

JOINT ASYMPTOTIC DISTRIBUTION OF CERTAIN PATH FUNCTIONALS OF THE REFLECTED PROCESS

ALEKSANDAR MIJATOVIĆ AND MARTIJN PISTORIUS

ABSTRACT. Let $\tau(x)$ be the first time the reflected process Y of a Lévy processes X crosses $x > 0$. The main aim of the paper is to investigate the asymptotic dependence of the path functionals: $Y(t) = X(t) - \inf_{0 \leq s \leq t} X(s)$, $M(t, x) = \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} Y(s) - x$ and $Z(x) = Y(\tau(x)) - x$. We prove that under Cramér's condition on $X(1)$, the functionals $Y(t)$, $M(t, y)$ and $Z(x + y)$ are asymptotically independent as $\min\{t, y, x\} \rightarrow \infty$. We also characterise the law of the limiting overshoot $Z(\infty)$ of the reflected process. If, as $\min\{t, x\} \rightarrow \infty$, the quantity $te^{-\gamma x}$ has a positive limit (γ denotes the Cramér coefficient), our results together with the theorem of Doney & Maller [6] imply the existence and the explicit form of the joint weak limit $(Y(\infty), M(\infty), Z(\infty))$.

1. INTRODUCTION

The reflected process Y of a Lévy process X is a strong Markov process on $\mathbb{R}_+ \doteq [0, \infty)$ equal to X reflected at its running infimum. The reflected process is of great importance in many areas of probability, ranging from the fluctuation theory for Lévy processes (e.g. [2, Ch. VI] and the references therein) to mathematical statistics (e.g. [13, 15], CUSUM method of cumulative sum), queueing theory (e.g. [1, 14]), mathematical finance (e.g. [9, 12], drawdown as risk measure), mathematical genetics (e.g. [11] and references therein) and many more. The aim of this paper is to study the asymptotic dependence and weak limiting behaviour of the functionals of the reflected process Y :

$$(1.1) \quad Y(t) \doteq X(t) - \inf_{0 \leq s \leq t} X(s), \quad M(t, x) \doteq Y^*(t) - x, \quad Z(x) \doteq Y(\tau(x)) - x,$$

where $t, x \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Here $\tau(x)$ and $Y^*(t)$ denote the first entry time of Y into the interval (x, ∞) and the supremum up to time t of the reflected process respectively,

$$\tau(x) \doteq \inf\{t \geq 0 : Y(t) > x\} \quad (\inf \emptyset \doteq \infty), \quad Y^*(t) \doteq \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} Y(s).$$

The main result of the paper identifies a condition on the Lévy measure of X , under which the triplet in (1.1) is essentially asymptotically independent in the following sense. A family of random vectors $\{(U_z^1, \dots, U_z^d)\}_{z \in \mathbb{R}_+^l}$ on a given probability space, where $d, l \in \mathbb{N}$, is *asymptotically independent* if

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60G51, 60F05, 60G17.

Key words and phrases. Reflected Lévy process, asymptotic independence, maximal increments, limiting overshoot, Cramér condition.

Acknowledgement: MP's research was supported in part by the NWO-STAR cluster.

the joint CDF is asymptotically equal to a product of the CDFs of the components: i.e. for any $a_i \in (-\infty, \infty]$, $i = 1, \dots, d$, it holds (denote $a \wedge b \doteq \min\{a, b\}$)

$$P(U_z^1 \leq a_1, \dots, U_z^d \leq a_d) = \prod_{i=1}^d P(U_z^i \leq a_i) + o(1) \quad \text{as } z_1 \wedge \dots \wedge z_d \rightarrow \infty.$$

Under Assumption 1, which is assumed throughout the paper, our main result, Theorem 1, holds.

Assumption 1. The mean of $X(1)$ is finite, *Cramér's condition*, $E[e^{\gamma X(1)}] = 1$ for $\gamma > 0$, holds, $E[e^{\gamma X(1)} | X(1)] < \infty$ and either the Lévy measure of X is non-lattice or 0 is regular for $(0, \infty)$.

Theorem 1. *The triplet $\{(Y(t), Z(x+y), M(t,x))\}_{t,x,y \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ is asymptotically independent and the weak limit $Z(x) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} Z(\infty)$, as $x \rightarrow \infty$, holds, where ϕ is the Laplace exponent of the increasing ladder-height process of X :¹*

$$(1.2) \quad E[e^{-vZ(\infty)}] = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma + v} \cdot \frac{\phi(v)}{\phi(0)} \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

The asymptotic independence in Theorem 1 should be contrasted to the intuition that the functionals $Z(x+y)$ and $M(t,x)$ (and hence the triplet in Theorem 1) are unlikely to be asymptotically independent if the Lévy measure of X is heavy-tailed (e.g. if its tail function is regularly varying at infinity). Intuitively, in this case the asymptotic behaviour of the functionals is governed by infrequent but very large jumps that determine the values of $Z(x+y)$ and $M(t,x)$ simultaneously. This is analogous to the behaviour of the path at time t' in Figure 1. In fact, in contrast to the heavy-tailed case, the intuitive reason for the asymptotic independence under As. 1 is closely related to the following assertion: the likelihood of a single excursion of Y straddling both the running time t and the first-passage time $\tau(x+y)$, as depicted in Figure 1, tends to zero (see remarks following Lemma 3, Section 2.2, for a more detailed intuitive explanation of this phenomenon under As. 1). This fact will be used to establish the asymptotic independence of $M(t,x)$, $Z(x+y)$ and $Y(t)$.

It is not hard to see that in general the functionals $M(t,x)$ and $Z(x)$ are not asymptotically independent as $t \wedge x \rightarrow \infty$. We show (see the remark following Lemma 4) that the probability that both random variables occur during the same excursion of the reflected process Y away from zero, as is the case at time t' in Figure 1, may not decay to zero under As. 1. However, by Theorem 1, the pair $\{(M(t,x), Z(x+y))\}_{t,x,y \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ is asymptotically independent as $t \wedge x \wedge y \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, for any $\alpha > 1$ so are the variables $M(t,x)$ and $Z(\alpha x)$ as $t \wedge x \rightarrow \infty$,

While it may appear intuitively clear that the overshoot $Z(x)$ of a *high* level x does not occur frequently *during* the excursion straddling t' but *before* time t' (as depicted in Figure 1)—indeed, this excursion still has time to run and reach higher levels, while previous excursions, which have concluded their runs, are more likely to have got to the level x —it does not seem immediately

¹Note that the Cramér condition implies $E[X(1)] < 0$ and hence $\phi(0) > 0$ (see (2.1) for definition of ϕ and Section 2.1 for more details on ladder processes), making the formula in (1.2) well defined.




