

Expansive Multisets: Asymptotic Enumeration

Konstantinos Panagiotou* and Leon Ramzews†

March 30, 2022

Abstract

Consider a non-negative sequence $c_n = h(n) \cdot n^{\alpha-1} \cdot \rho^{-n}$, where h is slowly varying, $\alpha > 0$, $0 < \rho < 1$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We investigate the coefficients of $G(x, y) = \prod_{k \geq 1} (1 - x^k y)^{-c_k}$, which is the bivariate generating series of the multiset construction of combinatorial objects. By a powerful blend of probabilistic methods based on the Boltzmann model and analytic techniques exploiting the well-known saddle-point method we determine the number of multisets of total size n with N components, that is, the coefficient of $x^n y^N$ in $G(x, y)$, asymptotically as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and for all ranges of N . Our results reveal a phase transition in the structure of the counting formula that depends on the ratio n/N and that demonstrates a prototypical passage from a bivariate local limit to an univariate one.

Contents

1	Introduction and Main Results	2
1.1	Main Results	4
1.2	Notes on the Proof & Perspective	7
1.3	Plan of the Paper	8
2	Preparations	8
2.1	Existence, Uniqueness and Properties of N_n^* and (x_n, y_n)	8
2.2	Probabilistic Estimates	11
2.3	Estimates for Power Series	11
2.4	Euler-Maclaurin Summation	14
3	General Proof Strategy	14
3.1	Proof Setup: the Boltzmann Model	14
3.2	Proof of the Main Results	16
4	Proofs	20
4.1	Proof of Lemma 3.1	20
4.2	Proof of Lemma 3.3	21
4.2.1	Proof of Lemma 3.3(I)	21
4.2.2	Proof of Lemma 3.3(II)	22
4.3	Proof of Lemma 3.4	23
4.4	Proof of Lemma 3.5	24
4.5	Proof of Lemma 3.6	29
4.6	Proof of Lemma 3.7	31
4.7	Proof of Corollaries 3.8 and 3.9	39
4.8	Proof of Lemma 3.10	40
4.8.1	Proof of Lemma 3.10(I)	40
4.8.2	Proof of Lemma 3.10(II)	43
4.9	Proof of Lemma 3.11	45
4.10	Proof of Theorem 1.1	46
A	Appendix: Slowly Varying Functions	50

*Department of Mathematics, Ludwigs-Maximilians-Universität München. E-mail: kpanagio@math.lmu.de.

†Department of Mathematics, Ludwigs-Maximilians-Universität München. E-mail: ramzews@math.lmu.de. Funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation), Project PA 2080/3-1.

1 Introduction and Main Results

Multisets The focus of this work is on a simple, yet powerful and ubiquitous construction. Given a set \mathcal{C} , we define the class $\mathcal{G} = \text{MSET}(\mathcal{C})$ of \mathcal{C} -*multisets* or *partitions weighted by \mathcal{C}* to be the collection of all elements of the form

$$\{(C_1, d_1), \dots, (C_k, d_k)\}, \quad C_i \in \mathcal{C} \text{ pairwise distinct, } d_i \in \mathbb{N}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

The tuple (C, d) (informally) means that the object $C \in \mathcal{C}$ occurs d times in the multiset. The asymptotic study – enumeration, properties, limit laws – of multisets has a long and rich history. One of the very first and monumental results in this context was achieved by Hardy and Ramanujan [23], who studied number partitions, which are nothing else than multisets of natural numbers, i.e., $\mathcal{C} = \mathbb{N}$ in our notation. They discovered the beautiful asymptotic formula

$$|\mathcal{P}_n| \sim \frac{1}{4\sqrt{3n}} \exp\left\{\pi\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}n}\right\}, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where \mathcal{P}_n contains all number partitions of $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In their paper they made the simple, though substantial, observation that a very general class of enumeration problems can be solved by applying Cauchy’s formula and performing an appropriate analysis of the resulting complex integral. This powerful idea, which is nowadays known as the *saddle-point method* or *method of steepest descent* and which is (much) older than [23], has seen tremendous extensions, has been rediscovered numerous times, and has seen widespread applications in various fields inside and outside of mathematics, particularly in physics. The field is far too broad so that we could review it here; we refer to the classical textbook [11], the modern exposition [34], and to the excellent treatments in [15, 41], which also put a particular emphasis on the combinatorial perspective.

Another predominant idea in this area is to reformulate the counting problem into a probabilistic question, so as to profit from probability theory’s huge toolbox. A central result was established by Arratia and Tavaré [1], who showed that many random combinatorial objects possess a component structure whose joint distribution is equal to that of random variables that are conditioned to have a specific (weighted) sum and are otherwise *independent*. This, of course, rings the bell of every probabilist and calls for local limit theorems. Moreover, it lies at the core of *Khinchin’s probabilistic method* that originated in [28], see [16] for some historical perspective, and that makes the relation of counting and probability a general and guiding principle.

In this paper we are concerned with the asymptotic enumeration of multisets, and the two fundamentally different methods/principles will play an important role in what is to come. To be precise, assume for the moment that \mathcal{C} is a combinatorial class, that is, it is equipped with a size function $|\cdot| : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{C}_n := \{C \in \mathcal{C} : |C| = n\}$ contains only finitely many objects for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we associate to elements in $\mathcal{G} = \text{MSET}(\mathcal{C})$ in a natural way a (total) size and a number of components, that is,

$$|G| := \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} d_i |C_i|, \quad \kappa(G) := \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} d_i, \quad \text{where } G = \{(C_1, d_1), \dots, (C_k, d_k)\} \in \mathcal{G}.$$

We further set

$$\mathcal{G}_n := \{G \in \mathcal{G} : |G| = n\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{G}_{n,N} := \{G \in \mathcal{G}_n : \kappa(G) = N\}, \quad n, N \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We write $C(x) := \sum_{k \geq 1} |\mathcal{C}_k| x^k$ for the generating series of \mathcal{C} . Then it is well-known, see [15, 32], that the bivariate generating series for the class \mathcal{G} fulfills the fundamental relations

$$G(x, y) := \sum_{k, \ell \geq 1} |\mathcal{G}_{k, \ell}| x^k y^\ell = \prod_{k \geq 1} (1 - x^k y)^{-c_k} = \exp\left\{\sum_{j \geq 1} C(x^j) y^j / j\right\}.$$

For a generating series $F(x)$ we will write $[x^n]F(x)$ for the coefficient of x^n in $F(x)$, and for a bivariate series $F(x, y)$ we will denote by $[x^n y^N]F(x, y)$ the coefficient of $x^n y^N$ in $F(x, y)$. As already mentioned, if $\mathcal{C} = \mathbb{N}$, then we obtain the class of number partitions $\mathcal{P} = \text{MSET}(\mathbb{N})$ and $|\mathcal{P}_n| = [x^n]G(x, 1)$, which is the starting point for the analytical methods employed in [23]. Naturally, the determination of $g_n := [x^n]G(x, 1)$ for general $C(x)$, respectively $(|\mathcal{C}_n|)_{n \geq 1}$, has become a very active research topic. From today’s viewpoint, the

asymptotic value of g_n is very well-understood and was determined under various general conditions and for several specific classes. A particularly prominent and broad setting, and the one considered here, is when

$$c_n := |\mathcal{C}_n| = h(n) \cdot n^{\alpha-1} \cdot \rho^{-n}, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \quad 0 < \rho \leq 1, \quad (1.1)$$

where $h : [1, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is an eventually positive, continuous and slowly varying, which means that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h(\lambda x)}{h(x)} = 1 \quad \text{for all } \lambda > 0.$$

As it turns out, depending on the value of α the models have fairly different features. The state-of-the-art results for multiset enumeration, i.e., the (asymptotic) determination of $g_n = [x^n]G(x, 1)$ in the so-called *expansive* case $\alpha > 0$ are by Granovsky and Stark [20], whereas the *logarithmic* case $\alpha = 0$ is treated in the excellent book by Arratia et al. [2] and the *convergent* case $\alpha < 0$ is studied in Stufler [43]. There are many other treatises that also highlight several other aspects, like the typical structure of multisets, and that provide explicit formulas [21, 36, 35, 22, 16, 3, 5, 33], the methods ranging from purely analytic to probabilistic as previously described.

Our Contribution While the enumeration problem is fairly well-studied, the fundamental question about the distribution of the number of components in a (uniformly random) multiset, and in particular the asymptotic determination of $g_{n,N} := |\mathcal{G}_{n,N}|$, is far less understood and actually much more complex. Indeed, both the saddle-point method and the probabilistic method hit a barrier. In the saddle point method, we are faced with an integral over \mathbb{C}^2 and obtaining control over the integration contour is – as the orders of magnitude of n and N may be vastly incompatible – extremely challenging from a technical viewpoint; in the probabilistic method, on the other hand, we have to deal with bivariate local limit theorems for random variables with a specific dependency structure. Although there are many general and notable results that address the multivariate setting in both the analytic and probabilistic settings, see for example the extensive treatment in [41], they are not sufficient for the desired level of generality considered here.

In this paper we study the expansive case $\alpha > 0$ in (1.1) and we demonstrate that a *combination* of both methods is very effective for determining $g_{n,N}$ (and not only ...) in all relevant cases, that is, when $n \rightarrow \infty$ and N is not too close to one or to the maximum possible number of components. Indeed, we first set up an appropriate probabilistic framework, which differs substantially from the “classical” aforementioned ones used in enumeration of multisets; to wit, the previous approaches, that are directly or indirectly based on [28], use a description with negative binomials, while our approach, which is inspired by modern Boltzmann sampling techniques in combinatorics [7], makes use of Poisson variables. A thorough discussion and comparison is made in Section 1.2. Having achieved this, we use probabilistic methods to reduce the determination of $g_{n,N}$ to an one dimensional problem, which then, in turn, is tackled with the saddle-point method. At this point it seems unavoidable to resort to probabilistic methods only, as the problem involves a genuine triangle array of random variables for which we need a local limit theorem.

Before we build up the theory and present the results in the following sections we review some previous work that addresses the determination of $g_{n,N}$ in specific settings. In the context of number partitions $\mathcal{P} = \text{MSET}(\mathbb{N})$ the picture is quite clear. In [29] the asymptotic order of $|\mathcal{P}_{n,N}|$ for $n, N, n - N \rightarrow \infty$ is determined and a phase transition, depending on whether N is $\mathcal{O}(n^{1/2})$ or $\omega(n^{1/2})$, in the structure of the counting sequence is observed. For $N \geq d\sqrt{n} \ln n$ and $d > d_0$ for some $d_0 > 0$ it is even true that $g_{n,N} \sim |\mathcal{P}|_{n-N}$, as shown in [24]. Another setting in which the picture is fully described is the subexponential case in (1.1), that is, when $\alpha < 0$. For example, if $c_1 = 1$, the authors showed that there is an $A > 0$ such that $g_{n,N} \sim A c_{n-N}$ for all $n, N, n - N \rightarrow \infty$, that is, the number of N -component \mathcal{C} -multisets is proportional to c_{n-N} for all ranges of $n - N$. The result was shown with the help of a probabilistic method, but as the result itself suggests, this bivariate problem is actually and in essence a univariate one. Finally, in the expansive case $\mathcal{G} = \text{MSET}(\mathcal{C})$, under the stronger assumptions $c_n \sim C n^{\alpha-1}$ for $C > 0$, $\alpha > 0$ and additional analytical assumptions, $g_{n,N}$ was determined asymptotically for $N = \omega(\ln^3 n)$ and $N = o(n^{\alpha/(\alpha+1)})$ in Stark [42]. Actually, in that paper the author accomplishes the herculean task of performing a bivariate saddle-point integration, though only for a limited range of the parameters. In any case, the results of [42] give reason to conjecture that $g_{n,N}$, as in the case of number partitions, undergoes a phase transition depending on the ratio of N and $n^{\alpha/(\alpha+1)}$ in this general setting as well. We will confirm in this paper that such transitions are prototypical for the considered counting problems.

1.1 Main Results

Let us fix the setting that we consider. Let $h : [1, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be an eventually positive, continuous and slowly varying function. Consider the real-valued sequence $(c_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ given by

$$c_n = h(n) \cdot n^{\alpha-1} \cdot \rho^{-n} \quad \text{where } \alpha > 0, 0 < \rho < 1 \text{ and } n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (1.2)$$

Note that there are two differences to (1.1). First, the sequence here does not have to be a counting sequence, since the c_n 's may not be integral. Second, we assume $\rho < 1$ and exclude the single case $\rho = 1$, as our methods necessitate this. Following [20], we call sequences $(c_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ fulfilling (1.2) *expansive*. We also say that the corresponding generating series $C(x) := \sum_{k \geq 1} c_k x^k$ is expansive.

Further, define $m = m(C) \in \mathbb{N}$ to be the smallest integer such that $c_m \neq 0$, that is, $c_1 = \dots = c_{m-1} = 0$ and $c_m > 0$. Recall/consider the power series

$$G(x, y) := \exp \left\{ \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{C(x^j)}{j} y^j \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad G^{\geq 2}(x, y) := \exp \left\{ \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{C(x^j)}{j} y^j \right\}. \quad (1.3)$$

Note that since we defined $(c_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ to be real-valued the series $G(x, y)$ has a priori no combinatorial meaning. However, if $(c_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the counting sequence of a combinatorial class \mathcal{C} , then, as we saw previously, $G(x, y)$ is the generating series of $\mathcal{G} = \text{MSET}(\mathcal{C})$, where x tags the size and y the number of components. Nonetheless, we study $G(x, y)$ as a series having possibly non-integral coefficients for the rest of this work unless stated otherwise. The series $G^{\geq 2}(x, y)$ is an auxiliary object that we will need later.

As already mentioned, the quantity $g_n = [x^n]G(x, 1)$ is a well-researched object. The authors of [20] investigated, among other cases, g_n in the expansive case. We present the following theorem that is a straightforward consequence from the results and their proofs in [20, Thm. 1 and Cor. 1]. However, as we use a different notation and the connection to [20] is not immediately obvious, we will give a short self-contained two-page proof that also demonstrates our methodology quite well in Section 4.10.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that $C(x)$ is expansive as in (1.2). Let z_n be the unique solution to $z_n C'(z_n) = n$. Then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$z_n \sim \rho \quad \text{and} \quad [x^n]G(x, 1) \sim G^{\geq 2}(\rho, 1) \cdot \frac{\exp\{C(z_n)\}}{\sqrt{2\pi z_n^2 C''(z_n)}} \cdot z_n^{-n}. \quad (\text{LLT})$$

The form of the enumeration result (LLT) is prototypical: there is a saddle-point (z_n) , an exponential term (z_n^{-n}) , a term in which the power series is evaluated ($G^{\geq 2}(\rho, 1) \exp C(z_n) \sim G(z_n, 1)$), and a polynomial term $(2\pi z_n^2 C''(z_n))^{-1/2}$. The latter is the result of an appropriate integration around the saddle point, or, in a terminology that we prefer here, the result of a local limit theorem, i.e., the probability that a sum of specific independent and identically distributed random variables equals its mean. We will see much more of that later. Let us remark, however, that in the generality considered here, we cannot expect to be able to say much more than (LLT): in general, it is not possible to derive a more explicit asymptotic expression for $\exp\{C(z_n)\}$ (though it is possible to do so for $C(z_n)$ and for its derivatives), and the actual order of magnitude depends very much on the micro-structure of h .

We now move on the main mission of this work, namely the study of $g_{n,N} = [x^n y^N]G(x, y)$. We need some preparations. For $(n, N) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ consider the system of equations in the variables x, y

$$xyC'(x) + mc_m \frac{x^m y}{1 - x^m y} = n, \quad yC(x) + c_m \frac{x^m y}{1 - x^m y} = N, \quad x, y > 0 \text{ and } x^m y < 1. \quad (1.4)$$

We will explain later in detail where these equations come from and only tease for now that the left-hand sides are (more or less) the expected value of the size and the number of components, which we “tune” to n and N , respectively, in a specifically designed random multiset. Equations (1.4) are – in some sense – the bivariate equivalent of the saddle-point equation in Theorem 1.1. Further, for $v \in \mathbb{R}^+$ consider the equation in the single variable u

$$u \cdot h(u)^{1/(\alpha+1)} = v^{1/(\alpha+1)} \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \leq u \leq v. \quad (1.5)$$

Our first auxiliary result is that the previous systems of equations have unique solutions.

Lemma 1.2. *The following statements are true.*

(i) *Suppose that $C(x)$ is expansive. For n, N and $n - mN$ sufficiently large there is a unique solution $(x_{n,N}, y_{n,N})$ to (1.4).*

(ii) *For v sufficiently large there is a unique solution u_v to (1.5) given by $u_v = v^{1/(\alpha+1)}/g(v)$, where $g : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is slowly varying.*

With the slowly varying function g from Lemma 1.2(ii) at hand, define the “magic” value

$$N_n^* := C_0 \cdot g(n) \cdot n^{\alpha/(\alpha+1)}, \quad \text{where } C_0 := \alpha^{-1}(\rho^{-m}\Gamma(\alpha+1))^{1/(\alpha+1)}. \quad (1.6)$$

As we will see shortly, the quantity N_n^* marks a phase transition in the structure of the counting sequence $[x^n y^N]G(x, y)$ (and much more ...) dependent on whether $N/N_n^* < 1$ or $N/N_n^* > 1$. More precisely, assume that we are given a real-valued positive sequence $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$N_n = \lambda_n N_n^* \in \mathbb{N}, \quad N_n \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{and} \quad n - mN_n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (1.7)$$

Note that by these definitions N_n becomes a function of n and the solutions $(x_n, y_n) \equiv (x_{n,N_n}, y_{n,N_n})$ to (1.4) and N_n^* from (1.6) are all well defined for sufficiently large n due to Lemma 1.2. We will from now on distinguish the two cases

$$(I) : \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n < 1 \quad \text{and} \quad (II) : \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n > 1.$$

Our first main result determines the asymptotic growth (in several equivalent forms that have their own merits) of $[x^n y^{N_n}]G(x, y)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in case (I).

Theorem 1(I). *Suppose that $C(x)$ is expansive. In case (I), that is, if $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n < 1$,*

$$[x^n y^{N_n}]G(x, y) \sim G^{\geq 2}(\rho, y_n) \cdot \frac{\exp\{y_n C(x_n)\}}{2\pi \sqrt{N_n y_n x_n^2 C''(x_n)/(\alpha+1)}} \cdot x_n^{-n} y_n^{-N_n} \quad (\text{LLT-I})$$

$$\sim G^{\geq 2}(\rho, y_n) \cdot \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{2\pi} \cdot \exp\left\{-\frac{c_m \rho^m y_n}{1 - \rho^m y_n}\right\} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \cdot x_n^{-n} (y_n/e)^{-N_n} \quad (\text{Explicit-I})$$

$$\sim G^{\geq 2}(\rho, y_n) \cdot \frac{1}{N_n!} [x^n]C(x)^{N_n}. \quad (\text{Comb-I})$$

Some remarks are in place. First, (LLT-I) is the prototypical form of the result that very much resembles (LLT) in a bivariate setting. The second form (Explicit-I) is handy and most convenient to work with, as it includes no evaluation of derivatives and – crucially – powers of C at the saddle point. We feel lucky that we were able to derive such a form of the sequence, and this is mostly owed to the structure of the Equations (1.4) that have a very special property in case (I) (just to look ahead a bit, in that case $x^m y$ stays bounded away from one, so that $1/(1 - x^m y)$ remains bounded). The last identity (Comb-I) hints at an interesting fact when $G(x, y)$ is viewed in the combinatorial setting, i.e., as the generating series of multisets of a class \mathcal{C} . Indeed, $C(x)^N$ is the generating series for *sequences* (C_1, \dots, C_N) that are composed of N objects from \mathcal{C} . Then $C(x)^N/N!$ enumerates *sets* $\{C_1, \dots, C_N\}$, *provided that all elements are distinct*; otherwise there is no reasonable interpretation. So, (Comb-I) may let us speculate that a typical \mathcal{C} -multiset in \mathcal{G}_{n, N_n} has only distinct components, and moreover, that we can accurately describe a typical/random element in \mathcal{G}_{n, N_n} by a sequence of N_n objects from \mathcal{C} that are conditioned to have total size n and are otherwise independent. All this and actually much more is somehow true as we show in the companion paper [38], where we study limit laws of random multisets in \mathcal{G}_{n, N_n} .

Let us finish the discussion about Theorem 1(I) with the following remark. If $\lambda := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n \in [0, 1)$ exists, then, as we shall see in Lemma 4.1 below, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n = \rho^{-m} \lambda^{\alpha+1}$. Consequently, by writing $d(\lambda) = G^{\geq 2}(\rho, \rho^{-m} \lambda^{\alpha+1})$, the counting sequence has the simple(-r) form

$$[x^n y^{N_n}]G(x, y) \sim d(\lambda) \cdot \frac{1}{N_n!} [x^n]C(x)^{N_n} \sim d(\lambda) \cdot \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{2\pi} \cdot \exp\left\{-\frac{c_m \lambda^{\alpha+1}}{1 - \lambda^{\alpha+1}}\right\} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \cdot x_n^{-n} (y_n/e)^{-N_n}.$$

In order to treat $g_{n,N}$ in the second case (II) we define

$$G_{>m}^{\geq 2}(x, y) := \exp \left\{ \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{C(x^j) - c_m x^{jm}}{j x^{jm}} y^j \right\}.$$

Let us give a quick explanation for the choice of notation. Consider the class $\mathcal{C}_{>m}$ of all elements in \mathcal{C} of size greater than m together with the modified size function $|C|_{>m} := |C| - m > 0$ for all $C \in \mathcal{C}_{>m}$. We obtain that the generating series of $\mathcal{C}_{>m}$ is given by $C_{>m}(x) = (C(x) - c_m x^m)/x^m$. Then the generating series of $\mathcal{G}_{>m} := \text{MSET}(\mathcal{C}_{>m})$ is given by $G_{>m}(x) = \exp\{\sum_{j \geq 1} C_{>m}(x^j)/j\}$. The superscript in $G_{>m}^{\geq 2}$ accounts for the fact that we only sum up starting at $j = 2$.

Theorem 1(II). *Suppose that $C(x)$ is expansive. In case (II), that is, if $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n > 1$, there is a non-negative sequence $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ given by*

$$a_n := \lambda_n^{-1} \cdot \frac{g(n - mN_n)}{g(n)} \cdot \left(\frac{n - mN_n}{n} \right)^{\alpha/(\alpha+1)}$$

such that

$$[x^n y^{N_n}]G(x, y) \sim G_{>m}^{\geq 2}(\rho) \cdot \frac{\exp\{C_{>m}(x_n)\}}{\sqrt{2\pi\rho^{-m}x_n^2 C''(x_n)}} \cdot x_n^{-(n-mN_n)} \quad (\text{LLT-II})$$

$$\sim G_{>m}^{\geq 2}(\rho) \cdot \frac{((1 - a_n)N_n)^{c_m - 1}}{\Gamma(c_m)} \cdot [x^{n-mN_n}]e^{C_{>m}(x)}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{Comb-II})$$

We have again remarks. First, (LLT-II) is the classical form that looks like (LLT-I) and (LLT). Note that, however, (LLT-II) looks much more like (LLT) in the sense that it resembles a *univariate* local limit theorem – y_n does not appear in the formulation at all! This simplification is quite surprising, as we would expect a bivariate law like in Theorem 1(I). Here the alternative form (Comb-II) comes to help and gives – as before – a hint about what may be going on. When $G(x, y)$ is the generating series of \mathcal{C} -multisets, then $[x^n y^N]G(x, y)$ is the number of such multisets with N components and size n . But the factor

$$((1 - a_n)N)^{c_m - 1} / \Gamma(c_m) \sim \binom{(1 - a_n)N + c_m - 1}{c_m - 1}$$

in (Comb-II) counts the number of ways to create a multiset with $\sim (1 - a_n)N$ objects from \mathcal{C}_m . Where are the remaining $a_n N$ components? For the other term note that $\exp\{C_{>m}(x)\} = \sum_{k \geq 0} C_{>m}(x)^k / k!$. Then, as before, $C_{>m}(x)^k$ is the generating series of sequences of $\mathcal{C}_{>m}$ -objects of length k and, provided all elements in the sequence are distinct, $C_{>m}(x)^k / k!$ counts sets of k objects. Then $[x^{n-mN}] \exp\{C_{>m}(x)\}$ enumerates *sets* of distinct $\mathcal{C}_{>m}$ -objects with a varying number of components, which, however, concentrates around $a_n N$, and thus with (actual) size $\sim n - mN_n(1 - a_n)$. Concluding, we may speculate that a typical \mathcal{C} -multiset in $\mathcal{G}_{n,N}$ contains a random set of N' (that typically is $\sim a_n N$) components with size $> m$, and the remaining $N - N'$ components are of size m . So, since there is no restriction for the component count for objects of size $> m$, we arrive at a univariate limit law as in (LLT-II). Finally, let us note that in case (II) an explicit form as in (Explicit-I) is in general out of reach due to the reasons outlined after Theorem 1.1 – although it is possible to establish the first order of $C_{>m}(x_n)$ (and its derivatives), achieving a similar statement for $\exp\{C_{>m}(x_n)\}$ seems intractable in the general setting considered here.

Let us finish the discussion about Theorem 1(II) with the following remark. As we will see in Lemma 4.2 below, if the limit $\lambda := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n$ exists, then $a_n \sim \lambda^{-1}$ so that defining $d(\lambda) := G_{>m}^{\geq 2}(\rho)(1 - \lambda^{-1})^{c_m - 1}$, Theorem 1(II) yields the slightly simpler form

$$[x^n y^{N_n}]G(x, y) \sim d(\lambda) \cdot \frac{N^{c_m - 1}}{\Gamma(c_m)} \cdot [x^{n-mN_n}]e^{C_{>m}(x)}.$$

Let us close this section with a final remark. We, unfortunately, cannot offer a Theorem ($I\frac{1}{2}$) that describes what happens when $\lambda_n \rightarrow 1$. The point is that the answer actually depends on how this limit is approached and at what speed. In this context we leave it as an open problem to describe the scaling window and the exact behavior in- and outside of it.

1.2 Notes on the Proof & Perspective

Let us consider the combinatorial setting in which $C(x)$ is the generating series of a combinatorial class \mathcal{C} and $G(x, y)$ is the (bivariate) generating series of \mathcal{G} , the class of all \mathcal{C} -multisets. The main idea of the proof is to translate the task of determining $g_{n,N} = [x^n y^N]G(x, y)$ into a probabilistic problem by considering a multiset \mathbf{G}_n drawn uniformly at random from \mathcal{G}_n . Let us first discuss the quantity $g_n := [x^n]G(x, 1)$ – the total number of multisets of size n with no restrictions on the number of components – for which this kind of analysis has already been carried out successfully in several cases. Assume that we have at our disposal a randomized algorithm/stochastic process \mathbf{G} that outputs elements from \mathcal{G} with *a priori* no control on the size or the number of components, but with the guarantee that all objects of the same size are equiprobable. Then

$$\frac{1}{g_n} = \Pr[\mathbf{G}_n = G] = \frac{\Pr[\mathbf{G} = G]}{\Pr[|\mathbf{G}| = n]} \quad \text{for any } G \in \mathcal{G}_n. \quad (1.8)$$

The goal is to find an algorithm such that we can determine/estimate the terms in the latter expression, namely $\Pr[\mathbf{G} = G]$ (that is usually easy, by design of the algorithm) and $\Pr[|\mathbf{G}| = n]$ (the hard one). As it turns out, such algorithms exist and two different approaches stand out in the literature.

The first and classical approach, based on Khinchin’s probabilistic method and also referred to as *conditioning relation*, generates \mathbf{G} by (first) sampling for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ independently a random number X_k of components of size k ; thus $|\mathbf{G}| = \sum_{k \geq 1} kX_k$. The “right” choice for X_k is a negative binomial distribution with parameters (c_k, x_n^k) for a control value x_n . This is related to the alternative (and equivalent) representation of the generating function (1.3) for \mathcal{C} -multisets given by

$$G(x, y) = \prod_{k \geq 1} (1 - yx^k)^{-c_k} \quad (1.9)$$

for $y = 1$, see [15, 32]. Then, by “tuning” x_n such that $\mathbb{E}[|\mathbf{G}|] = n$ a local limit theorem for $\Pr[|\mathbf{G}| = n]$ can be shown to be true in certain cases. For example, if $c_n = \Theta(n^{\alpha-1}\rho^{-n})$ with $\alpha > 0, 0 < \rho < 1$ the authors of [20] proceed as described to determine g_n asymptotically. This tuning procedure is in general a feasible method for expansive multisets, as $\mathbb{E}[|\mathbf{G}|]$ is proportional to $C'(x_n)/C(x_n)$ and $\lim_{x_n \rightarrow \rho} C'(x_n) = \infty$ for $\alpha > 0$; in other cases, in particular when $\alpha < 0$, tuning is not possible. The conditioning relation is also used by other authors for solving various related problems, see for example the aforementioned works [21, 35, 22, 3, 2, 17]. Some historical remarks about Khinchin’s probabilistic method [28] are made in [16].

