

TOURNAMENTS AND RANDOM WALKS

SERTE DONDERWINKEL AND BRETT KOLESNIK

ABSTRACT. We study the relationship between tournaments and random walks. This connection was first observed by Erdős and Moser. Winston and Kleitman came close to showing that $S_n = \Theta(4^n/n^{5/2})$. Building on this, and works by Takács, these asymptotic bounds were confirmed by Kim and Pittel.

In this work, we verify Moser’s conjecture that $S_n \sim C4^n/n^{5/2}$, using limit theory for integrated random walk bridges. Moreover, we show that C can be described in terms of random walks. Combining this with a recent proof and number-theoretic description of C by the second author, we obtain an analogue of Louchard’s formula, for the Laplace transform of the squared Brownian excursion/Airy area measure. Finally, we describe the scaling limit of random score sequences, in terms of the Kolmogorov excursions, studied recently by Bär, Duraj and Wachtel.

Our results can also be interpreted as answering questions related to a class of random polymers, which began with influential work of Sinaï. From this point of view, our methods yield the precise asymptotics of a persistence probability, related to the pinning/wetting models from statistical physics, that was estimated up to constants by Aurzada, Dereich and Lifshits, as conjectured by Caravenna and Deuschel.

1. INTRODUCTION

A *tournament* T is an orientation of the complete graph K_n on $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Intuitively, we think of vertices as players and edges $\{i, j\}$ as games, oriented as $i \rightarrow j$ if i wins against j . The score sequence $\mathbf{s}(T)$ of T is the weakly increasing rearrangement of the out-degree sequence, which lists the total number of wins by each team.

UNIVERSITY OF GRONINGEN, BERNOULLI INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS, COMPUTER SCIENCE AND AI, AND COGNIGRON (GRONINGEN COGNITIVE SYSTEMS AND MATERIALS CENTER)

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS AND MAGDALEN COLLEGE
E-mail addresses: `s.a.donderwinkel@rug.nl`, `brett.kolesnik@stats.ox.ac.uk`.
 2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05C20; 11P21; 52B05; 60F05; 60G50; 62J15.

Key words and phrases. digraph; majorization; persistence probability; pinning model; random walk; scaling limit; score sequence; tournament; wetting model.

We call $\mathbf{v}_n = (0, 1, \dots, n-1)$ the *standard score sequence*. This corresponds to the acyclic tournament, in which i wins against all $j < i$. Intuitively, \mathbf{v}_n is as “spread out” as possible. Indeed, Landau [27] proved that $\mathbf{s} = (s_1 \leq \dots \leq s_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ is a score sequence if and only if \mathbf{s} is *majorized* (see, e.g., Marshall, Olkin and Arnold [30]) by \mathbf{v}_n , that is,

$$\sum_{i=1}^k s_i \geq \binom{k}{2}, \quad 1 \leq k < n, \quad (1.1)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n s_i = \binom{n}{2}. \quad (1.2)$$

These conditions are necessary, since any k teams must win at least the number of games between them $\binom{k}{2}$, and there are $\binom{n}{2}$ games in total. On the other hand, sufficiency follows directly, e.g., by the Havel–Hakimi [20, 21] algorithm and standard majorization techniques.

Equivalently, score sequences correspond to the weakly increasing lattice points of the permutahedron Π_{n-1} , that is, the convex hull of \mathbf{v}_n and its permutations. The set of all lattice points, on the other hand, is in bijection with the set of all spanning forests $F \subset K_n$. Therefore, score sequences correspond to a special class of spanning forests. See, e.g., Stanley [38] (cf. Postnikov [33]).

1.1. Counting score sequences. In contrast, the number S_n of score sequences appears not to have a simple description. For instance, MacMahon [29] calculated S_n for small values of n using symmetric functions, but such an analysis becomes challenging very quickly. Claesson, Dukes, Franklín and Stefánsson [11] recently verified a recursion, conjectured by Hanna [35]. However, this does not lead to a simple closed form expression, but a rather complicated cycle/product formula [11, (8)] (formally equivalent to the recursion itself).

The first asymptotic bounds on S_n were obtained by Erdős and Moser (see, e.g., Moon’s [31] classic monograph), who, according to Kleitman [25, p. 209], conjectured that $S_n = \Theta(4^n/n^{5/2})$. Furthermore, in 1968 symposium proceedings, Moser [32, p. 165] stated that

We feel that the asymptotic behavior should be of the form $c4^n/n^{5/2}$ and I hereby offer \$25.00 to anyone who will find a proof of this conjecture.

Winston and Kleitman [41] came close to proving that $S_n = \Theta(4^n/n^{5/2})$, up to a certain bound on the q -Catalan numbers (see [41, §9–11]). Building on works by Takács [39, 40], Kim and Pittel [24] finally verified this to be the correct asymptotic order of S_n .

Our first result is a short, probabilistic proof (see Section 3.3) of this fact, via its connection with integrated random walk bridges.

Theorem 1 ([24, 41]). $S_n = \Theta(4^n/n^{5/2})$.

This connection was, in fact, first recorded by Moser [32], and it plays a central role in the arguments of Winston and Kleitman (cf. [41, p. 212]).

If a score sequence $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ is drawn as a “bar graph,” we obtain an \uparrow, \rightarrow lattice walk $\mathcal{W}(\mathbf{s})$ from $(0, 0)$ to (n, n) . The \rightarrow steps are taken at times $s_k + k$, at which point the k th “bar” of height s_k is completed. We let $\mathcal{W}_n = \mathcal{W}(\mathbf{v}_n)$ denote the *staircase walk* corresponding to the standard score sequence \mathbf{v}_n . See Figure 1.

Rotating a walk $\mathcal{W}(\mathbf{s})$ clockwise by $\pi/4$, we obtain a bridge path $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{s})$. More precisely, this path has increments equal to -1 at times $t = s_k + k$, $1 \leq k \leq n$, and equal to $+1$ otherwise. Let $\check{\mathcal{P}}_n = \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{v}_n)$ denote the *sawtooth path*, obtained by rotating \mathcal{W}_n . Note that $\check{\mathcal{P}}_n$ oscillates between 0 and -1 . The conditions (1.1) and (1.2) for score sequences \mathbf{s} correspond to $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{s})$ having partial areas ≥ 0 and total area 0 above $\check{\mathcal{P}}_n$. See Figure 2.

The program outlined in [41] ignores the partial areas condition (1.2), which is the most technically challenging. In this work, we will take both conditions (1.1) and (1.2) into account, taking inspiration from the recent work of Balister, the first author, Groenland, Johnston and Scott [5], which asymptotically enumerates the number of graphical sequences. The connection with random walks [32, 41] continues to hold in this context. See Section 4.1 below for more details.

Our next result identifies the precise asymptotics of S_n , and proves Moser’s [32] conjecture.

Theorem 2. *As $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have that $n^{5/2}S_n/4^n \rightarrow C$.*

This result follows by Propositions 11, 12 and 21 and Theorem 7 below.

1.2. The constant C . The constant C is described in Section 2 below, in terms of simple random walk. Theorem 2 was recently proved by the second author in [26], using limit theory for infinitely divisible distributions, together with the recursion in [11], mentioned above. In this context, C has an alternative description in terms of the Erdős–Ginzburg–Ziv numbers from additive number theory, see Section 2 below.

1.3. An Airy integral. Equating the two expressions for C , given by Theorems 7 and 8 below, we obtain the following equation, which is reminiscent of Louchard’s formula [28, p. 490] (cf. [23, §13]) for the integrated Laplace transform of the *Brownian excursion area* \mathcal{B} in terms of the Airy function. We recall that \mathcal{B} is the area under the path of Brownian motion, conditioned




FIGURE 1. The \uparrow, \rightarrow lattice walk $\mathcal{W}(\mathbf{s})$ from $(0,0)$ to $(7,7)$ corresponding to score sequence $\mathbf{s} = 2222355$. Positive/negative excursions above/below the staircase walk \mathcal{W}_\uparrow (dotted), corresponding to standard score sequence $\mathbf{v}_7 = 0123456$, are red/blue.

to stay positive and return to 0 at time 1. Alternatively, $\mathcal{A} = 2^{3/2}\mathcal{B}$ is the *Airy area measure*.

Corollary 3. *The Brownian excursion area \mathcal{B} satisfies*

$$\int_0^\infty \mathbb{E}[\exp(-6x^3 \mathcal{B}^2)] \sqrt{1+1/x} dx = \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{3}}. \quad (1.3)$$

The simplicity of the right hand side calls for a more direct explanation, perhaps by expanding the left hand side, integrating term by term, and using known facts about the fractional, negative moments of \mathcal{B} .

1.4. Random polymers. A straightforward adaptation of our proof of Theorem 2 also leads to a sharpening of the main result in Aurzada, Dereich, and Lifshits [2].

Consider a simple random walk Y_n started at $Y_0 = 0$, and let $A_n = \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i$ be its area process. In [2, Theorem 1.1], it is shown that

$$\phi_n = \mathbb{P}(A_1, \dots, A_{4n} \geq 0 \mid Y_{4n} = A_{4n} = 0) = \Theta(n^{-1/2}), \quad (1.4)$$

as conjectured by Caravenna and Deuschel [9, §1.5], in their study of the *pinning/wetting models*.




FIGURE 2. *Above:* The bridge path $\mathcal{P}(s)$ obtained by rotating $\mathcal{W}(s)$ in Figure 1 and the sawtooth path $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_7$ (dotted) obtained by rotating the staircase walk \mathcal{W}_7 . *Below:* The height process above $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_7$, with positive/negative contributions to the area shaded in red/blue.

As discussed in [2, p. 2], the conditions in (1.4) are meant to “model a polymer chain with Laplace interaction and zero boundary conditions.” The history of such questions began with the influential work of Sinai [34], who showed that the *persistence probability* $\mathbb{P}(A_1, \dots, A_n \geq 0) = \Theta(n^{-1/4})$. See, e.g., the survey by Aurzada and Simon [3] for more on persistence probabilities and their applications.

Our proof of Theorem 2 can be adapted to obtain the following.

Corollary 4. *As $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have that $n^{1/2}\phi_n \rightarrow C'$.*

The definition of C' is similar to the definition of C . See Section 2.2 below.

In fact, the scheme in Section 3.3 can also be used to give a simpler proof of (1.4) itself.

We will give an alternative, combinatorial proof of this result, along with an explicit, number-theoretic description of C' in [14].

1.5. Scaling random score sequences. Finally, we investigate the “shape” of random score sequences. *Kolmogorov excursions* $(\mathbf{Y}_t, \mathbf{A}_t)$ were recently studied by Bär, Duraj and Wachtel [6]. Such a process is, informally, obtained (using h -transforms) by considering a Brownian bridge \mathbf{Y}_t , conditioned on its area process \mathbf{A}_t staying ≥ 0 and returning to 0 at time 1.

Theorem 5. Let $\mathbf{S}^{(n)} = (\mathbf{S}_1^{(n)} \leq \dots \leq \mathbf{S}_n^{(n)})$ be a uniformly random score sequence of length n . Then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have that

$$\left(\frac{\mathbf{S}_{\lfloor tn \rfloor}^{(n)} - \lfloor tn \rfloor}{\sqrt{n}}, 0 \leq t \leq 1 \right) \xrightarrow{d} (\mathbf{Y}_t, 0 \leq t \leq 1), \quad (1.5)$$

where $(\mathbf{Y}_t, \mathbf{A}_t)$ is a Kolmogorov excursion.

Therefore, a random score sequence $\mathbf{S}^{(n)}$ has Brownian $O(\sqrt{n})$ fluctuations around its mean \mathbf{v}_n (the staircase walk $\lfloor tn \rfloor$).

