example, we fix a time t , and a job with size $(\tau, R) = (1, 2)$ arrives at site -1 . Before its arrival, the workload at sites $-4, -3, 2$ is 2, at sites $-2, -1, 0, 3$ is 1, and at sites $1, 4$ is 3. After its arrival, the workload at sites $-4, 2$ is 2, at sites $-3, -2, -1$, is 4, at site 3 is 1, and at site 4 is 3.




Figure 1: Workloads before and after a Job Arrival.

1.2 Admissible paths, Workload, and Time Scales

We now rigorously define workload via *admissible* paths. Suppose the arrival times $(N_x)_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ and spatial sizes R of jobs are known. For any $0 \leq u \leq t$, an admissible path is a piece-wise constant, right-continuous (càdlàg) function $\gamma : [u, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that, if $\gamma(s) \neq \gamma(s-)$, there is a job arriving at time $s \in [u, t]$ with center x for some $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ (equivalently, $N_x(s) = N_x(s-) + 1$) and sizes (τ, R) , and it *intersects* the path γ in the sense:

$$\gamma(s), \gamma(s-) \in B(x, R) := \{y : |y - x| \leq R\}. \quad (1.5)$$

We also use $\gamma_{u,t}$ when we want to emphasize that the admissible path is on a fixed interval $[u, t]$. So, given $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $t > 0$, the dual model $\{\mathcal{G}_s^{x,t}\}_{0 \leq s \leq t}$ has $y \in \mathcal{G}_s^{x,t}$ if and only if there exists an admissible path $\gamma_{t-s,t} : [t-s, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^d$ with $\gamma_{t-s,t}(t-s) = y$ and $\gamma_{t-s,t}(t) = x$. For each admissible path $\gamma_{u,t}$, we can define its *load*

$$U(\gamma_{u,t}) = \sum \tau_i, \quad (1.6)$$

by summing over all jobs intersecting the admissible path $\gamma_{u,t}$ in the sense of (1.5), and assign it a score

$$V(\gamma_{u,t}) = U(\gamma_{u,t}) - (t - u). \quad (1.7)$$

The workload at the site (t, x) is the maximal score over all admissible paths $\gamma_{u,t}$ starting at some positive time $u \in [0, t]$ and ending at $\gamma_{u,t}(t) = x$, see [BF11],

$$W(t, x) = \sup_{0 \leq u \leq t} \left(\sup_{\substack{\gamma_{u,t}(t)=x, \\ \gamma_{u,t} \text{ admissible}}} V(\gamma_{u,t}) \right). \quad (1.8)$$

If one admits the value ∞ as a possible value, then $W(t, x)$ is well defined given any $\{\Phi(x)\}_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$, whether a queuing model can be defined or not. However in the case where the dual model does not explode we have that the random variable $W(t, x)$ equals the additional time that the queuing model required until x has served all jobs that arrived before the time t , and required service from x , see [BCF16, BF11, FKM18]. If one takes (1.8) as a definition of $W(t, x)$ without referencing to a queuing system, then in fact, (see Remark 1 after Theorem 1.1) there are nontrivial models that have workload $W(t, x) = \infty$ almost surely for any time $t > 0$. However, this is not the focus of our article. Instead, we study the *stability* of the system, and derive sufficient conditions for it, though these sufficient conditions for stability imply that the workload is finite for any positive time t almost surely. From (1.8), one can verify the properties (1.2) and (1.3). See Figure 2 for an illustration for an admissible path, its score and workload. In this example, red horizontal intervals represent job arrivals with temporal sizes τ_i . The blue line represents an admissible path $\gamma_{u,t}$, which passes jobs $\tau_2, \tau_4, \tau_6, \tau_7$. The load of $\gamma_{u,t}$ is $U(\gamma_{u,t}) = \tau_2 + \tau_4 + \tau_6 + \tau_7$, and $\gamma_{u,t}$ has a score $V(\gamma_{u,t}) = \tau_2 + \tau_4 + \tau_6 + \tau_7 - (t - u)$. $W(t, \mathbf{0})$ is the supremum of these scores over all such paths starting from some (u, y) and ending at $(t, \mathbf{0})$.




Figure 2: Admissible Path, Score, and Workload.

We set the initial starting point $\gamma(0) = \mathbf{0}$ to obtain a new random variable

$$\tilde{W}(t, \mathbf{0}) = \sup_{0 \leq u \leq t} \sup_{\substack{\gamma_{0,u}(0)=\mathbf{0}, \\ \gamma_{0,u} \text{ admissible}}} V(\gamma_{0,u}), \quad (1.9)$$

which by time reversibility and homogeneity of Poisson processes has the same distribution as $W(t, x)$ for any (t, x) . An advantage of using $\tilde{W}(t, \mathbf{0})$ is that $\tilde{W}(t, \mathbf{0})$ is increasing in t almost surely. This monotonicity is different from those in Remark 1, below and we apply it in Lemma 3.1. Since the growth estimate in Lemma 3.1 is related to $\sup U(\gamma_{0,t})$, we also remark that $\tilde{W}(t, \mathbf{0})$ involves all admissible paths with the initial point $(0, \mathbf{0})$ and some ending time $u \leq t$, whereas $W(t, \mathbf{0})$ involves admissible paths with the fixed final point $(t, \mathbf{0})$. Another advantage of $\tilde{W}(t, \mathbf{0})$ is that it enjoys superadditivity properties.

1.3 Stability and Results

We now define *stability*. From (1.8), given a system $\{\Phi(x)\}_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$, we see that $W(t, \mathbf{0})$ is stochastically increasing in t . Given a law \tilde{P} for the couple (τ, R) , we say that the family of $\{\Phi(x)\}_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ as λ varies, is *stable* if there exists a $\lambda_1 > 0$ so that for rate $0 < \lambda < \lambda_1$, the system $\{\Phi(x)\}_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ is such that $\{W(t, \mathbf{0})\}_{t \geq 0}$ is tight. In this case, we also say \tilde{P} is tight. We are interested in the stability of systems. We stress that the notion of stability depends on the law \tilde{P} and not on the existence of a queueing model. It is not clear that a queueing system can be defined when our dual model explodes. But for such a model to exist meaningfully it must have its workload given by (1.8). By translation invariance \tilde{P} is stable if and only if for any $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $\{W(t, x)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is tight. The central question in this article is to understand the stability of the system. It is natural to expect that if λ is small, $W(t, \mathbf{0})$ does not grow fast in time, and it decreases due to no arrivals of job but if a job of large spatial size follows a job of large temporal size, the system has many sites with large workload. In fact, one can show one of the three scenarios holds for a system:

- a) $W(t, \mathbf{0})$ is *infinite* for some time $t > 0$ with probability one,
- b) the system is unstable but with $W(t, \mathbf{0})$ *finite* for any time $t > 0$ with probability one,
- c) or the system is stable with $W(t, \mathbf{0})$ *finite* for any time $t > 0$ with probability one.

In [FKM18], Foss, Konstantopoulos, and Mountford showed that a finite $d + 1 + \epsilon$ -th moment for the sum of R and τ is sufficient for stability, and they also showed that for every $0 < \epsilon < d + 1$, there is an unstable system with a finite $d + 1 - \epsilon$ -th moment for the sum of R and τ . As a consequence, $d + 1$ is a critical moment for the sum of R and τ . Their method is via techniques introduced in the study of greedy lattice animals of \mathbb{Z}^d , see [CGGK93, M02] for instance. We can interpret these two results by considering critical moments for positive random variables R and τ . Let

$$\alpha := \sup\{a \geq -d : \mathbb{E}[R^{d+a}] < \infty\}, \quad \beta := \sup\{b \geq -1 : \mathbb{E}[\tau^{1+b}] < \infty\}. \quad (1.10)$$

So every law \tilde{P} defines a point (α, β) in $[-d, \infty] \times [-1, \infty]$. We say that a law \tilde{P} is in a region A if the corresponding pair (α, β) is in A . We divide up the space for (α, β) into regions, see Figure 3.




Figure 3: Stability and Critical Moments

The results of [FKM18] say that the system is always stable in the region I= $\{\alpha > 1, \beta > d\}$, and there exists an unstable system for every point in the region II= $\{\alpha < 1, \beta < d\}$. Stability in region III= $\{\alpha > 1, \beta < d\}$, region IV= $\{0 \leq \alpha < 1, \beta > d, \alpha\beta < d\}$, and region V= $\{0 < \alpha < 1, \alpha\beta > d\}$ are not clear from their results. Our results are

Theorem 1.1 *Consider the Poisson hail problem in any dimension $d \geq 1$. Let $d + \alpha, 1 + \beta$ be the critical moments for R and τ as defined in (1.10). Then*

1. *every nontrivial system in region II and III, $\{\beta < d\}$ is unstable;*
2. *every nontrivial system in $\{\alpha < 0$ or $\beta \leq 0\}$ is unstable;*
3. *for every point (α, β) in region IV= $\{\alpha\beta < d, \beta > d, 0 < \alpha < 1\}$, there is an unstable system with*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[R^{d+\alpha} + \tau^{1+\beta} \right] < \infty.$$

and

Theorem 1.2 *Consider the Poisson hail problem in dimension $d \geq 1$. Any system with parameters (α, β) in region V= $\{\alpha\beta > d, 0 < \alpha < 1\}$ or on the ray $\{(\alpha, \beta) : \beta > d, \alpha = 1\}$ is stable.*

These results (and [W22]) permit a classification of the models according to the parameters (α, β) . We do not consider boundaries between regions though for some boundaries simple monotonicity considerations permit a classification. The proofs of these various classifications are obtained as follows.

- I This is shown in [FKM18].
- II This is the content of Theorem 1.1, part 1.
- III This is the content of Theorem 1.1, part 1.
- IV This is the content of Theorem 1.1, part 3 and [W22].
- V This is the content of Theorem 1.2.

The region IV is the only one for which the stability or instability of a system with (α, β) in the given region is not determined by the region. In fact [W22] shows that for any (α, β) in IV, there exist both stable models and unstable models corresponding to (α, β) .

We end this subsection remarking on monotonicity properties for the workload $W(t, x)$ which can be found in [FKM18]. One can also verify these properties with the formula for workload $W(t, x)$, see (1.8) in the previous subsection.

Remark 1 *The model has monotonicity properties: $W(t, x)$ increases if we (a) increase the temporal size of the stones, or (b) enlarge the spatial shape. Due to the monotonicity of the model,*

1. *We treat general convex shapes for hailstones in the system. One way is to generalize R as the maximal distances between two points in the hailstone (under a certain norm). By enlarging the spatial shape of the hailstone to a cube with diameter R , we get an upper bound for $W(t, x)$. Together with Theorem 2.1, we can get a similar upper bound for workloads for general shapes. This "upper bound" may not be optimal if the shape does not have nonempty interior.*
2. *We can construct a new system from a generic stable system by the following strategy: for fixed increasing sequences $(S_i), (T_j)$, we enlarge the job sizes (τ, R) to (T_{j+1}, S_{i+1}) , if $S_i \leq R < S_{i+1}$ and $T_j \leq \tau < T_{j+1}$ for some i, j . The new system has sizes R (and τ) with distribution satisfying (1.11) (and (2.10), see below), for some parameters (α, β) and two normalizing constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$. The parameters (α, β) of the new system are typically smaller than (α_o, β_o) of the original system, but they can be chosen to be in region V for appropriate $(S_i), (T_j)$. For details, see the discussion of Theorem 1.2 in subsection 2.2.*

Systems in regions IV and V behave differently to systems in the region I due to different tail behaviors of R . A major difference is that the spatial growth of admissible paths can be arbitrarily fast in regions IV and V and the spatial growth introduces different time scales. To illustrate this, we consider a system in dimension $d = 1$ belonging to region $\{0 < \alpha < 1\}$, and the spatial size R has distribution of the form

$$P(R = S_i) = c_1 S_i^{-(d+\alpha)}, \quad \text{and} \quad R \in \{S_i\}_{i \geq 1}, \quad (1.11)$$

for some increasing sequence (S_i) increasing at least geometrically fast and a normalizing constant c_1 . In analyzing $W(t, \mathbf{0})$, it is equivalent to analyze $\tilde{W}(t, \mathbf{0})$, which we now do. In dimension $d = 1$, we have the advantage of defining the left-most and right-most points, L_t and R_t , reached by admissible paths with initial point $(0, 0)$ by time t ,

$$L_t = \inf_{\substack{\gamma(0)=\mathbf{0}, \\ \gamma \text{ admissible}}} \gamma(t), \quad R_t = \sup_{\substack{\gamma(0)=\mathbf{0}, \\ \gamma \text{ admissible}}} \gamma(t).$$

It is not hard to see that $D(t) = R_t - L_t$ can be compared to two (non independent) compound Poisson processes,

$$\sum_i \frac{1}{2} S_i \cdot v_i(t) \leq D(t) \leq \sum_i 2S_i \cdot V_i(t), \quad (1.12)$$

where for i fixed v_i and V_i are not independent but $(v_i(t), V_i(t))_{i \geq 1}$ are independent as i varies, and for each i , $v_i(t)$ and $V_i(t)$ are Poisson variables with rates $(\frac{c}{2} S_i^{-\alpha} t)_i$ and $(2c S_i^{-\alpha} t)_i$. The lower bound indicates that $D(t)$ grows super-linearly,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{D(t)}{t} \geq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{v_i(t)}{2t} S_i = \frac{1}{2} S_i^{1-\alpha},$$

while the upper bound indicates $D(s)$ has increment of sizes at most $2S_i$ at time scales S_i^α . The different speeds $S_i^{1-\alpha}$ in different time scales S_i^α indicate that the ‘‘domain of influence’’ \mathcal{R}_t for $\tilde{W}(t, \mathbf{0})$ is growing at different speeds on different time scales too, and this leads to nontrivial growth behaviors of $\tilde{W}(t, \mathbf{0})$. We use one example in the proof of Theorem 1.1, where we construct unstable models with $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{W(t, \mathbf{0})}{t} = \infty$ almost surely. In these models, we find jobs of large temporal sizes with high probability in time-space boxes with increasing spatial and temporal sizes. In particular, the ratio of the spatial sizes and the temporal size of these time-space boxes diverges as the temporal size grows.

1.4 Overview of the Proofs and Outline

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is similar to the proof of Theorem 2 in [FKM18]. We look into time-space boxes of increasing sizes, and consider the probability of obtaining jobs of large temporal sizes in these boxes connected via some admissible path. We can concatenate disjoint boxes so that the numbers of jobs inside are independent and apply the Law of Large Numbers for independent random variables to estimate the probability of getting an admissible path with a high score. The detailed proof of Theorem 1.1 is presented in subsection 2.1.

The proof of Theorem 1.2 relies on two reductions. In section 2 we reduce a generic system to a new system by enlarging job sizes to some discrete values as suggested in Remark 1. The new system may have smaller parameters (α, β) though still being in region V , and the workload of the new system dominates the workload of the original system stochastically. We choose the job sizes via two sequences of specific forms, see (2.3). These values allows us get some conditions, see (3.2)–(3.8) in section 3, under which we prove Theorem 2.1. These conditions are not necessary, but they enable the proof of Theorem 2.1. In section 3, we further reduce the proof Theorem 1.2 to two technical propositions. The principle task essentially reduces to showing Proposition 3.2.