On the other hand, and this is the method that we choose and develop further in this work, the *Pólya-Boltzmann model* [8] is used to find a decomposition of \mathbf{G} into random \mathcal{C} -objects attached to cycles of a random permutation, which is helpful to get rid of cumbersome appearances of symmetries and that gives rise to Poisson distributions instead of negative binomials; this difference is reflected by the two different representations (1.3) and (1.9). Again we obtain independent random variables tuned by a control parameter x_n that can be used to describe $|\mathbf{G}|$ in a better-to-handle manner. For a precise description of the involved random variables have a peek at Section 3, where we present (a bivariate extension of) the framework in full detail. The crucial property of the corresponding variables is that all objects attached to cycles of length $j \geq 2$ in the permutation are drawn according to a probability distribution with mean proportional to $C(x_n^j)$. Since $0 < x_n \leq \rho$ we infer that $C(x_n^j)$ is decreasing exponentially fast in j for $0 < \rho < 1$. Hence, objects associated to fixpoints, that is, for $j = 1$, are dominant in the structure of \mathbf{G} ; this essentially reduces the analysis to the study of iid random variables, rendering this method particularly useful whenever $0 < \rho < 1$. For example, [43] determines (among other more general things) g_n with this technique in the prominent setting where c_n is subexponential, which corresponds to our setting with $\alpha < 0$. For other applications of the Pólya-Boltzmann model regarding random multisets, see for instance [40, 39].

Let us return to our actual problem, where we want to find an asymptotic expression for $g_{n,N}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and for essentially all $N \rightarrow \infty$. As in (1.8) we obtain

$$\frac{g_{n,N}}{g_n} = \Pr[\kappa(\mathbf{G}_n) = N] = \frac{\Pr[|\mathbf{G}| = n, \kappa(\mathbf{G}) = N]}{\Pr[|\mathbf{G}| = n]}. \quad (1.10)$$

Here we see a major difficulty that suddenly may appear: the one-parametric models have the property $\mathbb{E}[|\mathbf{G}|] = n$ that we obtained by tuning x_n , but at the same time $\kappa(\mathbf{G})$ can possibly be far away from N .

This, however, is not always a problem, and the one-parameteric models can also be useful, as demonstrated in [37] in the aforementioned subexponential case. On the other hand, in the expansive case a two-parametric description of \mathbf{G} must be found in order to tune the expectation of $\kappa(\mathbf{G})$ to be (close to) N . Then the problem of determining $g_{n,N}$ boils down to finding a two-dimensional local limit law for $K_{n,N} := \Pr[|\mathbf{G}| = n, \kappa(\mathbf{G}) = N]$. Achieving this is a difficult problem, since there is a significant interplay between $|\mathbf{G}|$ and $\kappa(\mathbf{G})$. The author of [42] solved this problem under the assumption that $c_n \sim Cn^{\alpha-1}$ for $C, \alpha > 0$ and the restrictions $N = o(n^{\alpha/(\alpha+1)})$ and $N = \omega(\ln^3 n)$ by using the conditioning relation and a bivariate saddle-point integration. Other parameter ranges have not been studied as far as we are aware of.

In this work we consider the general setting (1.2). To get a grip on $K_{n,N}$ we conduct a novel application of a bivariate Boltzmann model with the parameters $x_{n,N}$ and $y_{n,N}$ solving (1.4). This solution asserts (more or less) that $\mathbb{E}[|\mathbf{G}|] = n$ and $\mathbb{E}[\kappa(\mathbf{G})] = N$. As the two parameters interact in a complex way such that depending on the ratio of n and N the main contribution to $|\mathbf{G}|$ or $\kappa(\mathbf{G})$ is not necessarily given only by the fixpoints anymore, we come to the conclusion that there is a phase transition in N at which the behaviour of $g_{n,N}$ changes significantly. This can be recognized in the different natures of Theorems 1(I) and 1(II).

1.3 Plan of the Paper

The preparations for the proofs of the main theorems are contained in Section 2, which is a collection of many auxiliary results and technical statements. In particular, properties of x_n, y_n, N_n^* and more general results regarding coefficients of products of certain power series tailored to our needs are derived. In Section 3.1 we begin with the proof and introduce the Boltzmann model. Subsequently, we present the proof of our main theorems in a layered structure starting with the statement of more general important lemmas in Section 3.2, where we also describe how they can be combined such as to arrive at the assertions of Theorems 1(I) and 1(II). The respective proofs of these lemmas can be then found in Section 4. Finally, some general (textbook) results about slowly varying functions are placed in the self-contained Appendix A.

Acknowledgements The authors are grateful to Michael Drmota who gave valuable insights into the saddle-point method.

2 Preparations

In this section we start by exposing some general results that are relevant for all forthcoming proofs in the paper: in Section 2.1 we prove Lemma 1.2 establishing the existence and uniqueness of the solutions to (1.4) and (1.5). Then, in Section 2.2 we recall some well-known probabilistic estimates about Poisson distributed random variables. Subsequently, Section 2.3 contains statements about large coefficients of products of power series. Finally, the Euler-Maclaurin-formula that will help us to approximate sums by integrals is presented in Section 2.4.

2.1 Existence, Uniqueness and Properties of N_n^* and (x_n, y_n)

In this section we prove Lemma 1.2 and find some further properties of x_n, y_n and N_n^* .

Proof of Lemma 1.2(i). Define the power series $S : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$, $z \mapsto \sum_{k \geq 1} z^k$ and consider the system of equations

$$xyC'(x) + mc_m S(x^m y) = n, \quad (2.1)$$

$$yC(x) + c_m S(x^m y) = N. \quad (2.2)$$

If we find a pair $(x_{n,N}, y_{n,N}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ satisfying (2.1) and (2.2), then this pair is also a solution to our system (1.4). $S(x_{n,N}^m y_{n,N})$ diverges for $x_{n,N}^m y_{n,N} \geq 1$, so that $x_{n,N}^m y_{n,N} < 1$ and $S(x_{n,N}^m y_{n,N}) = x_{n,N}^m y_{n,N} / (1 - x_{n,N}^m y_{n,N})$. Vice versa, any solution to (1.4) satisfies (2.1), (2.2). Thus it suffices to find a pair $(x_{n,N}, y_{n,N}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ satisfying (2.1), (2.2). Subtracting m times (2.2) from (2.1) we obtain

$$y = (n - mN) \left(\frac{x C'(x)}{C(x)} - m \right)^{-1} C(x)^{-1} =: a(x) \cdot C(x)^{-1}. \quad (2.3)$$

Plugging this into (2.2) and reformulating yields the one-variable equation

$$f(x) := a(x) + c_m S(b(x)) = N, \quad \text{where } b(x) := x^m \cdot a(x)C(x)^{-1}. \quad (2.4)$$

Before we solve this equation let us have a closer look at the expression $xC'(x)/C(x)$. Since $(c_k)_{k \geq 1}$ is a non-negative and non-zero sequence and since C has radius of convergence ρ we know that $xC'(x)/C(x)$ is continuous and strictly increasing on the (open) interval $(0, \rho)$. Moreover, as m is the first index such that $c_m > 0$ and as $c_n = h(n)n^{\alpha-1}\rho^{-n}$ for some $\alpha > 0$

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{xC'(x)}{C(x)} = m \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \rho} \frac{xC'(x)}{C(x)} = \infty.$$

With these facts at hand we study a and b . The monotonicity properties of $xC'(x)/C(x)$ imply that $a(x)$ is strictly decreasing in $(0, \rho)$ with

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} a(x) = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \rho} a(x) = 0.$$

Moreover, $b(x)$ is also strictly decreasing on $(0, \rho)$ as the product of two strictly decreasing positive functions $a(x)$ and $x^m/C(x) = 1/\sum_{k \geq m} c_k x^{k-m}$ and satisfies

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} b(x) = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \rho} b(x) = 0.$$

Let $\delta \in (0, \rho)$ be the unique number such that $b(\rho - \delta) = 1$ and so $b(x) \in (0, 1)$ for $x \in (\rho - \delta, \rho)$. We immediately obtain that any solution to (2.4), that is, any x solving $f(x) = N$ must be in $(\rho - \delta, \rho)$ and we look only in this interval for solutions.

Note that if there is any solution, then it must be unique. Indeed, a, b are both strictly decreasing, and $S(b(x))$ too, since S has only non-negative coefficients. Thus, f is strictly decreasing in $(\rho - \delta, \rho)$.

Finally, we argue that there exists a solution to $f(x) = N$. From our considerations we obtain that the function $S(b(x))$, defined on $(\rho - \varepsilon, \rho)$, takes any value in $(0, \infty)$. On the other hand, we know that $a(x) \rightarrow 0$ for $x \rightarrow \rho$. We conclude that $f(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $x \rightarrow \rho$ and $f(x) \rightarrow \infty$ as $x \rightarrow \rho - \delta$. This implies the existence of (a unique value) $x_{n,N}$ such that $f(x_{n,N}) = N$. With this at hand we determine $y_{n,N}$ by (2.3), and the proof is completed. \square

Proof of Lemma 1.2(ii). Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1/(\alpha+1)$. We first show that there is a solution in the interval (u_-, u_+) , where $u_- := v^{1/(\alpha+1)-\varepsilon}$ and $u_+ := v^{1/(\alpha+1)+\varepsilon}$, and that there are no solutions in $[1, v] \setminus (u_-, u_+)$. Set

$$F_v(x) := xh(x)^{1/(\alpha+1)} - v^{1/(\alpha+1)}.$$

Then $F_v(u_-) = v^{1/(\alpha+1)-\varepsilon}h(v^{1/(\alpha+1)-\varepsilon}) - v^{1/(\alpha+1)} < 0$ for v sufficiently large, since h being expansive guarantees that $h(t) = t^{o(1)}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, see also (A.2). Analogously we obtain that $F_v(u_+) > 0$ for large v . Since h is continuous by assumption, also F_v is continuous and there is $u_v \in (u_-, u_+)$ with $F_v(u_v) = 0$ for v large enough.

Now consider $1 \leq u \leq u_-$. Let $\delta > 0$ be such that $(1/(\alpha+1) - \varepsilon)(1 + \delta) < 1/(\alpha+1)$. Due to (A.2), for v large enough

$$F_v(u) = uh(u)^{1/(\alpha+1)} - v^{1/(\alpha+1)} \leq u_-^{1+\delta} - v^{1/(\alpha+1)} = v^{(1/(\alpha+1)-\varepsilon)(1+\delta)} - v^{1/(\alpha+1)} < 0.$$

So, there is no solution in $[1, u_-]$. Next consider $u_+ \leq u \leq v$. Then with room to spare (A.2) guarantees $h(u)^{1/(\alpha+1)} > u^{-\varepsilon/2} \geq v^{-\varepsilon/2}$ for v sufficiently large. Hence

$$F_v(u) = uh(u)^{1/(\alpha+1)} - v^{1/(\alpha+1)} > v^{1/(\alpha+1)+\varepsilon}v^{-\varepsilon/2} - v^{1/(\alpha+1)} > 0,$$

which proves that there is no solution in $[u_+, v]$.

Next, let us show that the solution $u_v \in (u_-, u_+)$ is unique. Assume that $u_- < u_-^* < u_+^* < u_+$ are two distinct solutions. Then due to (A.2) we obtain for $0 < \delta < 1$ and v sufficiently large

$$\frac{u_-^*}{u_+^*} = \frac{h(u_+^*)^{1/(\alpha+1)}}{h(u_-^*)^{1/(\alpha+1)}} \geq \left(\frac{u_-^*}{u_+^*}\right)^\delta$$

implying that $u_-^*/u_+^* \geq 1$, a contradiction.

Finally, we show that $g(v) = h(u_v)^{1/(\alpha+1)}$ is slowly varying; since $u_v = g(v)^{-1}v^{1/(\alpha+1)}$ the proof is finished. Let $\lambda > 0$ be arbitrary. Denote by $u_{\lambda v}$ the solution to $u_{\lambda v}h(u_{\lambda v})^{1/(\alpha+1)} = (\lambda v)^{1/(\alpha+1)}$ which, as we have just shown, exists and is unique for λv sufficiently large. Then

$$\left(\frac{g(v)}{g(\lambda v)}\right)^{\alpha+1} = \frac{h(u_v)}{h(u_{\lambda v})} = \frac{h(h(u_v)^{-1/(\alpha+1)}v^{1/(\alpha+1)})}{h(h(u_{\lambda v})^{-1/(\alpha+1)}(\lambda v)^{1/(\alpha+1)})}.$$

Abbreviate $t = h(u_v)/h(u_{\lambda v})$. By applying (A.2) to the last expression in the previous display we obtain for any $0 < \delta < 1$ and sufficiently large v

$$\min\{(\lambda t)^\delta, (\lambda t)^{-\delta}\} \leq t \leq \max\{(\lambda t)^\delta, (\lambda t)^{-\delta}\}.$$

Note that $\lambda^\delta, \lambda^{-\delta}$ get arbitrarily close to 1 if we let $\delta \rightarrow 0$. So, since $\delta < 1$ we have proven that g is slowly varying, i.e., $g(v)/g(\lambda v) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. \square

In the rest of the section we retrieve useful asymptotic properties of $(x_n, y_n) \equiv (x_{n, N_n}, y_{n, N_n})$, where it is instructive to write $x_n = \rho e^{-\chi_n}$. This will allow us to determine the values of $y_n C(x_n)$ in the different regimes of N_n .

Lemma 2.1. *Let $N_n = \lambda_n N_n^*$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be a sequence as in (1.7) and set $\chi_n = \ln(\rho/x_n)$. Let g be the slowly varying function from Lemma 1.2(ii). Then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\chi_n \sim g\left(\frac{n - mN_n}{y_n}\right) \cdot \left(\frac{n - mN_n}{\Gamma(\alpha + 1)y_n}\right)^{-1/(\alpha+1)} \sim o(1), \quad (2.5)$$

and further, for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$x_n^k C^{(k)}(x_n) \sim \Gamma(\alpha + k) \cdot h(\chi_n^{-1}) \cdot \chi_n^{-\alpha-k} \sim \Gamma(\alpha + k) \cdot g\left(\frac{n - mN_n}{y_n}\right)^{1-k} \cdot \left(\frac{n - mN_n}{\Gamma(\alpha + 1)y_n}\right)^{\frac{\alpha+k}{\alpha+1}} \quad (2.6)$$

and moreover $x_n y_n C'(x_n) \sim n - mN_n$.

Proof. First we show that y_n is bounded from above. For the sake of contradiction, assume that there is an increasing \mathbb{N} -valued sequence $(n_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $y_{n_\ell} \rightarrow \infty$. Since $x_{n_\ell}^m y_{n_\ell} < 1$ due to (1.4) we have $x_{n_\ell} \rightarrow 0$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$. As $C(x) \sim c_m x^m$ and $C'(x) \sim m c_m x^{m-1}$ as $x \rightarrow 0$ we get as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$

$$y_{n_\ell} C(x_{n_\ell}) = \mathcal{O}(1) \quad \text{and} \quad x_{n_\ell} y_{n_\ell} C'(x_{n_\ell}) = \mathcal{O}(1).$$

But $x_{n_\ell} y_{n_\ell} C'(x_{n_\ell}) - m y_{n_\ell} C(x_{n_\ell}) = n_\ell - mN_{n_\ell} \rightarrow \infty$, contradicting (1.4).

Next we show that $\chi_n \rightarrow 0$. For the sake of contradiction, assume that there is a strictly increasing \mathbb{N} -valued sequence $(n_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ and an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\chi_{n_\ell} := \ln(\rho/x_{n_\ell}) \geq \varepsilon$ for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Since both C, C' have radius of convergence ρ we infer that there is a $\Delta > 0$ such that $C(x_{n_\ell}), x_{n_\ell} C'(x_{n_\ell}) \leq \Delta$ for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. From (1.4) and the fact that y_n is bounded we then obtain that, as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$,

$$c_m S_{n_\ell} := c_m x_{n_\ell}^m y_{n_\ell} / (1 - x_{n_\ell}^m y_{n_\ell}) = N_{n_\ell} + \mathcal{O}(1) \quad \text{and} \quad m c_m S_{n_\ell} = n_\ell + \mathcal{O}(1).$$

Since $n_\ell - mN_{n_\ell} \rightarrow \infty$ this is a contradiction, and we have established that $\chi_n \rightarrow 0$.

The proof can now be finished rather routinely. By applying a well-known result for slowly varying functions, see [6, Thm. 1.7.1] and also Theorem A.4, we immediately obtain

$$x_n^k C^{(k)}(x_n) \sim \Gamma(\alpha + k) h(\chi_n^{-1}) \chi_n^{-\alpha-k}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0, n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.7)$$

From this we readily obtain that $x_n C'(x_n) = \omega(C(x_n))$, and then, since $x_n y_n C'(x_n) - m y_n C(x_n) = n - mN_n$ according to (1.4) we infer that $x_n y_n C'(x_n) \sim n - mN_n$. Plugging (2.7) into $x_n y_n C'(x_n) \sim n - mN_n$ and rearranging the terms yields

$$\chi_n^{-1} h(\chi_n^{-1})^{1/(\alpha+1)} = \left(\frac{n - mN_n}{\Gamma(\alpha + 1)y_n}\right)^{1/(\alpha+1)} (1 + o(1)). \quad (2.8)$$

As $y_n > 0$ is bounded from above it follows that $t := (n - mN_n)/(\Gamma(\alpha + 1)y_n) \cdot (1 + o(1)) \rightarrow \infty$. Consequently, Lemma 1.2(ii) asserts that there is a unique solution $\chi_n^{-1} = t^{1/(\alpha+1)}/g(t)$. As g is slowly varying we obtain (2.5). Further, plugging (2.5) into (2.7) yields the last remaining statement (2.6). \square

2.2 Probabilistic Estimates

The following well-known statement gives estimates for Poisson distributed random variables. A proof can be easily conducted by using Stirling's formula.

Proposition 2.2. *Let X be a $\text{Po}(\lambda)$ -distributed random variable. Then there exists $a > 0$ such that uniformly for $x, \lambda > 0$*

$$\Pr \left[|X - \lambda| \geq x\sqrt{\lambda} \right] \leq e^{-ax \min\{x, \sqrt{\lambda}\}}. \quad (2.9)$$

Further, for $x = o(\lambda^{1/6})$

$$\Pr \left[X = \lfloor \lambda + x\sqrt{\lambda} \rfloor \right] \sim (2\pi\lambda)^{-1/2} e^{-x^2/2} \quad \text{as } \lambda \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.10)$$

2.3 Estimates for Power Series

In the proofs of our main results we will often find ourselves in the situation where we have to retrieve coefficients of the product of two power series. In this basic setting the coefficient of the product is proportional to the coefficient of the series with the smaller radius of convergence as shown in the next classical lemma.

Lemma 2.3. *[9, Thm. 3.42] Let $A(x), R(x)$ be power series with radii of convergence $\rho_A, \rho_R > 0$. Suppose that $[x^{n-1}]A(x)/[x^n]A(x) \sim \rho_A^{-1}$. Moreover, assume that $\rho_R > \rho_A$ and $R(\rho_A) \neq 0$. Then*

$$[x^n]A(x)R(x) \sim R(\rho_A) \cdot [x^n]A(x), \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

In our forthcoming arguments the involved series A, R will also depend on n ; there we will use the following (rather technical) statement, which we tried to simplify as much as possible; it seems that the conditions cannot be weakened to obtain the desired conclusion that mimics Lemma 2.3.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $(A_n(x))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of power series and $(\rho_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ a real-valued positive sequence with $\bar{\rho} = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_n \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\frac{[x^{n-k}]A_n(x)}{[x^n]A_n(x)} \sim \rho_n^k \quad \text{for } k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \text{ and as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.11)$$

Moreover, assume that there exist $\varepsilon > 0$ and $n_0, k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\left| \frac{[x^{n-k}]A_n(x)}{[x^n]A_n(x)} \right| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)^k \rho_n^k \quad \text{for } k_0 \leq k \leq n \text{ and } n \geq n_0. \quad (2.12)$$

Let $(R_n(x))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of power series with radii of convergence at least $a := (1 + \varepsilon)\bar{\rho}$. Moreover, suppose that there is a sequence $(d_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $|[x^k]R_n(x)| \leq d_k$ for all $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sum_{k \geq 1} d_k a^k < \infty$. In addition, let $Q : [0, a] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be such that R_n converges uniformly to Q on $[0, a]$. If $\inf_{n \geq n_0} Q(\rho_n) > 0$, then

$$[x^n]A_n(x)R_n(x) \sim Q(\rho_n) \cdot [x^n]A_n(x) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. We abbreviate $a_{k,n} := [x^k]A_n(x)$ and $r_{k,n} := [x^k]R_n(x)$ for $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Write for $K \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\frac{1}{a_{n,n}} [x^n]A_n(x)R_n(x) = I(0, K) + I(K, n), \quad \text{where } I(i, j) := \sum_{i \leq k < j} \frac{a_{n-k,n}}{a_{n,n}} r_{k,n}.$$

Let $\varepsilon' > 0$. Let K_0 be such that for all $K \geq K_0$

$$\left| \sum_{0 \leq k < K} r_{k,n} \rho_n^k - Q(\rho_n) \right| \leq |R_n(\rho_n) - Q(\rho_n)| + \left| \sum_{k > K} r_{k,n} \rho_n^k \right| < \varepsilon';$$

such a K_0 exists since $R_n \rightarrow Q$ uniformly on $[0, a]$, $\rho_n \leq a$ for all n , and since $|\sum_{k > K} r_{k,n} \rho_n^k| \leq \sum_{k > K} d_k a^k$ gets arbitrarily small by the assumption that $\sum_{k \geq 1} d_k a^k$ converges.

Note further that for any $K \geq K_0$ the property (2.11) entails for sufficiently large n

$$\left| I(0, K) - \sum_{0 \leq k < K} r_{k,n} \rho_n^k \right| < \varepsilon'.$$

The triangle inequality readily implies that $|I(0, K) - Q(\rho_n)| < 2\varepsilon'$ for all $K \geq K_0$ and n sufficiently large. Further, (2.12) guarantees that there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $0 < a_{n-k,n}/a_{n,n} \leq (1+\varepsilon)^k \rho_n^k$ for all k, n sufficiently large. From that we conclude that there is a $K_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $K \geq K_1$

$$|I(K, n)| \leq \sum_{k \geq K} |r_{k,n}| (1+\varepsilon)^k \rho_n^k \leq \sum_{k \geq K} d_k (1+\varepsilon)^k \bar{\rho}^k < \varepsilon'.$$

All together, fixing $K \geq \max\{K_0, K_1\}$, we proved that there is an error term $|E| < 3\varepsilon'$ such that $a_{n,n}^{-1} \cdot [x^n]A_n(x)R_n(x) = Q(\rho_n) + E$ for n sufficiently large. Since $\varepsilon' > 0$ was arbitrary and $Q(\rho_n)$ is bounded away from zero, the claim follows. \square

The next statement applies Lemma 2.4 to the special case $A_n(x) = \exp\{h_n x\}$ and $Q(x) = R_n(x) = (1-x)^{-\gamma}$, where $\gamma > 0$ and h_n is approaching infinity. In particular, we observe what the effect of Q is on $[x^k]A_n(x) = h_n^k/k!$.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\gamma > 0$ and for a (eventually) positive sequence $(\alpha_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ define $h_n := \alpha_n n$.*

(i) *For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and α_n such that $h_n \rightarrow \infty$*

$$[x^k] \frac{1}{(1-x)^\gamma} e^{h_n x} \sim [x^k] e^{h_n x} \sim \frac{h_n^k}{k!} \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.13)$$

(ii) *If $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n > 1$*

$$[x^n] \frac{1}{(1-x)^\gamma} e^{h_n x} \sim \left(\frac{1}{1-\alpha_n^{-1}} \right)^\gamma \cdot \frac{h_n^n}{n!}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.14)$$

(iii) *If $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n < 1$ and $h_n \rightarrow \infty$ then*

$$[x^n] \frac{1}{(1-x)^\gamma} e^{h_n x} \sim \frac{((1-\alpha_n)n)^{\gamma-1}}{\Gamma(\gamma)} e^{h_n}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.15)$$

Proof. Statement (i) is easily verified, as for fixed k

$$[x^k] \frac{1}{(1-x)^\gamma} e^{h_n x} = \sum_{0 \leq \ell \leq k} \binom{k-\ell+\gamma-1}{\gamma-1} \frac{h_n^\ell}{\ell!} \sim \frac{h_n^k}{k!}.$$

We proceed to Part (ii). Set $R_n(x) := Q(x) := (1-x)^{-\gamma}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $A_n(x) := e^{h_n x}$. We want to apply Lemma 2.4 and verify its conditions one by one. First,

$$\frac{[x^{n-k-1}]A_n(x)}{[x^{n-k}]A_n(x)} = \frac{n-k}{h_n} \sim \frac{1}{\alpha_n} := \rho_n, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0, n \rightarrow \infty$$

that is, (2.11) is established. Next we see that (2.12) is valid since

$$\frac{[x^{N_n-k}]A_n(x)}{[x^n]A_n(x)} = \frac{n(n-1)\cdots(n-k-1)}{h_n^k} \leq \rho_n^k, \quad 0 \leq k \leq N_n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n > 1$ we have that $\bar{\rho} = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_n < 1$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be such that $a := (1+\varepsilon)\bar{\rho} < 1$. Establishing uniform convergence of $R_n \rightarrow Q$ on $[0, a]$ and estimating the coefficients of $R_n(x)$ is trivial, as

$R_n = Q$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and Q is absolute convergent on $[0, a]$. Lastly, $Q(\rho_n)$ is bounded from below away from zero as $0 < \rho_n \leq \bar{\rho} < 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence Lemma 2.4 entails

$$[x^n] \frac{1}{(1-x)^\gamma} e^{h_n x} \sim \frac{1}{(1-\alpha_n^{-1})^\gamma} [x^n] e^{h_n x} = \frac{1}{(1-\alpha_n^{-1})^\gamma} \frac{h_n^n}{n!}.$$

Finally, we show (iii). Let $X \sim \text{Po}(h_n)$. We split up the sum

$$\begin{aligned} [x^n] \frac{1}{(1-x)^\gamma} e^{h_n x} &= \sum_{0 \leq k \leq n} \binom{n-k+\gamma-1}{\gamma-1} \frac{h_n^k}{k!} \\ &= e^{h_n} \left(\sum_{|k-h_n| \leq \sqrt{h_n \ln n}} + \sum_{|k-h_n| > \sqrt{h_n \ln n}} \right) \binom{n-k+\gamma-1}{\gamma-1} \Pr[X = k] =: e^{h_n} (S_1 + S_2). \end{aligned}$$

For $h_n = \alpha_n n$ we have $n - k \sim (1 - \alpha_n)n = \omega(1)$ for all $|k - h_n| \leq \sqrt{h_n \ln n}$. Hence

$$S_1 \sim \frac{((1 - \alpha_n)n)^{\gamma-1}}{\Gamma(\gamma)} \Pr[|X - h_n| \leq \sqrt{h_n \ln n}].$$

By applying (2.9) we obtain for some $d > 0$ that $\Pr[|X - h_n| > \sqrt{h_n \ln n}] \leq e^{-d \ln^2 n}$, so that $|X - h_n| \leq \sqrt{h_n \ln n}$ with probability ~ 1 . Moreover, it is easy to see that S_2 is negligible: note that

$$S_2 \leq e^{-d \ln^2 n} \sum_{0 \leq k \leq n} \binom{n-k+\gamma-1}{\gamma-1} = e^{-d \ln^2 n} \binom{n+\gamma}{\gamma} = \Theta(e^{-d \ln^2 n} n^\gamma) = o(S_1).$$

□

The following simple and well-known saddle-point estimate for the coefficients of a power series will be useful several times.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $F(x) = \sum_{k \geq 0} f_k x^k$ be a power series with non-negative coefficients. Then, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $z > 0$*

$$f_n = [x^n] F(x) \leq F(z) z^{-n}. \quad (2.16)$$

Finally, we present a simple estimate which holds for any power series with non-negative coefficients and positive radius of convergence.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $F(x) = \sum_{k \geq m} f_k x^k$ be a power series with non-negative coefficients such that $f_m > 0$ and radius of convergence $\rho > 0$. Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Then there exists $A > 0$ such that for all $0 \leq z \leq (1 - \varepsilon)\rho$*

$$1 \leq \frac{F(z)}{f_m z^m} \leq 1 + Az.$$

Proof. The first inequality follows directly from the definition of F and m . Abbreviate $a := (1 - \varepsilon)\rho$ and note that since $\rho < 1$ also $a < \rho < 1$. Then

$$\frac{F(z)}{f_m z^m} \leq 1 + z \frac{1}{f_m} \sum_{k > m} f_k a^{k-m-1} = 1 + z \frac{a^{-m-1}}{f_m} \sum_{k > m} f_k a^k. \quad (2.17)$$

Thus, as $a < \rho < 1$, we obtain from (2.17) the claimed bound with $A = F(a) a^{-m-1} / f_m$. □

2.4 Euler-Maclaurin Summation

For a function g we will need several times to compute the sum $\sum_{k=a}^b g(k)$ for some $a < b$. The Euler-Maclaurin summation formula, discussed for example in [19, Ch. 9.5], relates the sum to an integral, which is sometimes easier to compute.