An analogous fact for uniformly random tournaments $\mathbf{T}^{(n)}$ was proved by Spencer [36, 37] (cf. Bollobás and Scott [7] and references therein). That is, the score sequence $\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{T}^{(n)})$ also has Brownian $O(\sqrt{n})$ fluctuations around its mean, in this case $\mathbf{u}_n = (n-1, \dots, n-1)/2$.

We note that \mathbf{v}_n and \mathbf{u}_n are the most extreme score sequences, being the most and least “spread out” as possible, respectively. The additional entropy, associated with weighting each \mathbf{s}' according to the number of tournaments T such that $\mathbf{s}(T) = \mathbf{s}'$, shifts us from one extreme to the other.

From a geometric point of view, Theorem 5 implies that most weakly increasing lattice points in the permutahedron are near the vertex \mathbf{v}_n .

1.6. Acknowledgments. We thank Sergi Elizalde, Christina Goldschmidt, Svante Janson and Jim Pitman for helpful discussions. SD would like to acknowledge the financial support of the CogniGron research center and the Ubbo Emmius Funds (Univ. of Groningen).

2. THE CONSTANT AND AIRY INTEGRAL

In this section, we describe two equivalent descriptions of the constant C in Theorem 2. Combining these, we will obtain the Airy integral (3). We will also introduce notation that will be used throughout this work, and formalize the connection between score sequences and random walks, discussed above.

2.1. Via random walk bridges. As discussed above, enumerating S_n is equivalent to finding the probability that a uniformly random \uparrow, \rightarrow lattice walk \mathscr{W} from $(0,0)$ to (n,n) has partial areas ≥ 0 and total area 0 above the staircase walk \mathscr{W}_n . Rotating clockwise by $\pi/4$, this can be rephrased in terms of a simple (symmetric) random walk $(Y_k : k \geq 0)$ on \mathbb{Z} .

Let

$$\check{Y}_k = Y_k + \mathbf{1}_{\{k \text{ odd}\}}, \quad \check{A}_k = \sum_{\ell=1}^k \check{Y}_\ell \quad (2.1)$$

be the height and partial area at time k , above the sawtooth path $\check{\mathscr{P}}_k$. We note that $\check{A}_k = A_k + \lceil k/2 \rceil$, where $A_k = \sum_{\ell=1}^k Y_\ell$.

For ease of notation, throughout this work, we let

$$\mathcal{A}_n = \{\check{A}_1, \dots, \check{A}_{2n} \geq 0\}, \quad (2.2)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_n = \{\check{Y}_{2n} = \check{A}_{2n} = 0\}. \quad (2.3)$$

Next, we observe that a random walk corresponds to a score sequence if and only if both of these events occur.

Lemma 6. *The number S_n of score sequences of length n satisfies*

$$S_n = 4^n \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}_n), \quad (2.4)$$

where

$$\mathcal{S}_n = \mathcal{A}_n \cap \mathcal{L}_n. \quad (2.5)$$

This relation is immediately clear (see, e.g., Figure 1 above), so we omit a formal proof. In fact, (2.4) is essentially a probabilistic reformulation of the observations in [41], discussed above. Indeed, by (1.1) and (1.2), it can be seen that

$$S_n = \binom{2n}{n} \times \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_n, \check{A}_{2n} = 0 \mid \check{Y}_{2n} = 0).$$

Moreover, on the event $\check{Y}_{2n} = 0$, when verifying \mathcal{A}_n , it suffices to check only at times t when $\check{Y}_t = 0$. This is because the area process \check{A}_k is monotone on excursions away from 0. Furthermore, due to the oscillatory nature of the sawtooth path $\check{\mathcal{P}}_n$, it suffices to check at even times t when $\check{Y}_t = 0$. Indeed, \check{Y}_t can only increase from 0 to 1 at odd times. Therefore, a positive excursion of \check{Y}_t is always preceded by an even time t at which $\check{Y}_t = 0$. Therefore, \check{Y}_t attains its minimum at an even time t for which $\check{Y}_t = 0$.

As such, even times $t \in [0, 2n]$ when \mathcal{L}_t occurs will play a special role. Roughly speaking, these times will play the role of, what we will call, “almost” renewal times. The reason for the “almost” is that the remainder of the walk will be shorter than n . However, as we will see, such times most likely occur only very close to the beginning and end of the walk.

Let

$$\rho = \mathbb{P}(\check{A}_\tau = 0), \quad \tau = \inf\{t : \check{Y}_t = 0, \check{A}_t \leq 0\}. \quad (2.6)$$

Note that if $\check{Y}_{2k} = 0$ and $\check{A}_{2k} < 0$, then condition (1.1) fails. Informally, ρ is the probability that when $\sum_{i=1}^k s_i \leq \binom{k}{2}$ first occurs at a time when it crosses the sawtooth path, it is only because $\sum_{i=1}^k s_i = \binom{k}{2}$.

In proving Theorem 2, we will obtain the following result.

Theorem 7. *As $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\frac{n^{5/2}}{4^n} S_n \rightarrow \frac{1}{1-\rho} \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2\pi^{3/2}} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{E}[\exp(-6x^3 \mathcal{B}^2)] \sqrt{1+1/x} dx. \quad (2.7)$$

A key ingredient in the proof of this result is an asymptotic formula (see Proposition 11 below), relating the asymptotics of S_n to a ratio of harmonic moments of two random variables N_n and M_n , which are related to the “almost” renewal times discussed above. We note that Theorem 7 follows, using this together with Propositions 12 and 21.

More specifically, the integral is related to $\mathbb{E}[N_n^{-1} \mid \mathcal{L}_n]$, where N_n counts the number even times $0 \leq t \leq 2n$ when $\check{Y}_t = 0$. Informally, these are potential, “almost” renewal times. The factor $1/(1-\rho)$, on the other hand, is related to $\mathbb{E}[M_n^{-1} \mid \mathcal{S}_n]$, where M_n counts the number of “almost” renewal times. As discussed, “almost” renewal times are most likely to occur only very close to the ends of the walks. The number of occurrences on either end are approximately geometric, and roughly independent, resulting in a negative binomial in the limit. In fact, $1-\rho$ is the harmonic moment $\mathbb{E}(1/X)$ of a shifted (taking values in $x = 1, 2, \dots$) negative binomial random variable X , with parameters $r = 2$ and $p = 1 - \rho$.

2.2. The constant for polymers. The proof of Corollary 4 is similar to the proof of Theorem 7, the difference being that the role of \check{Y} is played by Y . As such, we need to replace ρ in (2.6) with

$$\rho' = \mathbb{P}(A_{\tau'} = 0), \quad \tau' = \inf\{t : Y_t = 0, A_t \leq 0\},$$

where A is the area process of Y . Using Corollary 3, we find that, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$n^{1/2}\phi_n \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{6}} \frac{1}{1-\rho'}.$$

2.3. Via infinite divisibility. Theorem 2 was proved recently in [26] using limit theory for infinitely divisible sequences. We will discuss this briefly, so that we can compare these two equivalent descriptions of C .

Let \mathbf{s} be a score sequence. As discussed, the \uparrow, \rightarrow walk $\mathscr{W}(\mathbf{s})$ takes \rightarrow steps at times $s_1 + 1, \dots, s_n + n$. Note that these times form a subset of $\{0, 1, \dots, 2n - 1\}$ that sums to n^2 . We recall that Erdős, Ginzburg and Ziv [18] showed that *any* subset of $2n - 1$ integers contains a subset of size n that sums to a multiple of n . When the integers are consecutive, von Sterneck (see, e.g., Bachmann [4]) showed that the number V_n of such subsets satisfies

$$V_n = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{(-1)^{n+d}}{2n} \binom{2d}{d}, \quad d = \gcd(n, k). \quad (2.8)$$

Claesson, Dukes, Franklín and Stefánsson [11] showed that V_n is the “log transform” of S_n . That is,

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} S_n x^n = \exp \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{V_k}{k} x^k \right).$$

In other words, the associated generating functions satisfy $V(x) = x \frac{d}{dx} \log S(x)$. This is used in [26] to observe that $p_n = e^{-\lambda} S_n / 4^n$, $n \geq 0$, is an infinitely divisible probability distribution, where

$$\lambda = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{V_k}{k4^k}.$$

Then, applying the limit theorems of Hawkes and Jenkins [22] and Embrechts and Hawkes [16] (based on the analysis of Chover Ney and Wainger [10]), the asymptotics of S_n are obtained as follows.

Theorem 8 ([26]). *As $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\frac{n^{5/2}}{4^n} S_n \rightarrow \frac{e^\lambda}{2\sqrt{\pi}}. \quad (2.9)$$

For historical interest, we note that Kleitman's remarks, appended to [32, p. 166], include intuition which resembles the main ideas in the bijective proof in [11, Lemmas 8–10]. Therefore, in retrospect, it appears that all that was missing at the time (1968) of [32] towards a proof of Moser's conjecture was the connection with infinite divisibility (1978) and von Sterneck's formulas (early 1900s). Without these connections, Winston and Kleitman [41] tried (1983) to access these asymptotics from quite a different route, and it is this route which we will follow to its completion in the current work.

The constant e^λ has a probabilistic interpretation, and connection with the “almost” renewal times discussed in Section 2.1 above. The sequence S_n is a renewal sequence (see, e.g., Feller [19]). This means that the generating function satisfies $S(x) = 1/(1 - S_1(x))$. In this instance, $S_1(x)$ is the generating function for *irreducible* score sequences, that strictly satisfy (1.1), with equality attained only in (1.2). Indeed, any score sequence has a natural decomposition into irreducible parts, which correspond to strongly connected components in the tournament. Using the “reverse renewal theorem” in Alexander and Berger [1] (cf. [10]), it is shown in [26] that the number \mathcal{I}_n of irreducible parts in a uniformly random score sequence converges in distribution to a shifted negative binomial random variable with parameters $r = 2$ and $p = e^{-\lambda}$.

In this work, we will give an alternative proof of the fact that \mathcal{I}_n converges to a negative binomial, and one that provides an explanation in terms of random walks, as discussed at the end of Section 2.1 above. See Proposition 21 below.

2.4. The integral. Hence $\rho = 1 - e^{-\lambda}$, where ρ is as defined in (2.6). Therefore, comparing (2.7) and (2.9), we obtain Corollary 3.

3. THE CORRECT ORDER

In this section, we introduce some of the main tools which will be used throughout this work. In Section 3.3, we give a short proof of Theorem 1, which identifies the order of $S_n = \Theta(4^n/n^{5/2})$, as proved in [24, 41].

3.1. A local limit theorem. A key ingredient in our proofs is the following local limit theorem is proved in [2, Proposition 2.1] (cf. [9]).

Let \mathcal{Y}_n denote the set of all possible values (y, a) for random walk Y_{2n} and its area $A_{2n} = \sum_{i=1}^{2n} Y_i$. In particular, we require that $y \equiv 0$ and $a \equiv n \pmod{2}$.

Lemma 9 (Aurzada et al. [2]). *As $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\max_{(y,a) \in \mathcal{Y}_n} |n^2 \mathbb{P}(Y_{2n} = y, A_{2n} = a) - \phi(y, a)| \rightarrow 0,$$

where

$$\phi(y, a) = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{\pi} \exp\left(-\frac{y^2}{n} + \frac{3ay}{2n^2} - \frac{3a^2}{4n^3}\right).$$

We note that, in particular, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_n) = \mathbb{P}(Y_{2n} = 0, A_{2n} = -n) \sim \frac{\sqrt{3}}{\pi} \frac{1}{n^2}. \quad (3.1)$$

Also, since $\binom{2n}{n} \sim 4^n/\sqrt{\pi n}$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\check{A}_{2n} = 0 \mid \check{Y}_{2n} = 0) \sim \sqrt{\pi n} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_n) \sim \sqrt{\frac{3}{\pi}} \frac{1}{n^{3/2}}. \quad (3.2)$$

3.2. A cycle lemma. We will also use the following analogue of the classical cycle lemma (see, e.g., [13, 15]) for random processes.