The programme to show Proposition 3.2 consists of two steps corresponding to sections 4 and 5. The objective is to show that for fixed temporal size T_j , with large probability as t tends to infinity,

all admissible paths with a fixed end point of length t intersect at most $\frac{t}{T_j^{1+\delta'}}$ such jobs for $\delta' > 0$ not depending on j . In Section 4 we make a first step. We choose an "appropriate" spatial size S_{i_0} corresponding to j and show through various percolation arguments that with high probability all admissible paths starting at a given place which do not "use" job sizes S_i for $i > i_0$ have the desired bounds. We in fact show that the bounds hold outside exponentially small probabilities. It is here that the condition $\alpha\beta > d$ is used. In section 5 we use an induction argument on i to show that given an appropriate bound for admissible paths that do not "use" job sizes S_k for $k > i$, we can find an appropriate bound for admissible paths that do not "use" job sizes S_k for $k > i + 1$. The price to be paid is that the rate of the exponential bound for the bad events decreases as we pass from i to $i + 1$. Given that we have chosen the S_i to be increasing superexponentially, this does not pose a problem. The paper is concluded in section 6 by putting together the results of sections 4 and 5 to obtain Proposition 3.2.

2 Behaviors around the Critical Curve $\alpha\beta = d$

In this section, we first prove Theorem 1.1, which includes unstable cases in region II, III and IV. We understand the importance of the curve $L = \{\alpha\beta = d\}$ from the construction of an unstable model in region IV, see (2.2) below. We also look into models with parameters (α, β) above the critical curve, $\{\alpha\beta > d\}$. We then show that the proof of Theorem 1.2 need only be given for \tilde{P} which are discrete with possible values (for τ and R) well separated.

2.1 Unstable Models in Regions II, III and Constructing Unstable Models in Region IV

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is similar to that in section 5 of [FKM18]. It is an application of the graphical construction and the Law of Large Numbers for independent random variables. We investigate any generic model in regions II and III, $\{\beta < d\}$, and also construct an unstable model in region IV = $\{\alpha\beta > d, 0 \leq \alpha < 1\}$.

PROOF:(Theorem 1.1)

1. (Region II, III) Let the arrival rate be $\lambda > 0$. By the assumption that the system is nontrivial, we can use a large deviation estimate for a continuous time random walk, and get that there exists a strictly positive $c_0 = c_0(\lambda)$ and $n_0 < \infty$ such that $\forall n \geq n_0$

$$\inf_{x \in [-c_0 n, c_0 n]^d} P(\{\text{exists an admissible path } \gamma \text{ with } \gamma(n) = \mathbf{0} \text{ and } \gamma(0) = x\}) > 1 - e^{-c_0 n}.$$

We choose strictly positive $\epsilon < \frac{d-\beta}{3}$. By the definition of β we see that $E(\tau^{1+\beta+\epsilon}) = \infty$ so there exists a sequence n_i increasing to infinity such that n_i increasing to infinity with

$$P(\tau \geq 3n_i) \geq \frac{1}{n_i^{1+\beta+2\epsilon}}.$$

We may assume that $n_i > n_0 \forall i \geq 0$.

For any $i \geq 1$, the event that $W(2n_i, \mathbf{0}) \leq n_i$ is contained in the union of two events

- $\{\exists(t, x) \in [0, n_i] \times [-c_0 n_i, c_0 n_i]^d \text{ so that a job arrives at } (t, x) \text{ with } \tau \geq 3n_i\}$.
- $\{\exists \text{ an admissible path } \gamma : [n_i, 2n_i] \text{ with } \gamma(n_i) = x \text{ and } \gamma(2n_i) = \mathbf{0}\}$

But the probability of the first event is bounded by $e^{-\lambda \frac{(2c_0 n_i + 1)^d n_i}{n_i^{1+\beta+2\epsilon}}}$ which tends to zero as n_i tends to infinity, while the second conditioned on the existence of an x for the first chosen by non-random ordering of sites has probability bounded by $e^{-c_0 n_i}$ by our choice of c_0 . Thus the distributions $\{W(2n_i, \mathbf{0})\}_{i \geq 0}$ are not tight.

2. (Regions outside $\{\alpha \geq 0, \beta > 0\}$) The first case deals with $\beta \leq 0$ so we need only treat $\alpha < 0$. We suppose $e_1 > 0$ fixed so that $P(\tau > e_1) > e_1$. We fix $M \geq 4$ and as in the previous case, we fix $\epsilon > 0$ and less than $\frac{2}{3}$. Again we have the existence of n_i increasing to infinity with

$$P(R \geq 3n_i) \geq \frac{1}{n_i^{d-\epsilon}}.$$

For every i , the event $\{W(1, \mathbf{0}) < Me_1 - 1\}$ is contained in the union of

- $\{\text{for some } 1 \leq k \leq M \exists (x, t) \in [-n_i, n_i]^d \times [1 - \frac{k-1}{M}, 1 - \frac{2k-1}{2M}] \text{ so that a job arrives at } (x, t) \text{ with } R \geq 3n_i\}$.
- $\{\exists 1 \leq k \leq M \text{ so that } \exists (x, t) \in [-n_i, n_i]^d \times [1 - \frac{2k-1}{2M}, 1 - \frac{k}{M}] \text{ so that a job arrives at } (x, t) \text{ with } \tau > e_1\}$.

So, as above, $P(W(1, \mathbf{0}) < Me_1 - 1)$ is bounded by $Me^{-(2n_i+1)^d \frac{\lambda}{2Mn_i^{d-\epsilon}}} + Me^{-(2n_i+1)^d \lambda e_1 / 2M}$. We see the lack of tightness from the arbitrariness of i .

3. (Region IV) For any point (α, β) in Region IV = $\{\alpha\beta < d, 0 < \alpha < 1, \beta > d\}$, we construct an unstable system having (α, β) as its moment parameters. Note that unlike the previous two cases, we are not claiming that any distribution with parameters in this region is necessarily unstable.

For this system, jobs have discrete spatial and temporal sizes. In particular, for all positive integer i , we define $R_i := 2^{(1+\beta)i}$ and $\tau_i := 2^{(d+\alpha)i}$. The jobs have only sizes (τ_i, R_i) for some $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and with probability

$$\tilde{P}(\{(\tau_i, r_i)\}) = P((\tau, R) = (\tau_i, R_i)) = c \cdot 2^{-(d+\alpha)(1+\beta)i}, \quad (2.1)$$

where c is a normalizing constant $c = (\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 2^{-(d+\alpha)(1+\beta)i})^{-1}$. It is easy to check this system is in Region IV, and we only need to show that this system is unstable. The argument is similar to the first case. We consider $W(\frac{\tau_i}{4}, \mathbf{0})$. The number, N_i , of (τ_i, R_i) jobs arriving at a space time point in $[-\frac{R_i}{4}, \frac{R_i}{4}]^d \times [0, \frac{\tau_i}{4}]$ is a Poisson random variable with parameter

$$c2^{-(d+1)} R_i^d \tau_i 2^{-(d+\alpha)(1+\beta)i} = c2^{-(d+1)} 2^{i(d-\alpha\beta)}. \quad (2.2)$$

Since $d > \alpha\beta$, this parameter tends to infinity as i becomes large. By considering the admissible path $\gamma(s) \equiv \mathbf{0}$ for $0 \leq s \leq \frac{\tau_i}{4}$ we have that $W(\frac{\tau_i}{4}, \mathbf{0})$ is stochastically greater than $\tau_i(N_i - \frac{1}{4})$. This suffices to show the lack of tightness. □

Remark 2 We have the following two remarks on workload $W(t, x)$, the proofs are extensions of arguments in the above proof, and we omit their details.

1. In the proof of first case, we use the fact that the parameter β is strictly smaller than d , which implies the $d + 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ -th moment of τ is infinite. In fact, with an extra amount of work, we can show that the model is unstable with the condition that τ has an infinite $d + 1$ -th moment, so that there are also unstable models with parameters (α, β) on the boundary of regions II, III, (i.e. $\beta = d$). Similarly, we can also show that the model is unstable with the condition that R has an infinite d -th moment, when $\alpha = 0$.
2. When $\alpha < 0$, the workload $W(t, \mathbf{0})$ is infinite almost surely, for any $t > 0$.

2.2 Reduction of Theorem 1.2

The purpose of this subsection is to reduce the proof of Theorem 1.2 to proving corresponding results for a "discrete" comparison process. This discretization, as mentioned, permits the use of inductive arguments. The reduced result, Theorem 2.1 below, is subsequently further reduced in the next section. That is, our objective is to reduce proving Theorem 1.2 to proving Theorem 2.1 below.

Recall that $(\tau', R') \sim \tilde{P}$ means that \tilde{P} is the law of (τ', R') . We say that law \tilde{P} *dominates* \tilde{P} if

$$\exists \tau' \leq \tau \text{ and } R' \leq R \text{ so that } (\tau', R') \sim \tilde{P} \text{ and } (\tau, R) \sim \tilde{P}.$$

The main tool which follows from Remark 1 is

Proposition 2.1 *If \tilde{P} dominates \tilde{P} and \tilde{P} is stable, then so is \tilde{P} .*

We now give a family of distributions $\tilde{P}^{\theta, A}$ for $\theta, A > 0$ which always dominate a given \tilde{P} . Given θ, A and $\tilde{P} \in V$ we choose the sequences $i \geq 1$

$$S_i = 2^{(1+\delta)A(1+\theta)^{2i}}, \quad T_j = 2^{\alpha A(1+\theta)^{2j+1}}. \quad (2.3)$$

We also choose $T_0 = 0$ for convention. The value $\delta > 0$ is specified as a function of θ and \tilde{P} below. Given these sequences $\tilde{P}^{\theta, A}$ denotes the law of (τ', R') obtained from $(\tau, R) \sim \tilde{P}$ by specifying as in 2) of Remark 1. Thus from Proposition 2.1, we have that Theorem 1.2 is implied by the following:

Proposition 2.2 *For \tilde{P} in region V , there exists θ sufficiently small and such that there exists A sufficiently large so that $\tilde{P}^{\theta, A}$ is stable.*

It remains to discuss the value δ . We also introduce a fourth value $\kappa > 0$ which plays a role in our analysis. Consider a generic \tilde{P} in the region V . Notice that region $V = \{\alpha < 1, \alpha\beta > d\}$ is an open set, we can find parameters α_0, β_0 with $\alpha_0 \cdot \beta_0 > d \geq 1$, $0 < \alpha_0 < 1$, such that the job sizes (τ_o, R_o) satisfy moment conditions

$$\mathbb{E} \left[R_o^{d+\alpha_0} + \tau_o^{1+\beta_0} \right] < \infty. \quad (2.4)$$

Although the critical moments (α_c, β_c) of \tilde{P} may not have strict inequality as (2.4), from the definitions (1.10), we can always approximate (α_c, β_c) by (α_0, β_0) .

For $\theta > 0$, we define α_1, β_1 parametrized by θ

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{d + \alpha_0}{(1 + \theta)^2} - d, \text{ and } \beta_1 = \frac{1 + \beta_0}{(1 + \theta)^2} - 1. \quad (2.5)$$

Since $\lim_{\theta \downarrow 0} \alpha_1 \beta_1 = \alpha_0 \beta_0 > d$, we can find a $\theta > 0$, such that the pair (α_1, β_1) is a point in region V ,

$$0 < \alpha_1 < \alpha_0 < 1, \text{ and } \alpha_1 \beta_1 > d. \quad (2.6)$$

Then, we can define δ by

$$\delta = \min \left(\frac{\alpha_1 \beta_1 - d}{d + \alpha_1}, \frac{\theta}{3} \right) > 0, \quad (2.7)$$

and take a $\kappa < \min \left\{ \frac{1}{8}, \frac{\delta}{4(1+\delta)} \right\}$. It follows immediately that $\theta > 3\delta > \frac{3\kappa}{1-\kappa}$, and therefore, we have

$$\theta > \frac{3\kappa}{1-\kappa}. \quad (2.8)$$

By the Markov Inequality and (2.4), we have for each job in the new system (i.e, (τ, R) chosen from law $\tilde{P}^{\theta, A}$) for $i \geq 1, j \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} P(R = S_{i+1}) &\leq P(R_o \geq S_i) \leq \mathbb{E}[R_o^{d+\alpha_0}] S_i^{-(d+\alpha_0)}, \\ P(\tau = T_{j+1}) &\leq P(\tau_o \geq T_j) \leq \mathbb{E}[\tau_o^{1+\beta_0}] T_j^{-(1+\beta_0)}, \end{aligned}$$

which, from the choices of (α_1, β_1) and $S_{i+1} = S_i^{(1+\theta)^2}$, $T_{j+1} = T_j^{(1+\theta)^2}$, are bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[R_o^{d+\alpha_0} S_i^{-(d+\alpha_0)}] &= \mathbb{E}[R_o^{d+\alpha_0} S_{i+1}^{-\frac{d+\alpha_0}{(1+\theta)^2}}] \leq c_1 S_{i+1}^{-(d+\alpha_1)}, \\ \mathbb{E}[\tau_o^{1+\beta_0} T_j^{-(1+\beta_0)}] &= \mathbb{E}[\tau_o^{1+\beta_0} T_{j+1}^{-\frac{1+\beta_0}{(1+\theta)^2}}] \leq c_2 T_{j+1}^{-(1+\beta_1)},\end{aligned}$$

for some $c_1, c_2 > 0$.

Therefore, the distribution of (τ, R) in the new system (i.e. $P^{\tilde{\theta}, A}$) satisfies, for $i \geq 1, j \geq 1$

$$P(R = S_i) \leq c_1 S_i^{-(d+\alpha_1)}, \quad (2.9)$$

$$P(\tau = T_j) \leq c_2 T_j^{-(1+\beta_1)}, \quad (2.10)$$

for some $c_1, c_2 > 0$. Note while c_1, c_2 depends on A , exponents α_1, β_1 do not.

Our final reduction is just to suppose that in inequalities (2.9) and (2.10) we may take equality. Given law $\tilde{P}^{\theta, A}$ satisfying the above inequalities, it is immediate that by adding mass at points $(0, S_j)$ and $(T_j, 0)$, we can construct a measure (of mass at least 1) μ so that we have for μ equality in (2.9) and (2.10). Let $\tilde{\tilde{P}}^{\theta, A}$ be μ normalized to be a probability. We now simply note that from basic Poisson process properties that for each $\lambda > 0$ the system $\tilde{\tilde{P}}^{\theta, A}$ at rate $|\mu|\lambda$ dominates system \tilde{P} at rate λ with obvious meaning of dominates in this context. Thus we have that to show Proposition 2.2, and therefore Theorem 1.2 it suffices to show

Theorem 2.1 *Given \tilde{P} in V , let $\theta > 0$ be such that for all $A > 0$ the law $\tilde{\tilde{P}}^{\theta, A}$ is in region V and so that for $(\tau, R) \sim \tilde{\tilde{P}}^{\theta, A}$, $P(R = S_i) = c_1 S_i^{-(d+\alpha_1)}$, and $P(\tau = T_j) = c_2 T_j^{-(1+\beta_1)}$, for some c_1 and c_2 . Then for A sufficiently large $\tilde{\tilde{P}}^{\theta, A}$ is stable.*

3 A Stable Discretized Model, and Its Growth Estimates

In this section, we focus on the new discrete system introduced in Theorem 2.1. Our main goal of this section is to reduce the proof of Theorem 2.1 to a technical result, Proposition 3.2.

We start with some conditions satisfied by the job sizes for $\tilde{\tilde{P}}^{\theta, A}$, when A is sufficiently large. The specific form (2.3) of job sizes is convenient for presenting the estimates and proofs in this section. In principle, there are many other choices for (S_i, T_j) , as long as the system belongs to region V . The form (2.3) of (S_i, T_j) and a large enough A imply conditions (3.2) – (3.8) below, and they are in the assumptions of two technical propositions, Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 3.2. Again, these conditions are not necessary for the stability, but they aid our proofs. We will discuss their roles after stating them.