FIGURE 1. This schematic figure of a path of Y depicts the values of the three functionals in (1.1) at times t and t' , before and after the reflected process crosses the level $x + y$. It is intuitively clear that, in general, $M(t, x)$, $Z(x + y)$ and $Y(t)$ cannot be independent for fixed $t, x, y > 0$.

obvious how to make such heuristic arguments precise, particularly since in Theorem 1 the level x is allowed to go to infinity arbitrarily slowly compared to the running time t . One of the contributions of the paper is to establish rigorously the asymptotic independence of $Z(x)$ and $Y(t)$ (cf. Lemma 3 and remarks that follow).

The definition of asymptotic independence of the functionals in (1.1) requires an approximate factorisation of the joint CDF without specifying the rate of divergence or the mutual dependence of t, x, y as they tend to infinity. Hence the asymptotic independence in Theorem 1 does not require the existence of the weak limit of the functionals. It is clear however that the most interesting application of Theorem 1 is precisely in the case when, for each of the functionals, such a limit exist. A result of Doney & Maller [6, Thm 1] implies that $M(t, x)$ converges weakly to a Gumbel distribution if the quantity $te^{-\gamma x}$ tends to a positive constant as $t \uparrow \infty$ (see [7, Ch. 3] for the Gumbel distribution and Appendix A.1, equation (A.3), for a simple derivation of the limit law $M(\infty)$ from [6, Thm 1]). Cramér's condition implies that X tends to $-\infty$ almost surely, and hence, by the classical time reversal argument, the reflected process Y has a stationary distribution $Y(\infty)$ equal to the law of the ultimate supremum $\sup_{t \geq 0} X(t)$. The following corollary of Theorem 1 describes explicitly the various limit laws.

Corollary 2. (i) *The weak limit of the random vector $(Y(t), Z(x))$, as $x \wedge t \rightarrow \infty$, exists and the law $(Y(\infty), Z(\infty))$ is determined by the joint Laplace transform*

$$E[\exp(-uY(\infty) - vZ(\infty))] = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma + v} \cdot \frac{\phi(v)}{\phi(u)} \quad \text{for all } u, v \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

(ii) Let $m \doteq \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \phi(u)/u$ and ν_H be the Lévy measure of the Laplace exponent ϕ with the tail function $\bar{\nu}_H(x) \doteq \nu_H((x, \infty))$, $x > 0$. Then the law of the asymptotic overshoot $Z(\infty)$ is given by:

$$P(Z(\infty) > x) = \frac{\gamma}{\phi(0)} e^{-\gamma x} \int_x^\infty e^{\gamma y} \bar{\nu}_H(y) dy, \quad x \in [0, \infty), \quad \text{and} \quad P(Z(\infty) = 0) = \frac{\gamma}{\phi(0)} m.$$

In particular, $Z(\infty)$ is a continuous random variable except possibly at the origin.

(iii) Assume that $\lim_{t \uparrow \infty} te^{-\gamma t} = \lambda$ for some $\lambda > 0$. Then $(Y(t), Z(x+y), M(t, x))$ converges weakly as $t \wedge y \rightarrow \infty$ and the joint limit law $(Y(\infty), Z(\infty), M(\infty))$ is given by the Fourier-Laplace transform:

$$E[\exp(-uY(\infty) - vZ(\infty) + i\beta M(\infty))] = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma + v} \cdot \frac{\phi(v)}{\phi(u)} \cdot \Gamma\left(1 - \frac{i\beta}{\gamma}\right) \cdot \exp\left[i\beta\gamma^{-1} \log\left(\lambda \ell C_\gamma \widehat{\phi}(\gamma)\right)\right]$$

for all $u, v \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, where $\widehat{\phi}$ is the Laplace exponent of the decreasing ladder-height process, \widehat{L}^{-1} is the decreasing ladder-time processes with $\ell \doteq 1/E[\widehat{L}^{-1}(1)]$ (see Section 2.1 for the definitions of $\widehat{\phi}$ and \widehat{L}^{-1}), $\Gamma(\cdot)$ denotes the gamma function and the constant C_γ is given by

$$(1.3) \quad C_\gamma \doteq \frac{\phi(0)}{\gamma \phi'(-\gamma)}.$$

A brief description of the proofs and related literature. The main result of this paper is the asymptotic independence in Theorem 1. Its proof, carried out in Section 2.2, is in three steps. The first and in a certain sense the most important step establishes the asymptotic behaviour of the probability of an event involving the local time at zero of the reflected process. This event contains precisely the paths sketched in Figure 1. In the second step, a splitting property of an extended excursion process of the reflected process, introduced in the classical paper [8], is applied to factorise the probabilities of certain events, related to the ones involving the three functionals but with the running time t replaced by an independent exponential time $e(q)$. The third and final step in the proof applies the factorisations obtained in step two and the asymptotics from the first step to establish the stated asymptotic independence. This is achieved by studying (from first principles) the Laplace inversions of the probabilities arising in step two.

The law of the asymptotic overshoot, given by (1.2) of Theorem 1, is established in two steps in Section 2.3. First, in Proposition 7 we extend the Cramér asymptotics in [3] to the case of the two-sided exit. This step is based on the main result in [3] and a renewal argument from [4], applied in our setting under the Cramér measure. In the second step, the law of $Z(x)$ is expressed in terms of the excursion measure of the reflected process. The limit law is then studied under the excursion measure, using tools such as the result from step one, excursion theory and the asymptotics from [6].

The proof of Corollary 2 is straightforward, once Theorem 1 has been established. Apart from our main result, it involves a number of classical facts from the fluctuation theory of Lévy processes [2]. The details are given in Appendix A.1.

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

The asymptotic independence in Theorem 1 is a consequence of Proposition 6 proved in Section 2.2. The formula for the law of the asymptotic overshoot follows from Lemma 8 and Proposition 10 established in Section 2.3. Section 2.1 briefly defines the setting and notation of the proof.