Lemma 10. *Suppose that (X_1, \dots, X_n) is a random variable in \mathbb{R}^n whose law is invariant under cyclic shifts. That is, suppose that, for any $j \in [n]$,*

$$(X_1, \dots, X_n) \stackrel{d}{=} (X_{1+j}, \dots, X_{n+j}),$$

where the indices on the right hand side are to be interpreted cyclically, modulo n . Also suppose that $\sum_{i=1}^n X_i = 0$ almost surely. Then,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^k X_i \geq 0, \forall 1 \leq k \leq n-1\right) \geq 1/n$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^k X_i > 0, \forall 1 \leq k \leq n-1\right) \leq 1/n.$$

Equality is attained in both statements if and only if $\sum_{i=1}^k X_i$ has a unique global minimum almost surely for $1 \leq k \leq n-1$.

Proof. Note that $\sum_{i=1}^k X_{i+j} \geq 0$ for all $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ if and only if j is a time at which $\sum_{i=1}^j X_i$ attains its global minimum. Moreover, $\sum_{i=1}^k X_{i+j} > 0$ for all $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ if and only if j is the unique time at which $\sum_{i=1}^j X_i$ attains its global minimum.

Let \mathcal{J} be the set of indices j at which $\sum_{i=1}^j X_i$ attains its global minimum and let J be a uniformly random element in $[n]$, so that

$$(X_1, \dots, X_n) \stackrel{d}{=} (X_{1+J}, \dots, X_{n+J}).$$

For the first statement, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k X_i \geq 0, \forall 1 \leq k \leq n \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k X_{i+J} \geq 0, \forall 1 \leq k \leq n \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k X_{i+J} \geq 0, \forall 1 \leq k \leq n \mid X_1, \dots, X_n \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(J \in \mathcal{J} \mid X_1, \dots, X_n)] = \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{J}|. \end{aligned}$$

We see that $|\mathcal{J}| \geq 1$ with equality if and only if $\sum_{i=1}^k X_i$ has a unique global minimum almost surely for $1 \leq k \leq n-1$.

Similarly, for the second statement, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k X_i > 0, \forall 1 \leq k \leq n \right) &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(J \in \mathcal{J}, |\mathcal{J}| = 1 \mid X_1, \dots, X_n)] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{J}| = 1), \end{aligned}$$

and that $\mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{J}| = 1) \leq 1$ with equality, once again, if and only if $\sum_{i=1}^k X_i$ has a unique global minimum almost surely for $1 \leq k \leq n-1$. \blacksquare

3.3. Up to constants. Combining Lemmas 6, 9 and 10, we obtain the following short, probabilistic proof that $S_n = \Theta(4^n/n^{5/2})$.

As discussed in Section 2.1, the even times $0 \leq t \leq 2n$ when $\check{A}_t = \check{Y}_t = 0$ will play a key role. We let

$$0 = \tau_0 < \tau_1 < \dots < \tau_{N_n} = 2n$$

denote the sequence of even times that $\check{Y}_t = 0$. For $1 \leq k \leq N_n$, we let

$$\check{X}_k = \sum_{s=\tau_{k-1}+1}^{\tau_k} \check{Y}_s$$

denote the increment of the area process \check{A}_k between times τ_{k-1} and τ_k , and

$$\check{S}_k = \sum_{\ell=1}^k \check{X}_\ell$$

the partial sum of these increments. Note that $\check{A}_1, \dots, \check{A}_{2n} \geq 0$ if and only if $\check{S}_1, \dots, \check{S}_{N_n} \geq 0$. We let

$$0 = \xi_0 < \xi_1 < \dots < \xi_{M_n} = N_n$$

denote the sequence of times $1 \leq k \leq N_n$ that $\check{S}_k = 0$.

In the following proof, we will use the fact that

$$\mathbb{E}[1/N_n] = \Theta(n^{-1/2}), \quad (3.3)$$

which follows as a trivial consequence of Proposition 12 below.

Proof of Theorem 1. By Lemma 6, it suffices to show that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_n, \check{A}_{2n} = 0 \mid \check{Y}_{2n} = 0) = \Theta(n^{-2}).$$

To this end, by (3.2), it remains to show that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_n \mid \mathcal{Z}_n) = \Theta(n^{-1/2}).$$

By our observations above,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_n \mid \mathcal{Z}_n) = \mathbb{P}(\check{S}_1, \dots, \check{S}_{N_n} \geq 0 \mid \mathcal{Z}_n).$$

We will estimate this probability using Lemma 10.

Lower bound. On the event \mathcal{Z}_n , the increments of \check{S} satisfy the conditions of Lemma 10. Indeed, they sum to 0 and are invariant under cyclic shifts. Therefore, by the first bound in Lemma 10, for any N ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\check{S}_1, \dots, \check{S}_{N_n} \geq 0 \mid \mathcal{Z}_n, N_n = N) \geq 1/N.$$

Therefore, by (3.3),

$$\mathbb{P}(\check{S}_1, \dots, \check{S}_{N_n} \geq 0 \mid \mathcal{Z}_n) \geq \mathbb{E}[1/N_n] = \Theta(n^{-1/2}),$$

which concludes the proof of the lower bound.

Upper bound. For the upper bound, we will use the second bound in Lemma 10. However, this bound involves a strict inequality. As such, we will perform a small trick. First, we apply Lemma 10 and (3.3) to obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(\check{S}_1, \dots, \check{S}_{N_{n+3}-1} > 0 \mid \mathcal{Z}_{n+3}) \leq \mathbb{E}[1/N_{n+3}] = \Theta(n^{-1/2}).$$

To relate this to the probability of interest, we consider a special set of paths. Let \mathcal{E}_{n+3} be the event $(\check{Y}_1, \dots, \check{Y}_{2n+6})$ starts with

$$(\check{Y}_0, \check{Y}_1, \check{Y}_2) = (0, 1, 0)$$

and ends with

$$(\check{Y}_{2n+2}, \dots, \check{Y}_{2n+6}) = (0, 0, -1, 0, 0).$$

These conditions ensure that the first excursion has area 1 and that the last excursion has area -1 . See Figure 3. Then, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\check{S}_1, \dots, \check{S}_{N_{n+3}-1} > 0 \mid \mathcal{L}_{n+3}) \\ & \geq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{n+3}, \check{S}_1, \dots, \check{S}_{N_{n+3}-1} > 0 \mid \mathcal{L}_{n+3}) \\ & = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{n+3} \mid \mathcal{L}_{n+3}) \mathbb{P}(\check{S}_1, \dots, \check{S}_{N_{n+3}-1} > 0 \mid \mathcal{E}_{n+3}, \mathcal{L}_{n+3}). \end{aligned}$$

If \mathcal{E}_{n+3} and \mathcal{L}_{n+3} hold, then $\check{S}_1, \dots, \check{S}_{N_{n+3}-1} > 0$ holds if and only if the area process of $(\check{Y}_{i+2})_{0 \leq i \leq 2n}$ remains non-negative. Moreover, the process $(\check{Y}_{i+2})_{0 \leq i \leq 2n}$, on the events \mathcal{E}_{n+3} and \mathcal{L}_{n+3} , has the same law as $(\check{Y}_i)_{0 \leq i \leq 2n}$, on the event \mathcal{L}_n . Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}(\check{S}_1, \dots, \check{S}_{N_{n+3}-1} > 0 \mid \mathcal{E}_{n+3}, \mathcal{L}_{n+3}) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_n \mid \mathcal{L}_n).$$

Finally, we see that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{n+3} \mid \mathcal{L}_{n+3}) = 2^{-6} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L}_n) / \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L}_{n+3})$$

is bounded away from 0 by Lemma 9. This implies the upper bound. \blacksquare




FIGURE 3. The trick in the proof of Theorem 1 is to ask for a score sequence of length $n+3$ of the form $(1, \dots, n-2, n-2)$.

4. THE KEY FORMULA

The key to proving Theorem 2 is the following asymptotic equivalence.

Proposition 11. *As $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\frac{n^{5/2}}{4^n} S_n \sim \frac{3^{1/2}}{\pi} \frac{n^{1/2} \mathbb{E}[N_n^{-1} \mid \mathcal{L}_n]}{\mathbb{E}[M_n^{-1} \mid \mathcal{L}_n]}. \quad (4.1)$$

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of this result. The numerator and denominator will be investigated separately in Sections 5 and 6 below. As we will see (Propositions 12 and 21 below), the right hand side converges to a constant.

Proof. In light of Lemma 6 and (3.2), we focus on calculating

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_n \mid \mathcal{Z}_n),$$

which, as discussed above, is equivalent to

$$\mathbb{P}(\check{S}_1, \dots, \check{S}_{N_n} \geq 0 \mid \mathcal{Z}_n).$$

We will use Lemma 10 to calculate this probability. However, since the minimum of the process \check{S} is not necessarily unique, we will first perturb its increments by small, random amounts. To be precise, let $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{N_n}$ be IID samples from $[-1/2n, 1/2n]$ under the condition that $\sum_{\ell} \varepsilon_{\ell} = 0$. We put $\check{X}_k^* = \check{X}_k + \varepsilon_k$. Then

$$\check{S}_k^* = \check{S}_k + \sum_{\ell=1}^k \varepsilon_{\ell}.$$

For the modified process \check{S}^* , Lemma 10 applies. Indeed, the increments of \check{S}^* are invariant under cyclic shifts and sum to 0 and the minimum of \check{S}^* is unique almost surely. As such,

$$\mathbb{P}(\check{S}_1^*, \dots, \check{S}_{N_n}^* \geq 0 \mid \mathcal{Z}_n, N_n = N) = 1/N,$$

and so

$$\mathbb{P}(\check{S}_1^*, \dots, \check{S}_{N_n}^* \geq 0 \mid \mathcal{Z}_n) = \mathbb{E}[N_n^{-1} \mid \mathcal{Z}_n]. \quad (4.2)$$

Next, we note that the perturbations are sufficiently small so that $|\check{S}_k - \check{S}_k^*| < 1$ for all k . In particular, $\check{S}_k^* \geq 0$ implies $\check{S}_k \geq 0$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\check{S}_1^*, \dots, \check{S}_{N_n}^* \geq 0 \mid \mathcal{Z}_n) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\check{S}_1^*, \dots, \check{S}_{N_n}^* \geq 0, \check{S}_1, \dots, \check{S}_{N_n} \geq 0 \mid \mathcal{Z}_n) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\check{S}_1^*, \dots, \check{S}_{N_n}^* \geq 0 \mid \mathcal{Z}_n, \check{S}_1, \dots, \check{S}_{N_n} \geq 0) \mathbb{P}(\check{S}_1, \dots, \check{S}_{N_n} \geq 0 \mid \mathcal{Z}_n). \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

By (4.2), it remains to find an expression for the first factor on the right hand side, as then we can calculate the probability of interest.