Lemma 2.8. *Let $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be differentiable and $P_1(x) := x - [x] - 1/2$. Then for any $a < b$*

$$\sum_{k=a}^b g(k) = \int_a^b g(x)dx + \frac{g(a) + g(b)}{2} + \int_a^b g'(x)P_1(x)dx.$$

We will apply this to functions of the form $g(x) = e^{-dx^2}$ for some $d > 0$. Note that $|P_1(x)| \leq 1$ and $|g'(x)|$ equals $g'(x)$ for $x < 0$ and $-g'(x)$ for $x > 0$. Accordingly,

$$\sum_{k=a}^b g(k) = \int_a^b g(x)dx + Q, \quad \text{where } |Q| \leq \frac{g(a) + g(b)}{2} + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |g'(x)|dx \leq 3. \quad (2.18)$$

This will simplify the computation of $\sum g(k)$ considerably, as it will turn out that the remainder Q is negligible compared to $\int g(x)dx$ which, in turn, is well-studied.

3 General Proof Strategy

In this section we describe the general proof strategy. On the way, several important intermediate statements are stated and we explain how to assemble them in order to prove Theorems 1(I) and 1(II). Then all is left to show is that these intermediate statements are valid, the proof of which is deferred to Section 4.

3.1 Proof Setup: the Boltzmann Model

We begin with the definition of the Boltzmann model that will be central in the forthcoming considerations. Given a non-negative real-valued sequence $(c_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, the associated power series $C(x)$, and a positive real x_0 such that $C(x_0) < \infty$, we define the random variable $\Gamma C(x_0)$ by

$$\Pr[\Gamma C(x_0) = n] = c_n \frac{x_0^n}{C(x_0)}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We will refer to this distribution as the *Boltzmann distribution* or the *Boltzmann model* for $C(x)$ or for $(c_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ at x_0 . The Boltzmann model has a natural interpretation, if $(c_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the counting sequence of some combinatorial class \mathcal{C} ; this is actually where this terminology originates, see the seminal paper [14]. Indeed, imagine in that case that we put a “weight” of x_0^n to any object of size n in \mathcal{C} , so that the total weight $C(x_0)$ is finite. If we then draw an object from \mathcal{C} with a probability that is proportional to its weight, then we get precisely the Boltzmann distribution. Since we are going to need that later several times without explicitly referencing it, note that

$$\mathbb{E}[\Gamma C(x_0)] = \frac{x_0 C'(x_0)}{C(x_0)} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[\Gamma C(x_0)^2] = \frac{x_0^2 C''(x_0)}{C(x_0)} + \frac{x_0 C'(x_0)}{C(x_0)}.$$

In a completely analogous way we can define a bivariate variant of the Boltzmann model. Suppose that we are given a sequence of non-negative sequences $((g_{n,N})_{N \in \mathbb{N}})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with associated power series $G(x, y)$ and positive reals x_0, y_0 such that $G(x_0, y_0) < \infty$. Then we consider the \mathbb{N}^2 -valued random variable $\Gamma G(x_0, y_0)$ with distribution

$$\Pr[\Gamma G(x_0, y_0) = (n, N)] = g_{n,N} \frac{x_0^n y_0^N}{G(x_0, y_0)}, \quad n, N \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (3.1)$$

that we also call a Boltzmann distribution/model for G at (x_0, y_0) .

The crucial point behind the previous definitions is that we can exploit them to actually determine c_n and $g_{n,N}$. Indeed, if we could determine the probability on the left-hand side of (3.1), then would also

know $g_{n,N}$. This consideration is of course only useful if we had an appropriate hands-on description of $\Gamma G(x_0, y_0)$ that we could study appropriately. Here the Boltzmann models come into play: a particularly useful property of them – and one that made them so successful in combinatorics – is that they *compose well*, see also [14, 8]. For example, suppose that $C(x) = A(x)B(x)$ and x_0 be such that $A(x_0), B(x_0) < \infty$. Then we can relate the Boltzmann models $\Gamma C(x_0)$ and $\Gamma A(x_0), \Gamma B(x_0)$ as follows. Consider the following simple random process, that first draws independently from $\Gamma A(x_0), \Gamma B(x_0)$ and then creates the sum:

(P) Let independently $A = \Gamma A(x_0)$ and $B = \Gamma B(x_0)$ and set $C = A + B$.

Then it is quite easy to see that C is distributed like $\Gamma C(x_0)$; we do not show that here, since we do not need it, but we keep the guiding principle in mind: the *product of power series corresponds to independent components in the Boltzmann model*. Let us study a second example. Suppose that we are given $C(x)$ and $D(x) = \exp\{C(x)\}$ ¹. Assume that x_0 is such that $C(x_0) < \infty$, so that $D(x_0) < \infty$ as well. Then we can relate the models $\Gamma C(x_0)$ and $\Gamma D(x_0)$ by first drawing a Poisson random variable and then summing up independent $\Gamma C(x_0)$'s:

(S1) Let P be a Poisson distributed random variable with parameter $C(x_0)$.

(S2) Let C_1, \dots, C_P independent random variables distributed like $\Gamma C(x_0)$.

(S3) Set $D = C_1 + \dots + C_P$.

Then it is quite easy to see that D is distributed like $\Gamma D(x_0)$; again, we do not show that, but keep in mind: *exponentiation on the power series level corresponds to a Poisson distribution on the Boltzmann level*. Moreover, we can say that $\Gamma D(x_0)$ has a number of C -components distributed like $\text{Po}(C(x_0))$. Let us look at a last example. Suppose that $H(x) = C(x^j)$ for some $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and x_0 be such that $H(x_0) < \infty$. Consider the process

(E) Let $C = \Gamma C(x_0^j)$ and set $H = jC$.

Then we obtain that H is distributed like $\Gamma H(x_0)$, so that *potentiation of the argument on the power series level corresponds to multiplication on the Boltzmann level*, and we can say that $\Gamma H(x_0)$ has j components.

Here we are interested in the Boltzmann model on

$$G(x, y) = \exp \left\{ \sum_{j \geq 1} C(x^j) y^j / j \right\} = \prod_{j \geq 1} \exp \{ C(x^j) y^j / j \}, \quad \text{where } [x^n]C(x) = c_n \text{ satisfies (1.2)}$$

at some $(x_0, y_0) \in (\mathbb{R}^+)^2$ such that $G(x_0, y_0) < \infty$. Guided by the general principles (product \rightarrow independent components, exponentiation \rightarrow Poisson, potentiation \rightarrow multiplication) we consider the following process:

1. Let $(P_j)_{j \geq 1}$ be independent Poisson random variables with parameters $(C(x_0^j) y_0^j / j)_{j \geq 1}$.
2. Let $(C_{j,i})_{j,i \geq 1}$ be independent random variables with $C_{j,i} \sim \Gamma C(x_0^j)$ for $j, i \geq 1$.
3. Set $\Lambda(x_0, y_0) := (\sum_{j \geq 1} j \sum_{1 \leq i \leq P_j} C_{j,i}, \sum_{j \geq 1} j P_j)$.

Then, rather unsurprisingly, we obtain the following statement, whose proof is in Section 4.1.

Lemma 3.1. *The distributions of $\Gamma G(x_0, y_0)$ and $\Lambda(x_0, y_0)$ are identical.*

However, we can extract more from the aforementioned description of Λ . Let us write – motivated from the combinatorial background – for short for a pair $P = (n, N)$ (like $\Lambda(x_0, y_0)$) $\kappa(P) = N$ for the “number of components” and $|P| = n$ for the “size”. Define the events

$$\mathcal{P}_N := \{ \kappa(\Lambda(x_0, y_0)) = N \} = \left\{ \sum_{j \geq 1} j P_j = N \right\}, \quad \mathcal{E}_n := \{ |\Lambda(x_0, y_0)| = n \} = \left\{ \sum_{j \geq 1} j \sum_{1 \leq i \leq P_j} C_{j,i} = n \right\}. \quad (3.2)$$

¹In combinatorial terms this corresponds to the set-construction, that is, $[x^n]D(x)$ is the number of objects of size n that are unordered collections of elements in \mathcal{C} , cf. [15]

Then Lemma 3.1 reveals that

$$[x^n y^N]G(x, y) \frac{x_0^n y_0^N}{G(x_0, y_0)} = \Pr[\Gamma G(x_0, y_0) = (n, N)] = \Pr[\Lambda(x_0, y_0) = (n, N)] = \Pr[\mathcal{E}_n, \mathcal{P}_N].$$

Rewriting this yields an alternative representation of $[x^n y^N]G(x, y)$ in terms of iid random variables.

Corollary 3.2. *Let $x_0, y_0 > 0$ be such that $G(x_0, y_0) < \infty$. For any $n, N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $[x^n y^N]G(x, y) > 0$*

$$[x^n y^N]G(x, y) = x_0^{-n} y_0^{-N} G(x_0, y_0) \Pr[\mathcal{P}_N] \Pr[\mathcal{E}_n | \mathcal{P}_N].$$

In other words, if we can compute $G(x_0, y_0)$, $\Pr[\mathcal{P}_N]$ and $\Pr[\mathcal{E}_n | \mathcal{P}_N]$ then we also obtain the desired quantity $[x^n y^N]G(x, y)$ and we are done. How this can be achieved is the topic of the next section.

3.2 Proof of the Main Results

In order to prove Theorems 1(I) and 1(II) we will apply Corollary 3.2. Let us begin with a remark. Although Corollary 3.2 is true for all $n, N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x_0, y_0 > 0$ such that $G(x_0, y_0) < \infty$, we certainly cannot expect that it is *useful* for all choices of the parameters. Here, where we want to prove Theorems 1(I) and 1(II), we consider (large) sizes $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and a corresponding sequence N_n satisfying (1.7) and (1.6), that is,

$$N_n = \lambda_n N_n^* \quad \text{such that} \quad N_n, n - mN_n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then x_0, y_0 should be chosen in such a way that the events \mathcal{P}_{N_n} and \mathcal{E}_n are 'typical'. Note that the expectations satisfy

$$\mathbb{E}[|\Lambda(x_0, y_0)|] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j \geq 1} j \sum_{1 \leq i \leq P_j} C_{j,i}\right] = \sum_{j \geq 1} \mathbb{E}[P_j] j \mathbb{E}[C_{j,i}] = \sum_{j \geq 1} x_0^j y_0^j C'(x_0^j).$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[\kappa(\Lambda(x_0, y_0))] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j \geq 1} j \mathbb{E}[P_j]\right] = \sum_{j \geq 1} y_0^j C(x_0^j).$$

So, in order to get the most out of Corollary 3.2, it seems reasonable to choose x_0, y_0 such that

$$\sum_{j \geq 1} x_0^j y_0^j C'(x_0^j) = n \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j \geq 1} y_0^j C(x_0^j) = N_n. \quad (3.3)$$

Note, however, that actually we will *not* (quite) do that. Instead, we will choose (x_0, y_0) to be the unique solution (x_n, y_n) of (1.4); to wit, (1.4) reads here

$$x_n y_n C'(x_n) + m c_m \frac{x_n^m y_n}{1 - x_n^m y_n} = n, \quad y_n C(x_n) + c_m \frac{x_n^m y_n}{1 - x_n^m y_n} = N_n, \quad x_n, y_n > 0, \quad x_n^m y_n < 1. \quad (3.4)$$

To justify – informally, at this point – the “switch” to the set of simpler equations let us look closer at the second equation in (3.3):

$$N_n = \sum_{j \geq 1} y_0^j C(x_0^j) = y_0 C(x_0) + c_m \sum_{j \geq 1} (x_0^m y_0)^j + \sum_{j \geq 2} y_0^j (C(x_0^j) - c_m x_0^{jm}) - c_m x_0^m y_0.$$

(Note that, somehow arbitrarily, we pulled out the term $c_m x_0^m y_0$ so that we got a geometric series starting at 1. This will turn out convenient later, but actually it makes no difference.) Then we must certainly have that $x_0 < \rho$ and $0 < x_0^m y_0 < 1$, and so the first sum on the right-hand side equals $(x_0^m y_0)/(1 - x_0^m y_0)$ and the second one is bounded (since uniformly $C(x_0^j) - c_m x_0^{jm} = \mathcal{O}(x_0^{j(m+1)})$ by Lemma 2.7 and $\rho < 1$). So,

$$N_n = y_0 C(x_0) + c_m \frac{x_0^m y_0}{1 - x_0^m y_0} + \mathcal{O}(y_0) \quad (3.5)$$

and by ignoring the additive error term we arrive at the second equation in (3.4). Similarly we can justify the switch to the first equation.

To wrap up, in all of the following we will work with $\Lambda(x_n, y_n)$, where (x_n, y_n) is the unique solution to (3.4) and $N_n = \lambda_n N_n^*$ satisfies (1.6) and (1.7). In particular, we will consider independent random variables $(P_j)_{j \geq 1}$ and $(C_{j,i})_{j,i \geq 1}$ such that

$$P_j \sim \text{Po}(C(x_n^j) y_n^j / j), \quad j \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Pr[C_{j,i} = k] = c_k \frac{x_n^{jk}}{C(x_n^j)}, \quad j, i, k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.6)$$

By applying Corollary 3.2 we see that for the proof of Theorems 1(I) and 1(II) it suffices to determine

$$G(x_n, y_n), \quad \Pr[\mathcal{P}_{N_n}] \quad \text{and} \quad \Pr[\mathcal{E}_n \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}]$$

for \mathcal{P}_{N_n} and \mathcal{E}_n defined in (3.2). This will be performed in versions (I) and (II) of Lemmas 3.4, 3.5 and 3.10. Along the way some more (intermediate) statements will be needed. We will also abbreviate throughout without further reference

$$S_n := \frac{x_n^m y_n}{1 - x_n^m y_n}.$$

Up to this point there is nothing special about the relation of n and N_n . However, towards the proof of Theorems 1(I) and 1(II) we establish in the next lemma the key role of the value N_n^* . In particular, if we write $x_n = \rho e^{-\chi_n}$, then Lemma 2.1 reveals that $\chi_n = o(1)$ so that $x_n \sim \rho$. If we now consider $S_n = x_n^m y_n / (1 - x_n^m y_n)$, then it is obvious that y_n plays a crucial role: if y_n stays well below ρ^{-m} , then S_n is bounded, otherwise it becomes large. This transition happens precisely at N_n^* , as established in the following lemma, and it has far reaching consequences in the remainder; depending on whether $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} < \rho^{-m}$ or $y_n \sim \rho^{-m}$ there isn't/there is a crucial interplay between the terms $x_n y_n C'(x_n)$ (and $y_n C(x_n)$) and S_n in (3.4).

Lemma 3.3(I). *In case (I), that is, when $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n < 1$,*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n < \rho^{-m} \quad \text{and consequently} \quad y_n C(x_n) = N_n + \Theta(y_n), \quad S_n = \Theta(y_n).$$

Lemma 3.3(II). *In case (II), that is, when $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n > 1$,*

$$y_n \sim \rho^{-m} \quad \text{and consequently} \quad y_n C(x_n) \sim a_n \cdot N_n, \quad S_n \sim \frac{1 - a_n}{c_m} \cdot N_n$$

for some non-negative sequence $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n < 1$ and

$$a_n := \lambda_n^{-1} \cdot \frac{g(n - mN_n)}{g(n)} \left(\frac{n - mN_n}{n} \right)^{\alpha/(\alpha+1)}.$$

The proofs can be found in Section 4.2. These statements have an decisive impact on the quantities discussed in this section. Recall the definitions of $G^{\geq 2}$ and $G_{>m}^{\geq 2}$ from Section 1.1. We start with $G(x_n, y_n)$, where we already observe a qualitative difference in the asymptotic behavior.

Lemma 3.4(I). *In case (I)*

$$G(x_n, y_n) \sim G^{\geq 2}(\rho, y_n) \cdot \exp\{y_n C(x_n)\} \sim G^{\geq 2}(\rho, y_n) \cdot \exp\left\{-c_m \frac{\rho^m y_n}{1 - \rho^m y_n}\right\} \cdot \exp\{N_n\}.$$

Lemma 3.4(II). *Let $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence from Lemma 3.3(II). In case (II)*

$$G(x_n, y_n) \sim (ec_m)^{-c_m} \cdot G_{>m}^{\geq 2}(\rho) \cdot ((1 - a_n) N_n)^{c_m} \cdot \exp\{y_n C(x_n)\}.$$

The proofs are in Section 4.3. Next we consider $\Pr[\mathcal{P}_{N_n}]$. Recall that $P_j \sim \text{Po}(y_n^j C(x_n^j) / j)$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$. We saw in the discussion around (3.3)-(3.5) that $\sum_{j \geq 2} y_n^j C(x_n^j)$ is comparable to $S_n + \mathcal{O}(y_n)$. Hence, by Lemma 3.3(I), in case (I) P_1 has mean $N_n + \mathcal{O}(1)$, and moreover, the mean of the sum $\sum_{j \geq 2} j P_j$ is $\mathcal{O}(1)$. Thus, we suspect that $\Pr[\mathcal{P}_{N_n}] \approx \Pr[P_1 = N_n]$, that is, the whole ‘‘mass’’ condenses into P_1 . This is established in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.5(I). *In case (I)*

$$\Pr[\mathcal{P}_{N_n}] \sim \Pr[P_1 = N_n] \sim (2\pi N_n)^{-1/2}.$$

Further, there exist $A > 0, 0 < a < 1$ such that

$$\Pr\left[\sum_{j \geq 2} jP_j = K\right] \leq A \cdot \min\{a, y_n\}^K, \quad K \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.7)$$

The proof is in Section 4.4. In case (II) the behavior is quite different from that. We observe that $y_n^j C(x_n^j)$ is essentially $c_m(x_n^m y_n)^j$ as j grows bigger, so that in a first approximation $\sum_{j \geq 1} jP_j$ should behave like

$$P_1 + \sum_{j \geq 1} j\text{Po}(c_m(x_n^m y_n)^j/j).$$

Here Lemma 3.3(II) reveals that the mean of this sum is large, actually linear in N_n . By comparing the characteristic functions by an exp-ln-transformation we have for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 < \beta < 1$ that the sum of independent Poisson random variables $\sum_{j \geq 1} j\text{Po}(k\beta^j/j)$ is equal in distribution to the sum of iid geometric distributed random variables $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} \text{Geom}_i(1 - \beta)$. But this is nothing else than a multinomial distribution with parameters $1 - \beta$ and k , so that

$$\Pr\left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} \text{Geom}_i(1 - \beta) = N_n\right] = \binom{N_n - 1}{k - 1} (1 - \beta)^k \beta^{N_n - k}.$$

Plugging back $\beta = x_n^m y_n$ and $k = c_m$ as well as using $(1 - x_n^m y_n) \sim S_n^{-1} \sim c_m((1 - a_n)N_n)^{-1}$ due to Lemma 3.3(II) we obtain that

$$\Pr\left[\sum_{j \geq 1} j\text{Po}\left(c_m \frac{(x_n^m y_n)^j}{j}\right) = N_n\right] \sim \frac{c_m^{c_m}}{\Gamma(c_m)(1 - a_n)^{c_m}} \frac{(x_n^m y_n)^{N_n}}{N_n}.$$

Since P_1 is either negligible compared to $\sum_{j \geq 2} jP_j$ or at most of the same order ($a_n N_n$ vs. $(1 - a_n)N_n$ by Lemma 3.3(II)), this should be qualitatively the actual result. It turns out that this is true.

Lemma 3.5(II). *Let $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence from Lemma 3.3(II). In case (II),*

$$\Pr[\mathcal{P}_{N_n}] \sim \frac{c_m^{c_m} \exp\left\{c_m \frac{a_n}{1 - a_n}\right\}}{\Gamma(c_m)} \cdot \frac{(x_n^m y_n)^{N_n}}{(1 - a_n)N_n}.$$

Let $(K_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be sequence in \mathbb{N} such that $K_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then, for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$\Pr\left[\sum_{j > \ell} jP_j = K_n\right] \sim \frac{c_m^{c_m}}{(1 - a_n)^{c_m} \Gamma(c_m)} \cdot \frac{(x_n^m y_n)^{K_n}}{K_n} \cdot \left(\frac{K_n}{N_n}\right)^{c_m}. \quad (3.8)$$

The proof is in Section 4.4. Having studied the event \mathcal{P}_{N_n} itself we continue by investigating the effect on the probability space when conditioning on \mathcal{P}_{N_n} in order to determine $\Pr[\mathcal{E}_n | \mathcal{P}_{N_n}]$. For this purpose, we introduce some auxiliary notation. Define

$$L_p := \sum_{1 \leq i \leq p} (C_{1,i} - m), \quad p \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \text{and} \quad L := L_{P_1}, \quad \text{and} \quad R := \sum_{j \geq 2} j \sum_{1 \leq i \leq P_j} (C_{j,i} - m).$$

With this at hand we reformulate

$$\Pr[\mathcal{E}_n | \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] = \Pr[L + R = n - mN_n | \mathcal{P}_{N_n}]. \quad (3.9)$$

The driving idea behind these definitions is to split up $\sum_{j \geq 1} j \sum_{1 \leq i \leq P_j} (C_{j,i} - m)$ into a “dominant” large part L and “negligible” remainder R . We observe that the random variables $C_{j,i}$ have exponential tails for $j \geq 2$ since $x_n \leq \rho < 1$. In addition, $\mathbb{E}[C_{j,i}] = x_n C'(x_n^j)/C(x_n^j)$ tends to m exponentially fast in j so that the probability of $\{C_{j,i} - m = 0\}$ should tend exponentially fast to 1 in j . However, as we are conditioning on the event \mathcal{P}_{N_n} , where some of the P_j 's might be large, it is not obvious that R will be also small. The next lemma clarifies the picture.

Lemma 3.6. *In both cases (I) and (II) there are $0 < a < 1, A > 0$ such that*

$$\Pr [R = r \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] \leq A \cdot a^r, \quad r, n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

The proof is in Section 4.5. With this at hand, we try to get a handle on (3.9) by conditioning on R and P_1 having certain values, i.e.

$$\Pr [\mathcal{E}_n \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] = \sum_{p, r \geq 0} \Pr [L_p = n - mN_n - r] \Pr [P_1 = p, R = r \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}].$$

Then the exponential tails of R conditioned on \mathcal{P}_{N_n} established in Lemma 3.6 guarantee that we can omit all terms where r is large; further, all terms where p deviates “too much” from $\mathbb{E}[P_1] = y_n C(x_n)$ should be negligible as well, since P_1 is very much concentrated around its mean. This leads to

$$\Pr [\mathcal{E}_n \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] \approx \sum_{r \text{ “small”, } p \text{ “close to” } \mathbb{E}[P_1]} \Pr [L_p = n - mN_n - r] \Pr [P_1 = p, R = r \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}]. \quad (3.10)$$

To finish we will use the fact that the mean of L_p is close to $n - mN_n - r$ for small r and p in the vicinity of $\mathbb{E}[P_1]$. In the next lemma we actually show that L_p follows a local central limit theorem, which will allow us to obtain a very fine-grained understanding of (3.10). The mean and variance of L_p are given by

$$\mu_p := \mathbb{E}[L_p] = p \left(\frac{x_n C'(x_n)}{C(x_n)} - m \right) \quad \text{and} \quad (3.11)$$

$$\sigma_p^2 := \text{Var}(L_p) = p \left(\frac{x_n^2 C''(x_n) + x_n C'(x_n)}{C(x_n)} - \left(\frac{x_n C'(x_n)}{C(x_n)} \right)^2 \right). \quad (3.12)$$

According to Lemma 2.1 the asymptotic behaviour of these expressions is

$$\mu_p \sim \alpha p \chi_n^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_p^2 \sim \alpha p \chi_n^{-2}. \quad (3.13)$$

To prove the local limit theorem we will reformulate $\Pr [L_p = s] = C(x_n)^{-p} [x^s] C(x_n x)^p$ for $s = \mu_p + t\sigma_p$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Although there are many results in the literature on how to determine large coefficients of $H(x)^p$ /how to obtain local limit theorems, none of these are applicable in the generality considered here. To wit, in [12, 13] or [15, Thm. IX.16] the function H is assumed to be either logarithmic or to allow for a singular expansion; and in [15, Thms. VIII.8 and 9] as well as several applications in [41] the ratio n/p needs to be in $\Theta(1)$ to be able to determine $[x^n] H(x)^p$. Clearly this is not the case here as $\mu_p/p = \omega(1)$. In [10] a local limit theorem is derived, provided that a central limit theorem and additional assumptions, that in particular imply $\sigma_p^2/p = \mathcal{O}(1)$, are true; but note that $\sigma_p^2/p = \omega(1)$ in our setting. Indeed, we have to deal here with a *genuine* triangle array of independent random variables and thus we conduct a detailed saddle-point analysis from scratch on our own.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $p = p_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then for $t = o(p^{1/6})$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\Pr [L_p = \mu_p + t\sigma_p] \sim e^{-t^2/2} \cdot \Pr [L_p = \mu_p] \sim e^{-t^2/2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} \sigma_p} \sim e^{-t^2/2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{\chi_n}{\sqrt{p\alpha}}.$$

The proof is in Section 4.6. Assisted by this lemma we obtain from (3.10)

$$\Pr [\mathcal{E}_n \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] \approx \sum_{p \text{ “close to” } \mathbb{E}[P_1]} \Pr [L_p = n - mN_n] \Pr [P_1 = p \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}].$$

In the final step of the proof we determine $\Pr [L_p = n - mN_n]$. Here we observe for a last time the effect of cases (I)/(II). In particular, in case (I) it seems reasonable that it is enough to consider the case $P_1 = N_n$, see also Lemma 3.5(I); we obtain the following statements that are a direct consequence of Lemma 3.7.

Corollary 3.8. *In case (I)*

$$\Pr [L_{N_n} = n - mN_n] = \Pr \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq N_n} C_{1,i} = n \right] \sim \sqrt{\frac{\alpha + 1}{2\pi y_n x_n^2 C''(x_n)}} \sim \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{2\pi}} \frac{\sqrt{N_n}}{n}.$$

The proof is in Section 4.7. In case (II) we expect in light of $\mathbb{E}[P_1] \sim a_n N_n$ is (much) smaller than N_n a different behavior; here we do not stick to a particular value of P_1 .

Corollary 3.9. *In case (II)*

$$\Pr[L = n - mN_n] \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\rho^{-m}x_n^2 C''(x_n)}} \sim \sqrt{\frac{\alpha C_0}{2\pi(\alpha+1)} \cdot g(n - mN_n) \cdot (n - mN_n)^{-(\alpha+2)/(\alpha+1)}}.$$

Backed by this this groundwork we are able to determine $\Pr[\mathcal{E}_n \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}]$. The proofs are in Section 4.8.

Lemma 3.10(I). *In case (I)*

$$\Pr[\mathcal{E}_n \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] \sim \Pr\left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq N_n} C_{1,i} = n\right].$$

Lemma 3.10(II). *In case (II)*

$$\Pr[\mathcal{E}_n \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] \sim \Pr[L = n - mN_n].$$

The proofs are almost completed. It is straightforward to obtain the asymptotic order of $[x^n y^{N_n}]G(x, y)$ in Theorems 1(I) and 1(II) by combining the respective versions (I) and (II) of Lemmas 3.4, 3.5 and 3.10 and applying Corollary 3.2. We conclude this section by summarizing all the auxiliary statements that allow us to infer the “combinatorial” forms in Theorems 1(I) and 1(II). The proofs are in Section 4.9.

Lemma 3.11(I). *In case (I)*

$$\Pr\left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq N_n} C_{1,i} = n\right] \sim \sqrt{2\pi N_n} \cdot x_n^n y_n^{N_n} \cdot \exp\left\{c_m \frac{\rho^m y_n}{1 - \rho^m y_n}\right\} \cdot e^{-N_n} \cdot \frac{1}{N_n!} [x^n] C(x)^{N_n}.$$

Lemma 3.11(II). *Let $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence from Lemma 3.3(II). In case (II)*

$$\Pr[L = n - mN_n] \sim e^{c_m} \cdot x_n^{n - mN_n} \cdot \exp\left\{-\frac{C(x_n)}{x_n^m}\right\} \cdot [x^{n - mN_n}] \exp\left\{\frac{C(x) - c_m x^m}{x^m}\right\}.$$

Further

$$y_n C(x_n) - \frac{C(x_n)}{x_n^m} \sim -c_m \frac{a_n}{1 - a_n}.$$

4 Proofs

In this section we prove all lemmas and corollaries from Section 3, together with some auxiliary statements.