For large A , the sequences $(S_i), (T_j)$ satisfy the following conditions:

1. The choice of exponents implies that for $i > 1$

$$S_i^{\alpha(1+\theta)} = T_i^{1+\delta}. \quad (3.1)$$

2. Scales $\Delta t_{2i-1} = S_i^\alpha \geq 1, \Delta t_{2i} = T_i^{1+\delta} \geq 1$ are well separated: for all $i \geq 1$

$$\varrho^i \Delta t_i^{1+\kappa} < \varrho^{-(i+1)} \Delta t_{i+1}^{1-\kappa}, \quad (3.2)$$

where $\varrho = 10 + \frac{d}{\alpha\kappa}$. In fact, we can choose for each i ,

$$l_i = \varrho^{-i} \Delta t_i^{-\kappa}, r_i = \varrho^i \Delta t_i^\kappa, \quad (3.3)$$

so that we have an increasing sequence of times in \mathbb{R}_+

$$0 < l_1 \Delta t_1 < r_1 \Delta t_1 < l_2 \Delta t_2 < r_2 \Delta t_2 < \dots \quad (3.4)$$

To avoid confusion, we point out that the symbol Δt_i does not mean the increment of time $t_{i+1} - t_i$, but a scale corresponding to i .

We show (3.2) when i is odd, $i = 2j - 1$. Indeed, there is an $A > 0$ such that for all $j \geq 1$,

$$(\Delta t_{2j-1})^\kappa = 2^{A\kappa\alpha(1+\delta)(1+\theta)^{2j}} > 2^{2A\kappa\alpha\theta(1+\delta)j} > \rho^{4j-1}.$$

Then by (2.8), we have that $1 + \theta > \frac{1+2\kappa}{1-\kappa}$. Therefore, from (3.1),

$$\rho^{4j-1} \Delta t_{2j-1}^{1+\kappa} < \Delta t_{2j-1}^{1+2\kappa} < \Delta t_{2j-1}^{(1+\theta)(1-\kappa)} = \Delta t_{2j}^{(1-\kappa)},$$

which implies (3.2). Similarly, we can show the case when i is even, and we omit the proof.

In fact, (3.2) also implies the following two conditions (when A is large), see (3.5) (3.6) below and a short proof of them at the end of point 4.

3. Higher scale has little influence over lower scales: for all $i \geq 1$

$$\sum_{j>0} \rho^{2j} \Delta t_{2(i+j)-1}^{-(1-\kappa)} < \Delta t_{2i}^{-1}. \quad (3.5)$$

4. Summability: for each $C > 0$,

$$\sum_{i>1} \exp(-C\Delta t_i^\kappa) \ln(\Delta t_i) < \infty. \quad (3.6)$$

(3.5) and (3.6) follow from (3.2). In fact, (3.2) implies that for all $i \geq 1$,

$$\Delta t_i^{-1} > \rho^{2i+1} \Delta t_{i+1}^{-(1-\kappa)} > \rho^3 \Delta t_{i+1}^{-1}.$$

Therefore, we have that for any $j > 0$,

$$\rho^{-j} \Delta t_{2i}^{-1} > \rho^{2j} \Delta t_{2(i+j)-1}^{-(1-\kappa)}.$$

Summing over j , we can get (3.5).

Similarly, From (3.2), we get that $\Delta t_i \geq \rho^{3i}$. For any $C > 0$, there is an $M > 0$ such that the function $\exp(-Cx^\kappa) \ln(x)$ is decreasing in x on $[M, \infty)$. We can get (3.6) from the inequality $\sum_{i>1} \exp(-C\rho^{3i\kappa}) \ln(\rho^{3i}) < \infty$.

5. Leading order: for all $i \geq 1$

$$(S_i^{1-\alpha} \Delta t_{2i})^d \Delta t_{2i} T_i^{-(1+\beta)} < 1 \quad (3.7)$$

This is a consequence of $\alpha\beta > d$, and the choice of δ , see (2.7). In view of (3.1), we have that $S_i < T_i^{\frac{1+\delta}{\alpha}}$. Therefore, we bound the left hand side of (3.7) (strictly) by

$$T_i^{((\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}+1)d+1)(1+\delta)-(1+\beta)} = T_i^{\frac{d-\alpha\beta+(d+\alpha)\delta}{\alpha}} \leq 1.$$

6. Also, when A is large, we have inequalities for (S_i) , for all $k \geq 1$,

$$10 \sum_{i<k} S_i^{1-\alpha} < S_k^{1-\alpha}, \quad 10 \sum_{i>k} S_i^{-\alpha} < S_k^{-\alpha}. \quad (3.8)$$

Before going into the major bounds in the proof of Theorem 2.1, we briefly explain the roles of conditions (3.2) – (3.8) in the major steps. Conditions (3.2) and (3.6) are used directly in the proof of Theorem 2.1, see subsection 3.3 below. In general, (3.2) allows us to look at different time intervals corresponding to different time scales and obtain estimates according to these scales, while (3.6) allows us to get a finite sum from these estimates, and to apply a Borel-Cantelli type of argument, see

Lemma 3.1 below. Conditions (3.8) enable us to estimate the probability to connect two time-space points, which is used throughout sections 4, 5. In particular, condition (3.8) has nothing to do with temporal workload, and it controls spatial growth for admissible paths for $W(t, \mathbf{0})$. Condition (3.7) is the cornerstone to control the growth of the maximal numbers of jobs, see (3.9) and (3.10) below, and it plays a central role in Proposition 5.1. This condition implies that when jobs of spatial sizes larger than S_j are not involved, the density of jobs of temporal size T_j along any admissible paths, is at most $T_j^{-(1+\delta)}$, for some $\delta > 0$. Condition (3.5), on the other hand, ensures that jobs of sizes larger than S_j do not affect the leading order $T_j^{-(1+\delta)}$ for the density of jobs of temporal size T_j along any admissible paths, see Proposition 5.2. It is with (3.5) that we bound a family of tailored exponential moments, see Corollary 5.1 below, and derive from them the probabilistic estimates in Proposition 3.2.

3.1 Growth Estimates

The job sizes are discrete for $\tilde{P}^{\theta, A}$, so we can estimate the load of an admissible path by contribution from different job sizes. For any fixed admissible path $\gamma_{0,t}$, we denote by $n_j(\gamma_{0,t})$ the number of jobs of the temporal size T_j that $\gamma_{0,t}$ intersects (in the sense of (1.5)), and denote by $m_i(\gamma_{0,t})$ the number of jobs of spatial size S_i that $\gamma_{0,t}$ intersects:

$$n_j(\gamma_{0,t}) := \text{number of jobs of temporal size } T_j \text{ intersected by } \gamma_{0,t}, \quad (3.9)$$

$$m_i(\gamma_{0,t}) := \text{number of jobs of spatial size } S_i \text{ intersected by } \gamma_{0,t}. \quad (3.10)$$

The load of an admissible path can be written as

$$U(\gamma_{0,t}) = \sum_j n_j(\gamma_{0,t}) T_j.$$

Taking the supremum over all admissible paths with the initial point $\gamma_{0,t}(0) = \mathbf{0}$, we get three types of maximal quantities, which are all superadditive in time t ,

$$\sup U(\gamma_{0,t}), \sup n_j(\gamma_{0,t}), \text{ and } \sup m_j(\gamma_{0,t}).$$

The technical propositions involve bounding the growth of these quantities.

The main ingredient towards Theorem 2.1 is the following proposition on the maximal load up to time t , $\sup U(\gamma_{0,t})$. It says that $\sup U(\gamma_{0,t})$ grows at most linearly in time t with a high probability. In view of (3.4), the probabilistic estimate is related to different time scales on different time intervals. On each time interval larger than the time scale Δt_{2i} , the probability that $\sup U(\gamma_{0,t})$ grows faster than $c \cdot t$ is exponentially small in the time scale Δt_{2i} , up to a term which is proportional to the ratio of t and the next time scale $\Delta t_{2(i+1)}$; on the time interval close to the time scale Δt_{2i} , we can modify the event slightly.

Proposition 3.1 *Recall $\kappa < \min\{\frac{1}{8}, \frac{\delta}{4(1+\delta)}\}$. Suppose the assumption of Theorem 2.1 hold, and two sequence of numbers (S_i) (T_j) satisfy conditions (3.2)–(3.8), for $\Delta t_{2i-1} = S_i^\alpha$, $\Delta t_{2i} = T_i^{1+\delta}$, and l_i, r_i defined by (3.3), for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, there are positive constants c, C, C' , and λ_d such that if $\lambda < \lambda_d$, then for all $i \geq 1$,*

$$P(\sup U(\gamma_{0,t}) > c \cdot t) < \begin{cases} \exp(-C\Delta t_{2i}^\kappa) + C'\Delta t_{2i+2}^{-1}t & , \text{ if } l_{2i}\Delta t_{2i} \leq t < r_{2i}\Delta t_{2i} \\ \exp(-C\Delta t_{2i}^{-1} \cdot t) + C'\Delta t_{2i+2}^{-1}t & , \text{ if } r_{2i}\Delta t_{2i} \leq t < l_{2i+2}\Delta t_{2i+2} \end{cases}, \quad (3.11)$$

where the supremum is taken over all admissible paths with the initial point $\gamma_{0,t}(0) = \mathbf{0}$.

Before proceeding, we remark that we can get an upper bound for C' , but due to our choices of r_i, l_i and time scales Δt_i , (3.11) converges to 0 fast enough regardless of the values of C' . In fact, we use (3.11) to prove a Borel-Cantelli type of lemma, see Lemma 3.1 below.

Notice that the time scales have been standardized, in the sense that the scale $\Delta t_{2i} = T_i^{1+\delta}$ is a typical time of seeing one arrival of T_i along the maximal path. A more precise statement is Proposition 3.2. Let $A_{t,j}(c')$ be the event that the maximal number for jobs of temporal size T_j doesn't exceed $c' T_j^{-(1+\delta)} \cdot t$ by time t for any admissible path on $[0, t]$ with the initial point $(0, \mathbf{0})$,

$$A_{t,j}(c') := \left\{ \sup_{\substack{\gamma_{0,t}(0)=\mathbf{0}, \\ \gamma_{0,t} \text{ admissible}}} n_j(\gamma_{0,t}) \leq c' T_j^{-(1+\delta)} t \right\}, \quad (3.12)$$

and let $B_i(t)$ be the event that no jobs of spatial size S_j , $j \geq i+2$ occur along any admissible path on $[0, t]$ with the initial point $(0, \mathbf{0})$,

$$B_i(t) := \left\{ \sup_{\substack{\gamma_{0,t}(0)=\mathbf{0}, \\ \gamma_{0,t} \text{ admissible}}} m_j(\gamma_{0,t}) = 0, \text{ for all } j \geq i+2 \right\}. \quad (3.13)$$

For every t in a fixed time interval $[l_{2i}\Delta t_{2i}, l_{2i+2}\Delta t_{2i+2}]$, we consider events described by cases in Proposition 3.2 below, and estimate their probability, which are in general small. We then upper bound the probability of the event that $A_{t,j}(c')$ occurs for all j . Small modification is required when t is close to Δt_{2i} . In this case, the ratio $\Delta t_{2i}^{-1} t$ is like a constant, and we consider the event $A_{t,i}^c(c' \Delta t_{2i}^{2\kappa})$, which also has a small probability when $B_i(t)$ occurs, see (3.17) below. In general, we can chose $c = c' \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} T_j^{-(\delta-2\kappa)} < \infty$, and prove Proposition 3.1 by (3.18) in Proposition 3.2. So we omit the proof of Proposition 3.1.

Proposition 3.2 *Under the assumption of Proposition 3.1, there are positive constants c', C, C' and $\lambda_d < 1$, such that, if $\lambda < \lambda_d$, for any $t \in [l_{2i}\Delta t_{2i}, l_{2i+2}\Delta t_{2i+2})$ we have the following estimates on maximal numbers of jobs:*

1. $B_i(t)$ occurs with a high probability:

$$P(B_i(t)^c) \leq C' \Delta t_{2i+2}^{-1} t \leq C' l_{2i+2}; \quad (3.14)$$

2. if $j > i$,

$$P(A_{t,j}^c(0) \text{ and } B_i(t)) < C' \Delta t_{2j}^{-1} t; \quad (3.15)$$

3. if $j \leq i$,

$$P(A_{t,j}^c(c') \text{ and } B_i(t)) < \exp(-C\kappa^{i-j+2} \Delta t_{2j}^{-1} t); \quad (3.16)$$

4. in the case when $i = j$, and when $t < r_{2i}\Delta t_{2i}$,

$$P(A_{t,i}^c(c' \Delta t_{2i}^{2\kappa}) \text{ and } B_i(t)) < \exp(-C\Delta t_{2i}^{\kappa}); \quad (3.17)$$

Furthermore, we bound the event that $A_{t,j}(c' \Delta t_{2j}^{2\kappa})$ occurs for all j ,

$$1 - P(A_{t,j}(c' \Delta t_{2j}^{2\kappa}) \text{ for all } j) < \begin{cases} \exp(-C\Delta t_{2i}^{\kappa}) + C' \Delta t_{2i+2}^{-1} \cdot t & , \text{ if } l_i \Delta t_{2i} \leq t < r_i \Delta t_{2i} \\ \exp(-C\Delta t_{2i}^{-1} \cdot t) + C' \Delta t_{2i+2}^{-1} \cdot t & , \text{ if } r_i \Delta t_{2i} \leq t < l_{i+1} \Delta t_{2i+2} \end{cases} \quad (3.18)$$

The proof of Proposition 3.2 is postponed to section 6. To aid the proof, we introduce some tools in section 4, and use them to estimate exponential moments of the maximal numbers in section 5. By the Markov Inequalities, we derive estimates in Proposition 3.2 from exponential moments.

3.2 A Borel-Cantelli Type of Lemma

The next lemma shows that we can get stability from a Borel-Cantelli type of estimate, see (3.19), and therefore, showing Theorem 2.1 is reduced to Proposition 3.1. The proof is elementary, and it comes from extensions of admissible paths, and monotonicity of $\tilde{W}(t, \mathbf{0})$ in t . A similar argument can be found in the proof of Proposition 14 [FKM18].

Lemma 3.1 *Suppose there exist positive constants $a > 0$, $b < \frac{1}{1+a}$ and a diverging sequence of times (u_n) such that $u_n \leq u_{n+1} \leq (1+a)u_n$, and*

$$\sum_n P(\sup U(\gamma_{0,u_n}) > b \cdot u_n) < \infty, \quad (3.19)$$

where the supremum is over all admissible path with the initial point $(0, \mathbf{0})$. Then $\{\tilde{W}(t, \mathbf{0})\}_{t \geq 0}$ is tight.