Recalling that $|\check{S}_k - \check{S}_k^*| < 1$, we see that $\check{S}_k^* > 0$ if $\check{S}_k > 0$. Therefore, on the event $\check{S}_1, \dots, \check{S}_{N_n} \geq 0$, the condition $\check{S}_k^* \geq 0$ can only be violated if $\check{S}_k = 0$ and, in this case, the condition is violated if and only if $\sum_{\ell=1}^k \varepsilon_{\ell} < 0$. Hence, recalling that

$$0 = \xi_0 < \xi_1 < \dots < \xi_{M_n} = N_n$$

are the times k when $\check{S}_k = 0$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\check{S}_1^*, \dots, \check{S}_{N_n}^* \geq 0 \mid \mathcal{Z}_n, \check{S}_1, \dots, \check{S}_{N_n} \geq 0) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{\xi_k} \varepsilon_{\ell} \geq 0, \forall 1 \leq k \leq M_n \mid \mathcal{Z}_n, \check{S}_1, \dots, \check{S}_{N_n} \geq 0\right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we note that, on the event \mathcal{Z}_n and $\check{S}_1, \dots, \check{S}_{N_n} \geq 0$,

$$\left(\sum_{\ell=\xi_0+1}^{\xi_1} \varepsilon_\ell, \sum_{\ell=\xi_1+1}^{\xi_2} \varepsilon_\ell, \dots, \sum_{\ell=\xi_{M_n-1}+1}^{\xi_{M_n}} \varepsilon_\ell \right)$$

is invariant in law under cyclic shifts, sums to 0, and has a unique minimum almost surely. Therefore, by Lemma 10,

$$\mathbb{P}(\check{S}_1^*, \dots, \check{S}_{N_n}^* \geq 0 \mid \mathcal{Z}_n, \check{S}_1, \dots, \check{S}_{N_n} \geq 0, M_n = M) = 1/M,$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\check{S}_1^*, \dots, \check{S}_{N_n}^* \geq 0 \mid \mathcal{Z}_n, \check{S}_1, \dots, \check{S}_{N_n} \geq 0) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[M_n^{-1} \mid \mathcal{Z}_n, \check{S}_1, \dots, \check{S}_{N_n} \geq 0]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

Combining (3.2) and (4.2)–(4.4), together with Lemma 6, the result follows. \blacksquare

4.1. Graphical sequences. We recall that a sequence $\mathbf{d} = (d_1 \leq \dots \leq d_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ is *graphical* if it can be realized as the degree sequence of a graph. As discussed in Dahl and Flatberg [12], the classical conditions by Erdős and Gallai [17] can be rephrased in the language of majorization. Specifically, such a \mathbf{d} is graphical if and only if the sum of its entries is even and $\mathbf{d}' \in \mathbb{Z}^\kappa$ is *weakly majorized* by $\mathbf{d}^* \in \mathbb{Z}^\kappa$, where \mathbf{d}' has entries $d'_i = d_i + 1$, \mathbf{d}^* has entries $d_i^* = \#\{j : d_j \geq i\}$, and $\kappa = \max\{i : d_i \geq i\}$. In other words,

$$\sum_{i=1}^k (d_i + 1) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k d_i^*, \quad 1 \leq k \leq \kappa.$$

The difference between weak and usual majorization, is that there is no condition on the total sum, as in (1.2) above for score sequences.

The scheme used to obtain (4.1) is inspired by the methods in [5], which asymptotically enumerated graphical sequences by approximating the probability that a lazy simple random walk (Y'_1, \dots, Y'_{2n}) satisfies \mathcal{A}_n and $\mathcal{Z}'_n = \{Y'_{2n} = 0\}$. In this context, the role of Lemma 10 is played instead by a result in Burns [8] for random processes, whose laws are invariant under permutations and sign flips.

5. THE NUMERATOR

Recall that $\mathcal{A} = 2^{3/2} \mathcal{B}$ is the Airy area measure. In this section, we prove the following result, which expresses the numerator in (4.1) as an integral involving the Laplace transform of \mathcal{B}^2 .

As in Section 3.3, we let

$$0 = \tau_0 < \tau_1 < \dots < \tau_{N_n} = 2n$$

denote the even times t for which $\check{Y}_t = 0$.

Proposition 12. *As $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$n^{1/2} \mathbb{E}[N_n^{-1} \mid \mathcal{L}_n] \rightarrow \frac{1}{2\pi^{1/2}} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{E}[\exp(-6x^3 \mathcal{B}^2)] \sqrt{1+1/x} dx.$$

The first step in our proof of this result is the following observation.

Lemma 13. *We have that*

$$\mathbb{E}[N_n^{-1} \mid \mathcal{L}_n] = (2n)^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\tau_1 \mid \mathcal{L}_n].$$

Proof. By linearity,

$$2n \mathbb{E}[N_n^{-1} \mid \mathcal{L}_n] = \mathbb{E} \left[N_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N_n} (\tau_i - \tau_{i-1}) \mid \mathcal{L}_n \right]. \quad (5.1)$$

Next, note that

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau_1 \mid \mathcal{L}_n] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\tau_1 - \tau_0 \mid N_n, \mathcal{L}_n] \mid \mathcal{L}_n].$$

On the event \mathcal{L}_n , the intervals $\tau_i - \tau_{i-1}$ between even times that \check{Y} hits 0 are exchangeable. As such, the right hand side above is equal to

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[N_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N_n} (\tau_i - \tau_{i-1}) \mid N_n, \mathcal{L}_n \right] \mid \mathcal{L}_n \right],$$

which reduces to the right hand side in (5.1), and thereby concludes the proof. \blacksquare

With this result at hand, we turn to the proof of the main result of this section.

Proof of Proposition 12. We will show that

$$\begin{aligned} & n^{1/2} \mathbb{E}[N_n^{-1} \mid \mathcal{L}_n] \\ & \rightarrow \frac{1}{2\pi^{1/2}} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(-\frac{3}{4} \frac{x^3}{(1-x)^3} \mathcal{A}^2 \right) \right] x^{-1/2} (1-x)^{-2} dx, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{A} = 2^{3/2} \mathcal{B}$ is the Airy area measure. The result then follows by a simple change of variables.

By (3.1),

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau_1 \mid \mathcal{L}_n] \sim \frac{\pi n^2}{\sqrt{3}} \mathbb{E}[\tau_1 \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_{2n}=0, A_{2n}=-n\}}].$$

Therefore, by Lemma 13, it remains to show that

$$\begin{aligned} & n^{3/2} \mathbb{E}[\tau_1 \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_{2n}=0, A_{2n}=-n\}}] \\ & \rightarrow \frac{\sqrt{3}}{\pi^{3/2}} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(-\frac{3}{4} \frac{x^3}{(1-x)^3} \mathcal{A}^2 \right) \right] x^{-1/2} (1-x)^{-2} dx. \end{aligned}$$

We observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\tau_1 \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_{2n}=0, A_{2n}=-n\}}] &= \mathbb{E}[\tau_1 \mathbb{P}(Y_{2n} = 0, A_{2n} = -n \mid \tau_1, A_{\tau_1})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\tau_1 \mathbb{P}(Y'_{2n-\tau_1} = 0, A'_{2n-\tau_1} = -n - A_{\tau_1})],\end{aligned}$$

where (Y', A') is an independent copy of (Y, A) . Directly,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\tau_1 \mathbb{P}(Y'_{2n-\tau_1} = 0, A'_{2n-\tau_1} = -n - A_{\tau_1})] \\ = 2 \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{a=-t^2}^{t^2} t \mathbb{P}(\tau_1 = 2t, A_{\tau_1} = a) \mathbb{P}(Y'_{2(n-t)} = 0, A'_{2(n-t)} = -n - a).\end{aligned}\quad (5.2)$$

To estimate this sum, we fix $2/3 < \beta < 1$ and $n' = n - n^{1/4}$, and then evaluate over the following three regions:

- (1) $t \in [1, n^\beta]$,
- (2) $t \in (n^\beta, n']$,
- (3) $t \in (n', n]$.

(For ease of notation, we write n^β and n' , rather than $\lfloor n^\beta \rfloor$ and $\lfloor n' \rfloor$.) First, we will show that the first and third sums are $o(n^{-3/2})$. Then we will find the limit of the second sum, rescaled by $n^{3/2}$.

First region. By Lemma 9, there is a constant c such that

$$\mathbb{P}(Y'_{2(n-t)} = 0, A'_{2(n-t)} = -n - a) \leq cn^{-2}$$

for all a and $t \leq n^\beta$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{t=1}^{n^\beta} \sum_{a=-t^2}^{t^2} t \mathbb{P}(\tau_1 = 2t, A_{\tau_1} = a) \mathbb{P}(Y'_{2(n-t)} = 0, A'_{2(n-t)} = -n - a) \\ \leq cn^{-2} \sum_{t=1}^{n^\beta} t \mathbb{P}(\tau_1 = 2t).\end{aligned}$$

Next, we recall (see, e.g., Feller [19, Sec. III.7]) that

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_1 = 2t) = \frac{2}{(2t-1)4^t} \binom{2t-1}{t} \sim \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}t^{3/2}},\quad (5.3)$$

and so

$$\sum_{t=1}^{n^\beta} t \mathbb{P}(\tau_1 = 2t) = O(n^{\beta/2}).$$

As such, the contribution to (5.2) from the first region is $O(n^{\beta/2-2}) = o(n^{-3/2})$, since $\beta < 1$.

Third region. Next, we claim that, in fact,

$$\sum_{t=n'}^n \sum_{a=-t^2}^{t^2} t \mathbb{P}(\tau_1 = 2t, A_{\tau_1} = a) \mathbb{P}(Y'_{2(n-t)} = 0, A'_{2(n-t)} = -n - a) = 0.$$

Indeed, note that $n - t \leq n^{1/4}$ for $n' \leq t \leq n$. As such, $A'_{2(n-t)} \in [-\sqrt{n}, \sqrt{n}]$ deterministically, and so the second factor is 0 for $a \notin [-n - \sqrt{n}, -n + \sqrt{n}]$. On the other hand, $|A_{\tau_1}| \geq \tau_1 - 2$ deterministically, so the first factor is 0 for all other $a \in [-n - \sqrt{n}, -n + \sqrt{n}]$, and the claim follows.

Second region. Finally, we turn our attention to the sum over the second region, which, as we will see, is on the order $n^{3/2}$. Note that, by (5.3),

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=n^\beta}^{n'} \sum_{a=-t^2}^{t^2} t \mathbb{P}(\tau_1 = 2t, A_{\tau_1} = a) \mathbb{P}(Y'_{2(n-t)} = 0, A'_{2(n-t)} = -n - a) \\ &= \sum_{t=n^\beta}^{n'} \frac{2t \binom{2t-1}{t} 4^t}{(2t-1)4^t} \sum_{a=-t^2}^{t^2} \mathbb{P}(A_{\tau_1} = a \mid \tau_1 = 2t) \mathbb{P}(Y'_{2(n-t)} = 0, A'_{2(n-t)} = -n - a). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathcal{Y}'_m = \{a : (0, a) \in \mathcal{Y}_m\}$ be the set of all possible values for the area process, if the random walk hits 0 at time $t = 2m$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Then, Lemma 9,

$$\max_{a \in \mathcal{Y}'_m} \left| m^2 \mathbb{P}(Y'_{2m} = 0, A'_{2m} = a) - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{\pi} \exp\left(-\frac{3a^2}{4m^3}\right) \right| < \varepsilon,$$

for all $m \geq M$, for some sufficiently large M . Then, for $n - n' = n^{1/4} \geq M$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{t=n^\beta}^{n'} \frac{2t \binom{2t-1}{t} 4^t}{(2t-1)4^t} \sum_{a=-t^2}^{t^2} \mathbb{P}(A_{\tau_1} = a \mid \tau_1 = 2t) \mathbb{P}(Y'_{2(n-t)} = 0, A'_{2(n-t)} = -n - a) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{\pi} \sum_{t=n^\beta}^{n'} \frac{2t \binom{2t-1}{t} 4^t}{(2t-1)(n-t)^2 4^t} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{Y}'_t} \mathbb{P}(A_{\tau_1} = a \mid \tau_1 = 2t) \exp\left[-\frac{3(a+n)^2}{4(n-t)^3}\right] \right| \\ & \leq \varepsilon \sum_{t=n^\beta}^{n'} \frac{2t}{(2t-1)(n-t)^2 4^t} \binom{2t-1}{t}. \end{aligned}$$

