

# The left tail of the subcritical derivative martingale in a branching random walk

Benjamin BONNEFONT\*  
Vincent VARGAS†

December 22, 2023

## Abstract

Motivated by the study of the quantum Mabuchi theory [8], we obtain in this work a sharp estimate on the left tail of the distribution of the so-called derivative martingale in the  $L^4$  phase.

## 1 Introduction

Branching random walks (BRW) have a long history in probability theory and its applications. Given a real parameter  $\beta$  (the inverse temperature in the language of statistical physics), one can associate to a BRW a natural random measure called a multiplicative cascade. Multiplicative cascades were introduced by Mandelbrot in [10] as a toy model for Gaussian multiplicative chaos (GMC), a random measure which models energy dissipation in a turbulent flow. The precise mathematical construction of GMC was established by Kahane in the landmark paper [6] following the works on turbulence by Kolmogorov-Obukhov [7, 12] and Mandelbrot [9]. In both aforementioned models, the main object of interest (a random measure) is obtained as the limit of a positive martingale and it is also very natural to inquire on the existence and the properties of the derivatives of these martingales which form yet another sequence of martingales. In the case of GMC theory, these derivatives appear as a crucial ingredient in the construction of the quantum Mabuchi theory [8] or as so-called logarithmic fields in conformal field theory [13]. In this paper, we will work within the simplified framework of the Gaussian BRW as motivated by [8], we will give the first sharp estimates on the left tail of the derivative.

We consider the case of a BRW with binary splitting and independent standard Gaussian increments. The process is indexed by the binary tree  $\mathbb{T} = \cup_{n \geq 0} \{0, 1\}^n$  where by convention  $\{0, 1\}^0 = \{\emptyset\}$ . For  $u \in \mathbb{T}$ , let us denote  $|u|$  the length of  $u$ ,  $v \leq u$  if  $v$  is an ancestor of  $u$  and  $u \wedge v$  the *length* of the last common ancestor of  $u$  and  $v$ . The value of the BRW at  $u$  is given by

$$X_u := \sum_{\emptyset < v \leq u} G_v,$$

where  $(G_v)_{v \in \mathbb{T}}$  are i.i.d. standard Gaussian random variables<sup>1</sup>. The natural filtration of the process is given by  $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(X_u, |u| \leq n)$ . We can then define the additive martingale with real parameter

\*Sorbonne Université, LPSM, benjamin.bonnefont@sorbonne-universite.fr

†Université de Genève, Section de Mathématiques, vincent.vargas@unige.ch

<sup>1</sup>Here and hereafter, we adopt the classical conventions  $\sum_{\emptyset} = 0$  and  $\prod_{\emptyset} = 1$ .

$\beta$

$$W_n(\beta) := \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{|u|=n} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n},$$

which is a positive martingale with respect to  $(\mathcal{F}_n)$  and thus converges almost surely to a limit  $W_\beta$ . It is well known that this limit is non trivial if and only if  $\beta \in (-\beta_c, \beta_c)$  where  $\beta_c = \sqrt{2 \log 2}$ . **In the sequel, we will only consider the case  $\beta \in [0, \beta_c)$ .** The (almost surely positive) random variable  $W_\beta$  is very well understood. For instance the right tail is known with high precision and follows a power law decay, see for instance [4]. In particular,  $W_\beta$  is in  $L^p$  if and only if  $p < \left(\frac{\beta_c}{\beta}\right)^2$ .

Since for all  $\beta$ ,  $W_n(\beta)$  is a martingale, all higher order derivatives with respect to  $\beta$  are also martingales. In this paper, we will focus on the first derivative and hence study the following martingale

$$Z_n(\beta) := \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{|u|=n} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (X_u - \beta n).$$

Thanks to the almost sure uniform convergence on (complex) compact sets included in the domain  $\Lambda$  of figure 1 obtained in [1], the function  $\beta \mapsto W_\beta$  is almost surely analytical on  $\Lambda$ ,




Figure 1: The domain of convergence of the additive martingale  $\Lambda$  is delimited by the blue curves. The black circle delimits the  $L^2$  phase and the inner circle the  $L^4$  phase.

and  $Z_n(\beta)$  converges also almost surely to a non trivial limit  $Z_\beta = \partial_\beta W_\beta$  when  $\beta \in (0, \beta_c)^2$ . Contrary to the critical case, the limit  $Z_\beta$  is signed and has a highly non symmetrical distribution. Indeed, the right tail  $Z_\beta$  is expected to behave similarly to the right tail of  $W_\beta$  up to logarithmic corrections whereas the left tail is expected to be very thin. The behavior of the left tail was conjectured for general GMC measures in [8, Conjecture 1]. The purpose of this paper is precisely to prove this conjecture within the framework of the Gaussian BRW. In this context, the conjecture can be rephrased as follows: for  $\beta \in (0, \beta_c)$ , there exist constants  $c, c', C, C' > 0$  such that for all  $x \geq 0$

$$C e^{-cx^\gamma} \leq \mathbb{P}(Z_\beta < -x) \leq C' e^{-c'x^\gamma},$$

where

$$\gamma := \left(\frac{\beta_c}{\beta}\right)^2.$$

<sup>2</sup>In fact, the convergence holds in the whole domain of convergence.

We give a proof for the lower bound in the whole phase  $\beta \in (0, \beta_c)$  and one for the upper bound in the so-called  $L^4$  phase where  $\beta \in (0, \beta_c/2)$ .

## 1.1 Results

We will divide the presentation of our results in two parts. First we give a lower bound on the left tail in the full regime  $\beta \in (0, \beta_c)$ .

**Theorem 1.1.** *For  $\beta \in (0, \beta_c)$ , there exist  $c$  and  $C > 0$  such that for  $x \geq 0$*

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_\beta < -x) \geq Ce^{-cx^\gamma}.$$

Second we give an upper bound on the left tail in the regime  $\beta \in (0, \beta_c/2)$ .

**Theorem 1.2.** *For  $\beta \in (0, \frac{\beta_c}{2})$ , there exist  $c'$  and  $C' > 0$  such that for  $x \geq 0$*

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_\beta < -x) \leq C'e^{-c'x^\gamma}.$$

We will make two remarks on the limiting cases  $\beta = 0$  and  $\beta = \beta_c$  where much more is known and the behaviour of the left tail is quite different.

*Remark 1.3.* In the case  $\beta = 0$ , one can check that  $Z_0 = \lim_{\frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{|u|=n} X_u$  is a standard Gaussian random variable.

*Remark 1.4.* The case  $\beta = \beta_c$  has been thoroughly studied in the literature. In this case, the variable  $W_{\beta_c}$  is trivial; however  $Z_{\beta_c}$  is non trivial, negative almost surely and the left tail follows the power law

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_{\beta_c} < -x) \sim \frac{C}{x}, \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow +\infty,$$

for some  $C > 0$ , see [3].

## 2 Lower bound for the left tail: proof of Theorem 1.1

This section is devoted to proving Theorem 1.1.