PROOF: Firstly, for $s' < s$, we can always extend an admissible path $\gamma_{0,s'}$ on $[0, s']$ to a new one $\gamma_{0,s}$ on $[0, s]$ by letting $\gamma_{0,s}(u) = \gamma_{0,s'}(u)$, $0 \leq u \leq s'$, and $\gamma_{0,s'}(s')$, otherwise. Therefore, $U(\gamma_{0,s}) \geq U(\gamma_{0,s'})$. By (3.19), we get that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an n_ϵ , such that

$$P(U(\gamma_{0,u_n}) > b \cdot u_n, \text{ for some } n \geq n_\epsilon, \text{ and some admissible path } \gamma_{0,u_n} \text{ with } \gamma_{0,u_n}(0) = \mathbf{0}) < \epsilon.$$

Then by extending admissible paths, we have

$$P(U(\gamma_{0,s}) > b(1+a) \cdot s, \text{ for some } s \geq u_{n_\epsilon}, \text{ and some admissible path } \gamma_{0,s} \text{ with } \gamma_{0,s}(0) = \mathbf{0}) < \epsilon.$$

Since $V(\gamma_{0,s}) = U(\gamma_{0,s}) - s$, and $b(1+a) - 1 < 0$, we get

$$P(V(\gamma_{0,s}) > 0, \text{ for some } s \geq u_{n_\epsilon}, \text{ and some admissible path } \gamma_{0,s} \text{ with } \gamma_{0,s}(0) = \mathbf{0}) < \epsilon. \quad (3.20)$$

We also get a similar statement from (3.19) and extending admissible paths,

$$P(U(\gamma_{0,u_{n_\epsilon}}) > b \cdot u_{n_\epsilon}, \text{ for some admissible path } \gamma_{0,u_{n_\epsilon}} \text{ with } \gamma_{0,u_{n_\epsilon}}(0) = \mathbf{0}) < \epsilon,$$

which implies that

$$P(\tilde{W}(u_{n_\epsilon}, \mathbf{0}) > (b+1)u_{n_\epsilon}) < \epsilon. \quad (3.21)$$

Now we prove tightness of $(\tilde{W}(t, \mathbf{0}))$. If $t > u_{n_\epsilon}$, by (3.20), (3.21), and the definition of $\tilde{W}(t, \mathbf{0})$, we obtain that there is an $N_\epsilon = (b+1)u_{n_\epsilon} > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} P(\tilde{W}(t, \mathbf{0}) > N_\epsilon) &\leq P(\tilde{W}(u_{n_\epsilon}, \mathbf{0}) > N_\epsilon) \\ &\quad + P(V(\gamma_{0,s}) > N_\epsilon, \text{ for some } s \geq u_{n_\epsilon}, \text{ and some admissible path } \gamma_{0,s} \text{ with } \gamma_{0,s}(0) = \mathbf{0}) \\ &< 2\epsilon; \end{aligned}$$

If $t \leq u_{n_\epsilon}$, from the fact that $\tilde{W}(t, \mathbf{0})$ is increasing in t , we get that

$$P(\tilde{W}(t, \mathbf{0}) > N_\epsilon) \leq P(\tilde{W}(u_{n_\epsilon}, \mathbf{0}) > N_\epsilon) < \epsilon$$

We conclude that $(\tilde{W}(t, \mathbf{0}))_{t \geq 0}$ and $(W(t, \mathbf{0}))_{t \geq 0}$ are tight. \square

3.3 Proof of Theorem 2.1 given Proposition 3.2

Now we prove Theorem 2.1 by assuming Proposition 3.2, and therefore Proposition 3.1.

PROOF: (Theorem 2.1) In view of Lemma 3.1, we only need to find a sequence (u_n) and to verify (3.19) for some $b < 1$. Let $a > 0$, we define a sequence of (u_n) inductively:

$$\begin{cases} u_1 = l_1 \cdot \Delta t_1 \\ u_{n+1} = \min\{(1+a)u_n, l_k \cdot \Delta t_k, : l_k \cdot \Delta t_k > u_n, \text{ for some } k\} \end{cases}. \quad (3.22)$$

It is immediate that $u_{i+1} = (1+a)u_i$, if $u_{i+1} \neq l_k \cdot \Delta t_k$ for any k .

From Proposition 3.1, there exists positive constants c, C, C' such that, for any k

$$\sum_{l_k \cdot \Delta t_k \leq u_i < r_k \cdot \Delta t_k} P(\sup U(\gamma_{0,t_i}) > c \cdot u_i) < \sum_{l_k \cdot \Delta t_k \leq u_i < r_k \cdot \Delta t_k} (\exp(-C\Delta t_k^\kappa) + C' \Delta t_{k+1}^{-1} u_i).$$

By summing according to the constant $\exp(-C\Delta t_k^\kappa)$, and other terms linear in u_i , we rewrite the previous sum as

$$\exp(-C\Delta t_k^\kappa) \cdot |\{u_i : l_k \cdot \Delta t_k \leq u_i < r_k \cdot \Delta t_k\}| + C' \Delta t_{k+1}^{-1} \sum_{l_k \cdot \Delta t_k \leq u_i < r_k \cdot \Delta t_k} u_i.$$

Since (u_i) grows geometrically in i on the interval $[l_k \cdot \Delta t_k, r_k \cdot \Delta t_k]$, $u_{i+1} = (1+a)u_i$, we get the sum bounded by

$$\exp(-C\Delta t_k^\kappa) \left(\frac{\log(r_k) - \log(l_k)}{\log(1+a)} + 1 \right) + C' \frac{r_k \cdot \Delta t_k}{\Delta t_{k+1}} \frac{1}{a},$$

which by (3.2) and (3.3), is bounded by

$$\frac{2}{\log(1+a)} \exp(-C\Delta t_k^\kappa) \log(\varrho^k \Delta t_k) + \exp(-C\Delta t_k^\kappa) + C' \varrho^{-(k+1)}. \quad (3.23)$$

Similarly, for any k ,

$$\sum_{r_k \cdot \Delta t_k \leq u_i < l_{k+1} \cdot \Delta t_{k+1}} P(\sup U(\gamma_{0,t_i}) > c \cdot u_i) < \sum_{r_k \cdot \Delta t_k \leq u_i < l_{k+1} \cdot \Delta t_{k+1}} (\exp(-C\Delta t_k^{-1} \cdot u_i) + C' \Delta t_{k+1}^{-1} u_i)$$

Since $u_{i+1} = u_i(1+a)$ when $u_{i+1} \neq l_k \cdot \Delta t_k$ for any k , the sequence $(\exp(-C\Delta t_k^{-1} \cdot u_i))_{r_k \cdot \Delta t_k \leq u_i < l_{k+1} \cdot \Delta t_{k+1}}$ is bounded by a geometric sequence with its first term as $\exp(-Cr_k)$ and a ratio at most $\exp(-Ca \cdot r_k) \leq \exp(-Ca)$. Therefore, we bound the sum by

$$\begin{aligned} & \exp(-Cr_k) \cdot \frac{1}{1 - \exp(-Ca)} + C' \Delta t_{k+1}^{-1} \sum_{r_k \cdot \Delta t_k \leq u_i < l_{k+1} \cdot \Delta t_{k+1}} u_i \\ & < \exp(-Cr_k) \cdot \frac{1}{1 - \exp(-Ca)} + C' \frac{l_{k+1}}{a}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.24)$$

Summing over k and by (3.6), we get

$$\sum_n P(\sup U(\gamma_{0,u_n}) > c \cdot u_n) < \infty.$$

By rescaling the arrival rate of the system by a factor $r = \min\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\lambda_1}{c(1+a)}\}$, and choosing $u'_n = r^{-1} \cdot u_n$, we get the estimate (3.19) with $b = r \cdot c \leq \frac{\lambda_1}{1+a}$. Hence, the system is stable. \square

Thus our proof is reduced to proving Proposition 3.2.

4 Connectivity and Spatial Growth

In this section, we consider the growth of the range of the admissible paths, \mathcal{R}_t (see (4.3) below). For this question the temporal sizes T_j play no roles, and results only involve (S_n) . For convenience, we always assume that A is large enough so that (3.8) is valid for (S_n) . As the job arrivals follow independent Poisson processes, for the law $\tilde{P}^{\theta, A}$ in Theorem 2.1, the arrival rate λ_n for jobs with a (positive) spatial size S_n is

$$\lambda_n = c_1 \lambda S_n^{-(d+\alpha)}, \quad (4.1)$$

for some $c_1 > 0$; for convenience, we assume $c_1 = 1$ for the rest of paper. A major ingredient is to estimate the probability that two time-space points $(0, \mathbf{0})$ and (t, x) in $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{Z}^d$ are *connected* via admissible paths involving only jobs of spatial sizes S_j , for $j \leq n$. For $t < S_n^\alpha$, we show that the probability decays geometrically in the spatial l_∞ distance,

$$|(t, x)| \equiv |x|,$$

under the scale S_n , see equation (4.7) below. The estimate (4.7) is an analogue of (1.12). We then explain the similarity between these two inequalities. The value of this result is that it cuts down the number of admissible paths that we must consider.

Before we make more precise statement, we introduce some definitions and assumptions. Similarly to subsection 1.2, we use graphical constructions for the job arrivals. We define n -admissible paths, and a pair of n -connected time-space points by restricting to jobs of spatial sizes at most S_n :

1. An n -admissible path is an admissible path $\gamma^{(n)} : [u, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^d$ that starts from time-space point (u, x) and ends at (t, y) , and with the further restriction that only jobs of spatial sizes S_j , $j \leq n$ intersect it, in the sense of (1.5), i.e., if $\gamma^{(n)}(s) \neq \gamma^{(n)}(s-)$, then there is a job of spatial size S_j with $j \leq n$ arriving at (s, x) with

$$\gamma^{(n)}(s), \gamma^{(n)}(s-) \in B(x, S_j) := \{y : |y - x| \leq S_j\},$$

for some $j \leq n$.

We also use $\gamma_{u,t}^{(n)}$ or $\gamma_{u,t;x,y}^{(n)}$ when we emphasize that $\gamma^{(n)}$ is on the interval $[u, t]$ or it has end points (u, x) and (t, y) .

2. Two time-space points (t_1, x_1) and (t_2, x_2) are n -connected if there is an n -admissible path with starting and ending points (t_1, x_1) , (t_2, x_2) , such that

$$|x_1 - x_2|, |t_1 - t_2| \leq \frac{S_n}{2}. \quad (4.2)$$

These definitions are to facilitate a discretization of the model at the scale S_n . We note that for a pair of n -connected points (t_1, x_1) and (t_2, x_2) , there may not exist any n -admissible path $\gamma^{(n)}$ "connecting" them in the sense that $\gamma^{(n)}(t_1) = x_1$ and $\gamma^{(n)}(t_2) = x_2$. We also define the domain of influence \mathcal{R}_t as a collection of points in time-space which are connected (or n -connected) to $(0, \mathbf{0})$ by admissible (or n -admissible) paths,

$$\mathcal{R}_t := \{(x, s) : \exists \text{ an admissible path } \gamma_{0,t}, \text{ with } \gamma_{0,t}(0) = \mathbf{0}, \text{ and } \gamma_{0,t}(s) = x \text{ for some } s \leq t\}, \quad (4.3)$$

$$\mathcal{R}_t^{(n)} := \{(x, s) : \exists \text{ an } n\text{-admissible path } \gamma_{0,t}^{(n)}, \text{ with } \gamma_{0,t}^{(n)}(0) = \mathbf{0}, \text{ and } \gamma_{0,t}^{(n)}(s) = x \text{ for some } s \leq t\}, \quad (4.4)$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_t^{(n)} := \{(s, x) : (s, x) \text{ and } (0, \mathbf{0}) \text{ are } n\text{-connected for some } s \leq t\}. \quad (4.5)$$

It is obvious that $\mathcal{R}_t = \bigcup_n \mathcal{R}_t^{(n)} \subset \bigcup_n \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_t^{(n)}$.

Since the model is translation invariant, we need only consider the probabilities for two time-space points $(0, \mathbf{0})$ and (t, x) ,

$$p_n(t, x) := P((t, x) \text{ and } (0, \mathbf{0}) \text{ are } n\text{-connected}). \quad (4.6)$$

In the case when $d = 1$, we use (1.12) and large deviation estimates to show that $p_n(t, x)$ decays geometrically in x under the scale S_n when $t \leq S_n^\alpha$. In fact, in any dimension $d \geq 1$, it follows from Proposition 4.1 that this remains true.

Proposition 4.1 *Recall that (S_n) satisfy (3.8) when A is large enough. There are positive constants depending on λ , $q_n(\lambda) < 1$, so that for any $t \leq S_n^\alpha$ and positive integer i , when $(i - \frac{1}{2})S_n < |x| < (i + \frac{1}{2})S_n$*

$$p_n(t, x) \leq q_n(\lambda)^{i-1}. \quad (4.7)$$

Moreover, we can choose the upper bounds $q_n(\lambda)$ so that they satisfy the following properties:

- for all $n > 0$,

$$q_{n+1}(\lambda) = c_1 \lambda + (C_d \cdot q_n(\lambda))^{\frac{5S_{n+1}}{8S_n}}, \quad (4.8)$$

for some positive constants c_1, C_d depending only on the dimension d ,

- $\exists \lambda_d > 0$ and $c_d < \infty$ depending only on d so that for $\lambda < \lambda_d$,

$$q_n(\lambda) < c_d \lambda, \quad (4.9)$$

for all $n > 0$.

Before proving Proposition 4.1, we explain its content. It is immediate that $p_n(x, t)$ is increasing in t . Therefore, showing (4.7) amounts to showing that the probability to connect a time-space point (S_n^α, x) , with jobs of spatial sizes up to scale S_n , decays geometrically in their spatial distance $|x|$ under the scale S_n . This is not too surprising because S_n^α is the scale of seeing a job of spatial size S_n containing a particular spatial point, and it is much larger than S_{n-1}^α , which is the scale for the arrival of a job of strictly smaller spatial sizes containing a particular site. We expect the speed of the spatial growths for R_t to be of scale at most $\frac{S_{n-1}}{S_{n-1}^\alpha} = S_{n-1}^{1-\alpha}$ when jobs of size at most S_{n-1} are allowed, while connecting two points of distance S_n a spatial job of size S_n gives us a speed of scale at least $S_n^{1-\alpha}$, which is much larger. As a consequence, we expect the speed of the spatial growths for \mathcal{R}_t to be of scale $S_n^{1-\alpha}$ and the geometric decay in i from large deviation estimates. The harder part of Proposition 4.1 is to show that $q_n(\lambda) < c_d \lambda$ uniformly in n , when λ is small. Recall that when A is large, we have that S_n grows fast enough in n from (3.8): for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\sum_{j \leq n} 10 S_j^{1-\alpha} < S_{n+1}^{1-\alpha},$$

which implies that the ratio $\frac{5S_{n+1}}{8S_n} \geq 3$ when n is large. In fact, it provides a recursive formula (depending on dimension d) for an upper bound of q_n in terms of λ and S_n, S_{n+1} . In view of (4.8) and (3.8), we get (4.9) when λ is small enough, and we also see that condition (3.8) is *not optimal*.

For time $t > S_n^\alpha$, we show a corollary of Proposition 4.1, see Corollary 4.1 below. (4.10) can be derived with a similar argument for the second step in the proof of Proposition 4.1 below. We give a proof at the end of this section.

Corollary 4.1 *Recall that (S_n) satisfy (3.8) when A is large enough. Let λ_d be from Proposition 4.1. Then there exist positive constants $c'_d, \lambda_{d,0} < \lambda_d$ depending on d , so that $c'_d \lambda_{d,0} < 1$ and when $\lambda < \lambda_{d,0}$*

$$p_n(x, t) \leq (c'_d \lambda)^{\left(S_n^{-(1-\alpha)} \frac{|x|}{t} - 1\right)} \quad (4.10)$$

for all positive $t > S_n^\alpha$.