Let E_t be the area of a uniform Bernoulli excursion with length $2t$ (that has positive or negative sign, both with probability $1/2$). Then

$$\sum_{a \in \mathcal{Y}'_t} \mathbb{P}(A_{\tau_1} = a \mid \tau_1 = 2t) \exp\left(-\frac{3(a+n)^2}{4(n-t)^3}\right) = \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\frac{3(E_t+n)^2}{4(n-t)^3}\right)\right].$$

Takács [40, Theorem 3] showed that $t^{-3/2}|E_t| \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{A}$. We claim that, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\sup_{n^\beta \leq t \leq n'} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(-\frac{3}{4} \frac{(E_t + n)^2}{(n-t)^3} \right) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(-\frac{3}{4} \frac{t^3 \mathcal{A}^2}{(n-t)^3} \right) \right] \right| \rightarrow 0. \quad (5.4)$$

Since $\beta > 2/3$, we have that $n^2 = o(t^3)$. As such, $(E_t + n)^2/t^3 \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{A}^2$. We will work on a probability space where this convergence holds almost surely. Then, for any $\xi, \zeta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{n^\alpha \leq t \leq n'} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(-\frac{3}{4} \frac{t^3}{(n-t)^3} \frac{(E_t + n)^2}{t^3} \right) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(-\frac{3}{4} \frac{t^3 \mathcal{A}^2}{(n-t)^3} \right) \right] \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{n^\alpha \leq t \leq n'} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{r>0} \left| \exp \left(-r \frac{(E_t + n)^2}{t^3} \right) - \exp(-r \mathcal{A}^2) \right| \right] \\ & \leq \sup_{n^\alpha \leq t \leq n'} \left[\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{(E_t + n)^2}{t^3} \leq \xi \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{(E_t + n)^2}{t^3} - \mathcal{A}^2 \right| \geq \zeta \right) \right] \\ & \quad + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}^2 \leq \xi) + \sup_{r>0} \sup_{\substack{x, y > \xi \\ |x-y| < \zeta}} |e^{-rx} - e^{-ry}|. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. The functions e^{-rx} , for $r > 0$, are uniformly Lipschitz, so the final term is less than $\varepsilon/4$ for small enough $\zeta > 0$. By the almost sure convergence and the fact that \mathcal{A} puts no mass on 0, it follows that, for any $\xi, \zeta > 0$, all three probabilities in the last expression are less than $\varepsilon/4$. Therefore the left hand side in (5.4) is bounded by ε for all large n , and the claim follows.

Altogether, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & 2 \sum_{t=n^\beta}^{n'} \sum_{a=-t^2}^{t^2} t \mathbb{P}(\tau_1 = 2t, A_{\tau_1} = a) \mathbb{P}(Y'_{2(n-t)} = 0, A'_{2(n-t)} = -n-a) \\ & \sim \frac{\sqrt{3}}{\pi^{3/2}} \sum_{t=n^\beta}^{n'} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}(n-t)^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(-\frac{3}{4} \frac{t^3}{(n-t)^3} \mathcal{A}^2 \right) \right] \\ & \sim \frac{\sqrt{3}}{\pi^{3/2}} \frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(-\frac{3}{4} \frac{x^3}{(1-x)^3} \mathcal{A}^2 \right) \right] x^{-1/2} (1-x)^{-2} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since the contribution from the other regions is $o(n^{3/2})$, we find by (5.2) that

$$\begin{aligned} & n^{3/2} \mathbb{E}[\tau_1 \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_{2n}=0, A_{2n}=-n\}}] \\ & \rightarrow \frac{\sqrt{3}}{\pi^{3/2}} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(-\frac{3}{4} \frac{x^3}{(1-x)^3} \mathcal{A}^2 \right) \right] x^{-1/2} (1-x)^{-2} dx, \end{aligned}$$

as required. ■

6. THE DENOMINATOR

6.1. Near the boundary. The denominator in (11) involves M_n , the number of $k \leq n$ such that \mathcal{Z}_k occurs. Our first lemma shows that, with high probability, all such times are close to the start or end of the walk.

Lemma 14. *Suppose that $1 \ll m(n) \ll n$. Then*

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists k \in (m, n-m) : \mathcal{Z}_k \mid \mathcal{S}_n) \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. By Theorem 1 and Lemma 6, it follows that

$$p_n = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}_n) = \Theta(n^{-5/2}).$$

Therefore, for some $C > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_k \mid \mathcal{S}_n) = \frac{p_k p_{n-k}}{p_n} \leq C \left(\frac{n}{k(n-k)} \right)^{5/2},$$

for all $k \in (0, n)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\exists k \in (m, n-m) : \mathcal{Z}_k \mid \mathcal{S}_n) \\ & \leq C \sum_{k=m}^{n-m} \left(\frac{n}{k(n-k)} \right)^{5/2} \leq 2C \sum_{k=m}^{\lceil n/2 \rceil} \left(\frac{n}{k(n-k)} \right)^{5/2} \\ & \leq 2^{7/2} C \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} k^{-5/2} = O(m^{-3/2}) = o(1), \end{aligned}$$

as claimed. ■

6.2. “Almost” renewal times. Next, we will prove the following technical lemma, which is the key to making the idea of “almost” renewal times more precise.

Lemma 15. *Let $q_n = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_n \mid \mathcal{Z}_n)$. Then $q_{n-m}/q_n \rightarrow 1$, uniformly in $m \leq \log n$.*

We note that, by Theorem 1, Lemma 6 and (3.1),

$$q_n = \Theta(n^{-1/2}). \tag{6.1}$$

The proof of Lemma 15 is given at the end of this section, after a number of preliminary results are proved, see Lemmas 16–19 below.

The main idea is to compare the “long” process on $[2n]$ with a “shorter” process on $[2(n-m)]$. For $m \ll b \ll n$, we will show that the law of the first and last $n-b$ steps in the two processes are asymptotically indistinguishable. We will then show that, in both process, if the area process is non-negative

during the first and last $n - b$ steps, then it is unlikely to go negative in between.

We will start by studying the Radon–Nikodym derivative between the first and last $n - b$ steps in the two processes. Before stating our first lemma, we will set some notation.

Let Z be a function on the space of walks, of length $2n$ and starting at 0, that only depends on the first and last $n - b$ increments. To be precise, for $n > b$ and $Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_{2n})$, we let $Y_k^{\leftarrow} = Y_{2n-k} - Y_{2n}$ denote the time-reversed process of Y . We assume that Z is measurable with respect to

$$\Sigma_{n-b} = \sigma(Y_1, \dots, Y_{n-b}, Y_1^{\leftarrow}, \dots, Y_{n-b}^{\leftarrow}).$$

We note that

$$\Sigma_{n-b} = \sigma(\Delta Y_1, \dots, \Delta Y_{n-b}, \Delta Y_{n+b+1}, \dots, \Delta Y_{2n}),$$

where $\Delta Y_k = Y_k - Y_{k-1}$. Finally, we let

$$A_{n-b}^{\leftarrow} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-b} Y_i^{\leftarrow}$$

be the area under the last $n - b$ increments of Y , assuming that $Y_{2n} = 0$. Note that A_{n-b}^{\leftarrow} is measurable with respect to Σ_{n-b} .

Lemma 16. *Let*

$$\varphi_\ell(y, a) = \mathbb{P}(\check{Y}_{2\ell} = y, \check{A}_{2\ell} = a). \quad (6.2)$$

Let \mathbb{E}_n denote expectation with respect to the law of \check{Y} on $[2n]$, Then, for any $m < b < n$, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}_n [Z \mid \mathcal{Z}_n] = \mathbb{E}_{n-m} \left[Z \frac{\varphi_b(\gamma, \alpha)}{\varphi_{b-m}(\gamma, \alpha')} \frac{\varphi_{n-m}(0, 0)}{\varphi_n(0, 0)} \mid \mathcal{Z}_{n-m} \right],$$

where

$$\gamma = \check{Y}_{n-b}^{\leftarrow} - \check{Y}_{n-b}, \quad (6.3)$$

$$\alpha = -\check{A}_{n-b} - \check{A}_{n-b}^{\leftarrow} - 2b\check{Y}_{n-b}, \quad (6.4)$$

$$\alpha' = -\check{A}_{n-b} - \check{A}_{n-b}^{\leftarrow} - 2(b-m)\check{Y}_{n-b}. \quad (6.5)$$

Proof. Suppose that $b' < n'$ and that Z' only depends on $\Sigma_{b'}$. Then for $\mathbb{E}_{n'}$, the expectation with respect to the law of \check{Y} on $[2n']$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{n'} [Z' \mid \mathcal{Z}_{n'}] &= \frac{\mathbb{E}_{n'} [Z' \mathbf{1}(\mathcal{Z}_{n'})]}{\mathbb{P}_{n'}(\mathcal{Z}_{n'})} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}_{n'} [\mathbb{E}_{n'} [Z' \mathbf{1}(\mathcal{Z}_{n'}) \mid \Sigma_{b'}]]}{\mathbb{P}_{n'}(\mathcal{Z}_{n'})} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}_{n'} [Z' \mathbb{P}_{n'}(\mathcal{Z}_{n'} \mid \Sigma_{b'})]}{\mathbb{P}_{n'}(\mathcal{Z}_{n'})}. \end{aligned}$$

We can rewrite the event $\mathcal{L}_{n'}$ in terms of random variables that are measurable with respect to $\Sigma_{b'}$ or independent of $\Sigma_{b'}$, by separating the increments in the first and last b' steps from the remaining increments as follows:

$$\left\{ \check{Y}_{2n'-b'} - \check{Y}_{b'} = \check{Y}_{b'}^{\leftarrow} - \check{Y}_{b'}, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{2(n'-b')} (\check{Y}_{b'+i} - \check{Y}_{b'}) = -\check{A}_{b'} - \check{A}_{b'}^{\leftarrow} - 2(n'-b')\check{Y}_{b'} \right\}.$$

Indeed, since $\check{Y}_{2n'-b'} - \check{Y}_{b'}^{\leftarrow} = Y_{2n'}$, the first equality ensures that $\check{Y}_{2n'} = 0$, and the second equality clearly corresponds to $\check{A}_{2n'} = 0$.

Next, to rewrite $\mathbb{P}_{n'}(\mathcal{L}_{n'} \mid \Sigma_{b'})$, we note that $(\check{Y}_{b'+i} - \check{Y}_{b'})$ and (\check{Y}_i) have the same law conditional on $\Sigma_{b'}$. Hence

$$\mathbb{E}_{n'} \left[Z' \frac{\varphi_{n'-b'}(\check{Y}_{b'}^{\leftarrow} - \check{Y}_{b'}, -\check{A}_{b'} - \check{A}_{b'}^{\leftarrow} - 2(n'-b')\check{Y}_{b'})}{\varphi_{n'}(0,0)} \right] = \mathbb{E}_{n'}[Z' \mid \mathcal{L}_{n'}].$$

Finally, applying this equality with

$$Z' = Z \frac{\varphi_b(\gamma, \alpha)}{\varphi_{b-m}(\gamma, \alpha')} \frac{\varphi_{n-m}(0,0)}{\varphi_n(0,0)},$$

$n' = n - m$ and $b' = n - b$, we obtain the result. \blacksquare

In our application of Lemma 16, we will take $b = \lfloor n^{9/20} \rfloor$ and $m \leq \log n$. The next two lemmas find a region that, with high probability, contains the values of γ , α and α' in (6.3)–(6.5), and in which the Radon–Nikodym derivative is close to 1.