4.1 Proof of Lemma 3.1

Proof of Lemma 3.1. Let n, N be such that $[x^n y^N]G(x, y) > 0$ and $x_0, y_0 > 0$ such that $G(x_0, y_0) < \infty$. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ define the set $\Omega_k := \{(p_1, p_2, \dots) \in \mathbb{N}_0^\infty : \sum_{j \geq 1} j p_j = k\}$. Then per definition

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\Lambda(x_0, y_0) = (n, N)] &= \Pr\left[\sum_{j \geq 1} j \sum_{1 \leq i \leq P_j} C_{j,i} = n, \sum_{j \geq 1} j P_j = N\right] \\ &= \frac{y_0^N}{G(x_0, y_0)} \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in \Omega_N} \Pr\left[\sum_{j \geq 1} j \sum_{1 \leq i \leq p_j} C_{j,i} = n\right] \prod_{j \geq 1} \frac{(C(x_0^j)/j)^{p_j}}{p_j!}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

Next we reformulate

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{j \geq 1} j \sum_{1 \leq i \leq p_j} C_{j,i} = n \right] = [x^n] \mathbb{E} \left[x^{\sum_{j \geq 1} j \sum_{1 \leq i \leq p_j} C_{j,i}} \right] = x_0^n [x^n] \prod_{j \geq 1} \left(\frac{C(x^j)}{C(x_0^j)} \right)^{p_j}.$$

Plugging this back into (4.1) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr [\Lambda(x_0, y_0) = (n, N)] &= \frac{x_0^n y_0^N}{G(x_0, y_0)} \cdot [x^n] \sum_{p \in \Omega_N} \prod_{j \geq 1} \frac{(C(x^j)/j)^{p_j}}{p_j!} \\ &= \frac{x_0^n y_0^N}{G(x_0, y_0)} [x^n y^N] \sum_{k \geq 0} \sum_{p \in \Omega_k} \prod_{j \geq 1} \frac{(C(x^j) y^j / j)^{p_j}}{p_j!}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

Define by $(P_j(x, y))_{j \geq 1}$ independent Poisson variables with parameters $(C(x^j) y^j / j)_{j \geq 1}$. Then

$$[x^n y^N] \sum_{k \geq 0} \sum_{p \in \Omega_k} \prod_{j \geq 1} \frac{(C(x^j) y^j / j)^{p_j}}{p_j!} = [x^n y^N] G(x, y) \sum_{k \geq 0} \Pr \left[\sum_{j \geq 1} j P_j(x, y) = k \right] = [x^n y^N] G(x, y)$$

and inserting this into (4.2) yields $\Pr [\Lambda(x_0, y_0) = (n, N)] = [x^n y^N] G(x, y) x_0^n y_0^N / G(x_0, y_0)$, which equals $\Pr [\Gamma G(x_0, y_0) = (n, N)]$, as claimed. \square

4.2 Proof of Lemma 3.3

4.2.1 Proof of Lemma 3.3(I)

As we will need that later, we prove the following more general statement, from which Lemma 3.3(I) follows immediately.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\chi_n = \ln(\rho/x_n)$. In case (I)*

$$\chi_n \sim \alpha \frac{N_n}{n}, \quad y_n \sim \rho^{-m} \cdot \frac{h(n/N_n^*)}{h(n/N_n)} \cdot \lambda_n^{\alpha+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n < \rho^{-m}.$$

Further, if $\lambda_n = o(1)$ then $y_n = o(1)$ and if $\lambda_n = \Theta(1)$ then $y_n \sim \rho^{-m} \lambda_n^{\alpha+1} = \Theta(1)$. Moreover,

$$y_n C(x_n) = N_n + c_m S_n \quad \text{and} \quad S_n = \Theta(y_n).$$

Proof. We first show that $y_n C(x_n) = \Theta(N_n)$. Since $S_n = x_n^m y_n / (1 - x_n^m y_n) > 0$ we infer from (3.4) that $y_n C(x_n) < N_n$. For the sake of contradiction assume that there is a sequence $(n_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $y_{n_\ell} C(x_{n_\ell}) = o(N_{n_\ell})$. This implies that $S_{n_\ell} \sim N_{n_\ell}$ due to (3.4), which is only possible if $y_n \sim \rho^{-m}$, as we know that $x_n \sim \rho^m$ from Lemma 2.1. By applying (2.6) for $k = 0$ and since $n_\ell - m N_{n_\ell} \sim n_\ell$ in case (I) we thus infer that $y_{n_\ell} C(x_{n_\ell}) = \Theta(g(n_\ell) n_\ell^{\alpha/(\alpha+1)}) = \Theta(N_{n_\ell}^*) = \Omega(N_{n_\ell})$, the desired contradiction. We showed that $y_n C(x_n) = \Theta(N_n)$. We also immediately obtain from this fact that $\chi_n = \Theta(n/N_n)$, since $\chi_n^{-1} = \Theta(x_n C'(x_n) / C(x_n))$ due to Lemma 2.1.

Next we show that $S_n = \mathcal{O}(1)$, again by contradiction. Assume that there is a sequence $(n_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $S_{n_\ell} = \omega(1)$. Then again $y_{n_\ell} \sim \rho^{-m}$ so that we get with Lemma 2.1 and the definition of $N_{n_\ell}^*$ from (1.6) that, as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$,

$$y_{n_\ell} C(x_{n_\ell}) \sim C_0 g(n_\ell) n_\ell^{\alpha/(\alpha+1)} = N_{n_\ell}^*. \quad (4.3)$$

But in case (I) we have that $\limsup_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} y_{n_\ell} C(x_{n_\ell}) / N_{n_\ell}^* \leq \limsup_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} N_{n_\ell} / N_{n_\ell}^* < 1$, a contradiction. We just showed that $S_n = \mathcal{O}(1)$. It immediately follows that $y_n C(x_n) \sim N_n$ and $\alpha \chi_n^{-1} \sim x_n C'(x_n) / C(x_n) \sim n / N_n$ from (3.4).

From $S_n = \mathcal{O}(1)$ we also conclude that $\limsup y_n < \rho^{-m}$, as $x_n \sim \rho^m$ due to Lemma 2.1. This, in turn, also implies $S_n = \Theta(y_n)$, as claimed. It remains to show the validity of the asymptotic expression of y_n . By applying Lemma 2.1, in particular (2.8),

$$\chi_n^{-1} h(\chi_n^{-1})^{1/(\alpha+1)} \sim \left(\frac{n}{\Gamma(\alpha+1)y_n} \right)^{1/(\alpha+1)}.$$

Solving for y_n yields $y_n \sim n\chi_n^{\alpha+1}/(h(\chi_n^{-1})\Gamma(\alpha+1))$. We plug in $\chi_n \sim \alpha N_n/n$ as well as the definitions of $C_0 = \alpha^{-1}(\rho^{-m}\Gamma(\alpha+1))^{1/(\alpha+1)}$ and N_n^* from (1.6) and $N = \lambda_n N_n^* = \lambda_n g(n)n^{\alpha/(\alpha+1)}$ to obtain that

$$y_n \sim \rho^{-m} \cdot \frac{g(n)^{\alpha+1}}{h(n/N_n)} \cdot \lambda_n^{\alpha+1}.$$

Since $g(n) = h(n/N_n^*)^{1/(\alpha+1)}$, which can be seen directly from (1.5) for $u = n/N_n^*$ and $v = n$, we are done. If $\lambda_n = o(1)$ we have with (A.2) that there is a $0 < \delta < \alpha+1$ such that $\lambda_n^{\alpha+1} \cdot h(n/N_n^*)/h(n/N_n) \leq (N_n^*/N_n)^\delta = \lambda_n^{\alpha+1-\delta} = o(1)$. If $\lambda_n = \Theta(1)$ then $h(n/N_n^*)/h(n/N_n) \sim 1$ finishing the proof. \square

4.2.2 Proof of Lemma 3.3(II)

We later need the following statement which contains Lemma 3.3(II) together with asymptotic properties of the solution (x_n, y_n) to (3.4) in case (II).

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\chi_n = \ln(\rho/x_n)$. Consider the non-negative sequence*

$$a_n := \lambda_n^{-1} \cdot \frac{g(n - mN_n)}{g(n)} \cdot \left(\frac{n - mN_n}{n} \right)^{\alpha/(\alpha+1)}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N} \quad (4.4)$$

that fulfills

$$a_n \leq \lambda_n^{-1} \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ sufficiently large} \quad \text{and} \quad a_n \sim \lambda_n^{-1} \text{ for } N_n = o(n).$$

Then, in case (II),

$$\begin{aligned} y_n &\sim \rho^{-m} \quad \text{and} \quad \chi_n \sim \alpha \cdot a_n \cdot \frac{N_n}{n - mN_n} \sim \alpha C_0 \cdot g(n - mN_n) \cdot (n - mN_n)^{-1/(\alpha+1)}, \\ y_n C(x_n) &\sim a_n \cdot N_n \sim C_0 \cdot g(n - mN_n) \cdot (n - mN_n)^{\alpha/(\alpha+1)} \quad \text{and} \quad S_n \sim \frac{1 - a_n}{c_m} \cdot N_n. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since $x_n^m y_n < 1$ and $x_n \sim \rho$ according to Lemma 2.1, it is clear that $y_n \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\rho^{-m}$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and all sufficiently large n . First of all, we show that $y_n \sim \rho^{-m}$ by establishing that even $S_n = \Theta(N_n)$. We know that $S_n \leq N_n$, as $y_n C(x_n) \geq 0$ in (3.4). We show $S_n = \Omega(N_n)$ by contradiction. Assume there is a sequence $(n_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $S_{n_\ell} = o(N_{n_\ell})$. From (3.4) and by applying Lemma 2.1 and $N_{n_\ell} = \lambda_{n_\ell} N_{n_\ell}^* = \lambda_{n_\ell} C_0 g(n_\ell) n_\ell^{\alpha/(\alpha+1)}$, where $C_0 = \alpha^{-1}(\rho^{-m}\Gamma(\alpha+1))^{1/(\alpha+1)}$, we obtain

$$1 \sim \frac{y_{n_\ell} C(x_{n_\ell})}{N_{n_\ell}} \sim \rho^{m/(\alpha+1)} y_{n_\ell} \lambda_{n_\ell}^{-1} \frac{g((n_\ell - mN_{n_\ell})/y_{n_\ell})}{g(n_\ell)} \left(\frac{n_\ell - mN_{n_\ell}}{n_\ell y_{n_\ell}} \right)^{\alpha/(\alpha+1)}. \quad (4.5)$$

Since g is slowly varying we obtain from (A.2) for $0 < \delta < 1/(\alpha+1)$ and sufficiently large ℓ

$$\frac{g((n_\ell - mN_{n_\ell})/y_{n_\ell})}{g(n_\ell)} \leq \max \left\{ \left(\frac{n_\ell - mN_{n_\ell}}{n_\ell y_{n_\ell}} \right)^\delta, \left(\frac{n_\ell - mN_{n_\ell}}{n_\ell y_{n_\ell}} \right)^{-\delta} \right\}.$$

Together with (4.5) and the simple fact $(n_\ell - mN_{n_\ell})/(n_\ell y_{n_\ell}) \leq y_{n_\ell}^{-1}$ we obtain

$$\frac{y_{n_\ell} C(x_{n_\ell})}{N_{n_\ell}} \leq \rho^{m/(\alpha+1)} y_{n_\ell} \lambda_{n_\ell}^{-1} \max \{ y_{n_\ell}^{-\alpha/(\alpha+1)-\delta}, y_{n_\ell}^{-\alpha/(\alpha+1)+\delta} \} \leq (1 + \varepsilon)^{1/(\alpha+1)} \lambda_{n_\ell}^{-1} ((1 + \varepsilon)\rho)^\delta.$$

As $\liminf_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{n_\ell} > 1$, this can be made < 1 by choosing $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ sufficiently small. This contradicts (4.5) so that we have shown that $S_n = \Theta(N_n)$ also implying $y_n \sim \rho^{-m}$.

With this at hand and plugging $y_n \sim \rho^{-m}$ into the expressions for $C(x_n)$ and χ_n from Lemma 2.1 as well as recalling $C_0 := \alpha^{-1}(\rho^{-m}\Gamma(\alpha+1))^{1/(\alpha+1)}$ we obtain

$$y_n C(x_n) \sim C_0 \cdot g(n - mN_n) \cdot (n - mN_n)^{\alpha/(\alpha+1)} \text{ and } \chi_n \sim \alpha C_0 \cdot g(n - mN_n) \cdot (n - mN_n)^{-1/(\alpha+1)}.$$

Multiplying both right-hand sides by $1 = N_n^*/N_n^* = \lambda_n^{-1}N_n/(C_0g(n)n^{\alpha/(\alpha+1)})$ we obtain the claimed representations $y_n C(x_n) \sim a_n \cdot N_n$ and $\chi_n \sim \alpha \cdot a_n \cdot N_n/(n - mN_n)$ for

$$a_n := \lambda_n^{-1} \cdot \frac{g(n - mN_n)}{g(n)} \cdot \left(\frac{n - mN_n}{n} \right)^{\alpha/(\alpha+1)}.$$

The properties of a_n are readily obtained by noting that g is slowly varying and the simple fact $(n - mN_n)/n \leq 1$. Finally, since a_n is bounded away from one, we also obtain from (3.4) that $S_n = (N_n - y_n C(x_n))/c_m \sim (1 - a_n)/c_m \cdot N_n$. □

4.3 Proof of Lemma 3.4

Proof of Lemma 3.4(I). Due to (3.4) and Lemma 4.1 we know that $y_n C(x_n) = N_n - c_m x_n^m y_n / (1 - x_n^m y_n) = N_n - c_m \rho^m y_n / (1 - \rho^m y_n) + o(1)$. Further, Lemma 2.7 entails that there is $A > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{C(x_n^j)}{j} y_n^j = \sum_{j \geq 2} (x_n^m y_n)^j \frac{C(x_n^j)}{j x_n^{jm}} \leq c_m \sum_{j \geq 2} (x_n^m y_n)^j (1 + A x_n^j).$$

This is bounded from above: due to Lemma 4.1 we know that $\limsup y_n < \rho^{-m}$ and $x_n \leq \rho$, which in turn implies that $x_n^m y_n$ is bounded from above by something strictly smaller than 1. Hence, using that $G(x, y)$ is continuous in x and $x_n \sim \rho$ we obtain by dominated convergence

$$G(x_n, y_n) = \exp \left\{ y_n C(x_n) + \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{C(x_n^j)}{j} y_n^j \right\} \sim \exp \left\{ N_n - c_m \frac{\rho^m y_n}{1 - \rho^m y_n} \right\} \exp \left\{ \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{C(\rho^j)}{j} y_n^j \right\}.$$

□

Proof of Lemma 3.4(II). Let $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence from Lemma 4.2. Since $x_n^m y_n \rightarrow 1$ and $(1 - x_n^m y_n)^{-1} \sim (1 - a_n)/c_m \cdot N_n$ due to Lemma 4.2 we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} G(x_n, y_n) &= \exp \left\{ y_n C(x_n) + c_m \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{(x_n^m y_n)^j}{j} - c_m x_n^m y_n + \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{C(x_n^j) y_n^j - c_m x_n^{jm} y_n^j}{j} \right\} \\ &\sim \exp \{ y_n C(x_n) \} \cdot \frac{1}{c_m^m} \cdot ((1 - a_n) N_n)^{c_m} \cdot \exp \left\{ -c_m + \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{C(x_n^j) y_n^j - c_m x_n^{jm} y_n^j}{j} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

With Lemma 2.7 there is some $A > 0$ such that for all $j \geq 2$

$$(C(x_n^j) y_n^j - c_m x_n^{jm} y_n^j) / j \leq A (x_n^m y_n)^j x_n^j.$$

Since $\limsup x_n^{m+1} y_n = \rho < 1$ the expression in the previous display is summable and by dominated convergence we obtain that

$$\exp \left\{ \sum_{j \geq 2} (C(x_n^j) y_n^j - c_m x_n^{jm} y_n^j) / j \right\} \rightarrow \exp \left\{ \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{C(\rho^j) - c_m \rho^{jm}}{j \rho^{jm}} \right\} = G_{> m}^{\geq 2}(\rho).$$

□

4.4 Proof of Lemma 3.5

We will use the probability generating function (pgf) $F^{(\ell)}(x) = \mathbb{E}[x^{P^{(\ell)}}]$ of the sum of Poisson random variables $P^{(\ell)} := \sum_{j>\ell} jP_j$ for $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Define the auxiliary series

$$G^{(\ell)}(x, y) := \exp \left\{ \sum_{j>\ell} \frac{C(x^j)}{j} y^j \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad R^{(\ell)}(x) := \exp \left\{ -c_m \sum_{1 \leq j \leq \ell} \frac{x^j}{j} + \sum_{j>\ell} \frac{C(x_n^j) - c_m x_n^{jm}}{j x_n^{jm}} x^j \right\}.$$

The pgf of a $\text{Po}(\lambda)$ random variable equals $e^{\lambda(x-1)}$. By the independence of the P_j 's,

$$F^{(\ell)}(x) = \frac{1}{G^{(\ell)}(x_n, y_n)} \exp \left\{ \sum_{j>\ell} \frac{C(x_n^j) y_n^j}{j} x^j \right\}.$$

We want to determine $[x^{N_n}]F^{(0)}(x)$ that is precisely the probability of $\mathcal{P}_{N_n} = \{P^{(0)} = N_n\}$. In general, when computing coefficients of these pgfs we will factorize $F^{(\ell)}(x)$ in such a way that Lemma 2.5 is applicable. More precisely, we split up for any $K \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$

$$[x^K]F^{(\ell)}(x) = \frac{(x_n^m y_n)^K}{G^{(\ell)}(x_n, y_n)} \cdot [x^K] \frac{1}{(1-x)^{c_m}} \cdot R^{(\ell)}(x). \quad (4.6)$$

When investigating (4.6) great care has to be taken. In $R^{(0)}(x)$ the term $C(x_n)/x_n^m$, which tends to infinity due to Lemma 2.1, appears. Setting $R(x) := R^{(1)}(x)$ and $F(x) := F^{(0)}(x)$ we rewrite

$$[x^{N_n}]F(x) = \frac{(x_n^m y_n)^{N_n}}{G(x_n, y_n)} \cdot [x^{N_n}] \frac{1}{(1-x)^{c_m}} \cdot \exp \left\{ \frac{C(x_n)}{x_n^m} x \right\} \cdot R(x). \quad (4.7)$$

In order to apply Lemma 2.5 we get rid of the term $R(x)$. This is achieved by using Lemma 2.4, where we need to establish uniform convergence of R as n gets large. Note that the coefficients of $F^{(\ell)}(x)$ are much easier to compute for $\ell > 1$ as the term involving $C(x_n)/x_n^m$ is absent. Nevertheless, we need uniform convergence for $R^{(\ell)}$ in this case as well.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and set*

$$Q^{(\ell)}(x) := \exp \left\{ -c_m \sum_{1 \leq j \leq \ell} \frac{x^j}{j} + \sum_{j>\ell} \frac{C(\rho^j) - c_m \rho^{jm}}{j \rho^{jm}} x^j \right\}.$$

Let $0 < \varepsilon < \rho^{-1}$. Then $R^{(\ell)}$ converges uniformly to $Q^{(\ell)}$ on $[0, \rho^{-1} - \varepsilon]$ and the radius of convergence of $Q^{(\ell)}$ is at least $\rho^{-1} > 1$. Further, there exists a sequence $(d_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ such that $|[x^k]R^{(\ell)}(x)| \leq d_k$ for all $k, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $\sum_{k \geq 0} d_k x^k < \infty$ for any $x \in [0, \rho^{-1} - \varepsilon]$.

Proof. We will use the following standard result in real analysis. Let $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be real-valued functions all defined on some closed interval $[a, b]$. Suppose that f_n is strictly monotone for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and that $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges pointwise to a continuous function f . Then the convergence is uniform. In our setting, we have that

$$R^{(\ell)}(x) = \exp \left\{ -c_m \sum_{1 \leq j \leq \ell} \frac{x^j}{j} \right\} \cdot \exp \left\{ \sum_{j>\ell} \frac{C(x_n^j) - c_m x_n^{jm}}{j x_n^{jm}} \cdot x^j \right\} =: e(x) \cdot f_n(x).$$

Clearly, if we show that $f_n(x)$ converges uniformly to some $f(x)$, then $R^{(\ell)}(x)$ converges uniformly to $e(x)f(x)$. A direct application of Lemma 2.7 yields that there exists some $A > 0$ such that

$$\log f_n(x) \leq A \sum_{j>\ell} \frac{x_n^j}{j} \leq A \sum_{j>\ell} \frac{\rho^j}{j}. \quad (4.8)$$

Hence the radius of convergence of $f_n(x)$ is at least ρ^{-1} , implying that $f_n(x)$ is defined on $[0, \rho^{-1} - \varepsilon]$ for any $0 < \varepsilon < \rho^{-1}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, f_n has only non-negative coefficients, so it is strictly increasing. Finally, (4.8) shows that by dominated convergence f_n converges pointwise to $f(x) := Q^{(\ell)}(x)/e(x)$. Since f is continuous we have proven that the convergence is uniform and the claim that $R^{(\ell)}(x)$ converges uniformly to $e(x)f(x) = Q^{(\ell)}(x)$ follows immediately.

We proceed with estimating $|[x^k]R^{(\ell)}(x)|$. Let us first note that $|[x^k]e^{-px^q}| = [x^k]e^{px^q}$ for any $p > 0$ and $k, q \in \mathbb{N}$. Further the second sum in $\ln R^{(\ell)}(x)$ involves only non-negative terms, so that

$$|[x^k]R^{(\ell)}(x)| = [x^k]R_+^{(\ell)}(x), \text{ where } R_+^{(\ell)} := \exp\left\{c_m \sum_{1 \leq j \leq \ell} \frac{x^j}{j} + \sum_{j > \ell} \frac{C(x_n^j) - c_m x_n^{jm}}{j x_n^{jm}} x^j\right\}.$$

Since $R_+^{(\ell)}(x)$ has only non-negative coefficients, we deduce from (2.16) that for all $0 < k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and setting $y = \rho^{-1} - \varepsilon/2$

$$|[x^k]R^{(\ell)}(x)| \leq R_+^{(\ell)}(y) \cdot y^{-k}.$$

Since $x_n \sim \rho$ due to Lemma 2.1 we obtain analogous to (4.8) that there is some $A_3 > 0$ such that $R_+^{(\ell)}(y) \leq A_3$. Setting $d_k := A_3 y^{-k}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ the claim is verified since $d_k(\rho^{-1} - \varepsilon)^k = A_3(\rho^{-1} - \varepsilon)^k/(\rho^{-1} - \varepsilon/2)^k$ is summable. \square

With these ingredients at hand we are able to prove Lemmas 3.5(I) and 3.5(II).

Proof of Lemma 3.5(I). Abbreviate $h_n := C(x_n)/x_n^m$ and set

$$A(x) := \frac{1}{(1-x)^{c_m}} \cdot \exp\{h_n x\} \quad \text{and} \quad R(x) := \exp\left\{-c_m x + \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{C(x_n^j) - c_m x_n^{jm}}{j x_n^{jm}} x^j\right\}.$$

With this at hand, we use (4.7) to reformulate

$$\Pr[\mathcal{P}_{N_n}] = \frac{(x_n^m y_n)^{N_n}}{G(x_n, y_n)} \cdot [x^{N_n}]A(x)R(x).$$

We will apply Lemma 2.4 to $A(x)R(x)$ and verify conditions (2.11) and (2.12) first. Set $\alpha_n := h_n/N_n$ and $\alpha_{n,k} := h_n/(N_n - k)$ for $0 \leq k < N_n$. We obtain from Lemma 4.1

$$\alpha_n = \frac{y_n C(x_n)}{y_n x_n^m} \frac{1}{N_n} \sim \frac{1}{y_n x_n^m} \sim \frac{h(n/N_n)}{h(n/N_n^*)} \cdot \lambda_n^{-(\alpha+1)}, \quad (4.9)$$

so that, again by Lemma 4.1, $\liminf \alpha_n = \rho^{-m}/\limsup y_n > 1$ and $\liminf \alpha_{n,k} > 1$, too, uniformly for $0 \leq k < N_n$. Hence, Lemma 2.5(ii) is applicable and we obtain for all k such that $N_n - k \rightarrow \infty$

$$[x^{N_n-k}]A(x) = [x^{N_n-k}] \frac{1}{(1-x)^{c_m}} e^{\alpha_{n,k}(N_n-k)x} \sim \left(\frac{1}{1-\alpha_{n,k}^{-1}}\right)^{c_m} \cdot \frac{h_n^{N_n-k}}{(N_n-k)!}. \quad (4.10)$$

This implies (2.11), i.e., for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and as $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$\frac{[x^{N_n-k}]A(x)}{[x^{N_n-k+1}]A(x)} \sim \left(\frac{1-\alpha_{n,k}^{-1}}{1-\alpha_{n,k-1}^{-1}}\right)^{c_m} \frac{N_n}{h_n} \stackrel{(4.9)}{\sim} \frac{h(n/N_n^*)}{h(n/N_n)} \cdot \lambda_n^{\alpha+1} =: \rho_n.$$

Set $\bar{\rho} := \limsup \rho_n < 1$. Due to (4.10) we have for any k such that $N_n - k \rightarrow \infty$

$$\frac{[x^{N_n-k}]A(x)}{[x^{N_n}]A(x)} \sim \left(\frac{1-\alpha_{n,k}^{-1}}{1-\alpha_{n,k}^{-1}}\right)^{c_m} \frac{N_n!}{(N_n-k)!} N_n^{-k} \left(\frac{N_n}{h_n}\right)^k \sim \left(\frac{1-\alpha_{n,k}^{-1}}{1-\alpha_{n,k}^{-1}}\right)^{c_m} \frac{N_n!}{(N_n-k)!} N_n^{-k} \rho_n^k.$$

Since $\alpha_{n,k} \geq \alpha_n$ and $N_n!/(N_n - k)!N_n^{-k} \leq 1$ we obtain for any $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\frac{[x^{N_n-k}]A(x)}{[x^{N_n}]A(x)} \leq (1 + \varepsilon)^k \rho_n^k, \quad N_n - k \text{ sufficiently large.} \quad (4.11)$$

Lemma 2.5(i) and (4.10) imply that for any k such that $N_n - k = \mathcal{O}(1)$

$$\frac{[x^{N_n-k}]A(x)}{[x^{N_n}]A(x)} \sim (1 - \alpha_n^{-1})^{c_m} \frac{N_n!}{(N_n - k)!} h_n^{-k} \sim (1 - \alpha_n^{-1})^{c_m} \frac{N_n!}{(N_n - k)!} N_n^{-k} \rho_n^k \leq \rho_n^k.$$

Again this entails that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and N_n sufficiently large

$$\frac{[x^{N_n-k}]A(x)}{[x^{N_n}]A(x)} \leq (1 + \varepsilon)^k \rho_n^k \quad \text{for } N_n - k = \mathcal{O}(1). \quad (4.12)$$

Together with (4.11) this shows that condition (2.12) is fulfilled for any $\varepsilon > 0$ as long as n is sufficiently large. Let us proceed with checking the remaining conditions of Lemma 2.4. Choose $\varepsilon > 0$ in (4.11) and (4.12) such that $a := (1 + \varepsilon)\bar{\rho} < \rho^{-1}$; this is possible, since $\bar{\rho} < 1$ and $\rho > 1$. Then the series $R(x)$ are all analytic at a by Lemma 4.3. Moreover, by the same lemma, $R(x)$ converges uniformly to

$$Q(x) := \exp \left\{ -c_m x + \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{C(\rho^j) - c_m \rho^{jm}}{j \rho^{jm}} \cdot x^j \right\}$$

in any closed subinterval of $[0, \rho^{-1})$. In particular, as $\rho^{-1} > 1$, we obtain uniform convergence on $[0, a]$. Moreover, Lemma 4.3 guarantees the existence of a sequence $(d_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ such that $|[x^k]R(x)| \leq d_k$ and $\sum_{k \geq 1} d_k a^k < \infty$. Finally $Q(\rho_n) \geq \exp\{-c_m \bar{\rho}\} > 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ so that all conditions of Lemma 2.4 are met. We deduce with a combination of (4.9) and (4.10)

$$[x^{N_n}]A(x) \cdot R(x) \sim Q(\rho_n) \cdot [x^{N_n}]A(x) \sim Q(\rho_n) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{1 - \rho_n} \right)^{c_m} \cdot \frac{h_n^{N_n}}{N_n!}.$$

Recalling (4.7) we have shown so far

$$\Pr[\mathcal{P}_{N_n}] \sim Q(\rho_n) \cdot \frac{(x_n^m y_n)^{N_n}}{G(x_n, y_n)} \left(\frac{1}{1 - \rho_n} \right)^{c_m} \cdot \frac{h_n^{N_n}}{N_n!}.$$

In what follows, we simplify this term. First note that $\rho^{-m} \rho_n \sim y_n$ by Lemma 4.1. Thus

$$\left(\frac{1}{1 - \rho_n} \right)^{c_m} \sim \exp \left\{ c_m \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{(\rho^m y_n)^j}{j} \right\}.$$