2.1. Setting and notation. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}, P)$ be a filtered probability space that carries a Lévy process X satisfying As. 1. Here $\Omega \doteq D(\mathbb{R})$ is the Skorokhod space of real-valued functions that are right-continuous on \mathbb{R}_+ and have left-limits on $(0, \infty)$, X is the coordinate process, $\{\mathcal{F}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ denotes the completed filtration generated by X , which is right-continuous, and \mathcal{F} is the completed sigma-algebra generated by $\{X(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ denote by P_x the probability measure on (Ω, \mathcal{F}) under which $X - x$ is a Lévy process. We refer to [2, Ch. I] for further background on Lévy processes.

Let L be a local time at zero of the reflected process $\widehat{Y} = \{\widehat{Y}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ of the dual $\widehat{X} \doteq -X$, i.e. $\widehat{Y}(t) \doteq X^*(t) - X(t)$, where $X^*(t) \doteq \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} X(s)$. The ladder-time process $L^{-1} = \{L^{-1}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is equal to the right-continuous inverse of L . The ladder-height process $H = \{H(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is given by $H(t) \doteq X(L^{-1}(t))$ for all $t \geq 0$ with $L^{-1}(t)$ finite and by $H(t) \doteq +\infty$ otherwise. Let ϕ be the Laplace exponent of H ,

$$(2.1) \quad \phi(\theta) \doteq -\log E[e^{-\theta H(1)} \mathbf{I}_{\{H(1) < \infty\}}], \quad \text{for any } \theta \in \mathbb{R}_+,$$

where \mathbf{I}_A denotes the indicator of a set A . Analogously, define the local time \widehat{L} of Y at zero, the decreasing ladder-time and ladder-height subordinators \widehat{L}^{-1} and \widehat{H} with $\widehat{\phi}$ the Laplace exponent of \widehat{H} . See [2, Sec. VI.1] for more details on ladder subordinators. Note that the Cramér assumption implies $E[X(1)] < 0$, making Y (resp. \widehat{Y}) a recurrent (resp. transient) Markov process on \mathbb{R}_+ . Hence $\phi(0) > 0$ and the stopping time $\tau(x)$ is a.s. finite for any $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$, making H a killed subordinator under P and the overshoot $Z(x)$ a P -almost surely defined random variable.

We now briefly review elements of Itô's excursion theory that will be used in the proof. We refer to [8] and [2, Ch. IV] for a general treatment and further references. Consider the Poisson point process of excursions away from zero associated to the strong Markov process Y . For each moment $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ of local time, let $\epsilon(t) \in \mathcal{E} = \{\epsilon \in \Omega : \epsilon \geq 0\}$ denote the excursion at t :

$$(2.2) \quad \epsilon(t) \doteq \begin{cases} \left\{ Y \left(s + \widehat{L}^{-1}(t-) \right), s \in [0, \widehat{L}^{-1}(t) - \widehat{L}^{-1}(t-)] \right\}, & \text{if } \widehat{L}^{-1}(t-) < \widehat{L}^{-1}(t), \\ \partial, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\partial \equiv 0$ is the null function, $\widehat{L}^{-1}(t-) \doteq \lim_{s \uparrow t} \widehat{L}^{-1}(s)$ if $t > 0$ and $\widehat{L}^{-1}(0-) = 0$ otherwise. Definition (2.2) uses the fact $\widehat{L}(\infty) \doteq \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{L}(s) = \infty$ P -a.s., which holds by the recurrence of Y . Itô [10] proved that ϵ is a Poisson point process under P . Let n be the intensity (or excursion) measure on $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{G})$ of ϵ , where $\mathcal{G} = \sigma(\epsilon(t), t \geq 0)$. In Sections 2.2 and 2.3, for any Borel-measurable

$F : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we denote $n(F) = n(F(\varepsilon)) \doteq \int_{\mathcal{E}} F \, dn$. In this notation the equality $n(A) = n(\mathbf{I}_A)$ holds for any $A \in \mathcal{G}$ and, if $n(A) \in (0, \infty)$, we denote $n(B|A) \doteq n(B \cap A)/n(A)$ for any $B \in \mathcal{G}$.

Let $\zeta(\varepsilon) \doteq \inf\{t > 0 : \varepsilon(t) = 0\}$ denote the lifetime of an element $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{E}$. (Note that $\zeta(\varepsilon(t))$ is given in terms of \widehat{L}^{-1} by $\zeta(\varepsilon(t)) = \widehat{L}^{-1}(t) - \widehat{L}^{-1}(t-)$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$.) Let N^q be an independent standard Poisson process with parameter q and consider the process (X, N^q) , which is defined on the probability space $(\Omega \times \Omega, \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{F}^N, P \times \mathbf{P}^N)$ where \mathcal{F}^N is the completed filtration generated by $\{N^q(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ and \mathbf{P}^N the probability law of N^q . Let $\mathbb{P} \doteq P \times \mathbf{P}^N$ be the product measure and note that under \mathbb{P} the random variable $T_{N^q}(1)$, defined by

$$(2.3) \quad T_f(1) \doteq \inf\{t \geq 0 : f(t) = 1\} \quad \text{for any } f \in D(\mathbb{R}),$$

is independent of X and exponentially distributed with mean $1/q$. We associate to the Lévy process (X, N^q) a two-dimensional point process $(\varepsilon, \eta) = \{(\varepsilon(t), \eta(t))\}_{t \geq 0}$, where

$$(2.4) \quad \eta(t) \doteq \begin{cases} \left\{ N^q(s + \widehat{L}^{-1}(t-)) - N^q(\widehat{L}^{-1}(t-)), s \in [0, \zeta(\varepsilon(t))] \right\}, & \text{if } \widehat{L}^{-1}(t-) < \widehat{L}^{-1}(t), \\ \partial, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Under \mathbb{P} the process (ε, η) is a Poisson point process with values in $\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}$. To the best of our knowledge, this construction first appeared in [8]. We refer to [2, Ch. O.5] for a treatment of Poisson point processes, the compensation formula and the properties of its characteristic measure.

2.2. Asymptotic independence. The proof of the asymptotic independence in Proposition 6 below relies on the following observations concerning the large time behaviour of the local time \widehat{L} .