### 2.1 Heuristics

A quick inspection of  $Z_n(\beta)$  as a function of  $(X_u)_{|u|=n}$ , namely

$$Z_n(\beta) = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{|u|=n} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (X_u - \beta n),$$

reveals that

$$\text{ess inf } Z_n(\beta) = -\frac{1}{\beta e} e^{\frac{\beta^2}{2}n} =: -m_n.$$

This value is achieved when all the particles are located at  $\beta n - \frac{1}{\beta}$ . This suggests the following scenario to get a lower bound. Put all the particles around  $\beta n - \frac{1}{\beta}$  to minimize  $Z_n(\beta)$  and then show that, on this event, the rest  $Z_\beta - Z_n(\beta)$  is negligible using the decomposition of the derivative martingale

$$Z_\beta = Z_n(\beta) + R_n(\beta),$$

with

$$R_n(\beta) = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{|u|=n} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} Z_\beta^u + \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{|u|=n} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (X_u - \beta n) (W_\beta^u - 1) \quad (2.1)$$

and  $(Z_\beta^u, W_\beta^u)$  are independent copies of  $(Z_\beta, W_\beta)$  independent of  $\mathcal{F}_n$ .

To see why this works, suppose for instance that we are in the  $L^2$  phase ( $\beta < \beta_c/\sqrt{2}$ ). In this case,  $Z^u$  and  $W^u - 1$  are centered with finite variance, thus the central limit theorem ensures that  $\sum_{|u|=n} Z_\beta^u$  fluctuates as  $2^{n/2}$ . If the  $X_u$  are all located near  $\beta n - \frac{1}{\beta}$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{|u|=n} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} Z_\beta^u \simeq \left( \frac{e^{\frac{\beta^2}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}} \right)^n \frac{1}{2^{\frac{n}{2}}} \sum_{|u|=n} Z_\beta^u$$

which is exponentially small thanks to the condition  $\beta < \beta_c$ .

The cost for placing all the particles around  $\beta n - \frac{1}{\beta}$  is of order  $\exp(-2^n)$  as we will see and noting that  $2^n = \left( e^{\frac{\beta^2}{2}n} \right)^\gamma$  shows that we obtain the expected order.

*Remark 2.1.* The probability that all the particles are near  $\beta n - \frac{1}{\beta}$  at time  $n$  in the i.i.d. case is

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{N}(0, n) = \beta n - \frac{1}{\beta} + O(1)\right)^{2^n} = e^{-\frac{\beta^2}{2}n2^n + o(n2^n)}.$$

We will see in the proof that the extra  $n$  term in the exponential comes from the i.i.d. assumption and it will disappear for the correlated process  $(X_u, |u| = n)$ .

Following the above heuristic, we start by giving a lower bound for the left tail of  $Z_n(\beta)$  and then a lower bound for the left tail of  $Z_\beta$  by showing that  $Z_n(\beta)$  and  $Z_\beta$  are close enough when the aforementioned scenario occurs.

## 2.2 Lower bound for the left tail of $Z_n(\beta)$

The process  $(X_u, |u| = n)$  is a Gaussian process with covariance given by  $\text{Cov}(X_u, X_v) = u \wedge v$ , where  $u \wedge v$  is the length of the last common ancestor of  $u$  and  $v$ . By ordering the  $n$ -th generation with the lexicographical order, this covariance gives a covariance matrix  $\Sigma_n \in \mathcal{M}_{2^n}(\mathbb{R})$ . The first ones are

$$\Sigma_1 = I_2, \quad \Sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Sigma_{n+1} = \left( \begin{array}{c|c} J_n + \Sigma_n & 0 \\ \hline 0 & J_n + \Sigma_n \end{array} \right),$$

where  $J_n \in \mathcal{M}_{2^n}(\mathbb{R})$  have all entries equal to 1. The recurrence relation above enables to compute the determinant of  $\Sigma_n$  which is  $(2^n - 1) \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (2^{n-k} - 1)^{2^k}$ . And the terms in the product are exactly the eigenvalues of  $\Sigma_n$  as can be seen by using the same recursion for the characteristic polynomials.

Now, recall that  $-m_n = -\frac{1}{e\beta} \exp\left(\frac{\beta^2}{2}n\right)$  is the essential infimum of  $Z_n(\beta)$  and for  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ , let

$$\mathcal{V}_n^\varepsilon := \left\{ x = (x_u)_{|u|=n} \in \mathbb{R}^{2^n} : \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{|u|=n} e^{\beta x_u - n \frac{\beta^2}{2}} (x_u - \beta n) < -(1 - \varepsilon)m_n \right\},$$

so that the following equality holds:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(Z_n(\beta) < -(1-\varepsilon)m_n) &= \mathbb{P}((X_u)_{|u|=n} \in \mathcal{V}_n^\varepsilon) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}^{2^n} \sqrt{\det \Sigma_n}} \int_{\mathcal{V}_n^\varepsilon} e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^t \Sigma_n^{-1} x} dx.\end{aligned}$$

If  $0 < \alpha_-^\varepsilon < 1 < \alpha_+^\varepsilon$  are the two solutions of the equation  $\alpha e^{-\alpha} = \frac{1}{e}(1-\varepsilon)$ , it is not hard to see that  $\Pi_n^\varepsilon := \left[\beta n - \frac{\alpha_+^\varepsilon}{\beta}, \beta n - \frac{\alpha_-^\varepsilon}{\beta}\right]^{2^n} \subset \mathcal{V}_n^\varepsilon$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(Z_n(\beta) < -(1-\varepsilon)m_n) &\geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}^{2^n} \sqrt{\det \Sigma_n}} \int_{\Pi_n^\varepsilon} e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^t \Sigma_n^{-1} x} dx \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}^{2^n} \sqrt{\det \Sigma_n}} \lambda(\Pi_n^\varepsilon) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \sup_{x \in \Pi_n^\varepsilon} x^t \Sigma_n^{-1} x\right).\end{aligned}$$

It is an exercise to show that  $\log \det \Sigma_n = \theta 2^n - 2 \log 2 + o(1)$  for some positive  $\theta \simeq 0.9458$ , the computations are done in Lemma A.2. Notice also that the biggest eigenvalue of  $\Sigma_n^{-1}$  is 1. Therefore if  $x \in \Pi_n^\varepsilon$ , by writing  $x = \left(\beta n - \frac{1}{\beta}\right) \mathbf{1} + h$  where  $\mathbf{1}$  is the vector with all coordinates equal to one, one has

$$\begin{aligned}x^t \Sigma_n^{-1} x &= \left(\beta n - \frac{1}{\beta}\right)^2 \mathbf{1}^t \Sigma_n^{-1} \mathbf{1} + 2 \left(\beta n - \frac{1}{\beta}\right) \mathbf{1}^t \Sigma_n^{-1} h + h^t \Sigma_n^{-1} h \\ &= \left(\beta n - \frac{1}{\beta}\right)^2 \frac{2^n}{2^n - 1} + 2 \left(\beta n - \frac{1}{\beta}\right) \frac{1}{2^n - 1} \sum_i h_i + h^t \Sigma_n^{-1} h \\ &\leq \left(\frac{\alpha_+^\varepsilon - 1}{\beta}\right)^2 2^n + O(n^2),\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that  $\alpha_+^\varepsilon - 1 > 1 - \alpha_-^\varepsilon$ . And one obtains

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_n(\beta) < -(1-\varepsilon)m_n) \geq e^{-\kappa_\varepsilon 2^n + O(n^2)},$$

where  $\kappa_\varepsilon := \frac{1}{2}(\log 2\pi + \theta) - \log \frac{\alpha_+^\varepsilon - \alpha_-^\varepsilon}{\beta} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\alpha_+^\varepsilon - 1}{\beta}\right)^2$ .