Further, recalling that $h_n := C(x_n)/x_n^m$, we obtain

$$(x_n^m y_n)^{N_n} h_n^{N_n} = (y_n C(x_n))^{N_n} \stackrel{(3.4)}{=} \left(N_n - c_m \frac{x_n^m y_n}{1 - x_n^m y_n} \right)^{N_n} \sim N_n^{N_n} \exp \left\{ -c_m \frac{\rho^m y_n}{1 - \rho^m y_n} \right\}.$$

Together with Lemma 3.4(I) this establishes the limit law

$$\Pr[\mathcal{P}_{N_n}] \sim Q(\rho^m y_n) \cdot \exp \left\{ c_m \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{(\rho^m y_n)^j}{j} \right\} \cdot \exp \left\{ - \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{C(\rho^j)}{j} y_n^j \right\} \cdot e^{-N_n} \frac{N_n^{N_n}}{N_n!} \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi N_n}},$$

as claimed. To show the second statement (3.7) we first estimate

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{j \geq 2} j P_j = K \right] \leq [x^K] \exp \left\{ \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{C(x_n^j) y_n^j}{j} x^j \right\}.$$

Applying (2.16) yields

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{j \geq 2} jP_j = K \right] \leq \exp \left\{ \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{C(x_n^j)}{j} \right\} y_n^K. \quad (4.13)$$

Further $\sum_{j \geq 2} C(x_n^j)/j \leq \sum_{j \geq 2} C(\rho^j)/j < \infty$. At the same time we observe with Lemma 2.7 that there is some $A > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{C(x_n^j) y_n^j}{j} x^j \leq A \cdot \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{(x_n^m y_n)^j}{j} x^j.$$

Since according to Lemma 4.1 we have that $\limsup x_n^m y_n \leq 1 - \varepsilon$ for some $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ we deduce that there is some $a > 1$ with $(1 - \varepsilon)a < 1$ such that by (2.16) we obtain

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{j \geq 2} jP_j = K \right] \leq \exp \left\{ A \cdot \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{((1 - \varepsilon)a)^j}{j} \right\} a^{-K},$$

finishing the proof together with (4.13). \square

Proof of Lemma 3.5(II). Abbreviate $h_n := C(x_n)/x_n^m$ and set

$$A(x) := \frac{1}{(1-x)^{c_m}} \cdot \exp \{h_n x\} \quad \text{and} \quad R(x) := \exp \left\{ -c_m x + \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{C(x_n^j) - c_m x_n^{jm}}{j x_n^{jm}} x^j \right\}.$$

Then, from (4.7) we obtain that

$$\Pr [\mathcal{P}_{N_n}] = \frac{(x_n^m y_n)^{N_n}}{G(x_n, y_n)} \cdot [x^{N_n}] A(x) \cdot R(x).$$

We will apply Lemma 2.4 to $A(x)R(x)$. Let us first verify the conditions (2.11), (2.12). Set $\alpha_n := h_n/N_n$ and $\alpha_{n,k} := h_n/(N_n - k)$. Let $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence from (4.4). Then, as stated in Lemma 4.2,

$$\alpha_n = \frac{y_n C(x_n)}{x_n^m y_n} \frac{1}{N_n} \sim a_n$$

and

$$[x^{N_n - k}] A(x) = [x^{N_n - k}] \frac{1}{(1-x)^{c_m}} e^{\alpha_{n,k} (N_n - k)x}, \quad p \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (4.14)$$

For (fixed) $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and using (4.4) we obtain that $\limsup \alpha_{n,k} = \limsup \alpha_n \leq \limsup \lambda_n^{-1} < 1$. Thus Lemma 2.5(iii) yields

$$[x^{N_n - p}] A(x) \sim \frac{((1 - \alpha_n) N_n)^{c_m - 1}}{\Gamma(c_m)} e^{h_n}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0, n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.15)$$

Hence condition (2.11) is fulfilled with $\rho_n \sim 1$ and $\bar{\rho} = \limsup \rho_n = 1$. We verify condition (2.12) as well. Let $\delta > 0$ be such that $(1 + \delta) \limsup h_n/N_n < 1$. Such a δ exists, since $\limsup h_n/N_n = \limsup \alpha_n < 1$, as we already saw before. With this at hand we split up $\{0, \dots, N_n\}$ into

$$B_1 := \{0, \dots, N_n - (1 + \delta)h_n - 1\} \quad \text{and} \quad B_2 := \{N_n - (1 + \delta)h_n, \dots, N_n\}.$$

Consider $k \in B_1$. Then $\limsup \alpha_{n,k} \leq \limsup \alpha_n N_n / ((1 + \delta)h_n) = (1 + \delta)^{-1} < 1$. Further $N_n - k \rightarrow \infty$ in this case, so that we obtain from (4.14) and Lemma 2.5(iii)

$$[x^{N_n - k}] A(x) \sim \frac{((1 - \alpha_{n,k})(N_n - k))^{c_m - 1}}{\Gamma(c_m)} e^{h_n}.$$

This leads to

$$\frac{[x^{N_n-k}]A(x)}{[x^{N_n}]A(x)} \sim \left(\frac{1-\alpha_{n,N_n-k}}{1-\alpha_n}\right)^{c_m-1} \left(1-\frac{k}{N_n}\right)^{c_m-1} = \left(1-\frac{k}{N_n(1-\alpha_n)}\right)^{c_m-1}, \quad k \in B_1.$$

If $c_m - 1 \geq 0$, then this is at most 1. If $c_m - 1 \in (-1, 0)$, then it is at most $(1 - k/N_n(1 - \alpha_n))^{-1} = 1 + k/(N_n(1 - \alpha_n) - k) \leq e^{k/(N_n(1 - \alpha_n) - k)}$. By assumption $N_n(1 - \alpha_n) - k \rightarrow \infty$, and so for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\frac{[x^{N_n-k}]A(x)}{[x^{N_n}]A(x)} \leq (1 + \varepsilon)^k, \quad k \in B_1. \quad (4.16)$$

Next consider $k \in B_2$. Set $z := 1 - h_n^{-1/2}$. Then the bound (2.16) together with (4.15) yield

$$\frac{[x^{N_n-k}]A(x)}{[x^{N_n}]A(x)} \leq \frac{(1-z)^{-c_m} \exp\{h_n z\} z^{-(N_n-k)}}{[x^{N_n}]A(x)} = \mathcal{O}\left(N_n \left(\frac{\sqrt{h_n}}{N_n}\right)^{c_m} \exp\{-\sqrt{h_n}\} z^{k-N_n}\right). \quad (4.17)$$

We further get that for any $k \in B_2$ that there exists $-h_n \leq t \leq \delta h_n$ with $N_n - k = h_n + t$ so that

$$z^{k-N_n} \leq \exp\left\{-h_n^{-1/2}(k-N_n)\right\} = \exp\left\{\sqrt{h_n} + t/\sqrt{h_n}\right\}.$$

Since $\sqrt{h_n} = o(N_n)$ we get from (4.17)

$$\frac{[x^{N_n-k}]A(x)}{[x^{N_n}]A(x)} = o\left(N_n \exp\left\{t/\sqrt{h_n}\right\}\right) = o\left(N_n \exp\left\{\delta\sqrt{N_n}\right\}\right) \quad \text{for all } k \in B_2.$$

However, since any $k \in B_2$ satisfies $k = \Omega(N_n)$, this bound is also $\leq (1 + \varepsilon)^k$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and n sufficiently large. Together with (4.16) this finally verifies condition (2.12) of Lemma 2.4 (recall that $\rho_n \sim 1$).

We show that the remaining conditions of Lemma 2.4 are satisfied as well. By applying Lemma 4.3 we obtain that $R(x)$ converges uniformly to

$$Q(x) := \exp\left\{-c_m x + \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{C(\rho^j) - c_m \rho^{jm}}{j \rho^{jm}} \cdot x^j\right\}$$

on any interval $[0, a]$ with $a < \rho^{-1}$. Since $\rho^{-1} > 1$ we may even choose $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $a = (1 + \varepsilon)\bar{\rho}$ and $1 = \bar{\rho} < a < \rho^{-1}$. Then Lemma 4.3 gives us the existence of the sequence $(d_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ with $|[x^k]R(x)| \leq d_k$ and $\sum_{k \geq 1} d_k a^k < \infty$. Finally $Q(\rho_n) \sim Q(1) > 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ so that all conditions of Lemma 2.4 are met and we deduce from (4.15)

$$\Pr[\mathcal{P}_{N_n}] \sim \frac{(x_n^m y_n)^{N_n}}{G(x_n, y_n)} \cdot Q(1) \cdot [x^{N_n}]A(x) \sim \frac{(x_n^m y_n)^{N_n}}{G(x_n, y_n)} \cdot Q(1) \cdot \frac{((1-a_n)N_n)^{c_m-1}}{\Gamma(c_m)} e^{h_n}.$$

Lemma 3.4(II) gives us (the asymptotics of) $G(x_n, y_n)$ and we obtain

$$\Pr[\mathcal{P}_{N_n}] \sim \frac{c_m^{c_m}}{(1-a_n)\Gamma(c_m)} \cdot \frac{(x_n^m y_n)^{N_n}}{N_n} \cdot e^{h_n - y_n C(x_n)}.$$

To conclude we observe by applying Lemma 4.2

$$h_n - y_n C(x_n) = \frac{C(x_n)}{x_n^m} - y_n C(x_n) = y_n C(x_n) \cdot \frac{1 - x_n^m y_n}{x_n^m y_n} = \frac{y_n C(x_n)}{S_n} \sim c_m \frac{a_n}{1 - a_n}. \quad (4.18)$$

This shows the first statement of the lemma. Next we prove the second statement (3.8). Recall that $K \equiv K_n$ is such that $K_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. From (4.6) we obtain

$$\Pr\left[\sum_{j > \ell} j P_j = K\right] = \frac{(x_n^m y_n)^K}{G^{(\ell)}(x_n, y_n)} \cdot [x^K] \frac{1}{(1-x)^{c_m}} \cdot R^{(\ell)}(x).$$

Similar to the case $\ell = 0$ we want to apply Lemma 2.4 to $(1-x)^{-c_m} R^{(\ell)}(x)$, but this time it is much easier as $(1-x)^{-c_m}$ does not depend on n . It is elementary to verify that

$$[x^K] \frac{1}{(1-x)^{c_m}} = \binom{K+c_m-1}{K} \sim \frac{K^{c_m-1}}{\Gamma(c_m)}, \quad \text{as } K \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.19)$$

Hence (2.11) is fulfilled with $\rho_n = 1$ and $\bar{\rho} := \limsup \rho_n = 1$, and the explicit form readily allows us to establish condition (2.12) as well. Moreover, Lemma 4.3 asserts that $R^{(\ell)}(x)$ converges to

$$Q^{(\ell)}(x) := \exp \left\{ -c_m \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \frac{x^i}{i} + \sum_{j > \ell} \frac{C(\rho^j) - c_m \rho^{jm}}{j \rho^{jm}} x^j \right\}$$

uniformly on any closed interval in $[0, \rho^{-m})$. Completely analogous to the case $\ell = 0$ all the remaining conditions of Lemma 2.4 are also fulfilled and we obtain that

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{j > \ell} j P_j = K \right] \sim \frac{(x_n^m y_n)^K}{G^{(\ell)}(x_n, y_n)} \cdot Q^{(\ell)}(1) \cdot \frac{K^{c_m-1}}{\Gamma(c_m)}. \quad (4.20)$$

By a similar reformulation as in the proof of Lemma 3.4(II) we derive with Lemma 4.3

$$G^{(\ell)}(x_n, y_n) \sim c_m^{-c_m} \cdot ((1-a_n) N_n)^{c_m} \cdot Q^{(\ell)}(1),$$

and plugging this into (4.20) finally establishes (3.8). \square

4.5 Proof of Lemma 3.6

In order to prove that $\Pr[R \geq r \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}]$ gets exponentially small in r as claimed in Lemma 3.6 we show as a preparation the following estimate (that is nothing else than a Chernoff-type bound).

Lemma 4.4. *Set $\Omega_n := \{(p_1, \dots, p_{N_n}) \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N_n} : p_1 + 2p_2 \dots + N_n p_{N_n} = N_n\}$ and let $\lambda > 0$ be such that $0 < \lambda < -\ln \rho/2$. Then for $(\tau_j)_{j \geq 2} := (C(x_n^j e^{\lambda j}) y_n^j / e^{\lambda j m})_{j \geq 2}$*

$$\Pr[R \geq r \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] \leq e^{-\lambda r} \cdot e^{-\sum_{2 \leq j \leq N_n} C(x_n^j y_n^j / j)} \cdot \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in \Omega_n} \frac{\Pr[P_1 = p_1]}{\Pr[\mathcal{P}_{N_n}]} \cdot \prod_{2 \leq j \leq N_n} \frac{(\tau_j / j)^{p_j}}{p_j!}, \quad r \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Proof. The choice of λ guarantees that $e^{j\lambda x_n^j} < \rho$ for all $j \geq 2$. Hence

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{\lambda j (C_{j,i} - m)} \right] = e^{-\lambda j m} \frac{\sum_{k \geq 1} c_k (x_n^j e^{\lambda j})^k}{C(x_n^j)} = \frac{C(x_n^j e^{\lambda j})}{C(x_n^j) e^{\lambda j m}}, \quad i \geq 1, j \geq 2.$$

Then by Bayes and the independence of the P_j 's

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[R \geq r \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] &= \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in \Omega_n} \Pr \left[R \geq r \mid \bigcap_{1 \leq j \leq N} \{P_j = p_j\} \right] \Pr \left[\bigcap_{1 \leq j \leq N} \{P_j = p_j\} \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n} \right] \\ &= \Pr[\mathcal{P}_{N_n}]^{-1} \cdot \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in \Omega_n} \Pr \left[\sum_{j \geq 2} j \sum_{1 \leq i \leq p_j} (C_{j,i} - m) \geq r \right] \prod_{1 \leq j \leq N_n} \Pr[P_j = p_j]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

With Markov's inequality and the independence of the $(C_{j,i})_{j \geq 1, i \geq 1}$ and $(P_j)_{j \geq 1}$ we obtain

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{j \geq 2} j \sum_{1 \leq i \leq p_j} (C_{j,i} - m) \geq r \right] \leq e^{-\lambda r} \prod_{2 \leq j \leq N_n} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\lambda j (C_{j,i} - m)} \right]^{p_j} = e^{-\lambda r} \prod_{2 \leq j \leq N_n} \left(\frac{C(x_n^j e^{\lambda j})}{C(x_n^j) e^{\lambda j m}} \right)^{p_j}.$$

By plugging this into (4.21) and using that $P_j \sim \text{Po}(C(x_n^j) y_n^j / j)$ we obtain the claimed statement. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.6 in case (I). By applying Lemma 4.4 and using that the Poisson distribution is maximised at its mean, so that $\Pr [P_1 = p_1] / \Pr [\mathcal{P}_{N_n}] \leq 1$, we obtain for some $\lambda > 0$

$$\Pr [R \geq r \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] \leq e^{-\lambda r} \cdot \sum_{p \in \Omega_n} \prod_{2 \leq j \leq N_n} \frac{(\tau_j/j)^{p_j}}{p_j!}.$$

Lemma 2.7 yields that for some $A > 0$

$$\tau_j \leq c_m (x_n^m y_n)^j (1 + A x_n^j e^{\lambda j}), \quad j \geq 2.$$

Lemma 4.1 states that there is a $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ such that $x_n^m y_n < 1 - \varepsilon$ for all sufficiently large n . We deduce that $\exp\{\sum_{2 \leq j \leq N_n} \tau_j/j\} = \exp\{\mathcal{O}(\sum_{j \geq 2} (1 - \varepsilon)^j/j)\}$ is bounded. Consequently, setting $H = \sum_{2 \leq j \leq N_n} j H_j$ with $H_j \sim \text{Po}(\tau_j/j)$ independent, we obtain for some (other) $A > 0$

$$\Pr [R \geq r \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] \leq A \cdot e^{-\lambda r} \cdot \sum_{0 \leq p \leq N_n} \Pr [H = N_n - p] \leq A \cdot e^{-\lambda r}.$$

□

Proof of Lemma 3.6 in case (II). Our starting point is Lemma 4.4 so that

$$\Pr [R \geq r \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] \leq e^{-\lambda r} \cdot \exp \left\{ - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq N_n} \frac{C(x_n^j) y_n^j}{j} \right\} \sum_{p \in \Omega_n} \frac{\Pr [P_1 = p_1]}{\Pr [\mathcal{P}_{N_n}]} \cdot \sum_{2 \leq j \leq N_n} \frac{(\tau_j/j)^{p_j}}{p_j!}$$

for $0 < \lambda < -\ln \rho/2$. Using Lemmas 4.2 and 2.7 we obtain the estimate

$$\exp \left\{ \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{C(x_n^j) y_n^j}{j} \right\} = \frac{1}{(1 - x_n^m y_n)^{c_m}} \exp \left\{ -c_m x_n^m y_n + \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{C(x_n^j) y_n^j - c_m x_n^m y_n^j}{j} \right\} = \mathcal{O}(N_n^{c_m}).$$

Next let $H_j \sim \text{Po}(\tau_j/j)$ be independent random variables for $j \geq 2$ and set $H := \sum_{2 \leq j \leq N_n} j H_j$. Abbreviate $\Upsilon := \exp\{\sum_{2 \leq j \leq N_n} \tau_j/j\}$. We obtain for some $A_1 > 0$

$$\Pr [R = r \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] \leq A_1 \cdot e^{-\lambda r} \cdot N^{-c_m} \cdot \Upsilon \cdot \sum_{0 \leq p \leq N_n} \frac{\Pr [P_1 = p]}{\Pr [\mathcal{P}_{N_n}]} \Pr [H = N_n - p]. \quad (4.22)$$

Since $(H_j)_{j \geq 2}$ are independent

$$\Pr [H = N_n - p] = \Upsilon^{-1} [x^{N_n - p}] \exp \left\{ \sum_{j \geq 2} \tau_j x^j / j \right\}. \quad (4.23)$$

In the last expression we actually have to restrict to $2 \leq j \leq N_n$; however, for all $0 \leq M \leq N_n$, $[x^M] \exp\{\sum_{2 \leq j \leq N_n} \tau_j x^j / j\} = [x^M] \exp\{\sum_{j \geq 2} \tau_j x^j / j\}$. Then

$$\exp \left\{ \sum_{j \geq 2} \tau_j x^j / j \right\} = \frac{1}{(1 - x_n^m y_n x)^{c_m}} \cdot \exp \left\{ -c_m x_n^m y_n x + \sum_{j \geq 2} (\tau_j - c_m (x_n^m y_n)^j) \frac{x^j}{j} \right\}$$

and so, for any $0 \leq M \leq N_n$

$$[x^M] \exp \left\{ \sum_{j \geq 2} \tau_j x^j / j \right\} = (x_n^m y_n)^M \cdot [x^M] \frac{1}{(1 - x)^{c_m}} \cdot \exp \left\{ -c_m x + \sum_{j \geq 2} \left(\frac{C(x_n^j e^{\lambda j})}{x_n^{j m} e^{\lambda j m}} - c_m \right) \frac{x^j}{j} \right\}.$$

With Lemma 2.7 we get a bound which holds uniformly for some $A > 0$ and all $j \geq 2$

$$0 < a_{n,j} := \frac{C(x_n^j e^{\lambda j})}{x_n^{j m} e^{\lambda j m}} - c_m \leq \frac{C(\rho^j e^{\lambda j})}{\rho^{j m} e^{\lambda j m}} - c_m \leq A(\rho e^\lambda)^j =: a_j.$$

Using the fact that for a power series f with non-negative coefficients the coefficients of $e^{f(x)}$ can get only larger if we make the coefficients of f larger we get

$$\begin{aligned} (x_n^m y_n)^{-M} [x^M] \exp \left\{ \sum_{j \geq 2} \tau_j x^j / j \right\} &\leq \sum_{m_1+m_2+m_3=M} [x^{m_1}] \frac{1}{(1-x)^{c_m}} \cdot |[x^{m_2}] e^{-c_m x}| \cdot \left| [x^{m_3}] \exp \left\{ \sum_{j \geq 2} a_{n,j} x^j / j \right\} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{m_1+m_2+m_3=M} [x^{m_1}] \frac{1}{(1-x)^{c_m}} \cdot [x^{m_2}] e^{c_m x} \cdot [x^{m_3}] \exp \left\{ \sum_{j \geq 2} a_j x^j / j \right\} \\ &= [x^M] \frac{1}{(1-x)^{c_m}} \exp \left\{ c_m x + \sum_{j \geq 2} a_j x^j / j \right\} =: [x^M] A(x) \tilde{R}(x). \end{aligned}$$

Inserting this into (4.23) we obtain $\Pr[H = N_n - p] \leq \Upsilon^{-1} (x_n^m y_n)^{N_n - p} [x^{N_n - p}] A(x) \tilde{R}(x)$. The advantage of this estimate is that \tilde{R} does not depend on n anymore. We have that, compare to (4.19), $[x^n] A(x) \sim n^{c_m - 1} / \Gamma(c_m)$ implying that $[x^{n-1}] A(x) / [x^n] A(x) \sim 1$. In addition, $\tilde{R}(1) < \infty$, as the radius of convergence of \tilde{R} is at least $(\rho e^\lambda)^{-1} > 1$. With Lemma 2.3 we consequently obtain $[x^n] A(x) \tilde{R}(x) \sim \tilde{R}(1) n^{c_m - 1} / \Gamma(c_m)$. This, on the other hand, implies that we can find a $A_2 > 0$ such that uniformly in n and $0 \leq p < N_n$

$$[x^{N_n - p}] A(x) \tilde{R}(x) \leq A_2 (N_n - p)^{c_m - 1}.$$

All in all, noting that $(x_n^m y_n)^{N_n - p} \leq 1$, we get uniformly in n and $0 \leq p < N_n$

$$\Pr[H = N_n - p] = \mathcal{O}(\Upsilon^{-1} (N_n - p)^{c_m - 1}).$$

For the case $p = N_n$ note that the probability that H equals 0 is Υ^{-1} . Putting these pieces together into (4.22) we obtain that

$$\Pr[R \geq r | \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] = \mathcal{O} \left(e^{-\lambda r} \cdot N^{-c_m} \cdot \left(\sum_{0 \leq p < N_n} \frac{\Pr[P_1 = p]}{\Pr[\mathcal{P}_{N_n}]} (N_n - p)^{c_m - 1} + \frac{\Pr[P_1 = N_n]}{\Pr[\mathcal{P}_{N_n}]} \right) \right).$$

Since according to Lemma 3.5(II) we have that $\Pr[\mathcal{P}_{N_n}] = \Theta((x_n^m y_n)^{N_n} / N_n)$ and $x_n^m y_n = 1 - \Theta(1/N_n)$ due to Lemma 4.2, we have $\Pr[\mathcal{P}_{N_n}] = \Theta(1/N_n)$. Further Lemma 4.2 yields that $\limsup y_n C(x_n) / N_n \leq \limsup \lambda_n^{-1} < 1$ so that we can estimate $\Pr[P_1 = N_n] = \exp\{-\Omega(N_n)\}$ by (2.9). Hence

$$N^{-c_m} \Pr[P_1 = N_n] / \Pr[\mathcal{P}_{N_n}] = \mathcal{O}(N_n^{1-c_m} e^{-\Omega(N_n)}) = o(1).$$

With the estimates for $\Pr[\mathcal{P}_{N_n}]$ we further obtain

$$N_n^{-c_m} \cdot \sum_{0 \leq p < N_n} \frac{\Pr[P_1 = p]}{\Pr[\mathcal{P}_{N_n}]} (N_n - p)^{c_m - 1} = \mathcal{O} \left(\sum_{0 \leq p < N_n} \Pr[P_1 = p] \left(1 - \frac{p}{N_n}\right)^{c_m - 1} \right).$$

To finish the proof we show that the latter expression is $\mathcal{O}(1)$. This is clear for $c_m \geq 1$. If $0 < c_m < 1$ we note that there is some $\delta > 0$ such that $(1+\delta) \limsup \mathbb{E}[P_1] / N_n = (1+\delta) \limsup y_n C(x_n) / N_n \leq (1+\delta) \lambda_n^{-1} < 1$ due to Lemma 4.2. Then $\sum_{0 \leq p \leq N_n / (1+\delta)} \Pr[P_1 = p] (1 - p/N_n)^{c_m - 1} \leq (1+\delta)^{1-c_m}$. For $N/(1+\delta) < p < N_n$, on the other hand, we get that $\sum_{N_n / (1+\delta) < p < N_n} \Pr[P_1 = p] (1 - p/N_n)^{c_m - 1} \leq N_n^{1-c_m} \Pr[P_1 > N_n / (1+\delta)]$. This is $e^{-\Omega(N_n)}$ by (2.9) and the proof is completed. \square

4.6 Proof of Lemma 3.7

This entire section is devoted to the proof of Lemma 3.7. First of all note that the probability generating function of $C_{1,1}$ is given by $H(x) = C(x_n x) / C(x_n)$, that is, $\Pr[C_{1,1} = k] = [x^k] H(x)$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Define $K_p := \sum_{1 \leq i \leq p} C_{1,i}$ and $\nu := x_n C'(x_n) / C(x_n)$. Then

$$\Pr[L_p = \mu_p + t\sigma_p] = \Pr[K_p = p\nu + t\sigma_p] = [x^{p\nu + t\sigma_p}] H(x)^p.$$

The tool of our choice for tackling this problem is the saddle-point method. Therefore we need appropriate bounds for H in \mathbb{C} on a circle centred at the origin with radius close to ρ ; the next lemma shows a rather diverse picture. For future reference and since we will need this often, we apply Theorem A.4 to obtain that

$$\sum_{k \geq 1} h(k) k^{\beta-1} e^{-\eta k} \sim \Gamma(\beta) h(\eta^{-1}) \eta^{-\beta} \quad \beta > 0, \text{ as } \eta \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.24)$$

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\alpha > 1, 0 < \rho < 1$. Then there exist $\eta_0 > 0, c < 1, A > 0$ such that the following is true. Let $0 < \eta < \eta_0$ and set $G(x) := C(\omega x)/C(\omega)$, where $\omega = \rho e^{-\eta}$. Then*

$$|G(e^{i\theta})| \leq 1 - \frac{\alpha}{2} \left(\frac{\theta}{\eta} \right)^2 \quad \text{for any } |\theta| \leq \eta/(24\alpha^2). \quad (4.25)$$

Moreover,

$$|G(e^{i\theta})| \leq c \quad \text{for any } \eta/(24\alpha^2) \leq |\theta| \leq \pi \quad (4.26)$$

and

$$|G(e^{i\theta})| \leq A \cdot \max\{\eta/|\theta|, \eta\} \quad \text{for any } \eta \leq |\theta| \leq \pi. \quad (4.27)$$

Proof. We start with showing the first bound. Recall the basic inequalities

$$\cos(x) \leq 1 - x^2/2 + x^4/24 \quad \text{and} \quad \sin(x) \leq |x|, \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

that we will use more than once in the proof. Let $\delta_1 \in (0, 1)$. Let R denote the real part of $G(e^{i\theta})$. Then, using (4.24), for $\eta > 0$ sufficiently small,

$$R = \frac{1}{C(\omega)} \sum_{k \geq 1} c_k \rho^k e^{-\eta k} \cos(\theta k) \leq 1 - (1 - \delta_1) \frac{(\alpha + 1)\alpha}{2} \left(\frac{\theta}{\eta} \right)^2 + \frac{(\alpha + 3)(\alpha + 2)(\alpha + 1)\alpha}{12} \left(\frac{\theta}{\eta} \right)^4.$$

Further, if $|\theta| \leq ((\alpha + 3)(\alpha + 2))^{-1/2} \sqrt{\delta_1} \eta$,

$$R \leq 1 - (1 - 2\delta_1) \frac{(\alpha + 1)\alpha}{2} \left(\frac{\theta}{\eta} \right)^2.$$

Moreover, consider the imaginary part I of $G(e^{i\theta})$. Then we obtain with (4.24) that for $\eta > 0$ sufficiently small

$$I^2 = \frac{1}{C(\omega)^2} \left(\sum_{k \geq 1} c_k \rho^k e^{-\eta k} \sin(\theta k) \right)^2 \leq (1 + \delta_1) \alpha^2 \cdot \left(\frac{\theta}{\eta} \right)^2.$$

Combining these bounds yields for $\delta_1 > 0$ and $|\theta| \leq ((\alpha + 3)(\alpha + 2))^{-1/2} \sqrt{\delta_1} \eta$ that

$$|G(e^{i\theta})|^2 = R^2 + I^2 \leq 1 - \left((1 - 2\delta_1)\alpha - 3\delta_1\alpha^2 \right) \left(\frac{\theta}{\eta} \right)^2 + (\alpha + 1)^2 \alpha^2 \left(\frac{\theta}{\eta} \right)^4.$$

Then, as $|\theta| \leq ((\alpha + 3)(\alpha + 2))^{-1/2} \sqrt{\delta_1} \eta \leq \sqrt{\delta_1} \eta / (\alpha + 1)$, we obtain

$$|G(e^{i\theta})|^2 \leq 1 - \left((1 - 2\delta_1)\alpha - 4\delta_1\alpha^2 \right) \left(\frac{\theta}{\eta} \right)^2.$$

Choosing $\delta_1 = 1/(4 + 8\alpha)$ yields $|G(e^{i\theta})| \leq 1 - \alpha(\theta/\eta)^2/2$, as claimed and being very generous in the bound for θ . Note that for $\alpha > 1$ we have $1/(24\alpha^2) \leq \sqrt{\delta_1}/\sqrt{(\alpha + 2)(\alpha + 3)} \leq \sqrt{\delta_1}/(\alpha + 1)$ so that (4.25) follows.