Lemma 3. *The following statements hold true:*

(i) *The expectation of $\widehat{L}^{-1}(1)$ satisfies $E[\widehat{L}^{-1}(1)] \in (0, \infty)$.*

(ii) *Recall from Corollary 2 that $\ell = 1/E[\widehat{L}^{-1}(1)]$. Then for any $\delta \in (0, \ell/2)$ we have*

$$\limsup_{x \wedge t \rightarrow \infty} P(\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) \in t[\ell - \delta, \ell + \delta]) \leq \frac{4}{e\ell} \delta.$$

(iii) *The following limit holds $P(\widehat{L}(t) = \widehat{L}(\tau(x))) \rightarrow 0$ as $x \wedge t \rightarrow \infty$;*

(iv) *For any $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in [0, 1/4)$ we have*

$$(2.5) \quad \limsup_{x \wedge t \rightarrow \infty} P(\widehat{L}(t(1 - \delta_1)) \leq \widehat{L}(\tau(x)) \leq \widehat{L}(t(1 + \delta_2))) \leq \frac{8}{e} \max\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}.$$

For any fixed $s \in (0, \infty)$ it holds $P(\widehat{L}((t - s) \vee 0) \leq \widehat{L}(\tau(x)) < \widehat{L}(t)) \rightarrow 0$ as $x \wedge t \rightarrow \infty$.

Remarks. (1) Part (iii) in Lemma 3 implies that, as x and t tend to infinity, the probability that the excursion straddling t is the first excursion with height larger than x tends to zero. This fact can be viewed as an intuitive explanation for the asymptotic independence of $Z(\infty)$ and $Y(\infty)$. Part (iv) of Lemma 3 has analogous interpretation.

(2) The important role played by Lemma 3 in the proof of the asymptotic independence in Theorem 1

lies in the fact that, the limits in parts (iii) and (vi) do not require the point (t, x) in $(0, \infty)^2$ to tend to infinity along a specific trajectory but only for its norm $t \wedge x$ to increase beyond all bounds.

(3) In contrast to Lemma 3 (iv) the inequality $\limsup_{x \wedge t \rightarrow \infty} P(\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) < \widehat{L}(t) \leq \widehat{L}(\tau(x+z))) > 0$ holds for any fixed $z > 0$ (cf. remark following the statement of Lemma 4). To show this, recall $\widehat{L}(t)/t \rightarrow \ell$ a.s. as $t \uparrow \infty$ (see e.g. proof of Lemma 3 (iii) below) and note that for any small $\delta > 0$ we have $P(\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) < \widehat{L}(t) \leq \widehat{L}(\tau(x+z))) \geq P(\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) < t(\ell - \delta), \widehat{L}(\tau(x+z)) \geq t(\ell + \delta)) + o(1)$. Hence by Lemma 8 and equality (2.38) we find

$$\begin{aligned} & P(\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) < t(\ell - \delta), \widehat{L}(\tau(x+z)) \geq t(\ell + \delta)) \\ & \geq P(\widehat{L}(\tau(x+z)) \geq t(\ell + \delta)) - P(\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) \geq t(\ell - \delta)) \\ & = e^{-t(\ell + \delta)n(\rho(x+z) < \zeta)} - e^{-t(\ell - \delta)n(\rho(x) < \zeta)} \rightarrow e^{-(\ell + \delta)\lambda C_\gamma \widehat{\phi}(\gamma)e^{-\gamma z}} - e^{-(\ell - \delta)\lambda C_\gamma \widehat{\phi}(\gamma)} > 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $x \wedge t \rightarrow \infty$ in such a way that $te^{-x\gamma} \rightarrow \lambda > 0$. Since $z > 0$, the final inequality clearly holds for $\delta = 0$ and hence by continuity for all $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small.

Proof of Lemma 3. Part (i) of the lemma is known. For completeness a short proof, based on the Wiener-Hopf factorisation, is given in the Appendix.

(ii) For any $x, t \in (0, \infty)$, Lemma 8 implies $P(\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) > t) = e^{-tn(B(x))}$ for all $t \geq 0$, where $B(x) \doteq \{\rho(x) < \zeta\}$. Therefore for any $\delta \in (0, \ell/2)$ the following equality holds:

$$P(\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) \in t[\ell - \delta, \ell + \delta]) = e^{-t\ell n(B(x))} \left(e^{\delta t n(B(x))} - e^{-\delta t n(B(x))} \right).$$

Lagrange's theorem implies that there exists $\xi_{t,x} \in (-\delta, \delta)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} P(\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) \in t[\ell - \delta, \ell + \delta]) &= 2\delta t n(B(x)) e^{(\xi_{t,x} - \ell)tn(B(x))} \\ &\leq 2\delta t n(B(x)) e^{-tn(B(x))\ell/2} \leq \delta 4/(e\ell), \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from $|\xi_{t,x}| < \ell/2$. Since $t, x \in (0, \infty)$ were arbitrary, this concludes the proof of part (ii).

(iii) Since \widehat{L}^{-1} is a Lévy subordinator under P , the strong law of large numbers (see e.g. [2, p.92]) implies that, as $t \rightarrow \infty$, the ratio $t/\widehat{L}^{-1}(t)$ tends to ℓ almost surely. Hence, for any $\delta \in (0, \ell/2)$,

$$(2.6) \quad P\left(\widehat{L}(t)/t \in [\ell - \delta, \ell + \delta]\right) = 1 + o(1), \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

Equation (2.6) yields the following as $t \wedge x \rightarrow \infty$:

$$\begin{aligned} P(\widehat{L}(t) = \widehat{L}(\tau(x))) &= P(\widehat{L}(t) = \widehat{L}(\tau(x)), \widehat{L}(t) \in t[\ell - \delta, \ell + \delta]) + o(1) \\ &\leq P(\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) \in t[\ell - \delta, \ell + \delta]) + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Hence part (ii) yields $\limsup_{x \wedge t \rightarrow \infty} P(\widehat{L}(t) = \widehat{L}(\tau(x))) \leq \delta 4/(e\ell)$. Since $\delta \in (0, \ell/2)$ was arbitrary and probabilities are non-negative quantities, the limit in part (iii) follows.