To show Proposition 4.1, we use two steps with similar ideas. The first step is an induction on i , which measures the spatial distance between $(0, \mathbf{0})$ and (S_n^α, x) under the scale S_n . We divide the lattice \mathbb{Z}^d into cubes with side length S_n . In order to connect $(0, \mathbf{0})$ and a point (S_n^α, x) with an n -admissible path $\gamma^{(n)}$, the n -admissible path must pass through a sequence of neighboring cubes of length at least i . Therefore, there are at most C_d^i (for example, $C_d = 3^d$) different sequences of cubes, and for each fixed sequence, we bound the probability that there is an n -admissible path connecting them. We use a stopping time argument to reduce the problem to the case when $i = 2$, see (4.11) below. With union bounds, we obtain that the probability decays geometrically in i (see (4.7)) from (4.11). The second step is to show (4.11) below, and to obtain a recursive formula for $q_n(\lambda)$, see (4.8). We use induction on n this time, and we again divide \mathbb{Z}^d into cubes with side length S_n , and consider a sequence of cubes connected by an n -admissible paths. In both steps, the stopping times (which are the first time to connect the next cubes) are bounded by S_n^α , but the total time is different: in the first step, it is S_n^α ; in the second step, it is S_{n+1}^α . This results in different constants due to different counting, and different bounds for the probability of a fixed n -connecting sequence of cubes, see (4.18) and (4.28) below.

PROOF:(Proposition 4.1) Let n be fixed. We can always extend an n -admissible path $\gamma^{(n)}$ on $[0, t]$ to an n -admissible path $\hat{\gamma}^{(n)}$ on $[0, s+t]$, for some $s > 0$, by letting $\hat{\gamma}^{(n)}$ to be constant after time t ,

$$\hat{\gamma}^{(n)}(u) = \begin{cases} \gamma^{(n)}(u) & , \text{ if } u < t \\ \gamma^{(n)}(t) & , \text{ if } u \geq t \end{cases}.$$

Hence, as claimed above, $p_n(t, x)$ is increasing in t , and we only need to estimate $p_n(S_n^\alpha, x)$. We divide this into two steps.

Step 1. We first assume the following statement (see (4.11) below) but defer its proof to the second step. There is a $\lambda_d > 0$, such that for any $\lambda < \lambda_d$, we have a constant $A_n(\lambda) < \frac{1}{4.9^d}$ depending on λ , such that

$$p_n(t, x) \leq A_n(\lambda), \quad (4.11)$$

for all $|x| \in [\frac{3}{2}S_n, \frac{5}{2}S_n]$ and $t \leq S_n^\alpha$.

Now we take a point $y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with $|y| \geq 2kS_n$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and we estimate $p_n(t, y)$, when $t \leq S_n^\alpha$. By considering centers of cubes of scale S_n , we see that if (t, y) and $(0, \mathbf{0})$ are n -connected, there exists at least $k + 1$ time-space points $\{(t_i, x_i) : i = 0, 1, \dots, k\}$, including $(t_0, x_0) = (0, \mathbf{0})$ and $(t_k, x_k) = (t, y)$, such that

$$t_{i+1} > t_i, \quad x_i \in (S_n\mathbb{Z})^d \text{ for } i = 0, \dots, k-1, \quad (4.12)$$

$$|x_{i+1} - x_i| = 2S_n \in \left[\frac{3}{2}S_n, \frac{5}{2}S_n \right] \quad (4.13)$$

and

$$(t_i, x_i) \text{ and } (t_{i+1}, x_{i+1}) \text{ are } n\text{-connected.} \quad (4.14)$$

By (4.12), (4.13), there are at most 5^{dk} such sequences of centers of cubes, $(x_i)_{i=1}^{k-1}$, and these sequence are deterministic. For each deterministic sequence $(x_i)_{i=0}^k$, we define an increasing sequence of (bounded) stopping times u_i inductively, such that the increments are bounded by S_n^α and $(u_i, x_i), (u_{i+1}, x_{i+1})$ are n -connected if $u_{i+1} - u_i < S_n^\alpha$:

$$u_0 := 0, \quad (4.15)$$

$$u_{i+1} := \inf\{u_i < t \leq u_i + S_n^\alpha : (u_i, x_i) \text{ and } (t, x_{i+1}) \text{ are } n\text{-connected}\}, \quad (4.16)$$

for $i = 0, \dots, k-1$. (4.11) indicates that each difference $u_{i+1} - u_i$ stochastically dominates a random variable $S_n^\alpha B_i$,

$$u_{i+1} - u_i \geq S_n^\alpha B_i, \quad (4.17)$$

where B_i is a Bernoulli random variable with $P(B_i = 1) = 1 - A_n$ and $P(B_i = 0) = A_n$. Then we use the strong Markov property of Poisson arrivals and Binomial random variable to get

$$\begin{aligned} & P\left(\text{there exists an increasing sequence } (u_i)_{i=0}^{k-1} \text{ such that} \right. \\ & \quad \left. (u_i, x'_i) \text{ and } (u_{i+1}, x'_{i+1}) \text{ are } n\text{-connected}\right) \\ & \leq P\left(\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} (u_{i+1} - u_i) < S_n^\alpha\right) \leq P\left(\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} B_i < 1\right) \leq A_n^k. \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

Therefore, for $|y| \geq 2kS_n$ and $t \leq S_n^\alpha$, we bound $p_n(t, y)$ by

$$p_n(t, y) \leq 3^{dk} A_n^k \leq q_n^{2k}. \quad (4.19)$$

In particular, $q_n(\lambda) := (5^d A_n(\lambda))^{\frac{1}{2}} < \frac{1}{2}$.

Step 2. In fact, (4.11) is not surprising, since there is a positive probability $1 - A_n$ such that no jobs of sizes S_j , $j \leq n$ with centers arriving in the time-space set $E_n := \{(t, x) : S_n < |x| < 3S_n, t < S_n^\alpha\}$. The harder part is to show that there is a $\lambda_d > 0$ independent of n , such that $A_n(\lambda)$ can be bounded uniformly in n when $\lambda < \lambda_d$. We use induction in n , and obtain a recursive formula for bounds of A_n in terms of λ , see (4.29) below.

- (a) The case when $n = 1$ is obvious. Since the number of jobs of size S_1 with centers arriving in the time-space set E_1 is a Poisson random variable, we get by (4.1)

$$P(\text{no job arrivals in } E_1) = \exp(-\lambda S_1^{-(d+\alpha)} |E_1|).$$

Therefore, (4.11) holds for $n = 1$, and there are constants Λ_d , such that if $\lambda < \Lambda_d$,

$$A_1(\lambda) = 1 - \exp(-\lambda S_1^{-(d+\alpha)} |E_1|) \leq 6^d \lambda, \quad (4.20)$$

which converges to 0 as λ goes to 0.

- (b) Assume that there is a positive $\lambda_d \leq \Lambda_d$, such that for all $n \leq k$, (4.11) holds. We also assume (3.8). We use an argument similar to Step 1.

Let $|x| \in [\frac{3}{2}S_{k+1}, \frac{5}{2}S_{k+1}]$. We get analogues of (4.12) (4.13) and (4.14). Notice that if (x, t) and $(\mathbf{0}, 0)$ are $k+1$ -connected, either there is a job of spatial size S_{k+1} with center in the time-space set E_{k+1} , or there are at least $L+1 = |x|(2S_k)^{-1} + 1$ many time-space points (t_i, x_i) in E_{k+1} , $i = 0, \dots, L$, that are k -connected. In particular, for $i = 0, \dots, L-1$,

$$t_{i+1} > t_i, \quad x_i \in (S_k \mathbb{Z})^d \quad (4.21)$$

$$|x_{i+1} - x_i| = 2S_k, \quad (4.22)$$

and the event

$$G_i(s) = \{(t_i, x_i) \text{ and } (s, x_{i+1}) \text{ are } k\text{-connected}\}, \quad (4.23)$$

occurs for every $s = t_{i+1}$.

The probability for the first event is bounded by

$$P(\text{a job of size } S_{k+1} \text{ arrives in } E_{k+1}) = 1 - \exp(-\lambda S_{k+1}^{-(d+\alpha)} |E_{k+1}|) \leq 6^d \lambda. \quad (4.24)$$

For the second event, we use arguments similar to Step 1. On one hand, from (4.21) and (4.22), we have at most 5^{dL} deterministic sequences (x_j) . On the other hand, for each consecutive pairs x_i, x_{i+1} , we consider the probability that (4.23) happens for some $s = t_{i+1} \leq t_i + S_k^\alpha$. By the induction hypothesis, the probability is upper bounded by

$$P(G_i(s) \text{ occurs for some } s \leq t_i + S_k^\alpha) \leq A_k(\lambda).$$

Therefore, we define a sequence of $L+1$ stopping times $(u'_i)_{i=0}^L$ recursively: $u'_0 = 0$,

$$u'_i := \inf\{u'_{i-1} < s \leq S_{k+1}^\alpha : (t_i, x_i) \text{ and } (s, x_{i+1}) \text{ are } k\text{-connected}\}, \quad (4.25)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, L$, and get that each difference $u'_i - u'_{i-1}$ stochastically dominates a random variable $S_k^\alpha B'_i$,

$$u'_i - u'_{i-1} \geq S_k^\alpha B'_i, \quad (4.26)$$

where B_i is a Bernoulli random variable with

$$P(B'_i = 0) = A_k(\lambda). \quad (4.27)$$

Hence, for each deterministic sequence $(x_j)_{j=0}^{L+1}$, we get from Markov property that

$$\begin{aligned} & P(\text{there exists an increasing sequence } (t_i)_{i=0}^{L+1} \text{ such that } G_i(t_i) \text{ occurs for all } i) \\ & \leq P\left(\sum_{i=1}^L (u'_i - u'_{i-1}) \leq S_{k+1}^\alpha\right) \leq P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{L-1} B'_i \leq L^\alpha\right) \leq (6A_k(\lambda))^{\frac{L}{2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.28)$$

where the last inequality is from applying the Markov Inequality to a Binomial random variable $B(N, p)$: when $a > 0$, we have

$$P(B(N, 1-p) \leq K) = P(B(N, p) \geq N - K) \leq \mathbb{E}[e^{aB(N,p)}] e^{-a(N-K)} \leq \exp((e^a - 1)Np - a(N - K)).$$

When N is large (such that $N^\alpha < \frac{N}{2}$), for any $K \leq N^\alpha$, we bound the last term by taking $a = -\ln(2p)$

$$\exp N \left((e^a - 1)p - \frac{a}{2} \right) \leq \exp N \left(\frac{\ln(2p)}{2} + \left(\frac{1}{2} - p \right) \right) \leq (6p)^{\frac{N}{2}}.$$

By (4.24) and (4.28), we have (from union bound) that

$$p_{k+1}(t, x) \leq 6^d \lambda + 5^{dL} (6A_k(\lambda))^{\frac{L}{2}} =: A_{k+1}(\lambda). \quad (4.29)$$

Choosing $q_k(\lambda) = A_k^{\frac{1}{2}}(\lambda)$ for all k , we get (4.8). Together with (4.20), we also see from (4.29) that there are positive constants $\lambda_d \leq \Lambda_d$ and c_d depending only on d , such that $A_{k+1}(\lambda) \leq c_d \lambda < 1$, when $\lambda < \lambda_d$. Therefore, (4.9) follows from an induction. □

We use a similar argument of the second step to prove Corollary 4.1.

PROOF:(Corollary 4.1) Without losing generality, we can assume that x and t are of the form $|x| = 2kmS_n$, and $t = mS_n^\alpha$ for some positive integers k, m . We first notice that the term $S_n^{-(1-\alpha)\frac{|x|}{t}}$ in the exponent of (4.10) is of order k so we aim to obtain probability bounds which are geometric in k . Notice also that if (t, x) and $(0, \mathbf{0})$ are n -connected, there exists at least $2m$ consecutive time-space points that are n -connected, and every two consecutive points are kS_n apart. Therefore, we consider the collection of $2m$ (deterministic) points

$$\mathcal{E}_m = \{(x_i)_{i=0}^{2m} : x_0 = 0, x_i \in (S_n \mathbb{Z})^d, |x_i - x_{i-1}| = kS_n, \text{ for all } i\}.$$

Notice that there is a constant C_d depending only on d such that the cardinality of \mathcal{E}_m is bounded by

$$|\mathcal{E}_m| \leq \left(\frac{C_d k^{d-1}}{4} \right)^m. \quad (4.30)$$

For each sequence of $(x_i)_{i=0}^{2m} \in \mathcal{E}_m$, we define a sequence of stopping times inductively: $u_0 = 0$, and

$$u_i := \inf\{s \geq u_i : (u_i, x_i) \text{ and } (u_{i-1}, x_{i-1}) \text{ are } n\text{-connected}\}$$

By Proposition 4.1, $u_{i+1} - u_i$ is dominated by the random variable $S_n^\alpha B_i$, where B_i is a Bernoulli random variable with

$$1 - p = P(B_i = 0) = q_n(\lambda)^{k-1},$$

and

$$q_n(\lambda) < c_d \lambda < 1$$

when $\lambda < \lambda_d$, for some λ_d depending only on d .

Therefore, we use the union bound, the Markov property, and (4.30) to conclude that, there exists some constants c'_d and $\lambda_{d,0} < \min\{\lambda_d, \frac{1}{c'_d}\}$ depending on dimension d , so that when $\lambda < \lambda_{d,0}$

$$\begin{aligned} p_n(t, x) &\leq \sum_{(x_i) \in \mathcal{E}_m} P(\exists (u_i)_{i=0}^{2m} : u_{i-1} < u_i < t, (u_i, x_i) \text{ and } (u_{i-1}, x_{i-1}) \text{ are } n\text{-connected for all } i) \\ &\leq \sum_{(x_i) \in \mathcal{E}_m} P(B(2m, p) \leq m) \\ &\leq |\mathcal{E}_m| \cdot P(B(2m, q_n(\lambda)^{k-1}) \geq m) \leq \left(C_d k^{d-1} q_n(\lambda)^{(k-1)} \right)^m \leq (c'_d \lambda)^{k-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.31)$$

where in the last line we use the classical result for a Binomial variable $B(2n, q)$ with parameters q and n ,

$$P(B(2n, q) \geq n) \leq \sum_{k=n}^{2n} \binom{2n}{k} q^k \leq 2^{2n} q^n.$$

Then, it is standard to derive (4.10) from (4.31) by removing the assumption that $|x| = 2kmS_n$ and $t = mS_n^\alpha$ for positive integers k and m . \square

5 Exponential Moments of the Maximal Numbers

The main object of this section is to estimate the exponential moments of the maximal numbers of jobs with the temporal size T_j along n -admissible paths. The exponential moments help us bounding probabilities of events $A_{t,j}^c$, see (3.12). Let

$$X_{s,t;x,j}^{(n)} = \sup n_j(\gamma_{s,t}^{(n)}) \quad (5.1)$$

where the supremum is taken over all n -admissible paths $\gamma_{s,t}^{(n)}$ with the initial point (s, x) . Since we are mostly interested in the case when j is fixed, and $s = 0$, we focus on $X_t^{(n)} = X_{0,t;x,j}^{(n)}$. Recall that when A is large enough, (T_n, S_n) satisfy properties (3.2)–(3.8). As in (4.1), we continue to assume $c_1 = 1$.