We recall that $\omega(1)$ denotes a function that $\rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Lemma 17. *Let*

$$\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_\gamma \cap \mathcal{R}_\alpha \cap \mathcal{R}_{\alpha'},$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}_\gamma = \{|\gamma| \leq n^{1/4}\},$$

$$\mathcal{R}_\alpha = \{|\alpha| \leq n^{29/40}\},$$

$$\mathcal{R}_{\alpha'} = \{|\alpha - \alpha'| \leq n^{3/5}\}.$$

Then, for $b = \lfloor n^{9/20} \rfloor$ and $m \leq \log n$, we have that, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\mathbb{P}_n(\mathcal{R} \mid \mathcal{L}_n) = 1 - n^{-\omega(1)},$$

$$\mathbb{P}_{n-m}(\mathcal{R} \mid \mathcal{L}_{n-m}) = 1 - n^{-\omega(1)}.$$

Proof. We will only show the first statement, as the second statement follows similarly. Note that $|\gamma| = |\check{Y}_{n-b} - \check{Y}_{n-b}|$. Also, observe that, on the event \mathcal{L}_n ,

$$\check{A}_n = \check{A}_{n-b} + \check{A}_{n-b}^{\leftarrow} + \sum_{i=1}^{2b} \check{Y}_{n-b+i} = 0.$$

Hence

$$\alpha = -\check{A}_{n-b} - \check{A}_{n-b}^{\leftarrow} - 2b\check{Y}_{n-b} = \sum_{i=1}^{2b} (\check{Y}_{n-b+i} - \check{Y}_{n-b}).$$

Therefore, since

$$2bn^{1/4} = O(n^{7/10}) \ll n^{29/40},$$

for all large n ,

$$\mathcal{R}_\gamma^c \cup (\mathcal{R}_\alpha^c \cap \mathcal{Z}_n) \subset \left\{ \max_{0 \leq i \leq 2b} |\check{Y}_{n-b+i} - \check{Y}_{n-b}| > n^{1/4} \right\}.$$

By the reflection principle, and Hoeffding's inequality, this event has probability at most $\exp[-\Omega(n^{1/2}/b)]$. Therefore, since $b = O(n^{9/20})$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_\gamma^c \cup (\mathcal{R}_\alpha^c \cap \mathcal{Z}_n)) \leq \exp[-\Omega(n^{1/20})].$$

Next, note that $|\alpha - \alpha'| = 2m|\check{Y}_{n-b}|$. As such, Hoeffding's inequality implies

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}_{\alpha'}^c) \leq \exp[-\Omega(n^{1/5}/\log^2 n)].$$

Altogether, we find that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}^c \cap \mathcal{Z}_n) = n^{-\omega(1)}$. Since $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{Z}_n) = \Theta(n^{-2})$ by (3.1), it follows that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R}^c | \mathcal{Z}_n) = n^{-\omega(1)}$, as claimed. \blacksquare

Next, we show that, on the event \mathcal{R} , the Radon–Nikodym derivative is close to 1.

Lemma 18. *Suppose that $b = \lfloor n^{9/20} \rfloor$ and $m \leq \log n$. Then*

$$\frac{\varphi_b(y, a)}{\varphi_{b-m}(y, a')} \frac{\varphi_{n-m}(0, 0)}{\varphi_n(0, 0)} \rightarrow 1,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, uniformly over $|y| \leq n^{1/4}$, $|a| \leq n^{29/40}$ and $|a - a'| \leq n^{3/5}$, for which $\varphi_b(y, a) > 0$ and $\varphi_{b-m}(0, 0) > 0$.

Proof. By Lemma 9, it follows that, for some constants c_1, \dots, c_4 and for some ε_ℓ , with $\varepsilon_\ell \rightarrow 0$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$, we have that

$$\varphi_\ell(y, a) = \frac{c_1}{\ell^2} \exp \left[c_2 \frac{y^2}{\ell} + c_3 \frac{ay}{\ell^2} + c_4 \frac{a^2}{\ell^3} + \varepsilon_\ell \right],$$

for a, ℓ and y such that $\varphi_\ell(y, a) > 0$.

In fact, the parity conditions for $\varphi_b(y, a) > 0$ and $\varphi_b(y, a') > 0$ (and similarly for $\varphi_{n-m}(0, 0)$ and $\varphi_n(0, 0)$) are equivalent, so we can ignore these conditions from now on (since \mathbb{E}_n does not put any mass on values which do not satisfy these conditions). Note that the parity condition for $\varphi_b(y, a) > 0$ requires that $y \equiv 0$ and $a \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$. Similarly, for $\varphi_b(y, a) > 0$, we require that $y \equiv 0$ and $a' \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$. However, since $a - a' \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$, the conditions are indeed equivalent.

Next, suppose that $a_0/a \rightarrow 0$ and $\ell_0/\ell \rightarrow 0$. Then, after some straightforward algebraic manipulations, it can be seen that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\varphi_\ell(y, a)}{\varphi_{\ell-\ell_0}(y, a - a_0)} \\ &= (1 - \ell_0/\ell)^2 \exp \left[O \left(\frac{y^2 \ell_0 + ya_0}{\ell^2} + \frac{ya\ell_0 + aa_0}{\ell^3} + \frac{a^2 \ell_0}{\ell^4} \right) + o(1) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we observe that, if $\ell = \Omega(n^{9/20})$ and $\ell_0 \leq \log n$, then this ratio converges to 1, uniformly in all $|y| \leq n^{1/4}$, $|a| \leq n^{29/40}$ and $|a_0| \leq n^{3/5}$. ■

By Lemmas 16–18 it follows that, for $k \leq \log n$ and $b = \lfloor n^{9/20} \rfloor$, that the law of the first and last $n - b$ steps of the “long” process on $[2n]$ and the “shorter” process on $[2(n - b)]$ are asymptotically indistinguishable. This implies the following result, which is very close to Lemma 15. In fact, the only difference is that, in the following, we do not consider the sign of the area process between times $n - b$ and $n + b$ in the “long” process and between times $n - b$ and $n - 2m + b$ in “shorter” process.

Let

$$\mathcal{A}_n^{n,b} = \{\check{A}_1, \dots, \check{A}_{n-b} \geq 0, \check{A}_{2n'-n+b}, \dots, \check{A}_{2n'} \geq 0\}.$$

Lemma 19. *Suppose that $b = \lfloor n^{9/20} \rfloor$. Then*

$$\mathbb{P}_n(\mathcal{A}_n^{n,b} \mid \mathcal{Z}_n) = (1 + o(1)) \mathbb{P}_{n-m}(\mathcal{A}_{n-m}^{n,b} \mid \mathcal{Z}_{n-m}),$$

where $o(1) \rightarrow 0$, uniformly in $m \leq \log n$.

Proof. Let $\underline{\delta}_n$ and $\overline{\delta}_n$ denote the minimum/maximum values of

$$\frac{\varphi_b(y, a)}{\varphi_{b-m}(y, a')} \frac{\varphi_{n-m}(0, 0)}{\varphi_n(0, 0)},$$

taken over the set of all $m \leq \log n$, $|y| \leq n^{1/4}$, $|a| \leq n^{29/40}$ and $|a - a'| \leq n^{3/5}$, for which $\varphi_b(y, a) > 0$ and $\varphi_{b-m}(0, 0) > 0$. By Lemma 18, $\underline{\delta}_n, \overline{\delta}_n \rightarrow 1$, uniformly.

Next, we apply Lemma 16 with

$$Z = \mathbf{1}(\check{A}_1, \dots, \check{A}_{n-b} \geq 0, \check{A}_1^{\leftarrow}, \dots, \check{A}_{n-b}^{\leftarrow} \geq 0, \mathcal{R}).$$

We find that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_n(\mathcal{A}_n^{n,b} \mid \mathcal{Z}_n) &\leq \mathbb{P}_n(\mathcal{A}_n^{n,b}, \mathcal{R} \mid \mathcal{Z}_n) + \mathbb{P}_n(\mathcal{R}^c \mid \mathcal{Z}_n) \\ &\leq \overline{\delta}_n \mathbb{P}_{n-m}(\mathcal{A}_{n-m}^{n,b}, \mathcal{R} \mid \mathcal{Z}_{n-m}) + \mathbb{P}_n(\mathcal{R}^c \mid \mathcal{Z}_n) \\ &\leq \overline{\delta}_n \mathbb{P}_{n-m}(\mathcal{A}_{n-m}^{n,b} \mid \mathcal{Z}_{n-m}) + \mathbb{P}_n(\mathcal{R}^c \mid \mathcal{Z}_n). \end{aligned}$$

Likewise,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_n(\mathcal{A}_n^{n,b} \mid \mathcal{L}_n) &\geq \mathbb{P}_n(\mathcal{A}_n^{n,b}, \mathcal{R} \mid \mathcal{L}_n) \\ &\geq \underline{\delta}_n \mathbb{P}_{n-m}(\mathcal{A}_{n-m}^{n,b}, \mathcal{R} \mid \mathcal{L}_{n-m}) \\ &\geq \underline{\delta}_n [\mathbb{P}_{n-m}(\mathcal{A}_{n-m}^{n,b} \mid \mathcal{L}_{n-m}) - \mathbb{P}_{n-m}(\mathcal{R}^c \mid \mathcal{L}_{n-m})]. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, note that $\mathbb{P}_n(\mathcal{A}_n^{n,b} \mid \mathcal{L}_n) \geq q_n$. Therefore, the result follows by Lemma 17 and (6.1). \blacksquare

We are ready to prove the main result of this section. As discussed above, it remains only to show that the sign of the area process is unlikely to change during the intermediate times not covered by Lemma 19.

Proof of Lemma 15. By Lemma 19, it suffices to show that, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}_n(\mathcal{A}_n^{n,b} \mid \mathcal{L}_n)}{q_n} \rightarrow 1 \quad (6.6)$$

and

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}_{n-m}(\mathcal{A}_{n-m}^{n,b} \mid \mathcal{L}_{n-m})}{q_{n-m}} \rightarrow 1 \quad (6.7)$$

uniformly in $m \leq \log(n)$.

We will show (6.6), and (6.7) follows similarly. By (6.1), it suffices to show

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists k \in (n-b, n+b] : \text{sgn}(\check{A}_{k-1}) \neq \text{sgn}(\check{A}_k) \mid \mathcal{L}_n) \ll n^{-1/2}.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} &\{\exists k \in (n-b, n+b] : \text{sgn}(\check{A}_{k-1}) \neq \text{sgn}(\check{A}_k)\} \\ &\subset \{|\check{A}_{n-b}| < 2bn^{21/40}\} \cup \left\{ \max_{1 \leq i \leq 2b} |\check{Y}_{n-b+i}| > n^{21/40} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By Hoeffding's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq 2b} |\check{Y}_{n-b+i}| > n^{21/40} \right) = n^{-\omega(1)}.$$

So we need only show that

$$\mathbb{P}(|\check{A}_{n-b}| < 2bn^{21/40} \mid \mathcal{L}_n) \ll n^{-1/2}.$$

By Lemma 16, this probability can be expressed as the expected value of

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{1}\{|\check{A}_{n-b}| < 2bn^{21/40}\} \\ &\times \frac{\mathbb{P}(\check{Y}'_{n+b} = -\check{Y}'_{n-b}, \check{A}'_{n+b} = -\check{A}'_{n-b} - (n+b)\check{Y}'_{n-b} \mid \check{Y}_{n-b}, \check{A}_{n-b})}{\mathbb{P}(\check{Y}'_{2n} = \check{A}'_{2n} = 0)}, \end{aligned}$$

where \check{Y}' is an independent copy of \check{Y} , and \check{A}' its area process.