(iv) Note that for any $\alpha \geq 0$ the quotient $\widehat{L}(t\alpha)/t$ tends to $\ell\alpha$ P -a.s. as $t \rightarrow \infty$. For any $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in [0, 1/4)$ we therefore find that the probability of the event

$$A_{\delta_1, \delta_2}(t, x) = \{\widehat{L}(t(1 - \delta_1)) \leq \widehat{L}(\tau(x)) \leq \widehat{L}(t(1 + \delta_2))\}$$

satisfies the following as $t \wedge x \rightarrow \infty$:

$$\begin{aligned} P(A_{\delta_1, \delta_2}(t, x)) &= P(A_{\delta_1, \delta_2}(t, x), \widehat{L}(t(1 - \delta_1)), \widehat{L}(t(1 + \delta_2)) \in t[\ell(1 - \delta), \ell(1 + \delta)]) + o(1) \\ (2.7) \quad &\leq P(\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) \in t[\ell(1 - \delta), \ell(1 + \delta)]) + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

for any $\delta \in (2 \max\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}, 1/2)$. Since $0 < \delta\ell < \ell/2$, part (ii) of the lemma and inequality (2.7) imply that $\limsup_{x \wedge t \rightarrow \infty} P(A_{\delta_1, \delta_2}(t, x)) \leq \delta 4/e$. Therefore the first inequality in part (iv) is satisfied. The second limit in part (iv) follows by noting that, for any $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\delta_1 \in (0, 1/4)$, the inclusion $\{\widehat{L}((t - s) \vee 0) \leq \widehat{L}(\tau(x)) < \widehat{L}(t)\} \subset A_{\delta_1, 0}(t, x)$ holds for all (t, x) with large $t \wedge x$. Hence by (2.5) the following holds

$$\limsup_{t \wedge x \rightarrow \infty} P(\widehat{L}((t - s) \vee 0) \leq \widehat{L}(\tau(x)) < \widehat{L}(t)) \leq \delta_1 8/e.$$

Since δ_1 can be chosen arbitrarily small, this proves part (iv) and hence the lemma. \square

Recall that the random variable $e(q) \doteq T_{N^q}(1)$, where N^q is defined immediately above (2.3) and $T_{N^q}(1)$ (for any path of N^q) is given in (2.3), is exponentially distributed with mean $1/q$ and independent of X . We establish the following lemma:

Lemma 4. *For any $q, x \in (0, \infty)$, $z \in [-x, 0]$, $y \in [0, x]$ and Borel sets $A, B, C \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ define the quantities*

$$\pi_1(q, A) \doteq \mathbb{P}(Y(e(q)) \in A), \quad \pi_2(x, B) \doteq P(Z(x) \in B), \quad \pi_3(q, x + z) \doteq \mathbb{P}(\widehat{L}(\tau(x + z)) < \widehat{L}(e(q)))$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} r(y, x, q, C, B) &\doteq \pi_2(x, B) \mathbb{P}(Y(e(q)) \in C, \widehat{L}(\tau(y)) = \widehat{L}(e(q))) \\ &\quad - \mathbb{P}(Y(e(q)) \in C, Z(x) \in B, \widehat{L}(\tau(y)) = \widehat{L}(e(q))), \\ R(q, x) &\doteq \pi_1(q, A) r(x, x, q, \mathbb{R}_+, B). \end{aligned}$$

Then the following equalities hold:

$$(2.8) \quad \mathbb{P}(Y(e(q)) \in A, Z(x) \in B) = \pi_1(q, A) \pi_2(x, B) + R_1(q, x),$$

$$(2.9) \quad \mathbb{P}(Y(e(q)) \in A, Z(x) \in B, \widehat{L}(\tau(x + z)) < \widehat{L}(e(q))) = \pi_1(q, A) \pi_2(x, B) \pi_3(q, x + z) + R_2(q, x, z),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R_1(q, x) &\doteq R(q, x) - r(x, x, q, A, B), \\ R_2(q, x, z) &\doteq R_1(q, x) + r(x + z, x, q, A, B). \end{aligned}$$

Remark. The proof of the asymptotic independence of the triplet $(Y(t), Z(x+y), M(t, x))$ in Proposition 6 is based on (2.9) and the fact that $R_2(q, x, z)$ is a linear combination of the probabilities of events, each of which is contained in an event of the form $\{\widehat{L}(e(q)) = \widehat{L}(\tau(x))\}$, the probability of which tends to zero as $t \wedge x \rightarrow \infty$ (cf. Lemma 3(iii)). It is important to note that the equality in (2.9) cannot be extended to the case $z > 0$, since the random variables $\mathbf{I}_{\{Z(x) \in B\}}$ and $\mathbf{I}_{\{\widehat{L}(\tau(x+z)) < \widehat{L}(e(q))\}}$ are clearly functions of the same excursion on the event $\{\widehat{L}(\tau(x+z)) = \widehat{L}(\tau(x))\}$ consisting of the paths of Y that cross the levels x and $x+z$ for the first time during the same excursion. In particular $\{Z(x) > z\} \subset \{\widehat{L}(\tau(x+z)) = \widehat{L}(\tau(x))\}$ and hence $P(\widehat{L}(\tau(x+z)) = \widehat{L}(\tau(x)))$ is in the limit as $x \rightarrow \infty$ bounded below by the strictly positive probability of $\{Z(\infty) > z\}$. This observation invalidates the proof of Lemma 4 if $z > 0$. Furthermore, it is not difficult to see that in general, for $z > 0$, the events $\{M(t, x) \leq z\}$ and $\{Z(x) \in B\}$ are not asymptotically independent as $t \wedge x \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof of Lemma 4. Define the set $A' \doteq \{(\varepsilon, \mu) \in \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E} : T_\mu(1) < \zeta(\varepsilon)\}$ and let $H_{A'} = \inf\{t \geq 0 : (\varepsilon(t), \eta(t)) \in A'\}$ be the first entry of the Poisson point process (ε, η) , defined in (2.2) and (2.4), into the set A' . For any set $A \in \mathcal{G}$, denote by ε^A the Poisson point process ε killed upon its first entrance into A , i.e. $\varepsilon^A(t)$ is equal to $\varepsilon(t)$ if $t < H_A$ and to ∂ otherwise, and define η^A analogously.