We use an induction on n . There are two types of estimates for $X_t^{(n)} = X_{0,t;x,j}^{(n)}$, which are exponential moments tailored to different job sizes. The first estimate, see Proposition 5.1, is the base case. It says that the maximal number of jobs with the temporal size T_j grows linearly with scale $T_j^{-(1+\delta)}$, when only jobs with spatial sizes at most S_j are in the system. The second estimate, see Proposition 5.2 is the inductive step. It implies that the growth of the maximal number is not affected much by jobs with spatial sizes larger than S_{j+1} , when S_{j+1} is large enough, see (5.5) below. We should remark that as large spatial jobs are involved, the parameter of exponential moments actually decreases. The proof of Proposition 5.1 is at the end of subsection 5.1, and the proof of Proposition 5.2 is at the end of subsection 5.2. Recall from (4.9) in Corollary 4.1 that $\lambda_{d,0}$ is a constant depending only on d .

Proposition 5.1 (*Leading Order*) *Recall that $\delta > 0$. Assume that T_j and $(S_n)_{n \leq j}$ satisfy (3.7), and (3.8). Then there exists positive constants $\lambda_{d,1} < \lambda_{d,0}$, $C'_{d,1}$, depending only on d , such that for any $\lambda < \lambda_{d,1}$, for any $t > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{X_t^{(j)}} \right] \leq e^{bt} \quad (5.2)$$

where $b = C'_{d,1} T_j^{-(1+\delta)}$.

We fix a constant $K = \frac{d}{\alpha\kappa} > \max(\frac{d}{\alpha}, 3)$, and put $g_n := K^{-n}$ for all $n \geq 0$. The second proposition says that we can estimate exponential moments of $X_t^{(n+1)}$ given an estimate for $X_t^{(n)}$, at a cost of reducing the exponents by a factor K^{-1} and increasing the factor from b_n to b_{n+1} by a small amount, see (5.5) below.

Proposition 5.2 (*Influence from Large Jumps*) *Recall that $g_1 = K^{-1} < \frac{\alpha}{d}$. Assume that for any $t > 0$, $X_t^{(n)}$ satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{aX_t^{(n)}} \right] \leq e^{ab_n t} \quad (5.3)$$

for some $b_n > 0$ and some $a \in (0, 1]$, then when $\lambda < \lambda_{d,0}$, there exists some positive constant C_K depending on d , such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{ag_1 X_t^{(n+1)}} \right] \leq e^{ag_1 b_{n+1} t}, \quad (5.4)$$

where b_{n+1} is a constant satisfying

$$b_{n+1} - b_n = C_K \cdot a^{-1} K \cdot S_{n+1}^{-(\alpha - dK^{-1})}. \quad (5.5)$$

Remark 3 Recall that in (3.9) and (5.1), a job with sizes $(R, \tau) = (S_{k+j}, T_j)$ for some $k \leq n$, is counted in $n_j(\gamma_{s,t}^{(n)})$ if its arrival (x, t') satisfies (1.5),

$$\gamma_{s,t}^{(n)}(t'-), \gamma_{s,t}^{(n)}(t') \in B(x, S_{k+j}),$$

It is possible that the change of $\gamma_{s,t}^{(n)}$ at time t' ,

$$\left| \gamma_{s,t}^{(n)}(t'-) - \gamma_{s,t}^{(n)}(t') \right|,$$

is small compared to S_{k+j} or there is no spatial change,

$$\gamma_{s,t}^{(n)}(t'-) = \gamma_{s,t}^{(n)}(t').$$

The conclusion of Proposition 5.2 covers these two cases.

With an induction and (2.3) for a concrete example of (S_n, T_n) , we get the following result from Propositions 5.1, 5.2. It says that a small exponential moment of $X_t^{(j+n)}$ is growing linearly in t under the scale $T_j^{-(1+\delta)}$. Since the sequence (b_{n+j}) is increasing, we get an upper bound b'_j from (5.2), (5.5) and (3.5).

Corollary 5.1 Recall that $\kappa < \min\left(\frac{1}{8}, \frac{\delta}{4(1+\delta)}\right)$, and $K = \frac{d}{\alpha\kappa} \in (3, \rho)$. Under the assumption of Proposition 5.1, if we have $(S_{n+j})_{n \geq 1}$ with (3.5) and (3.8), then there are constants $b'_j = (C'_{d,1} + C_K)T_j^{-(1+\delta)}$ and $\lambda_{d,1} > 0$, such that for any $t > 0$, and $g_n = \left(\frac{\kappa}{d}\right)^n \cdot \alpha^n < \alpha^n$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{g_n X_t^{(j+n)}} \right] \leq e^{g_n b'_j t}, \quad (5.6)$$

when $\lambda < \lambda_{d,1}$.

PROOF: The proof is elementary. From Proposition 5.1 and 5.2, there exists an increasing sequence $(b_{j,n})_{n \geq 1}$ such that (5.6) holds for any $t > 0$ if we replace b'_j by $b_{j,n}$ for any $n \geq 1$. In particular, this sequence $(b_{j,n})_{n \geq 1}$ satisfy (5.5) for all $n \geq 0$ when $b_{j,0} = b$, where b is from (5.2). We only need to verify that

$$b'_j = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_{j,n} < (C'_{d,1} + C_K)T_j^{-(1+\delta)}. \quad (5.7)$$

We sum the differences and get

$$b'_j - b_{j,0} < \sum_{n > j} C_K \varrho^{2(n+1)} S_{n+1}^{-\alpha(1-\kappa)},$$

which is bounded by $C_K T_j^{-(1+\delta)}$ from (3.5). Therefore, (5.7) follows from (5.2). \square

5.1 Small Jumps and Leading Order

We now prove Proposition 5.1 with the tools introduced in section 4. The proof of Proposition 5.1 works for any dimension $d \geq 1$. The argument can also be extended to dealing with (α, β) in region V. For a fixed j , we drop the subscript j and choose the increment of time $T = T_j^{1+\delta}$. The choice of $T = T_j^{1+\delta}$ is only used in subsection 5.1, and in subsection 5.2, we use $T = S_{n+1}^\alpha$.

Before giving the detailed proof, we summarize the steps. We use an elementary inequality, which can be seen as a generalization of union bounds. If we have a (deterministic) countable collection I of positive random variables Z_i , then the exponential moment of the maximum is bounded above by the sum of the exponential moments,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{i \in I} e^{Z_i} \right] \leq \sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{Z_i} \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_i \neq 0\}} \right] + P(\sup_{i \in I} Z_i = 0) \leq \sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{Z_i} \right]. \quad (5.8)$$

In our case, we want to encode j -admissible paths by collections of time-space boxes with a number of centers, which are chosen according to some rules, see (5.13), (5.14), (5.15), (5.18) below. The way to choose centers and boxes are similar to that in the proofs of classical Vitali Covering Lemma or Greedy Lattice Animal argument. Then to apply (5.8), we take Z_i as the total number of jobs with temporal size T_j inside the collection of time-space boxes, and take I as the set of all sequences of chosen centers. On one hand, we bound the exponential moment of Z_i by using Poisson random variables and an upper bound of the probability to connect two time-space points from Corollary 4.1. The exponential moment decays geometrically in the number of centers m_k at a rate which is linear in λ , see (5.17) below. On the other hand, we count different ways of obtaining these collections of time-space boxes, which is exponential in the number of centers. The exponential rate for different ways only depends on dimension d , but not on λ . Therefore, we can estimate the exponential moment by applying (5.8) when λ is sufficiently small, see (5.22) below. In particular, the argument and the bounds are independent of the index j .

PROOF:(Proposition 5.1) We fix time to be $t = L \cdot T$, for some large integer L . Notice that $X_t^{(j)}$ is super-additive, we have $\mathbb{E} \left[e^{X_{r+s}^{(j)}} \right] \geq \mathbb{E} \left[e^{X_r^{(j)}} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[e^{X_s^{(j)}} \right]$ for any $r, s \geq 0$. If we can show that (5.2) holds for a large time $t = L \cdot T$, then (5.2) also holds for any positive time. We estimate $\mathbb{E} \left[e^{X_t^{(j)}} \right]$ by considering sequences of (deterministic) time-space boxes, which cover j -admissible paths.

First, we partition the time-space set $[0, t] \times \mathbb{Z}^d$ into boxes of the form $(s, x) + U_j$, where

$$U_j = [0, T] \times [-S_j^{1-\alpha} T, S_j^{1-\alpha} T]^d, \text{ and } (s, x) \in (T \cdot \mathbb{N}) \times \left(2S_j^{1-\alpha} T \cdot \mathbb{Z} \right)^d. \quad (5.9)$$

Each box has a time-space volume $|U_j| = (2S_j^{1-\alpha})^d \cdot T^{d+1}$, and the number of jobs with temporal size T_j and 'centers' of arrivals in the box is a Poisson random variable with mean

$$\lambda 2^d c_2 T_j^{-(1+\beta)} \left(S_j^{1-\alpha} T \right)^d \cdot T,$$

where c_2 is the normalizing constant from Theorem 2.1. By condition (3.7), the mean is strictly smaller than

$$\lambda 2^d c_2 = b_j \cdot T < 1, \quad (5.10)$$

where $b_j = \lambda 2^d c_2 T_j^{-(1+\delta)} < T_j^{-(1+\delta)}$ when λ is strictly smaller than $\frac{1}{2^d c_2}$.

Then, we have encodings of paths: given a generic j -admissible path $\gamma^{(j)}$ on the time interval $I_k = [kT, (k+1)T]$, we first cover $\gamma^{(j)}$ by a collection of boxes of the form (5.9), then we extract a sub-collection of disjoint boxes, and lastly we cover the original collection of boxes by enlarging boxes in the sub-collection. More precisely, we do the following. Since the spatial size of jobs in j -admissible path are at most S_j , we can find an integer $m_k \geq 1$ and a sequence of m_k (stopping) times $s_{i,k} \in I_k$, such that distances between two consecutive points on $\gamma^{(j)}$ at these times are between $4S_j^{1-\alpha} T$ and $5S_j^{1-\alpha} T$:

$$s_{0,k} = k \cdot T, \quad (5.11)$$

$$s_{i,k} = \min \left((k+1) \cdot T, \inf \left\{ s_{i-1,k} \leq u \leq (k+1)T : 4S_j^{1-\alpha} T \leq \left| \gamma^{(j)}(u) - \gamma^{(j)}(s_{i-1,k}) \right| \leq 5S_j^{1-\alpha} T \right\} \right), \quad (5.12)$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m_k$. For each time $s_{i,k}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, m_k$, we can choose a center $x_{i,k} \in \left(2S_j^{1-\alpha} T \cdot \mathbb{Z} \right)^d$ such that the center is $S_j^{1-\alpha} T$ -close to $\gamma^{(j)}(s_{i,k})$,

$$\left| x_{i,k} - \gamma^{(j)}(s_{i,k}) \right| \leq S_j^{1-\alpha} T. \quad (5.13)$$

If there is more than one point in $\left(2S_j^{1-\alpha} T \cdot \mathbb{Z} \right)^d$ satisfying (5.13), we can choose according to certain rules since there are only finitely many such points. With these centers $\mathbf{x}_k = (x_{i,k})_{i=1}^{m_k}$, and

(5.12),(5.13), we obtain a covering $U_{\mathbf{x}_k}$ of the admissible path $\gamma^{(j)}$ on the time interval I_k by taking unions of a collection of boxes with side lengths $10S_j$,

$$U_{\mathbf{x}_k} := \bigcup_{i=1}^{m_k} \left((kT, x_{i,k}) + [0, T] \times [-5S_j^{1-\alpha}T, 5S_j^{1-\alpha}T]^d \right) \supset \gamma^{(j)}(I_k). \quad (5.14)$$

Therefore, on the time interval I_k , $\gamma^{(j)}$ corresponds to an encoding, which consists of m_k centers $\mathbf{x}_k = (x_{i,k})_{i=1}^{m_k}$ in $(2S_j^{1-\alpha}T \cdot \mathbb{Z})^d$.

For every encoding $\mathbf{x}_k = (x_{i,k})_{i=1}^{m_k}$ on I_k , we denote by $M_{\mathbf{x}_k}$ the number of arrivals of jobs with temporal size T_j inside $U_{\mathbf{x}_k}$,

$$M_{\mathbf{x}_k} = \left| \left\{ (y, t) \in U_{\mathbf{x}_k} : (t, T_j, B) \in \Phi_y \text{ for some } B \subset [-S_j, S_j]^d \right\} \right|,$$

and denote by $E_{\mathbf{x}_k}$ the event depending on $\mathbf{x}_k = (x_{i,k})_{i=1}^{m_k}$,

$$E_{\mathbf{x}_k} = \{ \text{the covering } U_{\mathbf{x}_k} \text{ contains a } j\text{-admissible path } \gamma^{(j)} \text{ with (5.13)} \}.$$

We consider $\mathbb{E} \left[e^{M_{\mathbf{x}_k}} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{E_{\mathbf{x}_k}} \right]$. By (5.10), (5.14), $M_{\mathbf{x}_k}$ is a Poisson random variable with parameter at most

$$C_d m_k b_j T,$$

for some constant C_d depending on the dimension. From (5.12), (5.13), and the fact that $(x_{i,k}) \subset (2S_j^{1-\alpha}T \cdot \mathbb{Z})^d$, we have that the distance $|x_{i,k} - x_{i-1,k}|$ between two consecutive centers is one of the numbers

$$4S_j^{1-\alpha}T \text{ or } 6S_j^{1-\alpha}T, \quad (5.15)$$

for all $i < m_k$, and it can be

$$r \cdot S_j^{1-\alpha}T, \quad (5.16)$$

where $r = 0, 1, 2, 3$, when $i = m_k$. Although these m_k centers may not be distinct, there is a sequence of $m_k - 1$ points in $I_k \times (2S_j^{1-\alpha}T \cdot \mathbb{Z})^d$ such that every two consecutive points are j -connected with the spatial distance at least $4S_j^{1-\alpha}T$. Therefore, we get from Corollary 4.1 and (5.15) that the probability $P(E_k)$ is bounded above, for all $\lambda < \lambda_{d,0}$

$$P(E_k) \leq (c'_d \lambda)^{6(m_k-1)},$$

where $c'_d, \lambda_{d,0}$ are from Corollary 4.1. By the Cauchy-Schwartz Inequality, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{M_{\mathbf{x}_k}} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{E_{\mathbf{x}_k}} \right] \leq \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} (e^2 - 1) C_d m_k b_j T \right) (c'_d \lambda)^{3(m_k-1)}. \quad (5.17)$$

By choosing $x_{0,k}$ to be the last point in $\mathbf{x}_{k-1} = (x_{i,k-1})_{i=0}^{m_{k-1}}$, for $k = 1, \dots, L$

$$x_{0,0} = \mathbf{0}, \text{ and } x_{0,k} = x_{m_{k-1},k-1}, \quad (5.18)$$

we get from (5.15), (5.16) and (5.18) that the number of encodings $(\mathbf{x}_k)_{k=0}^{L-1}$ on the time interval $[0, t] = \bigcup_{k=0}^{L-1} I_k$ is at most

$$\prod_{k=0}^{L-1} (h_d^{m_k}) \quad (5.19)$$

for some $h_d \geq 2$ depending on dimension d . Now we apply (5.17) and (5.19) to (5.8). We get from the independence of $(e^{M_{\mathbf{x}_k} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{E_{\mathbf{x}_k}}})_k$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{X_t^{(j)}} \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(\mathbf{x}_k)_{k=0}^{L-1}} \prod_{k=0}^{L-1} \left(e^{M_{\mathbf{x}_k} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{E_{\mathbf{x}_k}}} \right) \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{(\mathbf{x}_k)_{k=0}^{L-1}} \prod_{k=0}^{L-1} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{M_{\mathbf{x}_k} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{E_{\mathbf{x}_k}}} \right] \\ &\leq 1 + \sum_{(m_k) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^L} \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} (e^2 - 1) C_d b_j \cdot T \cdot \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} m_k \right) (h_d (c'_d \lambda)^3)^{\sum_{k=0}^{L-1} (m_k - 1)} (h_d)^L. \end{aligned} \quad (5.20)$$

From (5.10), we have that $\exp(\frac{1}{2}(e^2 - 1)C_d b_j \cdot T)$ is bounded uniformly in j . Therefore, from (4.9), there exists some $\lambda_{d,1} \leq \lambda_{d,0}$ depending on d , such that

$$h_d c'_d \lambda_{d,1} \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} (e^2 - 1) C_d b_j \cdot T \right) < \frac{1}{2}. \quad (5.21)$$

As a consequence, when L is large, we use the identity that for $q < 1$,

$$\sum_{(m_k) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^L} q^{\sum_{k=0}^{L-1} (m_k - 1)} = \prod_{k=0}^{L-1} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q^i \right) = \left(\frac{1}{1 - q} \right)^L$$

to bound (5.20) by

$$\left(3 h_d \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} (e^2 - 1) C_d b_j \cdot T \right) \right)^L. \quad (5.22)$$

Notice that $b_j \cdot T = \lambda 2^d$, we find a constant $C'_{d,1} = b \cdot T > 0$ depending only on d , and bound (5.22) by

$$\exp(C'_{d,1} \cdot L) = \exp(b \cdot t).$$

□

5.2 Influence from Large Jumps

The proof of Proposition 5.2 is similar to that of Proposition 5.1, which also relies on Corollary 4.1. We divide the proof into a few steps. Throughout this subsection, we use the time scale $T = S_{n+1}^\alpha$.