We continue with the proof of (4.26). Here we will use a basic trick that was used in similar forms already long ago, see [18], where $|G(e^{i\theta})|$ is related to the sum of the differences of consecutive terms. Here we use the following construction. Note that

$$(1 - e^{-\eta} e^{i\theta}) G(e^{i\theta}) = \frac{1}{C(\omega)} \sum_{k \geq 1} e^{i\theta k - \eta k} (\rho^k c_k - \rho^{k-1} c_{k-1}).$$

Note that $\rho^{-1}c_{k-1}/c_k = h(k-1)/h(k) \cdot (1-k^{-1})^{\alpha-1} \leq (1-k^{-1})^{\alpha-1+o(1)}$ due to (A.2). Accordingly, since $\alpha > 1$, we have for sufficiently large k that $\rho^{-1}c_{k-1} \leq c_k$. Let $\delta > 0$. Then, using (A.2), whenever k is sufficiently large,

$$|\rho^k c_k - \rho^{k-1} c_{k-1}| = \rho^k c_k \left(1 - \frac{\rho^{-1} c_{k-1}}{c_k}\right) = \rho^k c_k \left(1 - \frac{h(k-1)}{h(k)} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{\alpha-1}\right) \leq \rho^k c_k \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^{\alpha-1+\delta}\right).$$

Note that $(1-x)^a \geq 1 - (1+\delta)ax$ for any $a, \delta > 0$ and x sufficiently small. We thus obtain for sufficiently large k that

$$|\rho^k c_k - \rho^{k-1} c_{k-1}| \leq \frac{\alpha - 1 + \delta(\alpha + \delta)}{k} \rho^k c_k.$$

Using this and the triangle inequality we obtain that for any $\delta > 0$ there is some $K \in \mathbb{N}$ and $d > 0$ such that

$$|G(e^{i\theta})| \leq \frac{1}{C(\omega)|1 - e^{-\eta}e^{i\theta}|} \left((\alpha - 1 + \delta(\alpha + \delta)) \sum_{k \geq K} e^{-\eta k} \frac{\rho^k c_k}{k} + d \right). \quad (4.28)$$

A simple calculation reveals that

$$|1 - e^{-\eta}e^{i\theta}|^2 = 1 + e^{-2\eta} - 2e^{-\eta} \cos(\theta).$$

Since $|\theta| \in [\eta/24\alpha^2, \pi]$ the cos is maximized for $|\theta| = \eta/24\alpha^2$; using $e^{-x} = 1 - x + x^2/2 + \mathcal{O}(x^3)$ and $\cos(x) = 1 - x^2/2 + \mathcal{O}(x^4)$ for $x \rightarrow 0$ and abbreviating $a = 2(24\alpha^2)^2$ we get for sufficiently small η

$$\begin{aligned} |1 - e^{-\eta}e^{i\theta}|^2 &\geq 1 + e^{-2\eta} - 2e^{-\eta} \cos(\eta/24\alpha^2) \\ &= 1 + (1 - 2\eta + 2\eta^2) - 2(1 - \eta + \eta^2/2)(1 - \eta^2/a) + \mathcal{O}(\eta^3) \\ &= (1 + 2/a)\eta^2 + \mathcal{O}(\eta^3) \\ &\geq (1 + 1/a)\eta^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.29)$$

Moreover, since $\alpha > 1$ and using (4.24) as $\eta \rightarrow 0$

$$\sum_{k \geq K} e^{-\eta k} \frac{\rho^k c_k}{k} \leq \sum_{k \geq 1} e^{-\eta k} \frac{\rho^k c_k}{k} \sim \Gamma(\alpha - 1)h(\eta^{-1})\eta^{-\alpha+1}.$$

All in all, if $\alpha > 1$ and using the latter inequality as well as $C(\omega) \sim \Gamma(\alpha)h(\eta^{-1})\eta^{-\alpha}$ we obtain by plugging in (4.29) into (4.28) that for any $\delta > 0$ and η sufficiently small

$$|G(e^{i\theta})| \leq (1 + \delta) \frac{\alpha - 1 + \delta(\alpha + \delta)}{\Gamma(\alpha)h(\eta^{-1})\eta^{-\alpha}} \cdot \frac{\Gamma(\alpha - 1)h(\eta^{-1})\eta^{-\alpha+1}}{(1 + 1/a)^{1/2}\eta} \leq \frac{1 + \delta(1 + (\alpha + \delta)/(\alpha - 1))}{(1 + 1/a)^{1/2}}. \quad (4.30)$$

Since $\delta > 0$ was arbitrary and $a > 0$ the claim in (4.26) is established by choosing δ sufficiently small.

We complete the proof by showing (4.27). Note that there is a constant $b > 0$ such that for all $0 \leq x \leq \pi$

$$|e^{-x} - (1 - x)| \leq bx^2 \quad \text{and} \quad |\cos(x) - (1 - x^2/2)| \leq bx^4.$$

Applying this to any occurrence of e^x and $\cos(x)$ below we obtain that there is a $b > 0$ such that for all $|\theta| \leq \pi$ and η sufficiently small

$$||1 - e^{-\eta}e^{i\theta}|^2 - \theta^2| = |(1 + e^{-2\eta} - 2e^{-\eta} \cos(\theta)) - \theta^2| \leq b(\eta^2 + \eta\theta^2 + \theta^4).$$

In particular, if $|\theta| \geq \eta$ we obtain that

$$||1 - e^{-\eta}e^{i\theta}|^2 - \theta^2| \leq 3b\theta^4.$$

Especially, if $|\theta| \leq (6b)^{-1/2}$, then $|1 - e^{-\eta}e^{i\theta}|^2 \geq \theta^2/2$. Moreover, since $|1 - e^{-\eta}e^{i\theta}|^2$ is monotone increasing for $\theta \in [0, \pi]$ we obtain $|1 - e^{-\eta}e^{i\theta}|^2 \geq (12b)^{-1}$ for all $|\theta| \geq (6b)^{-1/2}$. Using these two last statements instead of (4.29) in (4.28) we arrive similarly to (4.30) at the desired estimate (4.27). \square

The previous statement applies only when $\alpha > 1$. To handle the case $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ we show the following property, which establishes that summing up iid random variables with probability generating function $G(x)$ sufficiently often we obtain a random variable based on the modified sequence $\tilde{c}_n = \tilde{h}(n)n^{\tilde{\alpha}-1}\rho^n$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ where \tilde{h} is slowly varying and $\tilde{\alpha} > 1$. With this trick we will be able to apply Lemma 4.5 even in the case $0 < \alpha \leq 1$.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $\alpha > 0$, $0 < \rho < 1$. Let $s \in \mathbb{N}$ and $Y_s := \sum_{1 \leq i \leq s} X_i$ where X_1, X_2, \dots are iid with probability generating function $G(x) = C(\omega x)/C(\omega)$, where $\omega = \rho e^{-\eta}$. Then there exists a eventually positive, continuous and slowly varying function \tilde{h} such that*

$$\Pr[Y_s = n] = \frac{\tilde{h}(n)n^{s\alpha-1}e^{-\eta n}}{C(\omega)^k}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Proof. Let $\alpha' = \ell\alpha$ for some $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and set $\beta = \alpha - 1$ as well as $\beta' = \alpha' - 1$. Let f be an eventually positive slowly varying function. We will show that

$$S := \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} f(k)k^{\beta'} \cdot h(n-k)(n-k)^\beta = \tilde{h}(n)n^{\beta'+\beta+1} \quad (4.31)$$

for some slowly varying \tilde{h} and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\tilde{h}(n) \sim I(\beta') \cdot f(n)h(n)$ for $I(\beta') = \int_0^1 x^{\beta'}(1-x)^\beta dx$. Then the claimed statement follows readily by induction. In order to see (4.31) let $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary and consider the (*middle*) sum

$$M := \sum_{k=\varepsilon n}^{(1-\varepsilon)n} f(k)k^{\beta'} \cdot h(n-k)(n-k)^\beta = f(n)h(n)n^{\beta'+\beta} \sum_{k=\varepsilon n}^{(1-\varepsilon)n} \frac{f(k)}{f(n)} \frac{h(n-k)}{h(n)} \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^{\beta'} \left(1 - \frac{k}{n}\right)^\beta.$$

By applying the Uniform Convergence Theorem A.1 we obtain that $f(k)/f(n)$ and $h(n-k)/h(n)$ both tend to 1 for any $k \in \{\varepsilon n, \dots, (1-\varepsilon)n\}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Further note that

$$\frac{1}{(1-2\varepsilon)n+2} \sum_{k=\varepsilon n}^{(1-\varepsilon)n} \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^{\beta'} \left(1 - \frac{k}{n}\right)^\beta$$

is a Riemann sum of $I_\varepsilon := \int_\varepsilon^{1-\varepsilon} x^{\beta'}(1-x)^\beta dx \in \mathbb{R}$. As $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary and $I_0 < \infty$

$$M \sim I_\varepsilon \cdot f(n)h(n)n^{\beta'+\beta+1}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.32)$$

Next consider the (*tail*) sum. With (A.3), Corollary A.3 and $h(\varepsilon n) \sim h(n)$ as well as $f(\varepsilon n) \sim f(n)$ we obtain

$$T := \sum_{k=1}^{\varepsilon n} f(k)k^{\beta'} \cdot h(n-k)(n-k)^\beta \leq \sup_{(1-\varepsilon)n \leq k \leq n} h(k)k^{\beta'} \cdot \sum_{k=1}^{\varepsilon n} f(k)k^{\beta'} = \varepsilon^{\beta'+1} \cdot \mathcal{O}\left(f(n)h(n)n^{\beta'+\beta+1}\right).$$

Analogously, consider the remaining terms

$$T' := \sum_{t=1}^{\varepsilon n} f(n-k)(n-k)^{\beta'} \cdot h(k)k^\beta = \varepsilon^{\beta'+1} \cdot \mathcal{O}\left(f(n)h(n)n^{\beta'+\beta+1}\right).$$

Comparing the estimates for T and T' with (4.32) and letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ we see that $S \sim I_0 f(n)h(n)n^{\beta'+\beta+1}$. Moreover, we readily see that $\tilde{h}(n) = I_0 \cdot f(n)h(n) + o(f(n)h(n))$, which is obviously slowly varying as f, h are. □

Combining all these statements we are finally able to prove Lemma 3.7.

Proof of Lemma 3.7. For the ease of reading we repeat some definitions. For $p \in \mathbb{N}$ let $K_p := \sum_{1 \leq i \leq p} C_{1,i}$ and define $\nu := \mathbb{E}[C_{1,i}] = x_n C'(x_n)/C(x_n)$. Further we need $\sigma_p^2 := \text{Var}[K_p] = p(x_n^2 C''(x_n)/C(x_n) - \nu + \nu^2)$. Then (3.12),(3.13) assert that $\nu \sim \alpha \chi_n^{-1}$ and $\sigma_p^2 \sim \alpha p \chi_n^{-2}$. We will use these properties several times without explicitly referencing them. Set $M := p\nu + t\sigma_p$. Then

$$\Pr[L_p = \mu_p + t\sigma_p] = \Pr[K_p = M] = [z^M]H(z)^p, \quad H(z) = \frac{C(x_n z)}{C(x_n)}.$$

With Cauchy's integral formula, where we integrate over an arbitrary closed curve encircling the origin,

$$\Pr[L_p = \mu_p + t\sigma_p] = \frac{C(x_n)^{-p}}{2\pi i} \oint e^{f(z)} \frac{dz}{z}, \quad f(z) = p \ln C(x_n z) - M \ln z. \quad (4.33)$$

Since we will need that several times, let us note that

$$\begin{aligned} f'(z) &= p \frac{x_n C'(x_n z)}{C(x_n z)} - \frac{M}{z}, & f''(z) &= p \left(\frac{x_n^2 C''(x_n z)}{C(x_n z)} - \left(\frac{x_n C'(x_n z)}{C(x_n z)} \right)^2 \right) + \frac{M}{z^2} \quad \text{and} \\ f'''(z) &= p \left(\frac{x_n^3 C'''(x_n z)}{C(x_n z)} - 3 \frac{x_n^3 C''(x_n z) C'(x_n z)}{C(x_n z)^2} + \left(\frac{x_n C'(x_n z)}{C(x_n z)} \right)^3 \right) - 2 \frac{M}{z^3}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.34)$$

The subsequent proof follows a very clear route that is strewn with several technical statements (as it is typical in this area). These statements, which have self-contained proofs are clearly marked, and the proofs are presented at the end of the section. We have in mind to apply the saddle-point method, that is, we will split the integral in (4.33) up into one dominating part, where a quadratic expansion of $f(z)$ is valid, and one negligible part. To this end, consider the saddle-point equation

$$f'(z) = 0 \Leftrightarrow p \frac{x_n z C'(x_n z)}{C(x_n z)} = M. \quad (4.35)$$

This equation has obviously a unique solution that we call $w \equiv w(n, p, t)$, the saddle-point. Note that $w = 1$ if $t = 0$. We claim that in general w satisfies

$$w = e^\xi, \quad \text{where} \quad \xi = t\sigma_p^{-1} + \xi_1, \quad \xi_1 = \mathcal{O}(t^2 p^{-1} \chi_n) \quad (\text{SaddleAsym})$$

uniformly for all $t = o(p^{1/6})$; the self-contained proof is at the end of the section. We proceed by specifying in (4.33) the curve over which integrate. We choose the simplest curve that passes the saddle point, i.e., the circle with radius w . By switching to polar coordinates

$$\frac{C(x_n)^{-p}}{2\pi i} \oint e^{f(z)} \frac{dz}{z} = \frac{C(x_n)^{-p}}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} e^{f(w e^{i\theta})} d\theta. \quad (4.36)$$

In the next step we study $f(w e^{i\theta})$ by considering the Taylor series around $\theta = 0$. Then $f'(w) = 0$ guarantees that $f(w e^{i\theta}) = f(w) - w^2 f''(w) \theta^2 / 2 + R$ for some remainder R that should be negligible in an appropriate interval around 0. Let us substantiate this. Set for the remainder of the proof

$$\eta := \chi_n - \xi \sim \chi_n, \quad \theta_0 := p^{-1/2+\varepsilon} \eta \text{ for some } 0 < \varepsilon < 1/6.$$

By applying (4.24) to (4.34) we obtain

$$f''(w) \sim \alpha p \eta^{-2} = \Theta(p \eta^{-2}) \quad \text{and} \quad f'''(w) = \mathcal{O}(p \eta^{-3}), \quad (4.37)$$

so that the saddle-point heuristic $f''(w) \theta_0^2 = \omega(1)$ and $f'''(w) \theta_0^3 = o(1)$ is fulfilled. We claim that a Gaussian expansion holds for $f(w e^{i\theta})$ as $\eta \rightarrow 0$ uniformly in $|\theta| < \theta_0$, that is, for $t = o(p^{1/6})$,

$$f(w e^{i\theta}) = f(w) - w^2 f''(w) \theta^2 / 2 + o(1), \quad (\text{GaussExp})$$

the proof of which is at the end of this section. With this at hand, we split up (4.36) into the integral over the – as we will establish, dominant – arc $\{we^{i\theta} : -\theta_0 \leq \theta \leq \theta_0\}$ and the remainder, i.e.,

$$\Pr[L_p = \mu_p + t\sigma_p] = \frac{C(x_n)^{-p}}{2\pi i} \oint e^{f(z)} \frac{dz}{z} = \frac{C(x_n)^{-p}}{2\pi} \left(\int_{-\theta_0}^{\theta_0} + \int_{\theta_0 \leq |\theta| \leq \pi} \right) e^{f(we^{i\theta})} d\theta =: I_1 + I_2. \quad (4.38)$$

We start with I_1 . Since θ_0 is such that $\theta_0^2 f''(w) \rightarrow \infty$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-y^2/2} dy = \sqrt{2\pi}$ we obtain due to (GaussExp)

$$I_1 \sim \frac{C(x_n)^{-p}}{2\pi} \int_{-\theta_0}^{\theta_0} e^{f(w) - w^2 f''(w) \frac{\theta^2}{2}} d\theta \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left(\frac{C(x_n w)}{C(x_n)} \right)^p w^{-M} \frac{1}{\sqrt{w^2 f''(w)}}. \quad (4.39)$$

We claim that for $t = o(p^{1/6})$ the first order of I_1 – the alleged dominating integral – satisfies

$$I_1 \sim e^{-t^2/2} (2\pi w^2 f''(w))^{-1/2}. \quad (\text{DomInt})$$

Due to (4.37) and using that $w \sim 1$ as well as $\eta \sim \chi_n$ we obtain that $w^2 f''(w) \sim \alpha p \chi_n^{-2} \sim \sigma_p^2$. Plugging this into (DomInt) we conclude that

$$I_1 \sim e^{-t^2/2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} \sigma_p} \sim e^{-t^2/2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{\chi_n}{\sqrt{p\alpha}}.$$

This establishes the claimed first order asymptotic of $\Pr[K_p = M] = \Pr[L_p = \mu_p + t\sigma_p]$. Hence, to finish the proof, we need to show that I_2 in (4.38) is negligible compared to I_1 . We first reformulate

$$I_2 = \left(\frac{C(x_n w)}{C(x_n)} \right)^p w^{-M} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\theta_0 \leq |\theta| \leq \pi} G(e^{i\theta})^p e^{-i\theta M} d\theta, \quad G(y) = \frac{C(x_n w y)}{C(x_n w)}. \quad (4.40)$$

In light of (4.39) and (4.37), in order to show that $I_2 = o(I_1)$ we just need to show that

$$\left| \int_{\theta_0}^{\pi} G(e^{i\theta})^p e^{-i\theta M} d\theta \right| = o\left(\eta p^{-1/2}\right). \quad (4.41)$$

We first consider the case $\alpha > 1$. With Lemma 4.5 we obtain that there are $c < 1, A, b > 0$ such that

$$|G(e^{i\theta})| \leq \begin{cases} 1 - \alpha (\theta/\eta)^2 / 2, & \theta \leq b\eta \\ c, & \theta \geq b\eta \\ A \max\{\eta/|\theta|, \eta\}, & \theta = \omega(\eta) \end{cases}. \quad (4.42)$$

Applying the triangle inequality yields

$$\left| \int_{\theta_0}^{\pi} G(e^{i\theta})^p e^{-i\theta M} d\theta \right| \leq \left(\int_{\theta_0}^{b\eta} + \int_{b\eta}^{\min\{\pi, \eta \ln p\}} + \int_{\min\{\pi, \eta \ln p\}}^{\pi} \right) |G(e^{i\theta})|^p d\theta =: R_1 + R_2 + R_3.$$

Due to (4.41) all that is left to show in order to obtain $I_2 = o(I_1)$ is

$$R_i = o\left(\eta p^{-1/2}\right), \quad i = 1, 2, 3. \quad (4.43)$$

Applying the first inequality of (4.42) and $1 - x \leq e^{-x}$ for sufficiently small $x > 0$ entails that

$$R_1 \leq \int_{\theta_0}^{b\eta} \exp\left\{-\frac{p\alpha}{2} \left(\frac{\theta}{\eta}\right)^2\right\} d\theta = \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{p\alpha}} \int_{\sqrt{\alpha p \varepsilon}}^{b\sqrt{\alpha p^{1/2}}} e^{-t^2/2} dx = o\left(\eta p^{-1/2}\right)$$

showing (4.43) for $i = 1$. We proceed to R_2 , where we apply the second inequality in (4.42) to obtain

$$R_2 \leq \eta \ln p \cdot c^p = (\eta p^{-1/2}) \cdot (p^{1/2} \ln p \cdot c^p).$$

Since $0 < c < 1$ this expression is $o(\eta p^{-1/2})$. For the remaining case we apply the third inequality in (4.42) to obtain that

$$R_3 \leq \left(\int_{\min\{1, \eta \ln p\}}^1 + \int_1^\pi \right) |G(e^{i\theta})|^p d\theta \leq (A\eta)^p \int_{\min\{1, \eta \ln p\}}^1 \theta^{-p} d\theta + \pi \cdot (C\eta)^p. \quad (4.44)$$

Then, as $p \rightarrow \infty$,

$$0 \leq (A\eta)^p \int_{\eta \ln p}^1 \theta^{-p} d\theta = (A\eta)^p \left[-\frac{\theta^{-p+1}}{p} \right]_{\eta \ln p}^1 \leq \frac{A^p \eta (\ln p)^{-p+1}}{p} \leq \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{p}} \cdot \left(\frac{A}{\ln p} \right)^p = o(\eta p^{-1/2}).$$

Hence all the terms on the right hand side of (4.44) are in $o(\eta p^{-1/2})$ validating (4.43) for $i = 3$. We have just demonstrated the validity of (4.43) for $i = 1, 2, 3$ and thus the assertion of Lemma 3.7 is fully proven for $\alpha > 1$.

In the case $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ we need to apply a trick in order to be able to make use of Lemma 4.5. Instead of (4.40) we write for some $s \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $s\alpha > 1$

$$I_2 = \left(\frac{C(x_n w)}{C(x_n)} \right)^p w^{-M} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\theta_0}^\pi G(e^{i\theta})^{p/s} e^{-i\theta M} d\theta, \quad G(y) = \left(\frac{C(x_n w y)}{C(x_n w)} \right)^s.$$

Now $G(y)$ is the generating function of a sum Y_s of s iid random variables with probability generating function $C(x_n w y)/C(x_n w)$. Hence we know from Lemma 4.6 that Y_s has probability generating function $\tilde{C}(x_n w y)/\tilde{C}(x_n w)$, where the coefficients of \tilde{C} are given by

$$\tilde{c}_n = \tilde{h}(n) n^{s\alpha-1} \rho^{-n}, \quad \tilde{h} \text{ eventually positive, continuous and slowly varying.}$$

As $s\alpha > 1$ this is exactly the setting considered in Lemma 4.5 so that adapting the proof after (4.41) is straightforward.

Proof of (SaddleAsym). Define for some (large) constant $A > 0$ the quantities $\xi_\pm = t\sigma_p^{-1} \pm A \cdot t^2 p^{-1} \chi_n$ and note that $x_n e^{\xi_\pm} = \rho e^{-\chi_n + \mathcal{O}(t\chi_n/\sqrt{p})} < \rho$. We will show that $f'(e^{\xi_-}) < 0 < f'(e^{\xi_+})$, from which (SaddleAsym) follows immediately by the continuity of f' . To this end we compute the Taylor series of $x_n z C'(x_n z)/C(x_n z)$ around $z = 1$. Let $\beta > 0$ such that $x_n e^\beta < \rho$. Then we obtain that there is some $|\delta| \in [0, \beta]$ such that

$$\frac{x_n e^\beta C'(x_n e^\beta)}{C(x_n e^\beta)} = \nu + \frac{\sigma_p^2}{p} (e^\beta - 1) + R(\delta, e^\beta), \quad R(\delta, e^\beta) := \frac{d^2}{dz^2} \frac{x_n z C'(x_n z)}{C(x_n z)} \Big|_{z=e^\delta} \frac{(e^\beta - 1)^2}{2}.$$

Hence, there are $|\delta_\pm| \in [0, \xi_\pm]$ such that plugging $\beta = \xi_\pm$ into the previous equation yields

$$p \frac{x_n e^{\xi_\pm} C'(x_n e^{\xi_\pm})}{C(x_n e^{\xi_\pm})} = M \pm At^2 \sigma_p^2 p^{-1} \chi_n + \mathcal{O}(t^2) + pR(\delta_\pm, e^{\xi_\pm}). \quad (4.45)$$

Moreover,

$$R(\delta_\pm, e^{\xi_\pm}) = \Theta \left(\frac{C'''(x_n e^{\delta_\pm})}{C(x_n e^{\delta_\pm})} + \frac{C''(x_n e^{\delta_\pm}) C'(x_n e^{\delta_\pm})}{C(x_n e^{\delta_\pm})^2} + \frac{C'(x_n e^{\delta_\pm})^3}{C(x_n e^{\delta_\pm})^3} \right) \cdot \xi_\pm^2,$$

where, crucially, the constants implicit in Θ do not depend on A . Using (4.24) and since $|\delta_\pm| \leq |\xi_\pm| = o(\chi_n)$ we get that

$$pR(\delta_\pm, e^{\xi_\pm}) = \mathcal{O}(p\chi_n^{-3} \cdot \xi_\pm^2) = \mathcal{O}(p\chi_n^{-3} \cdot t^2 \sigma_p^{-2}) = \mathcal{O}(\chi_n^{-1} t^2).$$

Moreover, since $1 = o(\sigma_p^2 p^{-1} \chi_n)$ we obtain from (4.45)

$$p \frac{x_n e^{\xi_\pm} C'(x_n e^{\xi_\pm})}{C(x_n e^{\xi_\pm})} = M \pm At^2 \chi_n^{-1} + \mathcal{O}(\chi_n^{-1} t^2),$$

where, again, the constant in \mathcal{O} does not depend on A . So, we may choose A large enough such that for ξ_+ this expression is $> M$ and for ξ_- it is $< M$. Together with $f'(z) = px_n C'(x_n z)/C(x_n z) - M/z$ we have thus established $f'(e^{\xi_-}) < 0 < f'(e^{\xi_+})$, as claimed.

Proof of (GaussExp). By applying Taylor's theorem we obtain that for every $|\theta| \leq \theta_0$ there is a $|\zeta| \leq |\theta|$ such that

$$f(we^{i\theta}) = f(w) - w^2 f''(w) \frac{\theta^2}{2} + (w^3 f'''(we^{i\zeta}) + 2w^2 f''(we^{i\zeta}) + w f'(we^{i\zeta})) \frac{(i\theta)^3}{6}. \quad (4.46)$$

To show that the terms involving ζ are $o(1)$, we claim that

$$|C(x_n we^{i\zeta})| \sim C(x_n w). \quad (4.47)$$

With this at hand, and as C and all its derivatives have only non-negative coefficients,

$$|\theta|^3 |w^3 f'''(we^{i\zeta}) + 2w^2 f''(we^{i\zeta}) + w f'(we^{i\zeta})| = |\theta|^3 p \cdot \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{C'''(x_n w)}{C(x_n w)} + \frac{C''(x_n w) C'(x_n w)}{C(x_n w)^2} + \frac{C'(x_n w)^3}{C(x_n w)^3} \right).$$

Applying (4.24) and using that $|\zeta| \leq |\theta| \leq \theta_0 = p^{-1/2+\varepsilon} \eta$ we obtain that the last term is $\mathcal{O}(\theta_0^3 p \cdot \eta^{-3}) = \mathcal{O}(p^{-1/2+3\varepsilon})$ and, since $\varepsilon < 1/6$, we are done with the proof of (GaussExp). All is left to show is (4.47). Clearly, $|C(x_n we^{i\zeta})| \leq C(x_n w)$ since C has only non-negative coefficients. Let $A > 0$ be a (large) constant. For $1 \leq k \leq A\eta^{-1}$ we obtain that $k\zeta = o(1)$ for $|\zeta| \leq \theta_0 = o(\eta)$ so that in this regime $\cos(\zeta k) \sim 1$. Thus

$$|C(x_n we^{i\zeta})| \geq \left| \sum_{k \geq 1} c_k (x_n w)^k \cos(\zeta k) \right| \sim |C(x_n w) - R_0 + R_1|, \quad R_i = \sum_{k > A\eta^{-1}} c_k (x_n w)^k \cos(\zeta k)^i, \quad i = 0, 1.$$

We estimate for $i = 0, 1$ and assisted by (A.3)

$$\begin{aligned} |R_i| &\leq \sum_{k \geq A\eta^{-1}} h(k) k^{\alpha-1} e^{-\eta k} \leq \sum_{k \geq A\eta^{-1}} \sup_{\ell \geq A\eta^{-1}} h(\ell) \ell^{-1} \cdot k^\alpha e^{-\eta k} \\ &\sim \frac{h(A\eta^{-1})}{A\eta^{-1}} \cdot \eta^{-\alpha} \cdot \sum_{k \geq A\eta^{-1}} (k\eta)^\alpha e^{-\eta k} \sim A^{-1} h(\eta^{-1}) \eta^{-\alpha} \int_A^\infty x^\alpha e^{-x} dx. \end{aligned}$$

The integral in the previous display is finite and so, letting $A \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain that $|R_i| = o(h(\eta^{-1}) \eta^{-\alpha}) = o(C(x_n w))$. It follows that $|C(x_n we^{i\zeta})| \sim C(x_n w)$, that is, (4.47) is valid which finishes the proof.