Taking for instance  $\varepsilon = 1/2$  gives the existence of a constant  $\lambda > 0$  such that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \mathbb{P}(Z_n(\beta) < -0.5m_n)}{2^n} \geq -\lambda.$$

### 2.3 Lower bound for the left tail of $Z_\beta$

We now show that  $Z_n(\beta)$  is a good approximation of  $Z_\beta$  when estimating the left tail below a fraction of  $m_n$ . Fix  $\delta > 0$ , and let us write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\left(|Z_\beta - Z_n(\beta)| \geq \delta |Z_n(\beta)| \mid \mathcal{F}_n\right) \\
&= \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{|u|=n} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} Z_\beta^u + \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{|u|=n} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (X_u - \beta n)(W_\beta^u - 1)\right| \geq \delta |Z_n(\beta)| \mid \mathcal{F}_n\right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{|u|=n} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} Z_\beta^u\right| \geq \frac{\delta |Z_n(\beta)|}{2} \mid \mathcal{F}_n\right) \\
&+ \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{|u|=n} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (X_u - \beta n)(W_\beta^u - 1)\right| \geq \frac{\delta |Z_n(\beta)|}{2} \mid \mathcal{F}_n\right) \\
&\leq \left(\frac{2}{\delta |Z_n(\beta)|}\right)^p B_p \left(\mathbb{E}|Z_\beta|^p \frac{1}{2^{np}} \sum_{|u|=n} e^{p\beta X_u - \frac{p\beta^2}{2}n} + \mathbb{E}|W_\beta - 1|^p \frac{1}{2^{np}} \sum_{|u|=n} e^{p\beta X_u - \frac{p\beta^2}{2}n} |X_u - \beta n|^p\right),
\end{aligned}$$

using Lemma A.1 for the last inequality with some  $p \in [1, \gamma \wedge 2)$ . On the event  $\{(X_u)_{|u|=n} \in \Pi_n^\varepsilon\}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|Z_n(\beta)| &\geq \frac{1-\varepsilon}{e^\beta} e^{\frac{\beta^2}{2}n}, \\
\frac{1}{2^{np}} \sum_{|u|=n} e^{p\beta X_u - \frac{p\beta^2}{2}n} &\leq e^{-p\alpha_\varepsilon} \frac{1}{2^{(p-1)n}} e^{p\frac{\beta^2}{2}n}, \\
\frac{1}{2^{np}} \sum_{|u|=n} e^{p\beta X_u - \frac{p\beta^2}{2}n} |X_u - \beta n|^p &\leq \left(\frac{e^{-\alpha_\varepsilon} \alpha_\varepsilon}{\beta}\right)^p \frac{1}{2^{(p-1)n}} e^{p\frac{\beta^2}{2}n}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|Z_\beta - Z_n(\beta)| \geq \delta |Z_n(\beta)| \mid \Pi_n^\varepsilon\right) \leq \left(\frac{2e\beta e^{-\alpha_\varepsilon}}{\delta(1-\varepsilon)}\right)^p B_p \left(\mathbb{E}|Z_\beta|^p + \mathbb{E}|W_\beta - 1|^p \left(\frac{\alpha_\varepsilon}{\beta}\right)^p\right) \frac{1}{2^{(p-1)n}}. \quad (2.2)$$

And the right term decays exponentially to 0 as soon as  $p > 1$ . Then, on  $\Pi_n^\varepsilon \cap \{|Z_\beta - Z_n(\beta)| \leq \delta |Z_n(\beta)|\}$ , one has

$$Z_\beta \leq -(1 - (\delta + \varepsilon))m_n,$$

thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(Z_\beta \leq -(1 - (\delta + \varepsilon))m_n) &\geq \mathbb{P}((X_u) \in \Pi_n^\varepsilon) \mathbb{P}(|Z_\beta - Z_n(\beta)| \leq \delta |Z_n(\beta)| \mid (X_u) \in \Pi_n^\varepsilon) \\
&\geq e^{-\kappa_\varepsilon 2^n + O(n^2)} \left(1 - \frac{C(\varepsilon, \delta)}{2^{(p-1)n}}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where  $C(\varepsilon, \delta)$  is the term in the r.h.s of Equation (2.2). This last inequality and the continuity of  $\kappa_\varepsilon$  for  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  lead to

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \mathbb{P}(Z_\beta \leq -(1 - \varepsilon)m_n)}{2^n} \geq -\kappa_\varepsilon.$$

And therefore,

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \mathbb{P}(Z_\beta \leq -x)}{x^\gamma} > -\infty$$

which concludes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

### 3 Upper bound for the left tail

#### 3.1 Large deviations with the branching property

From now on, we omit the subscript  $\beta$  to alleviate notations. The branching property gives the decomposition

$$Z = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{|u|=n} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (Z^u + (X_u - \beta n)W^u). \quad (3.1)$$

In order to obtain large deviations bounds, we need to control the Laplace transform of the random variables  $Z + aW$ . Intuitively, for  $a > 0$ , the fat right tail of  $W$  should help. For the same reason, it seems hopeless at first sight to obtain a nice bound in the case  $a < 0$ . But there must be some compensation with  $Z$  because a typical scenario for a large value for  $W$  leads to a positive large value for  $Z$  too (the box scenario of Subsection 2.2 being very atypical). Let us rewrite things a bit:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_n + aW_n &= \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{|u|=n} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (X_u - \beta n + a) \\ &= e^{-\beta a} \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{|u|=n} e^{\beta(X_u + a) - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} ((X_u + a) - \beta n). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $Z + aW = e^{-\beta a} Z^{[a]}$  where  $Z^{[a]}$  is the limit of the derivative martingale when the initial ancestor starts at  $a$ . Since the large negative values for  $Z_n$  are obtained when all the particles lie around  $\beta n$  at time  $n$ , it seems reasonable to expect that starting from  $a < 0$  makes it harder to achieve. In fact, by exponential tilting, we can shift the mean of the  $X_u$ 's and obtain a bound on the Laplace transform of  $Z^{[a]}$  with the Laplace transform of  $Z$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *For  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\lambda > 0$ , ones has*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-\lambda(Z+aW)} \right] \leq e^{\frac{a^2}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-2\lambda e^{-\beta a} Z} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

*Proof.* Recall that  $(X_u)_{|u|=n}$  is a centered Gaussian vector with covariance matrix  $\Sigma_n$  and note that  $\frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{|u|=n} X_u \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1 - 2^{-n})$ . Under the probability  $\mathbb{Q}_a$  defined by

$$\frac{d\mathbb{Q}_a}{d\mathbb{P}} = Y_n^{[a]} := e^{\frac{a}{(1-2^{-n})2^n} \sum_{|u|=n} X_u - \frac{a^2}{2(1-2^{-n})}},$$

the variables  $(X_u)_{|u|=n}$  are shifted: we have  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_a}[X_u] = a$  and the covariance matrix remains unchanged. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-\lambda Z_n^{[a]}} \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-\lambda \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{|u|=n} e^{\beta(X_u + a) - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (X_u + a - \beta n)} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ Y_n^{[a]} e^{-\lambda \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{|u|=n} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (X_u - \beta n)} \right] \\ &= e^{-\frac{a^2}{2(1-2^{-n})}} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{\frac{a}{(1-2^{-n})2^n} \sum_{|u|=n} X_u} e^{-\lambda \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{|u|=n} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (X_u - \beta n)} \right] \\ &\leq e^{-\frac{a^2}{2(1-2^{-n})}} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{\frac{2a}{(1-2^{-n})2^n} \sum_{|u|=n} X_u} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-2\lambda \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{|u|=n} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (X_u - \beta n)} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= e^{\frac{a^2}{2(1-2^{-n})}} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-2\lambda Z_n} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, applying Fatou's lemma and conditional Jensen's inequality yields