We first introduce a new system by adding some artificial jobs without any temporal workload at fixed time-space points to the original system. We consider the maximal number $Y_t^{(n+1)}$ in the new system,

$$Y_t^{(n+1)} = \sup n_j(\gamma_{0,t}^{(n+1)}), \quad (5.23)$$

where $\gamma_{0,t}^{(n+1)}$ where the supremum is taken over all $n+1$ -admissible paths $\gamma_{0,t}^{(n+1)}$ with the initial point $(0, \mathbf{0})$ in the new system. (5.23) is the same as (5.1) except that $Y_t^{(n+1)}$ is for the new system. Due to the additional artificial jobs, the maximal number $Y_t^{(n+1)}$ stochastically dominates $X_t^{(n+1)}$ in the original system, and waiting times between jobs of size strictly greater than S_n are bounded by S_{n+1}^α , which gives a natural discretization of the new system in time scale T . Then, we estimate the exponential moment of $Y_t^{(n+1)}$, $\mathbb{E} \left[e^{g_1 Y_t^{(n+1)}} \right]$ via an integral formula for a large time $t = T \cdot L$, where L is a large integer. This formula corresponds to a decomposition of $Y_t^{(n+1)}$ according to the occurrences of jobs of spatial sizes S_{n+1} and artificial jobs. We bound terms in the formula by (4.10) from Proposition 4.1. By applying a super-additive argument to $X_t^{(n+1)}$, we get (5.4) for any small time t .

More precisely, we obtain the following two lemmas. The first lemma says that we can estimate $\mathbb{E} \left[e^{g_1 X_t^{(n+1)}} \right]$ by adding artificial jobs of radius $\frac{S_{n+1}}{4}$ at fixed time-space points (s, x) , for $s \in T \cdot \mathbb{N}$,

$x \in S_{n+1}\mathbb{Z}^d$. And the maximal number of the new system has an estimate in terms of a function $w_n(s, x)$. In the second lemma, we use Corollary 4.1 to show that $w_n(s, x)$ decays geometrically in x in the scale S_{n+1} .

For convenience, we say two time-space points (u, x) and (v, y) are n -connected via some S_{n+1} neighbors, if there exists an n -admissible path with the initial point (u, x') and the final point (v, y') , such that

$$|x' - x|, |y' - y| \leq S_{n+1}. \quad (5.24)$$

We should notice that a pair of n -connected points are also n -connected via some S_{n+1} neighbors, but not vice versa. The difference is the condition on end points, see (4.2) and (5.24). Recall that $\lambda_{n+1} = \lambda S_{n+1}^{-(d+\alpha)}$.

Lemma 5.1 (A time-space integral) *Let $Y_t^{(n+1)}$ be the maximal number when there are additional artificial jobs with radius $\frac{S_{n+1}}{4}$, temporal size 0, and centers at time-space points (s, x) , where (s, x) are time-space points in $S_{n+1}^\alpha \mathbb{N} \times S_{n+1}\mathbb{Z}^d$. Then for a large time $t = T \cdot L = S_{n+1}^\alpha L$, $L \in \mathbb{N}$, the maximal number satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{g_1 X_t^{(n+1)}} \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[e^{g_1 Y_t^{(n+1)}} \right] \leq \sum_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{(x'_i) \in (\mathbb{Z}^d)^{N+L}} (\lambda_{n+1} t)^N e^{-\lambda_{n+1} t} \\ &\quad \int \cdots \int_{0=t_0 < \cdots < t_N < t} dt_1 dt_2 \cdots dt_N \prod_{i=0}^{N+L-1} w_n(t'_{i+1} - t'_i, x'_{i+1} - x'_i), \end{aligned} \quad (5.25)$$

where $x_0 = \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$,

$$w_n(s, x) = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{g_1 \max_{|y| \leq \frac{1}{2} S_{n+1}} X_{0,s,y}^{(n)} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{(s,x) \text{ and } (0,0) \text{ are } n\text{-connected via some } S_{n+1} \text{ neighbors}\}}} \right] e^{g_1}, \quad (5.26)$$

and $(t'_i)_{i=0}^{N+L}$ is the increasing sequence which is the union of $(t_i : i \leq N)$ and multiples of T up to t .

PROOF: As artificial jobs of radius $\frac{S_{n+1}}{4}$ are at fixed time-space points, every $(n+1)$ -admissible path in the original system is also an $(n+1)$ -admissible path in the new system. Therefore, $Y_t^{(n+1)} \geq X_t^{(n+1)}$ stochastically. To verify that the integral is an upper bound of $\mathbb{E} \left[e^{g_1 X_t^{(n+1)}} \right]$, we use the independence of arrivals of jobs with different sizes S_{n+1} and S_k , $k \leq n$.

Recall that $t = S_{n+1}^\alpha L$ is a large fixed time. For every realization of arrival processes of jobs with size S_{n+1} , we denote by \mathcal{C}_{n+1} the (random) collection of all finite sequences of consecutive arrivals of (centers of) artificial jobs or jobs with the spatial size S_{n+1} within the time interval $[0, t]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{n+1} &= \bigcup_{N=0}^{\infty} \{(\vec{t}, \vec{x}) = (t'_i, x'_i)_{i=1}^{N+L} \subset (\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{Z}^d) : t'_i < t'_{i+1}, t'_{N+L} = S_{n+1}^\alpha L, t_0 = 0, x_0 = \mathbf{0}, \\ &\quad \text{no artificial jobs or jobs of spatial size } S_{n+1} \text{ with the center } x'_{i+1} \text{ arrive between } (t'_i, t'_{i+1}), \\ &\quad \text{a job of spatial size } S_{n+1} \text{ or an artificial job with the center } x'_i \text{ arrives at } t'_i\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.27)$$

Since every $(n+1)$ -admissible path $\gamma^{(n+1)}$ can be decomposed into a collection of n -admissible paths connected by a collection of jobs with the spatial size S_{n+1} and artificial jobs, each $\gamma^{(n+1)}$ corresponds to a finite sequence of (random) time-space points $(\vec{t}, \vec{x}) = (t'_i, x'_i)_{i=1}^{N+L}$ in \mathcal{C}_{n+1} , such that $(t'_i, x'_i)_{i=1}^{N+L}$ encodes consecutive arrivals of artificial jobs or jobs with the spatial size S_{n+1} that intersect $\gamma^{(n+1)}$. For convenience, we take the closest center of artificial job if $\gamma^{(n+1)}$ does not intersect any artificial job at a time $i S_{n+1}^\alpha$, for $i = 1, \dots, L$. The collection of artificial jobs "intersecting" $\gamma^{(n+1)}$ are labeled by their centers $(i S_{n+1}^\alpha, \hat{x}_i)$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, L$; the collection of jobs of size S_{n+1} intersecting $\gamma^{(n+1)}$ are labeled by a sequence of time-space points (t_i, x_i) , $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$. The union $(t'_i, x'_i)_{i=1}^{N+L}$ of $(i S_{n+1}^\alpha, \hat{x}_i)_{i=1}^L$ and $(t_i, x_i)_{i=1}^N$ belongs to \mathcal{C}_{n+1} .

We obtain upper bounds of $e^{g_1 Y_t^{(n+1)}}$ by considering different $(n+1)$ -admissible paths characterized by elements $(t'_i, x'_i)_{i=1}^{N+L}$ in \mathcal{C}_{n+1} . Therefore, we get an upper bound of $e^{g_1 Y_t^{(n+1)}}$,

$$e^{g_1 Y_t^{(n+1)}} \leq \sum_{(\vec{x}, \vec{t}) \in \mathcal{C}_{n+1}} \prod_{i=0}^{N+L-1} \left(e^{g_1 \cdot \max_{|y| \leq S_{n+1}} X_{t'_i, t'_{i+1}, y+x'_i}^{(n)}} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{(t'_i, x'_i) \text{ and } (t'_{i+1}, x'_{i+1}) \text{ are } n\text{-connected via some } S_{n+1} \text{ neighbors}\}} e^{g_1} \right), \quad (5.28)$$

where $t_0 = 0, x_0 = \mathbf{0}$, and the term e^{g_1} is due to the fact that a job of size S_{n+1} may contribute a job of temporal size T_j . It is not clear that (5.28) is finite on the right yet. We take expectation and get an upper bound which is the right hand side of (5.25). In the proof of Proposition 5.2, we show that the integral is finite.

In fact, as job arrivals follow independent Poisson processes, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{g_1 Y_t^{(n+1)}} | \mathcal{C}_{n+1} \right] \leq \sum_{(x, t) \in \mathcal{C}_{n+1}} \prod_{i=0}^{N+L-1} w_n(t'_{i+1} - t'_i, x'_{i+1} - x'_i)$$

where $t_0 = 0, x_0 = \mathbf{0}$, and w_n is defined by (5.26). Also, for each fixed integer N , each fixed sequence of \mathbb{Z}^d -points $\mathbf{x} = (x'_i)_{i=0}^{N+L}$, and each fixed sequence of increasing times $(t'_i)_{i=0}^{N+L}$ ($(t'_i)_{i=0}^{N+L}$ is also the union of $(t_i)_{i=1}^N$ and $\{j S_{n+1}^\alpha : 0 \leq j \leq L\}$), the density of obtaining N non-artificial jobs at time-space points $(t'_i, x'_i)_{i=1}^{N+L}$ is

$$N! P(N_t = N) dt_1 dt_2 \cdots dt_N = (\lambda_{n+1} t)^N e^{-\lambda_{n+1} t} \mathbb{1}_{\{0=t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_N < t\}} dt_1 dt_2 \cdots dt_N,$$

where N_t is a Poisson random variable with rate $\lambda_{n+1} t$. As a consequence, the expectation of (5.28) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[e^{g_1 Y_t^{(n+1)}} \right] \\ & \leq \sum_N \sum_{(x_i) \in (\mathbb{Z}^d)^{N+L}} N! P(N_t = N) \int \cdots \int_{0=t_0 < \cdots < t_N < t} dt_1 dt_2 \cdots dt_N \prod_{i=0}^{N+L-1} w_n(t'_{i+1} - t'_i, x'_{i+1} - x'_i) \\ & \leq \sum_N \sum_{(x_i) \in (\mathbb{Z}^d)^{N+L}} (\lambda_{n+1} t)^N e^{-\lambda_{n+1} t} \int \cdots \int_{0=t_0 < \cdots < t_N < t} dt_1 dt_2 \cdots dt_N \prod_{i=0}^{N+L-1} w_n(t'_{i+1} - t'_i, x'_{i+1} - x'_i) \quad (5.29) \end{aligned}$$

□

Due to the additional artificial jobs, we see that $t'_{i+1} - t'_i$ is at most S_{n+1}^α . We estimate $w_n(s, x)$ by considering x in scales of S_{n+1} , and see that $w_n(s, x)$ decays geometrically in x under this scale. This is the content of the second lemma, and it is a consequence of Corollary 4.1.

Lemma 5.2 *Recall that $K > 3$. Let $w_n(s, x)$ be defined by equation (5.26). Assuming $X_t^{(n)}$ satisfy (5.3), we have the following estimates for $w_n(s, x)$, for any $s \leq S_{n+1}^\alpha$,*

$$w_n(s, x) \leq \begin{cases} CS_{n+1}^{\frac{d}{K}} e^{g_1(1+b_n s)} & , \text{ if } |x| \leq 3S_{n+1} \\ CS_{n+1}^{\frac{d}{K}} r_n^{i-1}(\lambda) e^{g_1(1+b_n s)} & , \text{ if } (2i-1)S_{n+1} < |x| \leq (2i+1)S_{n+1} \text{ for some } i \geq 2 \end{cases}, \quad (5.30)$$

where C is a constant depending on d , and $r_n(\lambda)$ is a constant depending on S_n, S_{n+1} and λ . Furthermore, there is a constant $C_{d,2}$ depending on d , such that $r_n(\lambda) < C_{d,2} \lambda$ when (S_n) satisfies (3.8) and $\lambda < \lambda_{d,0}$, where $\lambda_{d,0}$ is from Corollary 4.1.

PROOF: We divide the proof into two cases.

1. When $|x| \leq S_{n+1}$, assuming (5.3), we have for any $z > 0, s > 0$

$$P(g_n(X_s^{(n)} - b_n s) \geq z) \leq \exp(-z)$$

By the union bound, and stochastic dominance, we get

$$P\left(g_n \max_{|y| \leq S_{n+1}} (X_{0,s;y}^{(n)} - b_n s) \geq d \ln(1 + 2S_{n+1}) + z\right) \leq \exp(-z),$$

and $g_n \max_{|x| \leq \frac{1}{2}S_{n+1}} (X_{x,s}^{(n)} - b_n s)$ is stochastically dominated by $d \ln(1 + 2S_{n+1}) + Z$, where Z is an exponential random variable with rate 1. Therefore,

$$w_n(s, \mathbf{0}) = \mathbb{E}\left[e^{g_1 \max_{|y| \leq S_{n+1}} X_{0,s;y}^{(n)}}\right] e^{g_1} \leq (1 + 2S_{n+1})^{\frac{d}{K}} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{K}} e^{g_1(1+b_n s)}. \quad (5.31)$$

Clearly, $w_n(s, x) \leq w_n(s, \mathbf{0})$ since the indicator function always takes value 1 when $x = \mathbf{0}$.