However, by Lemma 9, there is a constant c such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\check{Y}'_{n+b} = y, \check{A}'_{n+b} = a) = O(n^{-2}).$$

By (3.1),

$$\mathbb{P}(\check{Y}'_{2n} = \check{A}'_{2n} = 0) = \Theta(n^{-2}).$$

It follows that, for some $c > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(|\check{A}_{n-b}| < 2bn^{21/40} \mid \mathcal{L}_n) \leq c\mathbb{P}(|\check{A}_{n-b}| < 2bn^{21/40}).$$

Note that any value of a can be realised by $O(\sqrt{a})$ values of y . Therefore, again by Lemma 9,

$$\mathbb{P}(|\check{A}_{n-b}| = a) = O(\sqrt{a}/n^2),$$

and so

$$\mathbb{P}(|\check{A}_{n-b}| < 2bn^{21/40}) = O((bn^{21/40})^{3/2}/n^2) = O(n^{-43/80}) \ll n^{-1/2},$$

as required. \blacksquare

6.3. Negative binomial limit. Finally, in this section, we will formalize the idea of the ‘‘almost’’ renewal times t , when $\check{Y}_{2t} = \check{A}_{2t} = 0$. Recall that the reason for ‘‘almost’’ is that after such a time, there is then less time remaining for the rest of the trajectory of the walk. However, by Lemma 14, with high probability, such times t only occur very close to the start and end of the walk. As such, the probability of an ‘‘almost’’ renewal time

$$\rho_n = \mathbb{P}(\exists k \leq \log n : \mathcal{L}_k \mid \mathcal{S}_n) \quad (6.8)$$

does not depend on n asymptotically.

Recall ρ as defined in (2.6).

Lemma 20. *As $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have that $\rho_n \rightarrow \rho$.*

Proof. Let

$$\zeta_1 = \min\{k > 0 : \check{Y}_{2k} = 0, \check{A}_{2k} \leq 0\}. \quad (6.9)$$

For any $k \leq \log n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_n \mid \mathcal{L}_n, \zeta_1 = k) &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_k \mid \mathcal{L}_n, \zeta_1 = k) \mathbb{P}(\check{A}_{2k+1}, \dots, \check{A}_n \geq 0 \mid \mathcal{L}_k, \mathcal{L}_n) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\check{A}_{2\zeta_1} = 0 \mid \mathcal{L}_n, \zeta_1 = k) q_{n-k}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, setting $m = \lfloor \log n \rfloor$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}(\zeta_1 \leq m \mid \mathcal{S}_n) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{\mathbb{P}(\zeta_1 = k \mid \mathcal{L}_n) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_n \mid \mathcal{L}_n, \zeta_1 = k)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_n \mid \mathcal{L}_n)} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbb{P}(\zeta_1 = k \mid \mathcal{L}_n) \mathbb{P}(\check{A}_{2\zeta_1} = 0 \mid \mathcal{L}_n, \zeta_1 = k) \frac{q_{n-k}}{q_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 15, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}(\zeta_1 \leq m \mid \mathcal{S}_n) = \mathbb{P}(\check{A}_{2\zeta_1} = 0, \zeta_1 \leq m \mid \mathcal{Z}_n) + o(1).$$

Next, we will show that the conditioning on \mathcal{Z}_n has a negligible effect on the probability of the event $\{\check{A}_{2\zeta_1} = 0, \zeta_1 \leq m\}$. Intuitively, note that this event is measurable with respect to the first $2m$ steps of the process, and that, on this scale, the process will hardly notice that it is tied down at the end.

To make this rigorous, we use ideas which are similar to the proof of Lemma 15. Specifically, note that

$$\frac{\varphi_{n-m}(y, a)}{\varphi_n(0, 0)} \rightarrow 1,$$

uniformly in $y \leq n^{1/4}$ and $a \leq n^{5/4}$, where is $\varphi_\ell(y, a)$ as defined in (6.2). Let

$$\mathcal{G} = \{|\check{Y}_{2m}|, |\check{A}_{2m}| \leq n^{1/4}\},$$

which occurs deterministically for all large n . Hence, for all such n ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\check{A}_{2\zeta_1} = 0, \zeta_1 \leq m \mid \mathcal{Z}_n) &= \mathbb{P}(\check{A}_{2\zeta_1} = 0, \zeta_1 \leq m, \mathcal{G}) + o(1) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\check{A}_{2\zeta_1} = 0, \zeta_1 \leq m) + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, note that $\check{A}_{2\zeta_1}$ does not depend on n . Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}(\check{A}_{2\zeta_1} = 0, \zeta_1 \leq m) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\check{A}_{2\zeta_1} = 0, \zeta_1 < \infty) = \rho,$$

since $\zeta_1 < \infty$ almost surely, which concludes the proof. \blacksquare

Finally, we obtain the asymptotic distribution of the number of ‘‘almost’’ renewal times M_n , that is, the number of events $\mathcal{Z}_k = 0$, $k \leq n$.

Proposition 21. *Let M be a negative binomial random variable with parameters $p = 1 - \rho$ and $r = 2$. Then, conditional on \mathcal{S}_n , we have that $M_n \xrightarrow{d} 1 + M$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In particular, $\mathbb{E}[M_n^{-1} \mid \mathcal{S}_n] \rightarrow 1 - \rho$.*

Proof. Once again, we let $m = \lfloor \log n \rfloor$. We will use Lemma 20 to show that, on the event \mathcal{S}_n , the random variables

$$\begin{aligned} M_n^{(1)} &= \#\{0 < k \leq m : \mathcal{Z}_k\}, \\ M_n^{(2)} &= \#\{n - m \leq k < n : \mathcal{Z}_k\}, \end{aligned}$$

jointly converge to independent geometric random variables, with parameters $p = 1 - \rho$. This implies that $M_n^{(1)} + M_n^{(2)} \xrightarrow{d} M$, and the result then follows by Lemma 14.

First, note that, by Lemma 20 and symmetry,

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n^{(i)} \geq 1 \mid \mathcal{S}_n) = \rho_n \rightarrow \rho, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Next, we claim that, for any $m_1, m_2 \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n^{(1)} \geq m_1 + 1 \mid M_n^{(1)} \geq m_1, M_n^{(2)} \geq m_2, \mathcal{S}_n) \rightarrow \rho. \quad (6.10)$$

Then, by symmetry, we find that, for any $m_1, m_2 \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} = (M_n^{(1)} \geq m_1, M_n^{(2)} \geq m_2 \mid \mathcal{S}_n) \rightarrow \rho^{m_1+m_2},$$

which implies the lemma.

Let $\zeta_j^{(1)}$ (resp. $\zeta_j^{(2)}$) denote the index of the j th smallest (resp. largest) time $t \in (0, n)$ that \mathcal{L}_t occurs. In particular, $\zeta_1 = \zeta_1^{(1)}$, as defined in (6.9). We note that, conditional on

$$\mathcal{S}_n^{m_1, m_2}(j, k) = \{M_n^{(1)} \geq m_1, \zeta_{m_1}^{(1)} = j, M_n^{(2)} \geq m_2, \zeta_{m_2}^{(2)} = k, \mathcal{S}_n\},$$

the process $(\check{Y}_{2j+i})_{0 \leq i \leq 2(n-j-k)}$ has the same law as $(\check{Y}_i)_{0 \leq i \leq 2(n-j-k)}$, conditional on \mathcal{S}_{n-j-k} . Therefore, for $j, k = O(\log \log n)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(M_n^{(1)} \geq m_1 + 1 \mid \mathcal{S}_n^{m_1, m_2}(j, k)) &= \mathbb{P}(\exists k \in (0, m-j] : \mathcal{L}_k \mid \mathcal{S}_{n-j-k}) \\ &= \rho_{n-j-k} + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

The $o(1)$ correction accounts for the discrepancy between m and $m-j$. Indeed, this discrepancy has a negligible $o(1)$ affect, by Lemma 14.

Therefore, by Lemma 20, the above converges to ρ , uniformly in all $j, k = O(\log \log n)$. On the other hand, by Lemma 14,

$$\mathbb{P}(\zeta_{m_1}^{(1)} > \log \log n \mid M_n^{(1)} \geq m_1, M_n^{(2)} \geq m_2, \mathcal{S}_n) \rightarrow 0.$$

Then, since

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n^{(1)} \geq m_1, M_n^{(2)} \geq m_2 \mid \mathcal{S}_n)$$

is bounded away from 0, (6.10) follows, as required. \blacksquare

7. THE SCALING LIMIT

Finally, in this section, we will prove Theorem 5.

We let $(\mathbf{Y}_t, \mathbf{A}_t)$ denote the *positive Kolmogorov excursion (from zero and back)* in [6]. We will first observe the following scaling limit for the lattice path associated with a random score sequence.

Proposition 22. *Let $\mathbf{S}^{(n)} = (\mathbf{S}_1^{(n)} \leq \dots \leq \mathbf{S}_n^{(n)})$ be a uniformly random score sequence of length n . Let $\mathbf{Y}^{(n)} = (\mathbf{Y}_0^{(n)}, \mathbf{Y}_1^{(n)}, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_{2n}^{(n)})$ denote the bridge path $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{S}^{(n)})$ obtained by rotating the walk $\mathbf{W}^{(n)} = \mathcal{W}(\mathbf{S}^{(n)})$ clockwise by $\pi/4$. Then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have that*

$$\left((2n)^{-1/2} \mathbf{Y}_{[2nt]}^{(n)}, 0 \leq t \leq 1 \right) \xrightarrow{d} (\mathbf{Y}_t, 0 \leq t \leq 1),$$

where $(\mathbf{Y}_t, \mathbf{A}_t)$ is a Kolmogorov excursion.

Proof. Let $(Y_i, 0 \leq i \leq 2n)$ be a simple random walk bridge, conditioned on its area process $A_k = \sum_{i=1}^k Y_i$ satisfying

$$A_k \geq -\lceil k/2 \rceil, \quad 1 \leq k < 2n, \quad (7.1)$$

$$A_{2n} = -n. \quad (7.2)$$

As discussed in Section 1, by the bijection in [41, p. 212] and a rotation clockwise by $\pi/4$, it follows that score sequences $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ satisfying (1.1) and (1.2) are in bijection with bridges $(Y_i, 0 \leq i \leq 2n)$ satisfying (7.1) and (7.2). Indeed, the bijection associates each \mathbf{s} to a bridge $Y = Y(\mathbf{s})$ with increments given by

$$Y_i - Y_{i-1} = \begin{cases} -1, & i \in \{s_1 + 1, \dots, s_n + n\}; \\ +1, & i \in [2n] \setminus \{s_1 + 1, \dots, s_n + n\}. \end{cases}$$

As such, it suffices to show that

$$((2n)^{-1/2} Y_{\lfloor 2nt \rfloor}, 0 \leq t \leq 1) \xrightarrow{d} (\mathbf{Y}_t, 0 \leq t \leq 1). \quad (7.3)$$

To show (7.3), we will first consider the following modified processes. Put

$$\begin{aligned} A'_k &= A_k + k/2 + 3/4, \\ Y'_k &= Y_k + 1/2. \end{aligned}$$

We claim that

$$\begin{aligned} &\{A'_k > 0, \forall 1 \leq k \leq 2n, A'_{2n} = 3/4, Y'_{2n} = 1/2\} \\ &= \{A_k \geq -\lceil k/2 \rceil, \forall 1 \leq k \leq 2n, A_{2n} = -n, Y_{2n} = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $A'_{2n} = 3/4$ and $Y'_{2n} = 1/2$ if and only if $A_{2n} = -n$ and $Y_{2n} = 0$. On the other hand, since A can only take integer values, it follows that, for integers $\ell \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \{A_{2\ell} \geq -\ell\} &= \{A_{2\ell} > -\ell - 3/4\} = \{A'_{2\ell} > 0\}, \\ \{A_{2\ell-1} \geq -\ell\} &= \{A_{2\ell-1} > -\ell - 1/4\} = \{A'_{2\ell-1} > 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

so the claim follows. Therefore, by [6, Theorem 2],

$$((2n)^{-1/2} Y'_{\lfloor 2nt \rfloor}, (2n)^{-3/2} A'_{\lfloor 2nt \rfloor}, 0 \leq t \leq 1) \xrightarrow{d} (\mathbf{Y}_t, \mathbf{A}_t, 0 \leq t \leq 1),$$

in the topology of uniform convergence on càdlàg processes on $[0, 1]$. Since $|Y'_n - Y_n|$ and $|A'_n - A_n|$ are of smaller order than the scaling factors, (7.3) follows, and this completes the proof. \blacksquare

Recall that score sequences are in bijection with bridges with partial areas ≥ 0 and total area 0 above the sawtooth path. Figures 1 and 2 above demonstrate the forward direction of this bijection. Essentially, a score sequence $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ is drawn as a “bar graph,” and then rotated clockwise by $\pi/4$.