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-\lambda Z^{[a]}} \right] \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{\frac{a^2}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-2\lambda \mathbb{E}[Z|\mathcal{F}_n]} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq e^{\frac{a^2}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-2\lambda Z} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Finally, using  $Z + aW = e^{-\beta a} Z^{[a]}$  gives

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-\lambda(Z+aW)} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-\lambda e^{-\beta a} Z^{[a]}} \right] \leq e^{\frac{a^2}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-2\lambda e^{-\beta a} Z} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

□

For high particles and under the sub-Gaussian assumption<sup>3</sup>, we have the more refined lemma:

**Lemma 3.2.** *For  $a > 0$  and  $\lambda \geq 0$ , we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-\lambda(Z+aW)} \right] \leq e^{C(\lambda e^{-\beta a} a + (\lambda e^{-\beta a})^2)}.$$

*Proof.* With the sub-Gaussian result of Proposition 3.3, we can sharpen the previous lemma using Hölder's inequality instead of Cauchy-Schwarz in the proof of Lemma 3.1. If  $a > 0$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-\lambda Z^{[a]}} \right] &\leq e^{(p-1)\frac{a^2}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-\frac{p}{p-1}\lambda Z} \right]^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \\ &\leq e^{(p-1)\frac{a^2}{2} + C\frac{p}{p-1}\lambda^2}. \end{aligned}$$

By choosing  $p = 1 + \frac{\lambda}{a}$ , one gets

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-\lambda Z^{[a]}} \right] \leq e^{C(\lambda a + \lambda^2)},$$

for some other constant  $C > 0$ . Therefore

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-\lambda(Z+aW)} \right] \leq e^{C(\lambda e^{-\beta a} a + (\lambda e^{-\beta a})^2)}.$$

□

We now turn to the proof of Theorem 1.2.

*Proof of Theorem 1.2:* We start with representation (3.1) and apply a Chernoff bound to the three following terms

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{X_u < \beta n} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (Z^u + (X_u - \beta n)W^u) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{X_u \in [\beta n, \beta n + 1]} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (Z^u + (X_u - \beta n)W^u) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{X_u > \beta n + 1} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (Z^u + (X_u - \beta n)W^u). \end{aligned}$$

From now on, fix some  $\alpha > 0$  whose value will be determined later.

---

<sup>3</sup>Here we think of sub-Gaussian on the left, meaning that a random variable  $V$  is sub-Gaussian if there exist  $c$  and  $C > 0$  such that for  $\lambda \geq 0$ , we have  $\mathbb{E} e^{-\lambda V} \leq C e^{c\lambda^2}$ . This will be proved in Proposition 3.3.



For the particles below  $\beta n$ , we have, for  $\lambda > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{X_u < \beta n} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (Z^u + (X_u - \beta n)W^u) < -\alpha e^{\frac{\beta^2}{2}n} \middle| \mathcal{F}_n\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\lambda \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{X_u < \beta n} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (Z^u + (X_u - \beta n)W^u)\right) > \exp\left(\lambda \alpha e^{\frac{\beta^2}{2}n}\right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_n\right] \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\lambda \alpha e^{\frac{\beta^2}{2}n}\right) \prod_{X_u < \beta n} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\lambda \frac{1}{2^n} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (Z^u + (X_u - \beta n)W^u)\right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_n\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Then, using Proposition 3.4,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\lambda \frac{1}{2^n} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (Z^u + (X_u - \beta n)W^u)\right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_n\right] \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\lambda \frac{1}{2^n} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (X_u - \beta n) + C \left(\left(\lambda \frac{1}{2^n} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} e^{-\beta(X_u - \beta n)}\right)^2 + 1\right)\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(\frac{1}{e\beta} \lambda \frac{e^{\frac{\beta^2}{2}n}}{2^n} + C \left(\left(\lambda \frac{e^{\frac{\beta^2}{2}n}}{2^n}\right)^2 + 1\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by choosing  $\lambda = 2^n e^{-\frac{\beta^2}{2}n}$ , one gets

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{X_u < \beta n} \frac{1}{2^n} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (Z^u + (X_u - \beta n)W^u) < -\alpha e^{\frac{\beta^2}{2}n} \middle| \mathcal{F}_n\right) \\ &\leq \exp(-\alpha 2^n) \prod_{X_u < \beta n} \exp\left(\frac{1}{e\beta} + 2C\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\left(\alpha - \frac{1}{e\beta} - C\right)2^n\right). \end{aligned}$$

For particles between  $\beta n$  and  $\beta n + 1$ , Lemma 3.1 and Proposition 3.3 provide  $C > 0$  such that, for  $\lambda, a \geq 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\lambda(Z+aW)}\right] \leq e^{\frac{a^2}{2} + C(\lambda e^{-\beta a})^2}.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{\beta n \leq X_u \leq \beta n + 1} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (Z^u + (X_u - \beta n)W^u) < -\alpha e^{\frac{\beta^2}{2}n} \middle| \mathcal{F}_n\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\lambda \alpha e^{\frac{\beta^2}{2}n}\right) \prod_{\beta n \leq X_u \leq \beta n + 1} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\lambda \frac{1}{2^n} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (Z^u + (X_u - \beta n)W^u)\right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_n\right] \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\lambda \alpha e^{\frac{\beta^2}{2}n}\right) \prod_{\beta n \leq X_u \leq \beta n + 1} \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}(X_u - \beta n)^2 + \left(\lambda \frac{1}{2^n} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} e^{-\beta(X_u - \beta n)}\right)^2\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\lambda \alpha e^{\frac{\beta^2}{2}n}\right) \prod_{\beta n \leq X_u \leq \beta n + 1} \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} + \left(\lambda \frac{e^{\frac{\beta^2}{2}n}}{2^n}\right)^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

Taking again  $\lambda = 2^n e^{-\frac{\beta^2}{2}n}$  gives

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{\beta n \leq X_u \leq \beta n + 1} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (Z^u + (X_u - \beta n)W^u) < -\alpha e^{\frac{\beta^2}{2}n} \middle| \mathcal{F}_n\right) \leq \exp\left(-\left(\alpha - \frac{3}{2}\right)2^n\right).$$

It remains to deal with the particles above  $\beta n + 1$ . An estimate on the Laplace transform of  $W$  is needed for this purpose. Recall that

$$W = \frac{1}{2} e^{\beta X_0 - \frac{\beta^2}{2}} W^0 + \frac{1}{2} e^{\beta X_1 - \frac{\beta^2}{2}} W^1,$$

where  $W^0$  and  $W^1$  are independent and have the same law as  $W$ . A straightforward computation shows that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log \log 1/\mathbb{P}(\frac{1}{2} e^{\beta X_0 - \frac{\beta^2}{2}} < x)}{\log \log 1/x} = 2.$$

And [11, Theorem 1.2] provides  $c > 0$  such that for every  $\lambda \geq 1$ , one has<sup>4</sup>

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\lambda W}\right] \leq e^{-c \log^{3/2}(\lambda)}. \quad (3.2)$$