2. When $(2i - 1)S_{n+1} < |x| \leq (2i + 1)S_{n+1}$ for some $i \geq 2$, we first get an upper bound similar to (5.31). For any $s > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{2g_1 \max_{|x| \leq S_{n+1}} X_{0,s;y}^{(n)}}\right] \leq (1 + 2S_{n+1})^{\frac{2d}{K}} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{2}{K}} e^{2g_1 b_n s}.$$

Then by the Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} w_n(s, x) &\leq \left(\mathbb{E}\left[e^{2g_1 \max_{|x| \leq S_{n+1}} X_{s,x}^{(n)}}\right] P((s, x) \text{ and } (0, \mathbf{0}) \text{ are } n\text{-connected via some } S_{n+1} \text{ neighbors})\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{g_1} \\ &\leq (1 + 2S_{n+1})^{\frac{d}{K}} \left(\frac{1}{1 - \frac{2}{K}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{g_1(1+b_n s)} \tilde{p}_n(s, x), \end{aligned} \quad (5.32)$$

where $\tilde{p}_n(s, x) = P((s, x) \text{ and } (0, \mathbf{0}) \text{ are } n\text{-connected via some } S_{n+1} \text{ neighbors})^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

As $s \leq S_{n+1}^\alpha$, we get an upper bound for $\tilde{p}_n(s, x)$ by the corollary of Proposition 4.1. More precisely, if (s, x) and $(0, \mathbf{0})$ are n -connected via some S_{n+1} neighbors, then there exists two points y, z in $(S_n \mathbb{Z})^d$ such that $|y|, |x - z| < \frac{S_{n+1}}{2}$, and $(0, y), (t, x)$ are n -connected. Since $(2i - 1)S_{n+1} < |x| \leq (2i + 1)S_{n+1}$, we get $2(i - 1)S_{n+1} < |y - z| \leq 2(i + 1)S_{n+1}$. Therefore, by (4.10) in Corollary 4.1, we get that there exist constant $C_{d,2} > c'_d$ only depending on d , such that

$$\tilde{p}_n(s, x) \leq \sum_{x,y} p_n(s, x - y) \leq \left(\frac{S_{n+1}}{S_n}\right)^d (c'_d \lambda)^i \left(\frac{S_{n+1}}{S_n}\right)^{1-\alpha} \leq r_n(\lambda)^{i-1}, \quad (5.33)$$

for some $r_n(\lambda) < c_d \lambda$ when $S_{n+1}^{1-\alpha} > 10 \sum_{j \leq n} S_j^{1-\alpha}$, and $\lambda < \lambda_{d,0}$. By (5.32) and (5.33), we get (5.30). □

Remark 4 We may get better bounds for $w_n(s, x)$. However, geometrical decay of $w_n(s, x)$ in x is sufficient for the proof of Proposition 5.2.

Now we prove Proposition 5.2 from Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2 for a large time t . And we also get the estimate for any positive time t using that $X_t^{(n+1)}$ is super-additive.

PROOF: (Proposition 5.2) By a change of variables $y_{i+1} = x'_{i+1} - x'_i = (y_{i,j})_{j=1}^d \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we rewrite (5.25) as

$$\sum_{N=0}^{\infty} \sum_{(y_i) \in (\mathbb{Z}^d)^{(N+L)}} (\lambda_{n+1} t)^N e^{-\lambda_{n+1} t} \int \dots \int_{0=t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_N < t} \prod_{i=0}^{N+L-1} w_n(t'_{i+1} - t'_i, y_{i+1}) dt_1 dt_2 \dots dt_N, \quad (5.34)$$

where $(t'_i)_{i=0}^{N+L}$ is the increasing sequence, which is also the union of $(t_i)_{i=1}^N$ and $\{j S_{n+1}^\alpha : 0 \leq j \leq L\}$. In view of Lemma 5.2, the product

$$\prod_{i=0}^{N+L-1} w_n(t'_{i+1} - t'_i, y_{i+1}) \leq (C e^{g_1} S_{n+1}^{\frac{d}{K}})^{N+L} e^{g_1 b_n T} r_n(\lambda)^{\sum y'_{i,j}}, \quad (5.35)$$

where $y'_i = (y'_{i,j})_{j=1}^d = \left(\max \left\{ \lfloor \frac{|y_{i,j}| - 3S_{n+1}}{2S_{n+1}} \rfloor, 0 \right\} \right)_{j=1}^d$. Therefore, for each y'_i , there are at most $(6S_{n+1} + 1)^d$ and at least $(4S_{n+1})^d$ different y_i corresponding to it. We get an upper bound for terms in (5.34) by summing over y_i according to y'_i , for every fixed N

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{(y'_i) \in \mathbb{N}^{N+L}} (\lambda_{n+1} t)^N e^{-\lambda_{n+1} t} \int \cdots \int_{0=t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_N < t} dt_1 dt_2 \cdots dt_N (6^d e^{g_1} C S_{n+1}^{d+\frac{d}{K}})^{N+L} e^{g_1 b_n t} r_n(\lambda)^{\sum y'_{i,j}} \\
&= e^{g_1 b_n t} (6^d e^{g_1} C S_{n+1}^{d+\frac{d}{K}})^{N+L} \left(\sum_{(y'_i) \in \mathbb{N}^{N+L}} r_n(\lambda)^{\sum y'_{i,j}} \right) \left((\lambda_{n+1} t)^N e^{-\lambda_{n+1} t} \int \cdots \int_{0=t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_N < t} dt_1 dt_2 \cdots dt_N \right), \\
&= e^{g_1 b_n t} (6^d e^{g_1} C S_{n+1}^{d+\frac{d}{K}})^{N+L} \left(\frac{1}{1 - r_n(\lambda)} \right)^{d(N+L)} P(N_t = N), \tag{5.36}
\end{aligned}$$

where N_t is a Poisson random variable with rate $\lambda_{n+1} t = \lambda S_{n+1}^{-(d+\alpha)} t$. Recall that $K > 3$. By Lemma 5.2, there exists a constant $\lambda_{d,2} = \min\{\frac{1}{2c_d}, \lambda_{d,0}\}$ depending only on d , such that for all $\lambda < \lambda_{d,2}$, we have that

$$r_n(\lambda) < c_d \lambda < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Therefore, we sum over N for (5.36) and get an upper bound for (5.25),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[e^{g_1 X_t^{(n+1)}} \right] &\leq \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} e^{g_1 b_n t} (6^d e^{g_1} C S_{n+1}^{d+\frac{d}{K}})^{N+L} \left(\frac{1}{1 - r_n(\lambda)} \right)^{d(N+L)} P(N_t = N) \\
&\leq e^{g_1 b_n t} \mathbb{E} \left[(12^d e^{g_1} C S_{n+1}^{d+\frac{d}{K}})^{N_t} \right] (12^d e^{g_1} C S_{n+1}^{d+\frac{d}{K}})^L \\
&\leq e^{g_1 b_n t} \exp \left((12^d e^{g_1} C S_{n+1}^{d+\frac{d}{K}}) \lambda_{n+1} t + S_{n+1}^{-\alpha} \ln(12^d e^{g_1} C S_{n+1}^{d+\frac{d}{K}}) t \right), \tag{5.37}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last line, we use the fact that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{b N_t} \right] = \exp \left((e^b - 1) \lambda_{n+1} t \right) \leq \begin{cases} \exp(3b \lambda_{n+1} t), & \text{when } b \leq 1 \\ \exp(e^b \lambda_{n+1} t), & \text{when } b > 1 \end{cases}.$$

Since $\lambda_{n+1} S_{n+1}^{d+\frac{d}{K}} = \lambda S_{n+1}^{-(\alpha-\frac{d}{K})} < \lambda_{d,2} S_{n+1}^{-(\alpha-\frac{d}{K})}$, and $\ln(12^d e^{g_1} C S_{n+1}^{d+\frac{d}{K}}) < C_{d,2} S_{n+1}^{\frac{d}{K}}$ for some $C_{d,2}$ depending on d , we bound (5.37) by

$$\exp \left((g_1 b_n + C_{d,2} S_{n+1}^{-(\alpha-\frac{d}{K})}) t \right). \tag{5.38}$$

Since $X_t^{(n+1)}$ is super-additive, we have $\mathbb{E} \left[e^{g_1 X_{r+s}^{(n+1)}} \right] \geq \mathbb{E} \left[e^{g_1 X_r^{(n+1)}} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[e^{g_1 X_s^{(n+1)}} \right]$, for any $r, s \geq 0$. Therefore, we also have for any $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{g_1 X_t^{(n+1)}} \right] \leq \exp \left(\left(g_1 b_n + C_{d,2} S_{n+1}^{-(\alpha-\frac{d}{K})} \right) t \right),$$

for some $C_{d,2}$ depending on d when $K > 3$. Lastly, we use a change of variables to replace g_1 by $a \cdot g_1$. \square

6 Proof of the Growth Estimate

In this section, we use Corollary 5.1 to prove Proposition 3.2. By conditioning on the occurrences of jobs of spatial size S_{i+j} for $j \geq 2$, we use the g_{i+2-k} -th exponential moments for the maximal numbers $X_{i;k}$ of jobs with temporal size T_k to bound the upper tails. Applying the union bound, we get (3.14)–(3.18).

PROOF:(Proposition 3.2) For a fixed time t between $l_{2i} \cdot \Delta t_{2i}$ and $l_{2i+2} \cdot \Delta t_{2i+2}$, we first recall the event $B_i(t)$ from (3.13)

$$\begin{aligned} B_i(t) &= \{\text{no job of spatial size } S_{i+j}, j \geq 2, \text{ is along an admissible path starting from } (0, \mathbf{0})\} \\ &= \{\sup m_{i+j}(\gamma_{0,t}) = 0, \text{ for all } j \geq 2\}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

where the supremum are taken over all admissible paths $\gamma_{0,t}$ with the initial point $(0, \mathbf{0})$. We estimate the probability $P(B_i(t)^c)$ by looking at time-space boxes $E_{i+j} = [0, t] \times [-3S_{i+j}, 3S_{i+j}]^d$ for all $j > 1$. If $B_i(t)^c$ occurs, then either there is a job of spatial size S_{i+j} inside E_{i+j} for some $j \geq 2$, or there is a point x in $(2S_{i+2}\mathbb{Z})^d$ with $|x| = 2S_{i+2}$, such that $(0, \mathbf{0})$ and (t, x) are $i+1$ -connected. As the arrivals for jobs of different spatial size follow independent Poisson processes, the first event occurs with a probability at most

$$\sum_{j \geq 2} 1 - \exp(-|E_{i+j}| \lambda_{i+j}) \leq \lambda \cdot \sum_{j \geq 2} S_{i+j}^{-\alpha} t,$$

where $\lambda_{i+j} = \lambda P(R = S_{i+j}) \leq \lambda S_{i+j}^{-\alpha}$, from (4.1). From Proposition 4.1 and Corollary 5.1, the second event occurs with probability at most

$$\left(\frac{S_{i+2}}{S_{i+1}}\right)^d q_{i+1}(\lambda) \left(\frac{S_{i+2}}{S_{i+1}}\right).$$

When $\lambda < \lambda_d$, and (S_i) satisfy (2.3), we have that for any $t \in [l_{2i} \cdot \Delta t_{2i}, l_{2(i+1)} \cdot \Delta t_{2(i+1)}]$

$$P(B_i^c(t)) \leq 2C_1 S_{i+2}^{-\alpha} t$$

which implies (3.14).

To get (3.15), we use Corollary 5.1 and the fact that $(X_{t,j})$ are integers. For $j > i$,

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(A_{t,j}^c(0), \text{ and } B_i(t)\right) &= P\left(X_{t,j}^{(i+2)} \geq 1\right) \\ &= P\left(X_{t,j}^{(j+2)} \geq 1\right) \\ &\leq (\exp(2g_2 T_j^{-(1+\delta)} t) - 1)(e^{g_2} - 1)^{-1} \\ &\leq 6T_j^{-(1+\delta)} t, \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

where we use $2g_2 T_{i+1}^{-(1+\delta)} t < l_{2i+2} < \frac{1}{2}$, and $\exp(x) - 1 \leq 3x$ for $0 \leq x \leq 1$ in the last line.

The arguments for (3.16) and (3.17) are very similar. Notice that on the event $B_i(t)$, we have its maximal number $X_{t,j}$ the same as $X_{t,j}^{(i+2)}$

$$X_{t,j} = \sup n_j(\gamma_t) = X_{t,j}^{(i+2)},$$

where the supremum is taken over all admissible paths γ_t with the initial point $(0, \mathbf{0})$. Therefore, for any $y \geq 0$, we get

$$P(X_{t,j} \geq y) \leq P\left(X_{t,j}^{(i+2)} \geq y, \text{ and } B_i(t)\right) + P(B_i^c(t)) \leq P\left(X_{t,j}^{(i+2)} \geq y\right) + P(B_i(t)^c). \quad (6.3)$$

By Corollary 5.1, we apply the Markov Inequality, and obtain (3.16),

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(A_{t,j}^c(3), \text{ and } B_i(t)\right) &\leq P\left(X_{t,j}^{(i+2)} > 3T_j^{-(1+\delta)} t\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{g_{i+2-j} X_{t,j}^{(i+2)}}\right] \exp(-3g_{i+2-j} T_j^{-(1+\delta)} t) \\ &\leq \exp(-g_{i+2-j} 2T_j^{-(1+\delta)} t). \end{aligned}$$

Following a similar computation, we use (3.2) to get (3.17)

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(A_{t,i}^c(3\Delta t_{2i}^{2\kappa}), \text{ and } B_i(t)\right) &\leq \exp(g_2 r_{2i} - 3l_{2i}\Delta t_{2i}^{2\kappa}) \\ &\leq \exp(-2\Delta t_{2i}^\kappa). \end{aligned}$$

Lastly, we use union bound and (3.14)–(3.17) to get (3.18). We show only the second case when t belongs to the interval $[r_{2i}\Delta t_{2i}, l_{2i+2}\Delta t_{2i+2})$:

$$\begin{aligned} &1 - P\left(A_{t,j}(3\Delta t_{2j}^{2\kappa}) \text{ for all } j\right) \\ &\leq P\left(B_i(t)^c\right) + \sum_{j>i} P\left(B_i(t) \text{ and } A_{t,j}^c(3\Delta t_{2j}^{2\kappa})\right) + \sum_{j\leq i} P\left(B_i(t) \text{ and } A_{t,j}^c(3\Delta t_{2j}^{2\kappa})\right) \\ &\leq 2C_1 S_{i+2}^{-\alpha} t + \sum_{j>i} 6T_j^{-(1+\delta)} t + \sum_{j\leq i} \exp(-g_{i+2-j} T_j^{-(1+\delta)} t). \end{aligned}$$

By condition (3.2), we get for some $C, C' > 0$,

$$\sum_{j>i} 6T_j^{-(1+\delta)} + 2C_1 S_{i+2}^{-\alpha} \leq C' T_{i+1}^{-(1+\delta)}, \quad \sum_{j\leq i} \exp(-g_{i+2-j} T_j^{-(1+\delta)} t) \leq \exp(-C T_i^{-(1+\delta)} t),$$

which implies (3.18) for $c' = 3$. □

7 Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the SNF grant 200021L – 169691.

References

- [BCF16] Baccelli, F., Chang-Lara, H., Foss, S.: Shape theorems for Poisson hail on a bivariate ground. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.* **48**, 525–543 (2016)
- [BF11] Baccelli, F., Foss, S.: Poisson hail on a hot ground. *J. Appl. Prob.* **48A**, 343–366 (2011)
- [CGGK93] Cox, J.T., Gandolfi, A., Griffin, P., Kesten, H.: Greedy lattice animals I: upper bound. *Ann. Probab.* **13**, 1151–1169 (1993)
- [FKM18] Foss, S., Konstantopoulos, T., Mountford, T.: Power law condition for stability of Poisson hail. *J. Appl. Prob.* **31**, 681–704 (2018)
- [M02] Martin, J.: Linear growth for greedy lattice animals. *Stoch. Process. Appl.* **98**, 43–66 (2002)
- [W22] Wang, Z.: Stable Systems with Power Law Conditions for Poisson Hail II. In preparation (2022)