The definitions of the Poisson point process (ε, η) in (2.2) and (2.4) and that of $T_f(1)$ in (2.3) imply $e(q) = T_{N^q}(1) = \widehat{L}^{-1}(H_{A'} -) + T_{\eta(H_{A'})}(1) < \widehat{L}^{-1}(H_{A'})$, which yields $Y(e(q)) = \varepsilon(H_{A'})(T_{\eta(H_{A'})}(1))$ and $\widehat{L}(e(q)) = H_{A'}$. Hence $\{Y(e(q)) \in A\} \in \sigma(\varepsilon(H_{A'}), \eta(H_{A'}))$ and the event $\{\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) < \widehat{L}(e(q)), Z(x) \in B\}$ is measurable with respect to the sigma-algebra $\sigma(\varepsilon^{A'}, \eta^{A'})$. Therefore the two events are independent by the splitting property (see [2, Sec O.5, Prop. O.2]) of the Poisson point process (ε, η) (note for example that the latter event would not be measurable with respect to $\sigma(\varepsilon^{A'}, \eta^{A'})$ if the strict inequality was replaced by “ \leq ”). Hence the following equality holds:

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) < \widehat{L}(e(q)), Z(x) \in B, Y(e(q)) \in A) \\ = \pi_1(q, A) \mathbb{P}(\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) < \widehat{L}(e(q)), Z(x) \in B). \end{aligned}$$

An analogous argument based on the splitting property of the Poisson point process (ε, η) implies that the events $\{Z(x) \in B\}$ and $\{\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) \leq \widehat{L}(e(q))\}$ are independent. Indeed, let $B' \doteq \{(\varepsilon, \mu) \in \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E} : \rho(x, \varepsilon) < \zeta(\varepsilon)\}$ and note that $\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) = H_{B'}$, which implies that $\{\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) > \widehat{L}(e(q))\} = \{H_{B'} > H_{A'}\}$ and hence $\{\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) \leq \widehat{L}(e(q))\} \in \sigma(\varepsilon^{B'}, \eta^{B'})$. Furthermore $\{Z(x) \in B\} = \{\varepsilon(H_{B'}) - x \in B\} \in \sigma(\varepsilon(H_{B'}))$ and hence the splitting property [2, Sec O.5, Prop. O.2] of the Poisson point process (ε, η) implies

$$(2.11) \quad \mathbb{P}(\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) \leq \widehat{L}(e(q)), Z(x) \in B) = \mathbb{P}(\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) \leq \widehat{L}(e(q))) P(Z(x) \in B).$$

The identities in (2.10) and (2.11) imply the equality in (2.9) in the case $z = 0$.

To prove (2.8) we first observe that the equality

$$(2.12) \quad \mathbb{P}(\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) > \widehat{L}(e(q)), Y(e(q)) \in A, Z(x) \in B) = \mathbb{P}(\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) > \widehat{L}(e(q)), Y(e(q)) \in A) \pi_2(x, B)$$

follows from the splitting property of the Poisson point process (ϵ, η) at $H_{B'}$. The identity

$$(2.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) > \widehat{L}(e(q)), Y(e(q)) \in A) &= \mathbb{P}(\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) \geq \widehat{L}(e(q)))\mathbb{P}(Y(e(q)) \in A) \\ &- \mathbb{P}(\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) = \widehat{L}(e(q)), Y(e(q)) \in A) \end{aligned}$$

follows by (2.10) for $B = \mathbb{R}_+$ and $z = 0$. The equality in (2.9) for $z = 0$, which was proved above, and identities (2.12) and (2.13) imply the equality in (2.8). This concludes the proof of (2.8).

For any $z \in [-x, 0)$ it holds $\widehat{L}(\tau(x+z)) \leq \widehat{L}(\tau(x))$ and hence, by the splitting property of the Poisson point process (ϵ, η) at $H_{B'}$, we find

$$(2.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\widehat{L}(\tau(x+z)) > \widehat{L}(e(q)), Y(e(q)) \in A, Z(x) \in B) \\ = \mathbb{P}(\widehat{L}(\tau(x+z)) > \widehat{L}(e(q)), Y(e(q)) \in A)\pi_2(x, B). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore the splitting property of (ϵ, η) applied one more time at $H_{A'}$ yields

$$(2.15) \quad \mathbb{P}(\widehat{L}(\tau(x+z)) < \widehat{L}(e(q)), Y(e(q)) \in A) = \pi_1(q, A)\mathbb{P}(\widehat{L}(\tau(x+z)) < \widehat{L}(e(q))).$$

The following elementary equality

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\widehat{L}(\tau(x+z)) < \widehat{L}(e(q)), Y(e(q)) \in A, Z(x) \in B) &= \mathbb{P}(Y(e(q)) \in A, Z(x) \in B) \\ &- \mathbb{P}(\widehat{L}(\tau(x+z)) > \widehat{L}(e(q)), Y(e(q)) \in A, Z(x) \in B) \\ &- \mathbb{P}(\widehat{L}(\tau(x+z)) = \widehat{L}(e(q)), Y(e(q)) \in A, Z(x) \in B) \end{aligned}$$

and identities (2.8), (2.14), (2.15) imply (2.9) holds in the case $z \in [-x, 0)$. This concludes the proof of the lemma. \square

Before proving the asymptotic independence of $Y(t)$, $Z(x+y)$ and $M(t, x)$ stated in Proposition 6 below, we need to establish the asymptotic behaviour of certain convolutions that will arise in the proof of Proposition 6. Let $T(x)$ and $\widehat{T}(x)$ denote the first-passage times of X into the intervals (x, ∞) and $(-\infty, -x)$ respectively for any $x \geq 0$,

$$(2.16) \quad T(x) \doteq \inf\{t \geq 0 : X(t) \in (x, \infty)\}, \quad \widehat{T}(x) \doteq \inf\{t \geq 0 : X(t) \in (-\infty, -x)\}.$$

Lemma 5. *Let $a \in [0, \infty)$ and recall that $T(a)$ is the first-passage time of X over the level a defined in (2.16). Then the following equality holds:*

$$(2.17) \quad \int_{[0, t]} P(\widehat{L}(\tau(y)) = \widehat{L}(t-s)) P(T(a) \in ds) = o(1)$$

as $y \wedge t \rightarrow \infty$. Furthermore, we have

$$(2.18) \quad \int_{[0, t]} P(\widehat{L}(\tau(y)) < \widehat{L}(t-s)) P(T(a) \in ds) = P(\widehat{L}(\tau(y)) < \widehat{L}(t)) P(T(a) \leq t) + o(1)$$

as $y \wedge t \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof of Lemma 5. The proof of this lemma is based on Lemma 3. Note that for fixed $t, y \in (0, \infty)$, the integral in (2.17) can be expressed as an integral over \mathbb{R}_+ (with respect to the measure $P(T(a) \in ds)$) of the integrand $s \mapsto I_{[0,t]}(s)P(\widehat{L}(\tau(y)) = \widehat{L}(t-s))$. Lemma 3 (iii) implies that for any fixed $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$ the integrand tends to zero as $y \wedge t \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore (2.17) follows as a consequence of the dominated convergence theorem, since the integrands are uniformly bounded by one and the measure is finite.