When  $x > \beta n + 1$ , we can use a portion of  $W$  to improve the Chernoff bound:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\lambda \frac{1}{2^n} e^{\beta x - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (Z + (x - \beta n)W)\right)\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\lambda \frac{1}{2^n} e^{\beta x - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (Z + (x - \beta n - 1)W)\right) \exp\left(-\lambda \frac{1}{2^n} e^{\beta x - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} W\right)\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-2\lambda \frac{1}{2^n} e^{\beta x - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (Z + (x - \beta n - 1)W)\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-2\lambda \frac{1}{2^n} e^{\beta x - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} W\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then using Lemma 3.2 for the first term and Equation (3.2) for the second term yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\lambda \frac{1}{2^n} e^{\beta x - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (Z + (x - \beta n)W)\right)\right] \\ &\leq \exp\left(C\lambda \frac{1}{2^n} e^{\beta x - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} e^{-\beta(x - \beta n - 1)}(x - \beta n - 1) + 2C\left(\lambda \frac{1}{2^n} e^{\beta x - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} e^{-\beta(x - \beta n - 1)}\right)^2\right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{c}{2} \log^{3/2}\left(2\lambda \frac{1}{2^n} e^{\beta x - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n}\right)\right) \\ &= \exp\left(C\lambda \frac{e^{\frac{\beta^2}{2}n}}{2^n} e^{\beta(x - \beta n - 1)} + 2C\left(\lambda \frac{e^{\frac{\beta^2}{2}n}}{2^n} e^{\beta}\right)^2 - \frac{c}{2} \log^{3/2}\left(2\lambda \frac{1}{2^n} e^{\beta x - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n}\right)\right), \end{aligned}$$

as soon as  $2\lambda \frac{1}{2^n} e^{\beta(\beta n + 1) - n\frac{\beta^2}{2}} \geq 1$ . For  $\lambda = e^{-\beta} 2^n e^{-\frac{\beta^2}{2}n}$ , this condition is fulfilled and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\lambda \frac{1}{2^n} e^{\beta x - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (Z + (x - \beta n)W)\right)\right] &\leq \exp\left(C(x - \beta n - 1) + 2C - \frac{c\beta^{3/2}}{2}(x - \beta n - 1)^{3/2}\right) \\ &\leq \exp(D), \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>4</sup>This is true for any exponent strictly below 2, here we choose 3/2.

for some  $D > 0$ <sup>5</sup>. Choosing  $\lambda = e^{-\beta} 2^n e^{-\frac{\beta^2}{2}n}$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{X_u > \beta n + 1} e^{\beta x - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (Z^u + (X_u - \beta n)W^u) < -\alpha e^{\frac{\beta^2}{2}n} \mid \mathcal{F}_n\right) \\ \leq \exp\left(-\lambda \alpha e^{\frac{\beta^2}{2}n}\right) \prod_{X_u > \beta n + 1} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\lambda \frac{1}{2^n} e^{\beta X_u - n \frac{\beta^2}{2}} (Z^u + (X_u - \beta n)W^u)\right) \mid \mathcal{F}_n\right] \\ \leq \exp\left(-(e^{-\beta} \alpha - D) 2^n\right). \end{aligned}$$

With  $\alpha = 3 \max\left(1 + C + \frac{1}{e\beta}, \frac{5}{2}, (1 + D)e^\beta\right)$ , one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(Z < -\alpha e^{\frac{\beta^2}{2}n}\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{X_u < \beta n} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (Z^u + (X_u - \beta n)W^u) < -\frac{\alpha}{3} e^{\frac{\beta^2}{2}n}\right) \\ &+ \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{\beta n \leq X_u \leq \beta n + 1} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (Z^u + (X_u - \beta n)W^u) < -\frac{\alpha}{3} e^{\frac{\beta^2}{2}n}\right) \\ &+ \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{X_u > \beta n + 1} e^{\beta X_u - \frac{\beta^2}{2}n} (Z^u + (X_u - \beta n)W^u) < -\frac{\alpha}{3} e^{\frac{\beta^2}{2}n}\right) \\ &\leq 3 \exp(-2^n). \end{aligned}$$

Now, if  $x > 1$ , picking  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\alpha e^{\frac{\beta^2}{2}n} \leq x < \alpha e^{\frac{\beta^2}{2}(n+1)}$  provides a  $c > 0$  such that

$$\mathbb{P}(Z < -x) \leq 3e^{-cx^\gamma}$$

and concludes the proof.

### 3.2 A continuous analogue

The aim of this section is twofold. First we prove that  $Z$  displays a sub-Gaussian left tail in the  $L^4$  phase ( $\beta < \beta_c/2$ ) using a related model. Then, we use the same techniques to recover a uniform bound on the Laplace transform of  $Z + aW$  when  $a < 0$ .

We consider the binary branching Wiener process which is defined the following way: start with one particule at 0 that splits into two particles which diffuse as standard Brownian motions. At time 1, those two particles split into two new particles which diffuse independently from the position of their ancestor and so on. More precisely, if  $(B^v)_{v \in \mathbb{T}}$  is a family of i.i.d. Brownian motions and  $\mathcal{N}_t := \{0, 1\}^{[t]}$ , where  $[t]$  is the smallest integer above  $t$ , define for  $t \geq 0$  and  $u \in \mathcal{N}_t$

$$X_t(u) := \sum_{\emptyset < v \leq u} B_1^v + B_{t-[t]}^u,$$

where  $[t]$  is the integer part of  $t$ . At time  $t$ , we thus have  $2^{[t]}$  particles and at integer times  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  the process is distributed as the original branching random walk. This detour by the continuous case will allow us to perform stochastic calculus.

The analogue of the derivative martingale is given by

$$Z_t := \frac{1}{2^{[t]}} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{N}_t} (X_t(u) - \beta t) e^{\beta X_t(u) - \frac{\beta^2}{2}t}.$$

---

<sup>5</sup>Here we use the fact that  $\beta > 0$ .

Note that despite the integer part in the definition of  $Z_t$ , it is a continuous martingale with respect to  $\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma(X_s(u), u \in \mathcal{N}_s, s \leq t)$ . Its quadratic variation is given by

$$\langle Z \rangle_t = \frac{1}{4^{\lfloor t \rfloor}} \sum_{u, v \in \mathcal{N}_t} \int_0^t (1 + \beta(X_s(u) - \beta s))(1 + \beta(X_s(v) - \beta s)) e^{\beta X_s(u) - \frac{\beta^2}{2}s} e^{\beta X_s(v) - \frac{\beta^2}{2}s} \mathbf{1}_{s \leq u \wedge v} ds,$$

where  $u \wedge v$  is the generation of the last common ancestor of  $u$  and  $v$ .

Let  $\partial\mathbb{T} := \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$  and for  $u \in \partial\mathbb{T}$ , let  $X_t(u)$  denotes the position of the ancestor of  $u$  at time  $t$ .  $\partial\mathbb{T}$  is endowed with the ultrametric distance  $d$  defined by  $d(u, v) = 2^{-u \wedge v}$  and the uniform probability measure  $\mu$  which is characterized by  $\mu(\{v : v \geq u\}) = 2^{-|u|}$ . The quadratic variation can be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle Z \rangle_t &= \int_{\partial\mathbb{T}^2 \times [0, t]} (1 + \beta(X_s(u) - \beta s))(1 + \beta(X_s(v) - \beta s)) e^{\beta(X_s(u) + X_s(v)) - \beta^2 s} \mathbf{1}_{s \leq u \wedge v} \mu(du) \mu(dv) ds \\ &= \int_{\partial\mathbb{T}^2 \times [0, t]} (1 + \beta(X_s(u) - \beta s))^2 e^{2\beta X_s(u) - \beta^2 s} \mathbf{1}_{s \leq u \wedge v} \mu(du) \mu(dv) ds. \end{aligned}$$

The approach laid in [8] is to define an auxiliary martingale  $\tilde{Z}$  where the excursions above some well chosen threshold are removed and to show Gaussian concentration for this new martingale and the difference with the original one by proving that their brackets remain bounded. We are reproducing the main ideas of the proof here since we are going to use them for the proof of Proposition 3.4. The following proposition states that the left tail of  $Z$  is sub-Gaussian in the  $L^4$  phase.