Proof of (DomInt). We need to show that

$$\left(\frac{C(x_n w)}{C(x_n)} \right)^p w^{-M} \sim e^{-t^2/2}.$$

Keeping in mind that $w = e^\xi$ we have due to a standard Taylor expansion of $C(x_n z)/C(x_n)$ around $z = 1$ that there is $\delta_1 \in [0, \xi]$ such that

$$\frac{C(x_n w)}{C(x_n)} = 1 + \frac{x_n C'(x_n)}{C(x_n)} (e^\xi - 1) + \frac{x_n^2 C''(x_n)}{C(x_n)} \frac{(e^\xi - 1)^2}{2} + R', \quad R' := \frac{x_n^3 C'''(x_n e^{\delta_1})}{C(x_n)} \frac{(e^\xi - 1)^3}{6}. \quad (4.48)$$

Since $|\delta_1| \leq |\xi| = o(\chi_n)$, we obtain by applying Lemma 2.1 that $R' = \mathcal{O}(\xi^3 \chi_n^{-3}) = o(p^{-1})$ for $t = o(p^{1/6})$. Further, we obtain with Lemma 2.1 that for $t = o(p^{1/6})$

$$\frac{x_n C'(x_n)}{C(x_n)} \xi^3 = o(p^{-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{x_n^2 C''(x_n)}{C(x_n)} \xi^3 = o(p^{-1}).$$

Hence we may rewrite (4.48) to

$$\frac{C(x_n w)}{C(x_n)} = 1 + \xi \frac{x_n C'(x_n)}{C(x_n)} + \frac{\xi^2}{2} \frac{x_n C''(x_n)}{C(x_n)} + \frac{\xi^2}{2} \frac{x_n^2 C'''(x_n)}{C(x_n)} + o(p^{-1}).$$

All the terms involving ξ in the latter equation are $o(1)$ for $t = o(p^{1/6})$. With this at hand, we obtain for such t

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{C(x_n w)}{C(x_n)}\right)^p &= \exp \left\{ p \ln \left(1 + \xi \frac{x_n C'(x_n)}{C(x_n)} + \frac{\xi^2 x_n C'(x_n)}{2 C(x_n)} + \frac{\xi^2 x_n^2 C''(x_n)}{2 C(x_n)} + o(p^{-1}) \right) \right\} \\ &\sim \exp \left\{ p \xi \frac{x_n C'(x_n)}{C(x_n)} + p \frac{\xi^2}{2} \left(\frac{x_n^2 C''(x_n)}{C(x_n)} - \left(\frac{x_n C'(x_n)}{C(x_n)} \right)^2 \right) \right\} = \exp \{ \xi p \nu + \xi^2 \sigma_p^2 / 2 \}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, recalling that $M = p\nu + t\sigma_p$,

$$\left(\frac{C(x_n w)}{C(x_n)}\right)^p w^{-M} \sim \exp \{ \xi p \nu + \xi^2 \sigma_p^2 / 2 - \xi(p\nu + t\sigma_p) \} = \exp \{ \xi^2 \sigma_p^2 / 2 - \xi t \sigma_p \}.$$

Next we replace ξ by the expressions given in [\(SaddleAsym\)](#) to obtain

$$\xi^2 \sigma_p^2 / 2 = t^2 / 2 + \mathcal{O}(t^4 p^{-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \xi t \sigma_p = t^2 + \mathcal{O}(t^3 p^{-1/2}).$$

For $t = o(p^{1/6})$ both \mathcal{O} -terms vanish and [\(DomInt\)](#) follows. \square

4.7 Proof of Corollaries 3.8 and 3.9

Proof of Corollary 3.8. We have that $x_n y_n C'(x_n) = n + \mathcal{O}(1)$ and $y_n C(x_n) = n + \mathcal{O}(1)$ due to [\(3.4\)](#) and Lemma [3.3\(I\)](#). Hence $\mu_{N_n} = \mathbb{E}[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq N_n} C_{1,i}] = N_n x_n C'(x_n) / C(x_n) = n + \mathcal{O}(n/N_n)$ and further $\sigma_{N_n}^2 = \text{Var}(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq N_n} C_{1,i}) \sim n^2 / (\alpha N_n)$ due to [\(3.13\)](#) and Lemma [4.1](#). We conclude that

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq N_n} C_{1,i} = n \right] = \Pr \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq N_n} C_{1,i} = \mu_{N_n} + \sigma_{N_n} \cdot \mathcal{O}(N_n^{-1/2}) \right].$$

Then apply Lemma [3.7](#) for some properly chosen $t = \mathcal{O}(N_n^{-1/2})$. Since $\sigma_{N_n}^2 \sim N_n (x_n^2 C''(x_n) / C(x_n) - (x_n C'(x_n) / C(x_n))^2) \sim y_n (x_n^2 C''(x_n) - (x_n C'(x_n))^2 / C(x_n)) \sim y_n x_n^2 C''(x_n) / (\alpha + 1)$ due to Lemmas [2.1](#) and [4.1](#) the claim follows. \square

Proof of Corollary 3.9. Set $\tau := \mathbb{E}[P_1] = y_n C(x_n)$ and $\tilde{n} = n - m N_n$. Let

$$B_{\leq} := \{p \in \mathbb{N}_0 : |\tau - p| \leq \sqrt{\tau} \ln \tau\} \quad \text{and} \quad B_{>} := \{p \in \mathbb{N}_0 : |\tau - p| > \sqrt{\tau} \ln \tau\}.$$

Then we split up

$$\Pr[L = \tilde{n}] = \left(\sum_{p \in B_{\leq}} + \sum_{p \in B_{>}} \right) \Pr[L_p = \tilde{n}] \Pr[P_1 = p] =: I_1 + I_2.$$

Recall that according to [\(3.13\)](#) the mean and variance of L_p are such that $\mu_p = p(x_n C'(x_n) / C(x_n) - m) \sim \alpha p \chi_n^{-1}$ and $\sigma_p^2 \sim \alpha p \chi_n^{-2}$, respectively. Due to [\(3.4\)](#) we see

$$\mathbb{E}[L] = \tau(\mathbb{E}[C_{1,1} - m]) = \tau \left(\frac{x_n C'(x_n)}{C(x_n)} - m \right) = \tilde{n}. \quad (4.49)$$

With this at hand we reformulate for $p \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\Pr[L_p = \tilde{n}] = \Pr[L_p = \mu_p + t\sigma_p], \quad t = t(p) = \frac{\tilde{n} - \mu_p}{\sigma_p} = (\tau - p) \frac{x_n C'(x_n) / C(x_n) - m}{\sigma_p}. \quad (4.50)$$

Let us first study I_1 . For $p \in B_{\leq}$ we obtain from Lemma [2.1](#), the asymptotics for σ_p , and $p \sim \tau$ that $t = \mathcal{O}(\ln \tau)$. Since $\ln \tau = o(p^{1/6})$ we can apply Lemma [3.7](#) to [\(4.50\)](#). We obtain for all $p \in B_{\leq}$

$$\Pr[L_p = \tilde{n}] \sim e^{-t^2/2} (2\pi\sigma_p^2)^{-1/2} \sim e^{-t^2/2} (2\pi\sigma_\tau^2)^{-1/2}$$

Further (2.10) yields for such p

$$\Pr [P_1 = p] = \Pr [P_1 = \tau + y\sqrt{\tau}] \sim e^{-y^2/2}(2\pi\tau)^{-1/2}, \quad y = y(p) = \frac{p - \tau}{\sqrt{\tau}}.$$

With this at hand we obtain

$$I_1 \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{\tau\sigma_\tau^2}} \sum_{p \in B_\leq} e^{-(t^2+y^2)/2}.$$

Set

$$\Delta := \frac{(x_n C'(x_n)/C(x_n) - m)^2}{\sigma_\tau^2} + \frac{1}{\tau} \sim \frac{\alpha + 1}{\tau}. \quad (4.51)$$

Since for all $p \in B_\leq$ we have due to (3.12) and (3.13)

$$|t^2 + y^2 - (\tau - p)^2 \Delta| = (\tau - p)^2 \left(\frac{x_n C'(x_n)}{C(x_n)} - m \right)^2 \cdot \left| \frac{1}{\sigma_p^2} - \frac{1}{\sigma_\tau^2} \right| = \mathcal{O}((\tau - p)^3 \tau^{-2}) = o(1).$$

Accordingly, we obtain

$$I_1 \sim \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{\tau\sigma_\tau^2}} \sum_{|p| \leq \sqrt{\tau} \ln \tau} e^{-p^2 \Delta/2}. \quad (4.52)$$

Applying (2.18) there exists Q with $|Q| \leq 3$ such that

$$\sum_{|p| \leq \sqrt{\tau} \ln \tau} e^{-p^2 \Delta/2} = \int_{-\sqrt{\tau} \ln \tau}^{\sqrt{\tau} \ln \tau} e^{-x^2 \Delta/2} dx + Q.$$

Since (4.51) guarantees that $\sqrt{\tau} \ln \tau \sqrt{\Delta} = \Theta(\ln \tau) = \omega(1)$ we compute

$$\int_{-\sqrt{\tau} \ln \tau}^{\sqrt{\tau} \ln \tau} e^{-x^2 \Delta/2} dx = \Delta^{-1/2} \int_{-\sqrt{\tau} \ln \tau \sqrt{\Delta}}^{\sqrt{\tau} \ln \tau \sqrt{\Delta}} e^{-x^2/2} dx \sim \sqrt{\frac{2\pi\tau}{\alpha + 1}} = \omega(1).$$

Hence (4.52) yields together with the expressions for the asymptotic behaviour of χ_n and τ in Lemma 4.2 as well as $\sigma_\tau^2 \sim \alpha p \chi_n^{-2}$

$$I_1 \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi(\alpha + 1)\sigma_\tau}} \sim \sqrt{\frac{\alpha C_0}{2\pi(\alpha + 1)}} \cdot g(n - mN_n) \cdot (n - mN_n)^{-(\alpha+2)/(\alpha+1)}.$$

By plugging in the asymptotics from Lemma 2.1 we also obtain $(\alpha + 1)\sigma_\tau^2 \sim \rho^{-m}(\alpha + 1)(x_n C'''(x_n) - (x_n C'(x_n))^2/C(x_n)) \sim \rho^{-m} x_n^2 C''(x_n)$. To show that I_2 is negligible compared to I_1 we apply (2.9) to obtain the existence of $d > 0$ such that $I_2 \leq e^{-d(\ln \tau)^2}$. Moreover, by applying Lemma 4.2 we obtain that for some $\delta > 0$ eventually $\tau \geq (n - mN_n)^\delta$ and in addition $I_1 \geq (n - mN_n)^{-\delta}$. From this we infer that $I_2 \leq e^{-d(\ln \tau)^2} = o(1)$ and the proof is finished. \square

4.8 Proof of Lemma 3.10

4.8.1 Proof of Lemma 3.10(I)

Proof of Lemma 3.10(I). We write $\tilde{n} := n - mN_n$. Assisted by (3.9) and using the independence of L, R we obtain

$$\Pr [\mathcal{E}_n \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] = \sum_{p, r \geq 0} \Pr [L_p = \tilde{n} - r] \Pr [P_1 = p, R = r \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}].$$

We partition the summation into three parts. For some $b > 0$ (that we will choose appropriately) set

$$\begin{aligned} B_{\leq} &:= \{(p, r) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 : |N_n - p| \leq \sqrt{N_n} \ln N_n, r \leq b \ln n\}, \\ B_{>} &:= \{(p, r) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 : r > b \ln n\} \quad \text{and} \\ B_{>, \leq} &:= \{(p, r) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 : |N_n - p| > \sqrt{N_n} \ln N_n, r \leq b \ln n\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we obtain the three partial sums

$$\Pr[\mathcal{E}_n \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] = \left(\sum_{(p,r) \in B_{\leq}} + \sum_{(p,r) \in B_{>}} + \sum_{(p,r) \in B_{>, \leq}} \right) \Pr[L_p = \tilde{n} - r] \Pr[P_1 = p, R = r \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] =: I_1 + I_2 + I_3.$$

It will turn out that the sum over B_{\leq} is essentially the whole sum. We will argue that

$$I_1 \sim \Pr[L_{N_n} = n], \quad I_2 = o(I_1) \quad \text{and} \quad I_3 = o(I_1). \quad (4.53)$$

Let us start by showing that $I_1 \sim \Pr[L_{N_n} = n]$. By (3.4) and (3.11)

$$\tilde{n} = y_n C(x_n) \left(\frac{x_n C'(x_n)}{C(x_n)} - m \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_p = \mathbb{E}[L_p] = p \left(\frac{x_n C'(x_n)}{C(x_n)} - m \right). \quad (4.54)$$

Also recall (3.13) which says

$$\mu_p \sim \alpha p \chi_n^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_p^2 := \text{Var}(L_p) \sim \alpha p \chi_n^{-2}. \quad (4.55)$$

Then

$$\Pr[L_p = \tilde{n} - r] = \Pr[L_p = \mu_p + (t - \tilde{r})\sigma_p], \quad t = t(p) := \frac{\tilde{n} - \mu_p}{\sigma_p}, \quad \tilde{r} = \tilde{r}(p) := \frac{r}{\sigma_p}.$$

According to Lemma 4.1 $y_n C(x_n) = N_n + \mathcal{O}(1)$. Hence with (4.54), (4.55) we obtain for $(p, r) \in B_{\leq}$ that

$$t = (y_n C(x_n) - p)(x_n C'(x_n)/C(x_n) - m)\sigma_p^{-1} \sim (N_n - p)\sqrt{\alpha/p} = \mathcal{O}(\ln N_n).$$

Further, as $0 \leq r \leq b \ln n$ and $\chi_n \sim \alpha n/N_n$ according to Lemma 4.1,

$$\tilde{r} = \mathcal{O}(r/\sqrt{p}\chi_n^{-1}) = o(1) \quad \text{and} \quad t\tilde{r} = o(1).$$

Since $t - \tilde{r} = o(p^{1/6})$ we may apply Lemma 3.7 and get for all $(p, r) \in B_{\leq}$

$$\Pr[L_p = \tilde{n} - r] \sim e^{-(t-\tilde{r})^2/2} \Pr[L_p = \mu_p] \sim e^{-t^2/2} \Pr[L_p = \mu_p].$$

We also deduce from Lemma 3.7 and by plugging in $\chi_n \sim \alpha N_n/n$ from Lemma 4.1 that $\Pr[L_p = \mu_p] \sim \sqrt{\alpha N_n/(2\pi)}/n$ whenever $p \sim N_n$. Then Corollary 3.8 reveals that $\Pr[L_p = \mu_p] \sim \Pr[L_{N_n} = \tilde{n}]$. Hence for all $(p, r) \in B_{\leq}$

$$\Pr[L_p = \tilde{n} - r] \sim e^{-t^2/2} \Pr[L_{N_n} = \tilde{n}]. \quad (4.56)$$

With this at hand, we simplify

$$\Pr[L_{N_n} = \tilde{n}]^{-1} \cdot I_1 = \sum_{|N_n - p| \leq \sqrt{N_n} \ln N_n} e^{-t^2/2} \Pr[P_1 = p \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] + \mathcal{O}(\Pr[R \geq b \ln n \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}]).$$

Due to Lemma 3.6 there is some $0 < a < 1$ such that $\Pr[P_1 = p, R = r \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] \leq a^{b \ln n}$ for all $r > b \ln n$, so that the \mathcal{O} -term is $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ for b sufficiently large. Hence

$$I_1 \sim \Pr[L_{N_n} = \tilde{n}] \sum_{|N_n - p| \leq \sqrt{N_n} \ln N_n} e^{-t^2/2} \Pr[P_1 = p \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] + o\left(\frac{\sqrt{N_n}}{n}\right). \quad (4.57)$$

Next we show that the main contribution to the sum in (4.57) is given by a very small range, namely $|N_n - p| \leq \ln N_n$. For that recall (4.54) and set

$$\Delta_p := \frac{t^2}{(\tau - p)^2} = \frac{(x_n C'(x_n)/C(x_n) - m)^2}{\sigma_p^2}.$$

It is true that $\Pr[P_1 = p | \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] = 0$ for $p > N_n$. Hence we can rewrite the sum in (4.57) as

$$\sum_{|N_n - p| \leq \sqrt{N_n} \ln N_n} e^{-t^2/2} \Pr[P_1 = p | \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] = \sum_{0 \leq q \leq \sqrt{N_n} \ln N_n} e^{-(\tau - N_n + q)^2 \Delta_{N_n - q}/2} \Pr[P_1 = N_n - q | \mathcal{P}_{N_n}]. \quad (4.58)$$

Disassemble

$$\Pr[P_1 = N_n - q | \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] = \frac{1}{\Pr[\mathcal{P}_{N_n}]} \Pr[P_1 = N_n - q] \Pr\left[\sum_{j \geq 2} j P_j = q\right].$$

We know that the density of a Poisson random variable P_1 is maximised at its mean, and so $\Pr[P_1 = N_n - q] \leq \Pr[P_1 = \tau]$ for any $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and further $\Pr[P_1 = \tau] \sim \Pr[\mathcal{P}_{N_n}]$ with Lemma 3.5(I). With Lemma 3.5(I) it also follows that $\Pr\left[\sum_{j \geq 2} j P_j = q\right] = \mathcal{O}(a^q)$ for some $0 < a < 1$ as $q \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, we obtain

$$\sum_{\ln N_n < q \leq \sqrt{N_n} \ln N_n} e^{-(\tau - N_n + q)^2 \Delta_{N_n - q}/2} \Pr[P_1 = N_n - q | \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] \leq \sum_{q > \ln N_n} \Pr\left[\sum_{j \geq 2} j P_j = q\right] = o(1). \quad (4.59)$$

Next we consider the range $0 \leq q \leq \ln N_n$. Here we have that $\Pr[P_1 = N_n - q] \sim \Pr[P_1 = \tau]$ since $\tau = N_n + \mathcal{O}(1)$ and by applying (2.10). Further note that $\Delta_{N_n - q} \sim \alpha/N_n$ for $|N_n - p| \leq \ln N_n$ according to (4.55) for that range of q such that $(\tau - N_n + q)^2 \cdot \Delta_{N_n - q} \sim \alpha(\log N_n)^2/N_n = o(1)$. Consequently, with the same $0 < a < 1$ from (4.59),

$$\sum_{0 \leq q \leq \ln N_n} e^{-(\tau - N_n + q)^2 \Delta_{N_n - q}/2} \Pr[P_1 = N_n - q | \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] \sim \sum_{0 \leq q \leq \ln N_n} \Pr\left[\sum_{j \geq 2} j P_j = q\right] = 1 - \mathcal{O}(a^{\ln N_n}) \sim 1. \quad (4.60)$$

Plugging (4.59) and (4.60) into (4.58) and then into (4.57) yields $I_1 \sim \Pr[L_{N_n} = \tilde{n}] + o(\sqrt{N_n}/n)$. Since $\Pr[L_{N_n} = n] = \Theta(\sqrt{N_n}/n)$ due to Corollary 3.8 the first part in (4.53) follows.

Next we dedicate ourselves to showing the remaining claims in (4.53). Since $I_1 = \Theta(\sqrt{N_n}/n)$ we need to prove that I_2 and I_3 are in $o(\sqrt{N_n}/n)$. Start with I_2 . According to Lemma 3.6 we obtain that there exists $0 < a < 1$ yielding for b sufficiently large

$$I_2 \leq \sum_{(p,r) \in B_{\cdot, >}} \Pr[P_1 = p, R = r | \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] \leq \Pr[R \geq r | \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] \leq a^{b \ln n} = o\left(\frac{\sqrt{N_n}}{n}\right). \quad (4.61)$$

Next we treat I_3 . We observe that $\Pr[|N_n - P_1| > \sqrt{N_n} \ln N_n] / \Pr[\mathcal{P}_{N_n}] = o(1)$ according to Lemma 3.5(I) and (2.9). Then Lemma 3.5(I) entails that there is some $0 < a < 1$ such that

$$I_3 \leq \sum_{|N_n - p| > \sqrt{N_n} \ln N_n} \Pr[P_1 = p | \mathcal{P}_n] = o(\min\{a, y_n\}^{\sqrt{N_n} \ln N_n}). \quad (4.62)$$

If $N_n \geq (\ln n)^3$, then this is certainly in $o(\sqrt{N_n}/n)$. If $N_n \leq (\ln n)^3$ and $N_n \rightarrow \infty$, then $\lambda_n \leq (\ln n)^3/N_n^*$ and from Lemma 4.1 we obtain that $y_n \leq n^{-c}$ for some $c > 0$ and all sufficiently large n . Plugging this into (4.62) yields $I_3 = n^{-\omega(1)}$ and the proof is finished. \square

4.8.2 Proof of Lemma 3.10(II)

Proof of Lemma 3.10(II). Let $\tilde{n} = n - mN_n$. With (3.9) we get

$$\Pr[\mathcal{E}_n \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] = \sum_{p,r \geq 0} \Pr[L_p = \tilde{n} - r] \Pr[P_1 = p, R = r \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}].$$

Set $\tau := \mathbb{E}[P_1] = y_n C(x_n)$. We partition the summation regime into three parts, namely, for some constant $b > 0$ (which we need to choose sufficiently large later) we define

$$\begin{aligned} B_{\leq} &:= \{(p, r) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 : |p - \tau| \leq \sqrt{\tau} \ln \tau, r \leq b(\ln \tilde{n})^2\}, \\ B_{>, >} &:= \{(p, r) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 : r > b(\ln \tilde{n})^2\} \quad \text{and} \\ B_{>,\leq} &:= \{(p, r) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 : |p - \tau| > \sqrt{\tau} \ln \tau, r \leq b(\ln \tilde{n})^2\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\Pr[\mathcal{E}_n \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] = \left(\sum_{(p,r) \in B_{\leq}} + \sum_{(p,r) \in B_{>, >}} + \sum_{(p,r) \in B_{>,\leq}} \right) \Pr[L_p = \tilde{n} - r] \Pr[P_1 = p, R = r \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] =: I_1 + I_2 + I_3.$$

We will show that the sum over B_{\leq} is dominant compared to the negligible sums over $B_{>, >}$ and $B_{>,\leq}$ as n tends to infinity, that is,

$$I_1 \sim \Pr[L = \tilde{n}], \quad I_2 = o(I_1) \quad \text{and} \quad I_3 = o(I_1). \quad (4.63)$$

Let us first determine I_1 . Set $\mu_p := \mathbb{E}[L_p] = p(x_n C'(x_n)/C(x_n) - m)$ and $\sigma_p^2 := \text{Var}(L_p)$. Due to (3.13) the asymptotics of these expressions are $\mu_p \sim \alpha p \chi_n^{-1}$ and $\sigma_p^2 \sim \alpha p \chi_n^{-2}$. We observe that for any p, r , compare also to (4.49),

$$\Pr[L_p = \tilde{n} - r] = \Pr[L_p = \mu_p + (t - \tilde{r})\sigma_p], \quad t := t(p) = (\tau - p) \frac{x_n C'(x_n)/C(x_n) - m}{\sigma_p}, \quad \tilde{r} := \tilde{r}(p) = \frac{r}{\sigma_p}.$$

We want to apply Lemma 3.7. Using (2.6), for $(p, r) \in B_{\leq}$ we obtain that $t = \mathcal{O}(\ln \tau) = o(p^{1/6})$. Moreover, plugging in the asymptotics of τ and χ_n from Lemma 4.2 and noting that g grows slower than any polynomial we obtain

$$\tilde{r} = \mathcal{O}\left((\ln \tilde{n})^2 \tau^{-1/2} \chi_n\right) = \mathcal{O}\left((\ln \tilde{n})^2 \sqrt{g(\tilde{n})} \tilde{n}^{-(\alpha+1)/(2(\alpha+1))}\right) = o(1) \quad (4.64)$$

implying $t - \tilde{r} = o(p^{1/6})$. So, by Lemma 3.7 we obtain for all $(p, r) \in B_{\leq}$

$$\frac{\Pr[L_p = \tilde{n} - r]}{\Pr[L_p = \tilde{n}]} = \frac{\Pr[L_p = \mu_p + (t - \tilde{r})\sigma_p]}{\Pr[L_p = \mu_p + t\sigma_p]} \sim e^{-((t-\tilde{r})^2 + t^2)/2}. \quad (4.65)$$

Since $t = \mathcal{O}(\ln \tau) = \mathcal{O}(\ln \tilde{n})$ due to Lemma 4.2, Equation (4.64) also implies that $t\tilde{r} = o(1)$. Thus we get due to (4.65) for all $(p, r) \in B_{\leq}$

$$\Pr[L_p = \tilde{n} - r] \sim \Pr[L_p = \tilde{n}].$$

Accordingly,

$$I_1 \sim \sum_{|p-\tau| \leq \sqrt{\tau} \ln \tau} \Pr[L_p = \tilde{n}] \sum_{0 \leq r \leq b(\ln \tilde{n})^2} \Pr[P_1 = p, R = r \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}]. \quad (4.66)$$

Next we claim that the sum over r equals asymptotically $\Pr[P_1 = p]$. For any p we have

$$\sum_{0 \leq r \leq b(\ln \tilde{n})^2} \Pr[P_1 = p, R = r \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] = \Pr[P_1 = p \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] - \sum_{r > b(\ln \tilde{n})^2} \Pr[P_1 = p, R = r \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}]. \quad (4.67)$$

According to Lemma 3.6 there is some $0 < a < 1$ such that

$$\sum_{r > b(\ln \tilde{n})^2} \Pr [P_1 = p, R = r \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] = \mathcal{O} \left(a^{b(\ln \tilde{n})^2} \right).$$

We further obtain with Lemma 3.5(II) for any $(p, r) \in B_{\leq}$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr [P_1 = p \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] &= \frac{\Pr \left[\sum_{j \geq 2} j P_j = N_n - p \right]}{\Pr [\mathcal{P}_{N_n}]} \Pr [P_1 = p] \\ &\sim \frac{\exp \left\{ -c_m \frac{a_n}{1-a_n} \right\}}{(1-a_n)^{c_m-1}} \cdot (x_n^m y_n)^{-p} \cdot \left(\frac{N_n - p}{N_n} \right)^{c_m-1} \cdot \Pr [P_1 = p]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.68)$$

Since according to Lemma 4.2 we have $p \sim \tau = y_n C(x_n) \sim a_n \cdot N_n$ we get that

$$\left(\frac{N_n - p}{(1-a_n)N_n} \right)^{c_m-1} \sim 1.$$

Further, Lemma 4.2 reveals that $\limsup a_n \leq \limsup \lambda_n^{-1} < 1$ and $x_n^m y_n / (1 - x_n^m y_n) \sim (1 - a_n) N_n / c_m$ implying $x_n^m y_n = 1 - c_m (1 - a_n)^{-1} N_n^{-1} + o((1 - a_n)^{-1} N_n^{-1})$, so that

$$(x_n^m y_n)^{-p} = \exp \{ -p \ln(x_n^m y_n) \} = \exp \left\{ c_m \frac{a_n}{1-a_n} + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{a_n}{(1-a_n)^2} N_n^{-1} \right) \right\} \sim \exp \left\{ c_m \frac{a_n}{1-a_n} \right\}.$$

Plugging the asymptotic identities in the previous two displays into (4.68) we deduce for $(p, r) \in B_{\leq}$ that $\Pr [P_1 = p \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] \sim \Pr [P_1 = p]$. Since p differs at most by $\sqrt{\tau} \ln \tau$ from the mean τ of P_1 we further obtain by (2.10) that $\Pr [P_1 = p] \sim 1 / \sqrt{2\pi\tau} \exp \{ -\mathcal{O}((\ln \tau)^2) \}$. From (A.2) and Lemma 4.2 we deduce that for any $\delta > 0$ eventually $\tau \leq \tilde{n}^{\alpha/(\alpha+1)+\delta}$. Hence $\Pr [P_1 = p] = \exp \{ -\mathcal{O}((\log \tilde{n})^2) \} = \omega(a^{b(\ln \tilde{n})^2})$ for b sufficiently large so that the expression in (4.67) is asymptotically given by $\Pr [P_1 = p]$ for $|\tau - p| \leq \sqrt{\tau} \ln \tau$. So far we have shown that (4.66) can be asymptotically simplified to

$$I_1 \sim \sum_{|p-\tau| \leq \sqrt{\tau} \ln \tau} \Pr [L_p = \tilde{n}] \Pr [P_1 = p],$$

where this sum in turn equals

$$I_1 \sim \Pr [L = \tilde{n}] - \sum_{|p-\tau| > \sqrt{\tau} \ln \tau} \Pr [L_p = \tilde{n}] \Pr [P_1 = p]. \quad (4.69)$$

With (2.9) and again using that $\ln \tau = \Omega(\ln \tilde{n})$ we obtain for some $d > 0$

$$\sum_{|p-\tau| > \sqrt{\tau} \ln \tau} \Pr [L_p = \tilde{n}] \Pr [P_1 = p] \leq \Pr [|P_1 - \tau| > \sqrt{\tau} \ln \tau] \leq e^{-d(\ln \tau)^2} = e^{-\Omega((\ln \tilde{n})^2)}.$$