To prove equality (2.18), first note that it is equivalent to the statement

$$(2.19) \quad \int_{[0,t]} \left(P(\widehat{L}(\tau(y)) < \widehat{L}(t)) - P(\widehat{L}(\tau(y)) < \widehat{L}(t-s)) \right) P(T(a) \in ds) = o(1)$$

as $y \wedge t \rightarrow \infty$. Since the local time \widehat{L} is non-decreasing, the integrand in (2.19) can be expressed as

$$(2.20) \quad P(\widehat{L}(\tau(y)) < \widehat{L}(t)) - P(\widehat{L}(\tau(y)) < \widehat{L}(t-s)) = P(\widehat{L}(t-s) \leq \widehat{L}(\tau(y)) < \widehat{L}(t)).$$

Equality (2.20), Lemma 3 (iv) and the dominated convergence theorem imply that (2.19), and hence (2.18), holds. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Proposition 6. *Let $A = (a, \infty)$ for some $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ and $C = (-\infty, z]$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$. Then the following holds as $t \wedge y \wedge (x-y) \rightarrow \infty$:*

$$(2.21) \quad P(Y(t) \in A, Z(x) \in B) = P(Y(t) \in A)P(Z(x) \in B) + o(1),$$

$$(2.22) \quad P(Y(t) \in A, Z(x) \in B, M(t, y) \in C) = P(Y(t) \in A)P(Z(x) \in B)P(M(t, y) \in C) + o(1).$$

Proof of Proposition 6. We first prove equality (2.21). Note that $t \wedge y \wedge (x-y) \rightarrow \infty$ in particular implies $t \wedge x \rightarrow \infty$ and $t \wedge y \rightarrow \infty$. By (2.8) we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(Y(t) \in A, Z(x) \in B) &= \mathcal{L}^{-1} \left(q \mapsto \frac{1}{q} \mathbb{P}(Y(e(q)) \in A, Z(x) \in B) \right) (t) \\ &= P(Y(t) \in A)P(Z(x) \in B) + \mathcal{L}^{-1} \left(q \mapsto \frac{1}{q} R_1(q, x) \right) (t), \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{L}^{-1} denotes the inverse Laplace transform and $R_1(q, x)$ is defined in Lemma 4. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^{-1} \left(q \mapsto \frac{1}{q} R_1(q, x) \right) (t) &= \mathcal{L}^{-1} \left(q \mapsto \frac{1}{q} R(q, x) \right) (t) - P(Y(t) \in A, Z(x) \in B, \widehat{L}(\tau(x)) = \widehat{L}(t)) \\ &\quad + P(Z(x) \in B)P(Y(t) \in A, \widehat{L}(\tau(x)) = \widehat{L}(t)) \\ (2.23) \quad &= \mathcal{L}^{-1} \left(q \mapsto \frac{1}{q} R(q, x) \right) (t) + o(1), \quad \text{as } t \wedge x \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality holds by Lemma 3 (iii).

To prove (2.21) we therefore need to establish the equality

$$(2.24) \quad \mathcal{L}^{-1} \left(q \mapsto \frac{1}{q} R(q, x) \right) (t) = o(1) \quad \text{as } t \wedge x \rightarrow \infty.$$

Since for every t , $Y(t)$ has the same law as $X^*(t) = \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} X(s)$, $P(\Delta X(t) = 0) = 1$ for all $t > 0$, where $\Delta X(t) \doteq X(t) - X(t-)$, and $\{X^*(t) > a, \Delta X(t) = 0\} = \{T(a) < t, \Delta X(t) = 0\}$, the following equalities hold:

$$(2.25) \quad \mathbb{P}(Y(e(q)) \in A) = \mathbb{P}(X^*(e(q)) > a) = \mathbb{P}(T(a) < e(q)) = \int_{[0, \infty)} e^{-qt} P(T(a) \in dt),$$

where as before $e(q)$ is an exponential time with mean $1/q$ that is independent of X and $T(a)$ is defined in (2.16). Since $q \mapsto \mathbb{P}(Y(e(q)) \in A)$ is by (2.25) the Laplace transform of the positive measure $P(T(a) \in dt)$ on \mathbb{R}_+ , the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{L}^{-1} \left(q \mapsto \mathbb{P}(Y(e(q)) \in A) \frac{1}{q} \mathbb{P}(\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) = \widehat{L}(e(q))) \right) (t) \\ &= \int_{[0, t]} P(\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) = \widehat{L}(t-s)) P(T(a) \in ds) = o(1) \quad \text{as } x \wedge t \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where the final equality follows by (2.17) in Lemma 5. An analogous argument shows that

$$\mathcal{L}^{-1} \left(q \mapsto \mathbb{P}(Y(e(q)) \in A) \frac{1}{q} \mathbb{P}(Z(x) \in B, \widehat{L}(\tau(x)) = \widehat{L}(e(q))) \right) (t) = o(1) \quad \text{as } x \wedge t \rightarrow \infty.$$

The definition of $R(q, x)$ in Lemma 4 and the two equalities above imply (2.24) and hence (2.21).

The proof of (2.22) is based on equality (2.27) below, which we now establish. Since by assumption $t \wedge y \wedge (x-y) \rightarrow \infty$, for large values of x and y we have $0 \leq y \leq x$. The definition of $r(y, x, q, A, B)$ in Lemma 4 implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^{-1} \left(q \mapsto \frac{1}{q} r(y, x, q, A, B) \right) (t) &= P(Z(x) \in B) P(Y(t) \in A, \widehat{L}(\tau(y)) = \widehat{L}(t)) \\ &\quad - P(Y(t) \in A, Z(x) \in B, \widehat{L}(\tau(y)) = \widehat{L}(t)) \\ (2.26) \quad &= o(1) \quad \text{as } t \wedge y \wedge (x-y) \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where the final equality follows from Lemma 3 (iii). The identity in (2.9) together with (2.26), identities (2.23), (2.24) and (2.25) and equality (2.18) in Lemma 5 imply:

$$\begin{aligned} & P(Y(t) \in A, Z(x) \in B, \widehat{L}(\tau(y)) < \widehat{L}(t)) \\ &= \mathcal{L}^{-1} \left(q \mapsto P(Z(x) \in B) \mathbb{P}(Y(e(q)) \in A) \frac{1}{q} \mathbb{P}(\widehat{L}(\tau(y)) < \widehat{L}(e(q))) + \frac{1}{q} R(q, x) \right) (t) + o(1) \\ &= P(Z(x) \in B) P(T(a) \leq t) P(\widehat{L}(\tau(y)) < \widehat{L}(t)) + o(1) \quad \text{as } t \wedge y \wedge (x-y) \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