Roughly speaking, we will obtain Theorem 5 by reversing this procedure in the continuum.

While $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ is of length n , its associated bridge path $\mathbf{y} = (y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{2n})$ is of length $2n$, with n up steps and n down steps. However, only the times of the down steps are needed to recover \mathbf{s} . More specifically, let ϑ_k be the time *before* the k th down step. Then $s_k = y_{\vartheta_k} + k - 1$, where $k - 1$ is the height of the k th step along the staircase walk. Informally, after the path is rotated counterclockwise by $\pi/4$, the up steps become vertical lines. These lines are “traversed instantly,” as we read the score sequence as a “bar graph” from left to right, so time changes from $[0, 2t]$ to $[0, t]$. See Figure 4.




FIGURE 4. *Above:* The bridge path in Figure 2, with its values before down steps indicated. *Below:* The bar graph in Figure 2 is recovered by adding these values to the staircase walk.

Since, by Proposition 22, the excursion has a Brownian limit, which changes directions constantly, the process

$$\left(n^{-1/2}(\mathbf{S}_{\lfloor nt \rfloor}^{(n)} - \lfloor nt \rfloor), 0 \leq t \leq 1 \right) \xrightarrow{d} (\mathbf{Y}_t, 0 \leq t \leq 1)$$

will have the same scaling limit \mathbf{Y}_t as the bridge path $\mathbf{Y}^{(n)}$ in Proposition 22. Note that $(\lfloor nt \rfloor, 0 \leq t \leq 1)$ is the staircase walk.

Proof of Theorem 5. Let $(X_i, 0 \leq i \leq 2n)$ be a simple random walk, so that X conditioned on \mathcal{S}_n is distributed as $\mathbf{Y}^{(n)}$, as in Proposition 22. Let $\vartheta_k = \vartheta_k(X)$ be the time before the k th down step of X . Formally, we put $\vartheta_0 = 0$ and then, for $1 \leq k \leq n$,

$$\vartheta_k = \inf\{\ell > \vartheta_{k-1} : X_\ell > X_{\ell+1}\}.$$

Then, we see that, for $1 \leq k \leq n$, the corresponding walk $\mathbf{W}^{(n)}$ passes through the points $(k-1, \mathbf{Y}_{\vartheta_k}^{(n)} + k - 1)$ and $(k, \mathbf{Y}_{\vartheta_k}^{(n)} + k - 1)$. Therefore,

$$\mathbf{S}_k^{(n)} = \mathbf{Y}_{\vartheta_k}^{(n)} + k - 1, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n. \quad (7.4)$$

Next, we will show that

$$\left((2n)^{-1} \vartheta_{\lfloor nt \rfloor}(\mathbf{Y}^{(n)}), 0 \leq t \leq 1 \right) \xrightarrow{d} (t, 0 \leq t \leq 1), \quad (7.5)$$

in the topology of uniform convergence. Then, the theorem follows by Proposition 22, (7.4) and the fact that $(\mathbf{Y}_t, 0 \leq t \leq 1)$ is continuous almost surely. For $1 \leq k \leq 2n$, let

$$\vartheta_k^{-1} = \vartheta_k^{-1}(X) = \#\{\ell \leq k : X_{\ell-1} > X_\ell\}$$

be the number of down steps in the first k steps. Then $\vartheta_k = \max\{\ell : \vartheta_\ell^{-1} < k\}$. It suffices to show that

$$\left(n^{-1} \vartheta_{\lfloor 2nt \rfloor}^{-1}(\mathbf{Y}^{(n)}), 0 \leq t \leq 1 \right) \xrightarrow{d} (t, 0 \leq t \leq 1), \quad (7.6)$$

in the topology of uniform convergence, since $(t, 0 \leq t \leq 1)$ is strictly increasing. Let B_1, B_2, \dots be i.i.d. Bernoulli(1/2) random variables. Note that

$$(\vartheta_k^{-1}(X), 1 \leq k \leq 2n) \stackrel{d}{=} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k B_i, 1 \leq k \leq 2n \right).$$

Therefore, applying Chernoff's bound at times $\lfloor \varepsilon kn/2 \rfloor$, and then taking a union bound, we find that, for some $\alpha > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{1 \leq k \leq 2n} n^{-1} |\vartheta_k^{-1}(X) - k/2| > \varepsilon \right) \leq e^{-\alpha n},$$

for all large n . Hence, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{1 \leq k \leq 2n} n^{-1} \left| \vartheta_k^{-1}(\mathbf{Y}^{(n)}) - k/2 \right| > \varepsilon \right) \leq \frac{e^{-\alpha n}}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}_n)} \rightarrow 0,$$

since $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}_n) = \Theta(n^{-5/2})$. This yields (7.6), and then (7.5) follows. As discussed, this completes the proof. \blacksquare

REFERENCES

1. K. S. Alexander and Q. Berger, *Local limit theorems and renewal theory with no moments*, Electron. J. Probab. **21** (2016), Paper No. 66, 18.
2. F. Aurzada, S. Dereich, and M. Lifshits, *Persistence probabilities for a bridge of an integrated simple random walk*, Probab. Math. Statist. **34** (2014), no. 1, 1–22.
3. F. Aurzada and T. Simon, *Persistence probabilities and exponents*, Lévy matters. V, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 2149, Springer, Cham, 2015, pp. 183–224.
4. P. G. H. Bachmann, *Niedere Zahlentheorie*, vol. 2, Leipzig B.G. Teubner, 1902.
5. P. Balister, S. Donderwinkel, C. Groenland, T. Johnston, and A. Scott, *Counting graphic sequences via integrated random walks*, preprint available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.07022>.
6. M. Bär, J. Duraj, and V. Wachtel, *Invariance principles for integrated random walks conditioned to stay positive*, Ann. Appl. Probab. **33** (2023), no. 1, 127–160.
7. B. Bollobás and A. Scott, *Intersections of random hypergraphs and tournaments*, European J. Combin. **44** (2015), no. part A, 125–139.
8. J. M. Burns, *The number of degree sequences of graphs*, Ph.D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2007.
9. F. Caravenna and J.-D. Deuschel, *Pinning and wetting transition for $(1+1)$ -dimensional fields with Laplacian interaction*, Ann. Probab. **36** (2008), no. 6, 2388–2433.
10. J. Chover, P. Ney, and S. Wainger, *Functions of probability measures*, J. Analyse Math. **26** (1973), 255–302.
11. A. Claesson, M. Dukes, A. F. Franklín, and S. Ö. Stefánsson, *Counting tournament score sequences*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **151** (2023), no. 9, 3691–3704.
12. G. Dahl and T. Flatberg, *A remark concerning graphical sequences*, Discrete Math. **304** (2005), no. 1-3, 62–64.
13. N. Dershowitz and S. Zaks, *The cycle lemma and some applications*, European J. Combin. **11** (1990), no. 1, 35–40.
14. S. Donderwinkel and B. Kolesnik, *Asymptotics for Sinai excursions*, preprint available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.12941>.
15. A. Dvoretzky and Th. Motzkin, *A problem of arrangements*, Duke Math. J. **14** (1947), 305–313.
16. P. Embrechts and J. Hawkes, *A limit theorem for the tails of discrete infinitely divisible laws with applications to fluctuation theory*, J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser. A **32** (1982), no. 3, 412–422.
17. P. Erdős and T. Gallai, *Gráfok előírt fokszámú pontokkal*, Mat. Lapok **11** (1960), 264–274.
18. P. Erdős, A. Ginzburg, and A. Ziv, *Theorem in the additive number theory*, Bull. Res. Council Israel Sect. F **10F** (1961), no. 1, 41–43.

19. W. Feller, *An introduction to probability theory and its applications. Vol. I*, third ed., John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York-London-Sydney, 1968.
20. S. L. Hakimi, *On realizability of a set of integers as degrees of the vertices of a linear graph. I*, J. Soc. Indust. Appl. Math. **10** (1962), 496–506.
21. V. Havel, *A remark on the existence of finite graphs*, Math. Bohemica **80** (1955), no. 4, 477–480.
22. J. Hawkes and J. D. Jenkins, *Infinitely divisible sequences*, Scand. Actuar. J. (1978), no. 2, 65–76.
23. S. Janson, *Brownian excursion area, Wright's constants in graph enumeration, and other Brownian areas*, Probab. Surv. **4** (2007), 80–145.
24. J. H. Kim and B. Pittel, *Confirming the Kleitman-Winston conjecture on the largest coefficient in a q -Catalan number*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **92** (2000), no. 2, 197–206.
25. D. Kleitman, *The number of tournament score sequences for a large number of players*, Combinatorial Structures and their Applications (Proc. Calgary Internat. Conf., Calgary, Alta., 1969), Gordon and Breach, New York-London-Paris, 1970, pp. 209–213.
26. B. Kolesnik, *The asymptotic number of score sequences*, Combinatorica **43** (2023), no. 4, 827–844.
27. H. G. Landau, *On dominance relations and the structure of animal societies. III. The condition for a score structure*, Bull. Math. Biophys. **15** (1953), 143–148.
28. G. Louchard, *Kac's formula, Levy's local time and Brownian excursion*, J. Appl. Probab. **21** (1984), no. 3, 479–499.
29. P. A. MacMahon, *An american tournament treated by the calculus of symmetric functions*, Quart. J. Math. **49** (1920), 1–36.
30. A. W. Marshall, I. Olkin, and B. C. Arnold, *Inequalities: theory of majorization and its applications*, second ed., Springer Series in Statistics, Springer, New York, 2011.
31. J. W. Moon, *Topics on tournaments*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York-Montreal, Que.-London, 1968.
32. L. Moser, *Asymptotics of tournament scores*, Combinatorics (Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., Vol. XIX, Univ. California, Los Angeles, Calif., 1968), Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1971, pp. 165–166.
33. A. Postnikov, *Permutohedra, associahedra, and beyond*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN (2009), no. 6, 1026–1106.
34. Ya. G. Sinai, *Distribution of some functionals of the integral of a random walk*, Teoret. Mat. Fiz. **90** (1992), no. 3, 323–353.
35. N. J. A. Sloane, *The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences*, sequence A000571, available at <https://oeis.org/A000571>.
36. J. Spencer, *Optimal ranking of tournaments*, Networks **1** (1971/72), 135–138.
37. ———, *Optimally ranking unrankable tournaments*, Period. Math. Hungar. **11** (1980), no. 2, 131–144.
38. R. P. Stanley, *Decompositions of rational convex polytopes*, Ann. Discrete Math. **6** (1980), 333–342.
39. L. Takács, *Some asymptotic formulas for lattice paths*, J. Statist. Plann. Inference **14** (1986), no. 1, 123–142.
40. ———, *A Bernoulli excursion and its various applications*, Adv. in Appl. Probab. **23** (1991), no. 3, 557–585.
41. K. J. Winston and D. J. Kleitman, *On the asymptotic number of tournament score sequences*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **35** (1983), no. 2, 208–230.