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $\beta < \frac{\beta_c}{2}$ , then there exists  $C > 0$  such that, for  $\lambda \geq 0$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-\lambda Z} \right] \leq e^{C\lambda^2}.$$

*Proof.* Let us define the following stopping times:

$$\begin{aligned} T_k^u &:= \inf \{ t \geq R_{k-1}^u : X_t(u) = (\beta + \eta)t + A \}, \\ R_k^u &:= \inf \{ t \geq T_k^u : X_t(u) = \beta t \}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $R_0^u := 0$ . Let  $\mathcal{R}^u := \cup_k [R_{k-1}^u, T_k^u]$  and define

$$\tilde{Z}_t := \int_{\partial\mathbb{T}} \int_0^t (1 + \beta(X_s(u) - \beta s)) e^{\beta X_s(u) - \frac{\beta^2}{2}s} \mathbf{1}_{s \in \mathcal{R}^u} dX_s(u) \mu(du).$$

It is a martingale and the difference with the original martingale  $Z$  is controlled by

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \int_{\partial\mathbb{T}} \sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{\{T_k^u < +\infty\}} (A + \eta T_k^u) e^{\left(\frac{\beta^2}{2} + \beta\eta\right) T_k^u + \beta A} \mu(du) \\ &=: \int_{\partial\mathbb{T}} Q^u \mu(du), \end{aligned}$$

and the fact that  $Z_\infty \geq \tilde{Z}_\infty - Q$ , see [8, Section 5.2] for more details.

Now we prove that both right terms exhibit Gaussian concentration. The bracket of the first one is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tilde{Z} \rangle_t &= \int_{\partial\mathbb{T}^2 \times [0,t]} (1 + \beta(X_s(u) - \beta s)) (1 + \beta(X_s(v) - \beta s)) e^{\beta(X_s(u) + X_s(v) - \beta^2 s)} \\ &\quad \mathbb{1}_{\{s \in \mathcal{R}^u \cap \mathcal{R}^v\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{s \leq u \wedge v\}} \mu(du) \mu(dv) ds \\ &= \int_{\partial\mathbb{T}^2 \times [0,t]} (1 + \beta(X_s(u) - \beta s))^2 e^{2\beta X_s(u) - \beta^2 s} \mathbb{1}_{\{s \in \mathcal{R}^u \cap \mathcal{R}^v\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{s \leq u \wedge v\}} \mu(du) \mu(dv) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that  $X_s(u) \leq (\beta + \eta)s + A$  when  $s \in \mathcal{R}^u$ , one gets

$$\langle \tilde{Z} \rangle_t \leq \int_{\partial\mathbb{T}^2 \times [0,t]} (1 + \beta(\eta s + A))^2 e^{(\beta^2 + 2\beta\eta)s + 2\beta A} \mathbb{1}_{\{s \leq u \wedge v\}} \mu(du) \mu(dv) ds.$$

Now, note that the following integral

$$\int_{\partial\mathbb{T}^2} e^{\alpha u \wedge v} \mu(du) \mu(dv) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{e^{\alpha n}}{2^{n+1}}$$

is finite if and only if  $\alpha < \log 2$ . This guaranties that  $\langle \tilde{Z} \rangle_\infty$  is bounded if  $\beta^2 + 2\beta\eta < \log 2$  and provides a sub-Gaussian tail for  $\tilde{Z}_\infty$ .

To prove Gaussian concentration for  $Q$ , the authors in [8] start by showing that  $\mathbb{E}Q < \infty$ . Then they use the continuous martingale  $Q_t^u := \mathbb{E}[Q^u | \mathcal{F}_t]$  and the decomposition

$$dQ_t^u := A_t^u dX_t(u).$$

This way, the bracket is given by

$$\langle Q \rangle_\infty = \int_{\partial\mathbb{T}^2 \times [0, \infty)} A_t^u A_t^v \mathbb{1}_{\{t \leq u \wedge v\}} \mu(du) \mu(dv) dt.$$

The method used in [8] to obtain the expression of  $A_t^u$  is «purely Brownian» and does not involve the covariance structure, it is therefore valid in our context. Let us reproduce the results here.

When  $t \in (T_k^u, R_k^u)$ , the Markov property for  $(X_t(u))_{t \geq 0}$  gives

$$Q^u = \sum_{i=1}^k (A + \eta T_i^u) e^{(\frac{\beta^2}{2} + \beta\eta)T_i^u} + \mathbb{E}_{X_t(u)} \left[ \sum_{i \geq 1} \mathbb{1}_{\widehat{T}_i^t < +\infty} (A + \eta(\widehat{T}_i^t + t)) e^{(\frac{\beta^2}{2} + \beta\eta)(\widehat{T}_i^t + t) + \beta A} \right],$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_z$  denotes the expectation with respect to the law of a standard Brownian motion starting at  $z$  and  $\widehat{T}_0^t := 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{R}_k^t &:= \inf \left\{ s \geq \widehat{T}_{k-1}^t : B_s \leq \beta(t + s) \right\}, \\ \widehat{T}_k^t &:= \inf \left\{ s \geq \widehat{R}_k^t : B_s = A + (\beta + \eta)(t + s) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

In this case, this yields to the following

$$A_t^u = \partial_z \left( \mathbb{E}_z \left[ \sum_{i \geq 1} \mathbb{1}_{\widehat{T}_i^t < +\infty} (A + \eta(\widehat{T}_i^t + t)) e^{(\frac{\beta^2}{2} + \beta\eta)(\widehat{T}_i^t + t) + \beta A} \right] \right) \Big|_{z=X_t(u)}.$$

When  $t \in (R_k^u, T_{k+1}^u)$ , in the same manner,

$$Q^u = \sum_{i=1}^k (A + \eta T_i^u) e^{(\frac{\beta^2}{2} + \beta\eta)T_i^u} + \mathbb{E}_{X_t(u)} \left[ \sum_{i \geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{T_i^t < +\infty} (A + \eta(T_i^t + t)) e^{(\frac{\beta^2}{2} + \beta\eta)(T_i^t + t) + \beta A} \right],$$

where  $R_0^t := 0$  and

$$\begin{aligned} T_k^t &:= \inf \left\{ s \geq R_{k-1}^t : B_s \leq A + (\beta + \eta)(t + s) \right\}, \\ R_k^t &:= \inf \left\{ s \geq R_k^t : B_s = \beta(t + s) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$A_t^u = \partial_z \left( \mathbb{E}_z \left[ \sum_{i \geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{T_i^t < +\infty} (A + \eta(T_i^t + t)) e^{(\frac{\beta^2}{2} + \beta\eta)(T_i^t + t) + \beta A} \right] \right) \Big|_{z=X_t(u)}.$$

In a more compact form, this gives

$$A_t^u = \begin{cases} f_1(t, X_t(u)), & \text{if } t \in (T_k^u, R_k^u), \\ f_2(t, X_t(u)), & \text{if } t \in (R_k^u, T_{k+1}^u). \end{cases}$$