Applying Corollary 3.9 and once again (A.2) we get for some $c > 0$ that

$$\Pr [L = \tilde{n}] = \omega(\tilde{n}^{-c}) = \omega(e^{-\Omega((\ln \tilde{n})^2)}),$$

delivering the first part of (4.63) in light of (4.69). We continue by applying Lemma 3.6 to I_2 , i.e. with $0 < a < 1$ from before we have

$$I_2 \leq \sum_{r > b(\ln \tilde{n})^2} \Pr [R = r \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] = \mathcal{O} \left(a^{b(\ln \tilde{n})^2} \right) = o(\tilde{n}^{-c}) = o(\Pr [L = \tilde{n}])$$

showing the second part of (4.63). Next we show that $I_3 = o(I_1)$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be such that $(1+\varepsilon) \limsup \tau / N_n < 1$. We can find such an ε because $\limsup \tau / N_n \leq \limsup \lambda_n^{-1} < 1$ due to Lemma 4.2. Then

$$I_3 \leq \left(\sum_{|p-\tau| > \sqrt{\tau} \ln \tau, p < N_n / (1+\varepsilon)} + \sum_{N_n / (1+\varepsilon) \leq p \leq N_n} \right) \Pr [P_1 = p \mid \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] =: R_1 + R_2.$$

Since $\liminf(1 - a_n) > 0$, see Lemma 4.2, we get analogous to (4.68) that

$$R_1 = \mathcal{O} \left(\sum_{|p-\tau| > \sqrt{\tau} \ln \tau, p < N_n/(1+\varepsilon)} \Pr [P_1 = p] (x_n^m y_n)^{-p} \left(1 - \frac{p}{N_n}\right)^{c_m - 1} \right).$$

Further $x_n^m y_n = 1 - \Theta(N_n^{-1})$ due to Lemma 4.2 by which we conclude for $p < N_n/(1 + \varepsilon)$ that $(x_n^m y_n)^{-p} = \mathcal{O}(1)$. For that range of p we also have that $1 - p/N_n = \Theta(1)$ so that with (2.9) there is some $d > 0$ yielding

$$R_1 = \mathcal{O} (\Pr [|P_1 - \tau| > \sqrt{\tau} \ln \tau]) = \mathcal{O} (e^{-d(\ln \tau)^2}) = o(\Pr [L = \tilde{n}]).$$

We proceed by treating R_2 . Here we estimate $\Pr [P_1 = p, R = r | \mathcal{P}_{N_n}] \leq \Pr [P_1 = p] / \Pr [\mathcal{P}_{N_n}]$. With Lemma 3.5(II) we further obtain $\Pr [\mathcal{P}_{N_n}] = \Theta(N_n^{-1})$. Setting $s = s(n) := (N_n/(1 + \varepsilon) - \tau) / \sqrt{\tau}$ an application of (2.9) gives for some $d > 0$

$$R_2 \leq \frac{\Pr [P_1 > N_n/(1 + \varepsilon)]}{\Pr [\mathcal{P}_{N_n}]} = \mathcal{O} (N_n \Pr [P_1 > \tau + s\sqrt{\tau}]) = \mathcal{O} (N_n e^{-ds \min\{s, \sqrt{\tau}\}}).$$

By the choice of ε we have that $s = N_n/\sqrt{\tau}((1 + \varepsilon)^{-1} - \tau/N_n) = \Theta(N_n/\sqrt{\tau})$. This lets us conclude that $s \min\{s, \sqrt{\tau}\} = \Theta(\min\{N_n^2/\tau, N_n\}) = \Omega(N_n) = \Omega(N_n^*)$. Due to (1.6) and (A.2) we know that $N_n^* = n^{\alpha/(\alpha+1)+o(1)}$ leading to $R_2 = n^{-\omega(1)}$ and the proof is finished. \square

4.9 Proof of Lemma 3.11

Proof of Lemma 3.11(I). Together with the basic fact that $[x^n]A(ax) = a^n[x^n]A(x)$ for any power series A we obtain with Lemma 3.10(I)

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq N_n} C_{1,i} = n \right] = [x^n] \frac{C(x_n x)^{N_n}}{C(x_n)^{N_n}} = \frac{x_n^n}{C(x_n)^{N_n}} [x^n] C(x)^{N_n}. \quad (4.70)$$

Further as $S_n = \mathcal{O}(1)$ according to Lemma 4.1

$$(y_n C(x_n))^{N_n} = (N_n - c_m S)^{N_n} = N_n^{N_n} \left(1 - c_m \frac{S_n}{N_n}\right)^{N_n} \sim N_n^{N_n} \exp\{-c_m S_n\}. \quad (4.71)$$

Lemma 3.11(I) follows since Lemma 4.1 implies that $e^{c_m S} \sim e^{c_m \rho^m y_n / (1 - \rho^m y_n)}$ and by applying Stirling's formula to $N_n^{N_n}$. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.11(II). First we argue that $\tau = y_n C(x_n)$ and $\tilde{\tau} := C(x_n)/x_n^m$ differ by $-c_m a_n / (1 - a_n) + o(1) = \mathcal{O}(1)$. This is true since $\tau - \tilde{\tau} = y_n C(x_n)(1 - (x_n^m y_n)^{-1})$ and Lemma 4.2 gives $y_n C(x_n) \sim a_n N_n$ as well as $1 - (x_n^m y_n)^{-1} = -S_n^{-1} \sim -c_m / ((1 - a_n)N_n)$. Thus by replacing τ by $\tilde{\tau}$, P_1 by $\tilde{P}_1 \sim \text{Po}(\tilde{\tau})$ and L by $\tilde{L} := \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \tilde{\tau}} (C_{1,i} - m)$ in the proof of Corollary 3.9 we obtain

$$\Pr [\tilde{L} = n - mN_n] \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi \rho^{-m} x_n^2 C''(x_n)}} \sim \Pr [L = n - mN_n].$$

As the probability generating function of $C_{1,1} - m$ is given by $x^{-m} C(x_n x) / C(x_n)$ we obtain

$$\Pr [L = n - mN_n] \sim \Pr [\tilde{L} = n - mN_n] = [x^{n-mN_n}] \exp \left\{ \frac{C(x_n)}{x_n^m} \left(x^{-m} \frac{C(x_n x)}{C(x_n)} - 1 \right) \right\}.$$

Next we use the basic fact that $[x^n]bF(ax) = a^n b[x^n]F(x)$ for any series F and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence

$$\Pr [L = n - mN_n] \sim x_n^{n-mN_n} \exp \left\{ -\frac{C(x_n)}{x_n^m} \right\} [x^{n-mN_n}] \exp \left\{ \frac{C(x)}{x^m} \right\}.$$

\square

4.10 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Let z_n be the solution to $z_n C'(z_n) = n$. Clearly $z_n = \rho e^{-\eta_n}$ with $\eta_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, so that by (4.24)

$$\eta_n \sim (\Gamma(\alpha + 1)h(\eta_n^{-1}))^{1/(\alpha+1)} n^{-1/(\alpha+1)}.$$

Since (1.2) implies that $c_n/c_{n-1} \sim \rho^{-1}$ we have due to [4, Cor. 4.3] that

$$\frac{[z^n] \exp \{C(z)\}}{[z^{n-1}] \exp \{C(z)\}} \sim \rho^{-1}.$$

Further $0 < \rho < 1$ implies that the radius of convergence of $\sum_{j \geq 2} C(z^j)/j$ is greater than ρ . Since the radius of convergence of $\exp \{C(z)\}$ is ρ we deduce from Lemma 2.3

$$g_n = [z^n] \exp \left\{ C(z) + \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{C(z^j)}{j} \right\} \sim \exp \left\{ \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{C(\rho^j)}{j} \right\} [z^n] \exp \{C(z)\}, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.72)$$

By virtue of this the task of determining g_n reduces to computing the coefficient of $\exp \{C(z)\}$. In what follows we consider the one-parametric Boltzmann model with the parameter z_n as explained at the beginning of Section 3.1. We need the following notation: Let P be a $\text{Po}(C(z_n))$ distributed random variable and C_1, C_2, \dots iid copies of $\Gamma C(z_n)$, that is,

$$\Pr [C_1 = k] = \frac{c_k z_n^k}{C(z_n)}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Further we need the sum of these random variables $K_p := \sum_{1 \leq i \leq p} C_i$ for $p \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and its randomly stopped version $K := K_P$. Noting that the probability generating functions of P and C_1 are given by $\exp \{C(z_n)(z - 1)\}$ and $C(z_n z)/C(z_n)$, respectively, we reformulate

$$[z^n] e^{C(z)} = z_n^{-n} e^{C(z_n)} [z^n] \exp \left\{ C(z_n) \left(\frac{C(z_n z)}{C(z_n)} - 1 \right) \right\} = z_n^{-n} e^{C(z_n)} \Pr [K = n]. \quad (4.73)$$

Set $\tau := C(z_n)$. Define

$$B_{\leq} := \{p \in \mathbb{N}_0 : |p - \tau| \leq \sqrt{\tau \ln n}\} \quad \text{and} \quad B_{>} := \{p \in \mathbb{N}_0 : |p - \tau| > \sqrt{\tau \ln n}\}.$$

With these definitions at hand we split up

$$\Pr [K = n] = \left(\sum_{p \in B_{\leq}} + \sum_{p \in B_{>}} \right) \Pr [K_p = n] \Pr [P = p] =: I_1 + I_2. \quad (4.74)$$

We start with I_1 . With the help of (4.24) we establish the identities

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_p &:= \mathbb{E}[K_p] = p \frac{z_n C'(z_n)}{C(z_n)} \sim \alpha p \eta_n^{-1} \quad \text{and} \\ \sigma_p^2 &:= \text{Var}(K_p) = p \left(\frac{z_n^2 C''(z_n) + z_n C'(z_n)}{C(z_n)} - \left(\frac{z_n C'(z_n)}{C(z_n)} \right)^2 \right) \sim \alpha p \eta_n^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Define $L_p = K_p - mp$ and $\mu_p = \mathbb{E}[L_p] = \nu_p - mp$ implying $\{L_p = \mu_p + d\} = \{K_p = \nu_p + d\}$ for any $d \in \mathbb{R}$. Let

$$t = t(p) := \frac{(\tau - p) z_n C'(z_n)/C(z_n)}{\sigma_p}.$$

With this definition of t we have $n = \tau z_n C'(z_n)/C(z_n) = \nu_p + t\sigma_p$. Further $t = \mathcal{O}(\ln n)$ for $p \in B_{\leq}$ so that Lemma 3.7 is applicable and we obtain

$$\Pr [K_p = n] = \Pr [L_p = \mu_p + t\sigma_p] \sim e^{-t^2/2} (2\pi\sigma_p^2)^{-1/2}. \quad (4.75)$$

Note that we used $\sigma_p \sim \sigma_\tau$ for $p \sim \tau$ in the latter display. Next we observe due to (2.10) that for $p \in B_\leq$ and $s = s(p) := (p - \tau)/\sqrt{\tau} = \mathcal{O}(\ln n)$

$$\Pr [P = p] = \Pr [P = \tau + s\sqrt{\tau}] \sim (2\pi\tau)^{-1/2} e^{-s^2/2}.$$

Plugging this and (4.75) into I_1 defined in (4.74) yields

$$I_1 \sim \frac{1}{2\pi} (\tau\sigma_\tau^2)^{-1/2} \sum_{p \in B_\leq} e^{-(s^2+t^2)/2}. \quad (4.76)$$

Set

$$\Delta := \frac{(z_n C'(z_n)/C(z_n))^2}{\sigma_\tau^2} + \frac{1}{\tau}.$$

By

$$|s^2 + t^2 - (\tau - p)^2 \Delta| = (\tau - p)^2 \left(\frac{z_n C'(z_n)}{C(z_n)} \right)^2 \left| \frac{1}{\sigma_p^2} - \frac{1}{\sigma_\tau^2} \right| = \mathcal{O} \left((\ln n)^3 \frac{\tau}{\tau^{3/2}} \right) = o(1)$$

and (4.76) we obtain the asymptotic identity

$$I_1 \sim \frac{1}{2\pi} (\tau\sigma_\tau^2)^{-1/2} \sum_{p \in B_\leq} e^{-(\tau-p)^2 \Delta/2} = \frac{1}{2\pi} (\tau\sigma_\tau^2)^{-1/2} \sum_{|p| \leq \sqrt{\tau} \ln n} e^{-p^2 \Delta/2}. \quad (4.77)$$

By (2.18) we obtain that there exists Q with $|Q| \leq 3$ such that

$$\sum_{|p| \leq \sqrt{\tau} \ln n} e^{-p^2 \Delta/2} = \int_{-\sqrt{\tau} \ln n}^{\sqrt{\tau} \ln n} e^{-x^2 \Delta/2} dx + Q. \quad (4.78)$$

By a change of variables and since $\sqrt{\Delta\tau} \ln n = \Theta(\ln n) = \omega(1)$

$$\int_{-\sqrt{\tau} \ln n}^{\sqrt{\tau} \ln n} e^{-x^2 \Delta/2} dx = \Delta^{-1/2} \int_{-\sqrt{\Delta\tau} \ln n}^{\sqrt{\Delta\tau} \ln n} e^{-x^2/2} dx \sim \Delta^{-1/2} \sqrt{2\pi}.$$

Combined with Equations (4.77) and (4.78) we readily obtain that $I_1 \sim (2\pi\tau\sigma_\tau^2\Delta)^{-1/2}$. Moreover, since $\tau\sigma_\tau^2\Delta = \tau \cdot (\sigma_\tau^2\Delta) = z_n C''(z_n) + z_n C'(z_n) \sim z_n C'''(z_n)$ the proof is finished.

References

- [1] R. Arratia and S. Tavaré. Independent Process Approximations for Random Combinatorial Structures. *Adv. Math.*, 104(1):90–154, 1994. ISSN 0001-8708. doi: 10.1006/aima.1994.1022. URL <https://doi-org.org/10.1006/aima.1994.1022>.
- [2] R. Arratia, A. Barbour, and S. Tavaré. *Logarithmic Combinatorial Structures: A Probabilistic Approach*. EMS monographs in mathematics. European Mathematical Society, 2003. ISBN 9783037190005. URL <https://books.google.de/books?id=oBPvAAAAMAAJ>.
- [3] A. Barbour and B. L. Granovsky. Random Combinatorial Structures: the Convergent Case. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 109(2):203–220, 2005. ISSN 0097-3165. doi: 10.1016/j.jcta.2004.09.001. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0097316504001347>.
- [4] J. P. Bell and S. N. Burris. Asymptotics for Logical Limit Laws: when the Growth of the Components is in an RT Class. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 355(9):3777–3794, 2003. ISSN 0002-9947. doi: 10.1090/S0002-9947-03-03299-9. URL <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9947-03-03299-9>.
- [5] J. P. Bell, E. A. Bender, P. J. Cameron, and L. B. Richmond. Asymptotics for the Probability of Connectedness and the Distribution of Number of Components. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 7:Research Paper 33, 22, 2000. URL <https://doi.org/10.37236/1511>.

- [6] N. H. Bingham, C. M. Goldie, and J. L. Teugels. *Regular Variation*, volume 27 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987. ISBN 0-521-30787-2. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511721434. URL <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511721434>.
- [7] M. Bodirsky, É. Fusy, M. Kang, and S. Vigerske. Enumeration and Asymptotic Properties of Unlabeled Outerplanar Graphs. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 14(1):Research Paper 66, 24, 2007. URL http://www.combinatorics.org/Volume_14/Abstracts/v14i1r66.html.
- [8] M. Bodirsky, É. Fusy, M. Kang, and S. Vigerske. Boltzmann Samplers, Pólya Theory, and Cycle Pointing. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 40(3):721–769, 2011. ISSN 0097-5397. doi: 10.1137/100790082. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/100790082>.
- [9] S. N. Burris. *Number Theoretic Density and Logical Limit Laws*, volume 86 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001. ISBN 0-8218-2666-2. doi: 10.1090/surv/086. URL <https://doi.org/10.1090/surv/086>.
- [10] B. Davis and D. McDonald. An Elementary Proof of the Local Central Limit Theorem. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 8(3):693–701, 1995. ISSN 0894-9840. doi: 10.1007/BF02218051. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02218051>.
- [11] N. G. de Bruijn. *Asymptotic Methods in Analysis*. Dover Publications, Inc., New York, third edition, 1981. ISBN 0-486-64221-6.
- [12] M. Drmota. A Bivariate Asymptotic Expansion of Coefficients of Powers of Generating Functions. *European J. Combin.*, 15(2):139–152, 1994. ISSN 0195-6698. doi: 10.1006/eujc.1994.1016. URL <https://doi.org/10.1006/eujc.1994.1016>.
- [13] M. Drmota and M. Soria. Marking in Combinatorial Constructions: Generating Functions and Limiting Distributions. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 144(1):67–99, 1995. ISSN 0304-3975. doi: 10.1016/0304-3975(94)00294-S. URL [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975\(94\)00294-S](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(94)00294-S).
- [14] P. Duchon, P. Flajolet, G. Louchard, and G. Schaeffer. Boltzmann Samplers for the Random Generation of Combinatorial Structures. *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, 13(4-5):577–625, 2004. ISSN 0963-5483. doi: 10.1017/S0963548304006315. URL <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548304006315>.
- [15] P. Flajolet and R. Sedgewick. *Analytic Combinatorics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2009. ISBN 978-0-521-89806-5. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511801655. URL <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511801655>.
- [16] G. A. Freiman and B. L. Granovsky. Clustering in Coagulation-fragmentation Processes, Random Combinatorial Structures and Additive Number Systems: Asymptotic Formulae and Limiting Laws. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 357(6):2483–2507, 2005. ISSN 0002-9947. doi: 10.1090/S0002-9947-04-03617-7. URL <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9947-04-03617-7>.
- [17] B. Fristedt. The Structure of Random Partitions of Large Integers. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 337(2):703–735, 1993. ISSN 0002-9947. doi: 10.2307/2154239. URL <https://doi.org/10.2307/2154239>.
- [18] N. G. Gamkrelidze. Application of a Smoothness Function in the Proof of a Local Limit Theorem. *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen.*, 33(2):373–376, 1988. ISSN 0040-361X. doi: 10.1137/1133053. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/1133053>.
- [19] R. L. Graham, D. E. Knuth, and O. Patashnik. *Concrete Mathematics*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, MA, second edition, 1994. ISBN 0-201-55802-5. A Foundation for Computer Science.
- [20] B. L. Granovsky and D. Stark. Asymptotic Enumeration and Logical Limit Laws for Expansive Multisets and Selections. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 73(1):252–272, 2006. ISSN 0024-6107. doi: 10.1112/S0024610705022477. URL <https://doi.org/10.1112/S0024610705022477>.
- [21] B. L. Granovsky and D. Stark. Developments in the Khintchine-Meinardus Probabilistic Method for Asymptotic Enumeration. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 22(4):Paper 4.32, 26, 2015. URL <https://doi.org/10.37236/4581>.
- [22] B. L. Granovsky, D. Stark, and M. Erlihson. Meinardus’ Theorem on Weighted Partitions: Extensions and a Probabilistic Proof. *Adv. in Appl. Math.*, 41(3):307–328, 2008. ISSN 0196-8858. doi: 10.1016/j.aam.2007.11.001. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aam.2007.11.001>.

- [23] G. H. Hardy and S. Ramanujan. Asymptotic Formulae in Combinatory Analysis. *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (2), 17:75–115, 1918. ISSN 0024-6115. doi: 10.1112/plms/s2-17.1.75. URL <https://doi.org/10.1112/plms/s2-17.1.75>.
- [24] H.-K. Hwang. Distribution of Integer Partitions with Large Number of Summands. *Acta Arith.*, 78(4):351–365, 1997. ISSN 0065-1036. doi: 10.4064/aa-78-4-351-365. URL <https://doi.org/10.4064/aa-78-4-351-365>.
- [25] J. Karamata. Sur un Mode de Croissance Régulière des fonctions. *Mathematica (Cluj)*, 4:38–53, 1930.
- [26] J. Karamata. Neuer Beweis und Verallgemeinerung der Tauberschen Sätze, welche die Laplacesche und Stieltjessche Transformation betreffen. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 164:27–39, 1931. ISSN 0075-4102. doi: 10.1515/crll.1931.164.27. URL <https://doi.org/10.1515/crll.1931.164.27>.
- [27] J. Karamata. Sur un Mode de Croissance Régulière. Théorèmes Fondamentaux. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 61: 55–62, 1933. ISSN 0037-9484. URL http://www.numdam.org/item?id=BSMF_1933__61__55_0.
- [28] A. Y. Khinchin. *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Statistics*. Graylock Press, Albany, N.Y., 1960. Translation from the first (1951) Russian ed., edited by Irwin Shapiro.
- [29] C. Knessl and J. B. Keller. Partition Asymptotics from Recursion Equations. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 50(2): 323–338, 1990. ISSN 0036-1399. doi: 10.1137/0150020. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/0150020>.
- [30] J. Korevaar. *Tauberian Theory, A Century of Developments*, volume 329 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004. ISBN 3-540-21058-X. doi: 10.1007/978-3-662-10225-1. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-10225-1>.
- [31] J. Korevaar, T. van Aardenne-Ehrenfest, and N. G. de Bruijn. A Note on Slowly Oscillating Functions. *Nieuw Arch. Wiskunde* (2), 23:77–86, 1949.
- [32] P. Leroux, F. Bergeron, and G. Labelle. *Combinatorial Species and Tree-Like Structures*, volume 67 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997. URL <http://www.bibsonomy.org/bibtex/216d18979a45d1a17ca0db4e5f58d3f47/brouder>.
- [33] G. Meinardus. Asymptotische Aussagen über Partitionen. *Math. Z.*, 59:388–398, 1954. ISSN 0025-5874. doi: 10.1007/BF01180268. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01180268>.
- [34] P. D. Miller. *Applied asymptotic analysis*, volume 75. American Mathematical Soc., 2006.
- [35] L. Mutafchiev. Limit Theorems for the Number of Parts in a Random Weighted Partition. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 18(1):Paper 206, 27, 2011. ISSN 1077-8926. URL <https://doi.org/10.37236/693>.
- [36] L. Mutafchiev. The Size of the Largest Part of Random Weighted Partitions of Large Integers. *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, 22(3):433–454, 2013. ISSN 0963-5483. doi: 10.1017/S0963548313000047. URL <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548313000047>.
- [37] K. Panagiotou and L. Ramzews. Asymptotic Enumeration and Limit Laws for Multisets: the Subexponential Case. *arXiv preprint*, 2021. arxiv: 2007.08274.
- [38] K. Panagiotou and L. Ramzews. Expansive Multisets: Limit Laws. *Manuscript*, 2022+.
- [39] K. Panagiotou and M. Sinha. Vertices of Degree k in Random Unlabeled Trees. *J. Graph Theory*, 69:114–130, 2012. ISSN 0364-9024. doi: 10.1002/jgt.20567. URL <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgt.20567>.
- [40] K. Panagiotou and B. Stuffer. Scaling Limits of Random Pólya Trees. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 170(3):801–820, 2018. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00440-017-0770-4>.
- [41] R. Pemantle and M. C. Wilson. *Analytic Combinatorics in Several Variables*, volume 140 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013. ISBN 978-1-107-03157-9. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781139381864. URL <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139381864>.
- [42] D. Stark. The Asymptotic Number of Weighted Partitions with a Given Number of Parts. *The Ramanujan Journal*, 2021. doi: 10.1007/s11139-020-00350-2. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11139-020-00350-2>.
- [43] B. Stuffer. Unlabelled Gibbs Partitions. *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, 29(2):293–309, 2020. ISSN 0963-5483. doi: 10.1017/s0963548319000336. URL <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0963548319000336>.

A Appendix: Slowly Varying Functions

Let $h : [1, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be a slowly varying function, that is, h is measurable and for any $\lambda > 0$

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h(\lambda x)}{h(x)} = 1. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

“Slowly varying” means essentially smaller than any polynomial, see also below in (A.2) for formal variants of this statement. All the results in this section for slowly varying strictly positive h do straightforwardly hold for $h[1, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that h is eventually positive and (A.1) is valid.

Results on Slowly Varying Functions The theory presented in this chapter goes back to Jovan Karamata, who proved all the basic results in his works [25, 26, 27]. A thorough overview can be found in the comprehensive textbooks [6] or [30, Chapter IV]. Let us begin with the *Uniform Convergence Theorem* that will be useful later.

Theorem A.1 ([6, Thm. 1.2.1]). *The convergence in (A.1) is uniform for λ in any compact subset of $(0, \infty)$.*

Let us continue with the famous *Representation Theorem*, first obtained by [27] in the continuous setting and again for arbitrary measurable functions by [31], c.f. [6, Theorem 1.3.1]. It states that there exist bounded measurable functions $c(x)$ and $\varepsilon(x)$ such that

$$h(x) = c(x) \exp\left(\int_1^x \frac{\varepsilon(t)}{t} dt\right),$$

where, for some $c > 0$,

$$c(x) \rightarrow c \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon(x) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty.$$

From this we immediately obtain for any $\delta > 0$ that there is an x_n such that

$$x^{-\delta} \leq h(x) \leq x^\delta \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\frac{x}{x'}\right)^\delta \leq \frac{h(x')}{h(x)} \leq \left(\frac{x'}{x}\right)^\delta \quad \text{for all } x' \geq x \geq x_n. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Moreover, see [6, Theorem 1.5.3], we obtain that for any $\mu > 0$

$$\sup_{1 \leq y \leq x} h(y)y^\mu \sim h(x)x^\mu \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{y \geq x} h(y)y^{-\mu} \sim h(x)x^{-\mu} \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Let $\alpha > 0$. From here we consider the function

$$c(s) = h(s)s^{\alpha-1}, \quad s \geq 1,$$

where h is continuous. Note that this is no restriction in our setting as c_n given in (1.2) is only defined for natural numbers, such that we can simply interpolate linearly to obtain continuity. We proceed with the following important result, known as *Karamata's Theorem*.

Theorem A.2 ([6, Prop. 1.5.8]). *Let h be slowly varying and $\alpha > 0$. Then for any $a \geq 1$*

$$\int_a^x c(t) dt \sim \alpha^{-1} h(x) x^\alpha, \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty.$$

We will be interested in sums rather than integrals. A simple trick and the “sub-polynomiality” of slowly varying functions will help us here. We doubt that the following statement was not known before, but we know of no reference.

Corollary A.3. *The previous theorem holds with \int_a^x replaced by \sum_a^{x-1} for $a \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. The bounds in (A.2) guarantee that $c(s)^{-1} \sup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} c(s+x) \leq \sup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} (1-x/s)^\alpha = 1$ and also $c(x)^{-1} \inf_{0 \leq x \leq 1} c(s+x) \geq \inf_{0 \leq x \leq 1} (1+x/s)^{-1} \sim 1-x/s$ for $s \rightarrow \infty$. Hence for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $s_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\left| \sup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} c(s+x) - \inf_{0 \leq x \leq 1} c(s+x) \right| \leq c(s)\varepsilon \quad \text{for all } s \in \mathbb{N}, s \geq s_0. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

This helps us in proving the claimed statement as follows. Note that

$$\left| \sum_{s=s_0}^{x-1} c(s) - \int_{s_0}^x c(t) dt \right| \leq \sum_{s=s_0}^{x-1} \left| c(s) - \int_s^{s+1} c(t) dt \right| \leq \sum_{s=s_0}^{x-1} \left| \sup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} c(s+x) - \inf_{0 \leq x \leq 1} c(s+x) \right|.$$

By using (A.4) we infer that this sum is at most $\varepsilon \sum_{s=s_0}^{x-1} c(s)$. Hence

$$\left| 1 - \frac{\sum_a^{x-1} c(s)}{\int_a^x c(t) dt} \right| \sim \left| 1 - \frac{\sum_{s_0}^{x-1} c(s)}{\int_{s_0}^x c(t) dt} \right| \leq \varepsilon.$$

As $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, the proof is completed. \square

Another ingredient in our proofs is the following property of sums, where the terms depend on some slowly varying function. Let U be a non-decreasing right-continuous function on \mathbb{R} such that $U(x) = 0$ for $x < 0$. Consider the Laplace-Stieltjes transform

$$\hat{U}(\chi_n) = \int_0^\infty e^{-\chi x} dU(x).$$

If U is a step function with jumps at the integers, that is, $U(s) = U(\lfloor s \rfloor)$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$, then

$$\hat{U}(\chi_n) = \sum_{s \geq 0} U(s) e^{-\chi_n s}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

The next result is referenced to as *Karamata's Tauberian Theorem* and was derived in [26].

Theorem A.4 ([6, Thm. 1.7.1]). *Let $\alpha \geq 0, h$ slowly varying and $c > 0$. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

1. $U(x) \sim \frac{c}{\Gamma(\alpha+1)} h(x) x^\alpha$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$.
2. $\hat{U}(\chi) \sim c h(\chi^{-1}) \chi^{-(\alpha+1)}$ as $\chi \rightarrow 0$.