If one chooses  $\eta$  such that  $2\eta > \beta$  and  $\beta^2 + 2\beta\eta < \log 2$  (which is possible in the  $L^4$  phase), [8, Lemma 5.3, Lemma 5.4]<sup>6</sup> provides  $C = C(A, \eta, \beta) > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} |f_1(t, z)| &\leq C(t+1)e^{(\frac{\beta^2}{2} + \beta\eta)t}, & \text{for } z \geq \beta t, \\ |f_2(t, z)| &\leq C(t+1)e^{(\frac{\beta^2}{2} + \beta\eta)t}, & \text{for } z \leq (\beta + \eta)t + A. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\langle Q \rangle_\infty \leq \int_{\partial\mathbb{T}^2 \times [0, \infty)} C^2(t+1)^2 e^{(\beta^2 + 2\beta\eta)t} \mathbf{1}_{t \leq u \wedge v} \mu(du) \mu(dv) dt < \infty,$$

which proves that  $Q$  displays Gaussian concentration.  $\square$

The above approach also provides a useful bound on the Laplace transform of low particles.

**Proposition 3.4.** *There exists  $C > 0$  such that, for  $a \leq 0$  and  $\lambda \geq 0$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-\lambda(Z+aW)} \right] \leq e^{-\lambda a + C \left( (\lambda e^{-\beta a})^2 + 1 \right)}.$$

*Proof.* As in the discrete case, define the derivative martingale when the initial ancestor starts at  $a \leq 0$ :

$$Z_t^{[a]} := \frac{1}{2^{|t|}} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{N}_t} (a + X_t(u) - \beta t) e^{\beta(a + X_t(u)) - \frac{\beta^2}{2}t}.$$

Define as previously

$$\begin{aligned} T_k^{u,[a]} &:= \inf \left\{ t \geq R_{k-1}^u : a + X_t(u) = (\beta + \eta)t + A \right\}, \\ R_k^{u,[a]} &:= \inf \left\{ t \geq T_k^u : a + X_t(u) = \beta t \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

<sup>6</sup>You should read  $z \leq (\gamma + \eta)t + A$  in the statement of Lemma 5.4.

where  $R_0^{u,[a]} := 0$ . Let  $\mathcal{R}^{u,[a]} := \bigcup_k [R_{k-1}^{u,[a]}, T_k^{u,[a]}]$  and define

$$\tilde{Z}_t^{[a]} = ae^{\beta a} + \int_{\partial\mathbb{T}} \int_0^t (1 + \beta(a + X_s(u) - \beta s)) e^{\beta(a + X_s(u) - \frac{\beta^2}{2}s)} \mathbf{1}_{s \in \mathcal{R}^{u,[a]}} dX_s(u) \mu(du).$$

It is a martingale bounded in  $L^2$  by Equation (3.3) and we have

$$Z_\infty^{[a]} \geq \tilde{Z}_\infty^{[a]} - Q^{[a]},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Q^{[a]} &= \int_{\partial\mathbb{T}} Q_u^{[a]} \mu(du) \\ &= \int_{\partial\mathbb{T}} \sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{T_k^{u,[a]} < +\infty} (A + \eta T_k^{u,[a]}) e^{(\frac{\beta^2}{2} + \beta\eta)T_k^{u,[a]} + \beta A} \mu(du). \end{aligned}$$

We are going to prove

$$\sup_{a \leq 0} \text{ess sup} \langle \tilde{Z}^{[a]} \rangle_\infty < \infty, \quad \mathbb{E}Q^{[a]} \leq \mathbb{E}Q, \quad \sup_{a \leq 0} \text{ess sup} \langle Q^{[a]} \rangle_\infty < \infty. \quad (3.3)$$

Let us admit for a moment those bounds. Then, using  $\mathbb{E}\tilde{Z}_\infty^{[a]} = ae^{\beta a}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-\lambda Z_\infty^{[a]}} \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{-2\lambda \tilde{Z}_\infty^{[a]}} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{2\lambda Q^{[a]}} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq e^{-\lambda \mathbb{E}\tilde{Z}_\infty^{[a]} + \text{ess sup} \langle \tilde{Z}^{[a]} \rangle_\infty \lambda^2} e^{\lambda \mathbb{E}Q^{[a]} + \text{ess sup} \langle Q^{[a]} \rangle_\infty \lambda^2} \\ &\leq e^{-\lambda ae^{\beta a} + C(\lambda^2 + 1)}, \end{aligned}$$

for some  $C > 0$ . And using  $Z + aW = e^{-\beta a} Z^{[a]}$  concludes the proof.

Now let us prove the 3 statements in (3.3). First, using the fact that  $a + X_s(u) \leq (\beta + \eta)s + A$  when  $s \in \mathcal{R}^{u,[a]}$ , one obtains the same finite bound as in the case  $a = 0$ , namely

$$\langle \tilde{Z}^{[a]} \rangle_\infty \leq \int_{\partial\mathbb{T}^2 \times [0, \infty)} (1 + \beta(\eta s + A))^2 e^{(\beta^2 + 2\beta\eta)s + 2\beta A} \mathbf{1}_{s \leq u \wedge v} \mu(du) \mu(dv) ds < \infty.$$

*Remark 3.5.* In the case  $a > 0$ , we lose the control on the bracket for  $t \in (0, T_1)$ .

The strong Markov property for  $(X_t(u), t \geq 0)$  applied at  $T_1^{u,[a]}$  shows that the conditional law of  $(T_k^{u,[a]})_{k \geq 2}$  given  $T_1^{u,[a]}$  is equal to the conditional law of  $(T_k^u)_{k \geq 2}$  given  $T_1^u$ . We can thus focus on the first hitting time. Now, recall that the hitting time  $T_{\alpha,b}$  of a line  $s \mapsto \alpha + bs$  with  $b > 0$  by a standard Brownian motion has a law given by

$$\mathbf{1}_{t > 0} \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{2\pi t^{\frac{3}{2}}}} e^{-\alpha b} e^{-\frac{b^2}{2}t - \frac{\alpha^2}{2t}} + (1 - e^{-2\alpha b}) \delta_\infty,$$

see for instance [2, Formula 2.0.2], and observe that the density part is decreasing in  $\alpha$  as soon as  $\alpha > \frac{1}{b}$ . Thus, if we choose  $A > \frac{1}{\beta + \eta}$ , we have, for  $t \in (0, \infty)$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(T_1^{u,[a]} = t) \leq \mathbb{P}(T_1^u = t) \text{ } ^7.$$

<sup>7</sup>Note that we also have  $T_1^{u,[a]} \geq T_1^u$  almost surely!

Then, with  $f^{u,[a]}(t) := \mathbb{P}(T_1^{u,[a]} = t)$ , one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(Q_u^{[a]} > x) &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(Q_u^{[a]} > x \mid T_1^{u,[a]} = t) \mathbb{P}(T_1^{u,[a]} = t) dt \\
&= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{T_k^{u,[a]} < +\infty} (A + \eta T_k^{u,[a]}) e^{(\frac{\beta^2}{2} + \beta\eta)T_k^{u,[a]} + \beta A} > x \mid T_1^{u,[a]} = t\right) f^{u,[a]}(t) dt \\
&= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{T_k^u < +\infty} (A + \eta T_k^u) e^{(\frac{\beta^2}{2} + \beta\eta)T_k^u + \beta A} > x \mid T_1^u = t\right) f^{u,[a]}(t) dt \\
&\leq \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{T_k^u < +\infty} (A + \eta T_k^u) e^{(\frac{\beta^2}{2} + \beta\eta)T_k^u + \beta A} > x \mid T_1^u = t\right) \mathbb{P}(T_1^u = t) dt \\
&= \mathbb{P}(Q_u > x).
\end{aligned}$$

We thus have the following stochastic dominance

$$Q_u^{[a]} \leq_s Q_u \text{ }^8. \quad (3.4)$$

And by linearity

$$\mathbb{E}Q^{[a]} = \int_{\partial\mathbb{T}} \mathbb{E}Q_u^{[a]} \mu(du) \leq \int_{\partial\mathbb{T}} \mathbb{E}Q_u \mu(du) = \mathbb{E}Q.$$

What remains to be proved is a uniform bound for  $\langle Q^{[a]} \rangle_\infty$  over  $a$ . The proof goes the same way as in [8]: with

$$Q_u^{[a]}(t) := \mathbb{E}\left[Q_u^{[a]} \mid \mathcal{F}_t\right],$$

and

$$dQ_u^{[a]}(t) = A_u^{[a]}(t) dX_t(u),$$

the Markov property applied to  $(a + X_t(u))_{t \geq 0}$  yields to the same expression for the infinitesimal increment

$$A_u^{[a]}(t) = \begin{cases} f_1(t, a + X_t(u)), & \text{if } t \in (T_k^{u,[a]}, R_k^{u,[a]}) , \\ f_2(t, a + X_t(u)), & \text{if } t \in (R_k^{u,[a]}, T_{k+1}^{u,[a]}) . \end{cases}$$

And since in the first case  $a + X_t(u) \geq \beta t$  and  $a + X_t(u) \leq (\beta + \eta)t + A$  in the second case, one has by [8, Lemma 5.3, Lemma 5.4]

$$|A_u^{[a]}(t)| \leq C(t+1)e^{(\frac{\beta^2}{2} + \beta\eta)t}.$$

This yields to the desired uniform bound over  $a$

$$\langle Q^{[a]} \rangle_\infty \leq \int_{\partial\mathbb{T}^2 \times [0, \infty)} C^2(t+1)^2 e^{(\beta^2 + 2\beta\eta)t} \mathbf{1}_{t \leq u \wedge v} \mu(du) \mu(dv) dt < \infty.$$

□

---

<sup>8</sup>We didn't find a way to extend it to  $Q^{[a]} \leq_s Q$ .



## A Appendix

The following lemma helps to control the terms in (2.1).

**Lemma A.1.** *If  $p \in [1, \gamma \wedge 2)$ , then  $Z_\beta, W_\beta \in L^p$  and there exists  $B_p > 0$  such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \sum_{|u|=n} e^{\beta X_u - n\kappa_\beta} Z_\beta^u \right|^p \middle| \mathcal{F}_n \right] \leq B_p \mathbb{E} |Z_\beta|^p \sum_{|u|=n} e^{p(\beta X_u - n\kappa_\beta)},$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \sum_{|u|=n} e^{\beta X_u - n\kappa_\beta} (X_u - \beta n) (W_\beta^u - 1) \right|^p \middle| \mathcal{F}_n \right] \leq B_p \mathbb{E} |W_\beta - 1|^p \sum_{|u|=n} e^{p(\beta X_u - n\kappa_\beta)} |X_u - \beta n|^p.$$

*Proof.* If  $Y_1, \dots, Y_N$  are centered and independent random variables in  $L^p$ , the Marcinkiewicz-Zygmund inequality provides a positive  $B_p$  (which does not depend on  $Y$ ) such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \sum_{k=1}^N Y_k \right|^p \right] \leq B_p \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{k=1}^N Y_k^2 \right)^{p/2} \right].$$

Now the function  $x \mapsto x^{p/2}$  is subadditive since  $p < 2$ , thus

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \sum_{k=1}^N Y_k \right|^p \right] \leq B_p \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^N |Y_k|^p \right],$$

and the proof of the proposition is a consequence of this last inequality applied to the random variables  $e^{\beta X_u - n\kappa_\beta} Z_\beta^u$  and  $e^{\beta X_u - n\kappa_\beta} (X_u - \beta n) (W_\beta^u - 1)$  conditionally on  $\mathcal{F}_n$ .  $\square$

**Lemma A.2.** *There exists  $\theta > 0$  such that*

$$\log \det \Sigma_n = \theta 2^n - 2 \log 2 + o(1).$$

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} \log \det \Sigma_n &= \log(2^n - 1) + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} 2^k \log(2^{n-k} - 1) \\ &= \log(2^n - 1) + 2^n \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{2^k} \left( k \log 2 + \log \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2^k} \right) \right) \\ &= 2^n \left( \log 2 \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{k}{2^k} + \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{2^k} \log \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2^k} \right) + \frac{\log(2^n - 1)}{2^n} \right) \\ &= 2^n \left( \underbrace{\theta - \log 2 \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{k}{2^k} - \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} \log \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2^k} \right) + \frac{\log(2^n - 1)}{2^n}}_{\frac{-2 \log 2}{2^n} + O(4^{-n})} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we set  $\theta = 2 \log 2 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} \log \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2^k} \right)$  and used  $\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{k}{2^k} = \frac{n+2}{2^n}$  and  $\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} \log \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2^k} \right) = O(4^{-n})$ .  $\square$

## Acknowledgements

The first author would like to thank Bastien Mallein for very stimulating discussions and for pointing out the scenario for the lower bound.

## References

- [1] J. D. Biggins. Uniform convergence of martingales in the branching random walk. *The Annals of Probability*, 20(1):137–151, 1992.
- [2] A. N. Borodin and P. Salminen. *Handbook of Brownian motion—facts and formulae*. Probability and its Applications. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, second edition, 2002.
- [3] D. Buraczewski. On tails of fixed points of the smoothing transform in the boundary case. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 119(11):3955–3961, 2009.
- [4] Y. Guivarc’h. Sur une extension de la notion de loi semi-stable. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.*, 26(2):261–285, 1990.
- [5] A. Iksanov, X. Liang, and Q. Liu. On  $L_p$ -convergence of the Biggins martingale with complex parameter. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 479(2):1653–1669, 2019.
- [6] J.-P. Kahane. Sur le chaos multiplicatif. *Annales des sciences mathématiques du Québec*, 9(2):105–150, 1985.
- [7] A. Kolmogorov. A refinement of previous hypotheses concerning the local structure of turbulence. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 13:83–85, 1962.
- [8] H. Lacoïn, R. Rhodes, and V. Vargas. Path integral for quantum Mabuchi K-energy. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 171(3):483 – 545, 2022.
- [9] B. Mandelbrot. A possible refinement of the lognormal hypothesis concerning the distribution of energy in intermittent turbulence, statistical models and turbulence. *Lecture Notes in Physics*, 12:333–335, 1972.
- [10] B. Mandelbrot. Multiplications aléatoires itérées et distributions invariantes par moyenne pondérée aléatoire. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A*, 278:289–292, 1974.
- [11] M. Nikula. Small deviations in lognormal Mandelbrot cascades. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 25:1 – 12, 2020.
- [12] A. Obukhov. Some specific features of atmospheric turbulence. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 13:77–81, 1962.
- [13] A. Zamolodchikov. Higher equations of motion in liouville field theory. *International Journal of Modern Physics A*, 19(2):510–523, 2004.