The process X drifts to $-\infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ by As. 1, which implies $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} P(T(a) = t) = 0$. Thus, we have the following equality for the set $A = (a, \infty)$:

$$P(T(a) \leq t) = P(T(a) < t) + P(T(a) = t) = P(Y(t) \in A) + o(1) \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

As a consequence the following asymptotic independence holds:

$$(2.27) \quad \begin{aligned} & P(Y(t) \in A, Z(x) \in B, \widehat{L}(\tau(y)) < \widehat{L}(t)) \\ &= P(Y(t) \in A)P(Z(x) \in B)P(\widehat{L}(\tau(y)) < \widehat{L}(t)) + o(1) \quad \text{as } t \wedge y \wedge (x - y) \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $C = (-\infty, z]$ for an arbitrary fixed $z \in \mathbb{R}$. In order to prove equality (2.22) note that the following inclusions hold for any $y \in \mathbb{R}_+$:

$$\begin{aligned} \{M(t, y) \in C\} &= \{Y^*(t) \leq y + z\} \subset \{\widehat{L}(t) \leq \widehat{L}(\tau((y + z)^+))\} \quad \text{and} \\ \{\widehat{L}(t) \leq \widehat{L}(\tau((y + z)^+))\} \cap \{M(t, y) \notin C\} &\subset \{\widehat{L}(\tau((y + z)^+)) = \widehat{L}(t)\} \end{aligned}$$

(recall that $\tau(x)$ is defined for $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$). These inclusions, together with Lemma 3 (iii), imply that the following equality holds for any family of events $E(t, x) \in \mathcal{F}$, $t, x \in \mathbb{R}_+$, as $t \wedge y \wedge (x - y) \rightarrow \infty$:

$$(2.28) \quad P\left(E(t, x), \widehat{L}(t) \leq \widehat{L}(\tau((y + z)^+))\right) = P(E(t, x), M(t, y) \in C) + o(1).$$

Since $t \wedge y \wedge (x - y) \rightarrow \infty$, for the fixed $z \in \mathbb{R}_+$ the inequalities $0 \leq y + z \leq x$ hold for all large y and x . In particular (2.27), applied to the complement $\{\widehat{L}(\tau(y + z)) < \widehat{L}(t)\}^c = \{\widehat{L}(\tau(y + z)) \geq \widehat{L}(t)\}$, and (2.28) yield the following equalities

$$\begin{aligned} P(Y(t) \in A, Z(x) \in B, M(t, y) \in C) &= P(Y(t) \in A, Z(x) \in B, \widehat{L}(t) \leq \widehat{L}(\tau(y + z))) + o(1) \\ &= P(Y(t) \in A)P(Z(x) \in B)P(\widehat{L}(t) \leq \widehat{L}(\tau(y + z))) + o(1) \\ &= P(Y(t) \in A)P(Z(x) \in B)P(M(t, y) \in C) + o(1) \end{aligned}$$

as $t \wedge y \wedge (x - y) \rightarrow \infty$. This concludes the proof of (2.22). \square

2.3. Limiting overshoot. In this section we prove the formula in (1.2) of Theorem 1, which characterises the law of the limiting overshoot $Z(\infty)$. This is achieved in two steps. We first establish Cramér's asymptotics for the exit probabilities of X from a finite interval. In the second step we describe the distribution of the overshoot $Z(x)$, defined in (1.1), in terms of the excursion measure n (see Sections 2.2 for the definition of n) and apply the result from step one to find the relevant asymptotics under the excursion measure, which in turn yield the Laplace transform of the limiting law $Z(\infty)$.

For any $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$, recall that $T(x)$ is given in (2.16) and define the overshoot

$$K(x) \doteq X(T(x)) - x \quad \text{on the event } \{T(x) < \infty\}.$$

Denote by $f(x) \simeq g(x)$ as $x \uparrow \infty$ the functions $f, g : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ satisfying $\lim_{x \uparrow \infty} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} = 1$.

Proposition 7. (i) **(Asymptotic two-sided exit probability)** *For any $z > 0$ we have*

$$(2.29) \quad P(T(x) < \widehat{T}(z)) \simeq C_\gamma e^{-\gamma x} \left(1 - E\left[e^{\gamma X(\widehat{T}(z))}\right]\right) \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty,$$

where the constant C_γ is given in (1.3) and $\widehat{T}(z)$ in (2.16).

(ii) **(Asymptotic overshoot)** Let $u \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and fix $z > 0$. Then we have as $x \rightarrow \infty$:

$$(2.30) \quad E \left[e^{-uK(x)} \mathbf{I}_{\{T(x) < \widehat{T}(z)\}} \right] \simeq C(u) e^{-\gamma x} \left(1 - E \left[e^{\gamma X(\widehat{T}(z))} \right] \right), \quad \text{with} \quad C(u) \doteq \frac{\gamma}{\gamma + u} \cdot \frac{\phi(u)}{\phi(0)} \cdot C_\gamma$$

and C_γ in (1.3).

Remarks. (i) Let $P_x^{(\gamma)}$ be the Cramér measure on (Ω, \mathcal{F}) . Its restriction to $\mathcal{F}(t)$ is given by

$$P_x^{(\gamma)}(A) \doteq E_x[e^{\gamma(X(t)-x)} \mathbf{I}_A], \quad A \in \mathcal{F}(t), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Here E_x is the expectation under P_x and \mathbf{I}_A is the indicator of A . Under As. 1 it follows that $P_x^{(\gamma)}$ is a probability measure and $X - x$ is a Lévy process under $P_x^{(\gamma)}$ with $E_x^{(\gamma)}[X(1) - x] \in (0, \infty)$.

(ii) Since the overshoot of X is the same as that of its ladder process, the weak limit under $P^{(\gamma)}$ of $K(x)$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$, needed in the proof of Proposition 7 is be derived from [4, Thm. 1].

(iii) Note that the random variable $X(\widehat{T}(z))$ under the expectation in (2.29) is well-defined P -a.s., since As. 1 implies that the Lévy process X drifts to $-\infty$ P -a.s.

(iv) The proof of the Proposition 7 is based on two ingredients: the Cramér estimate for Lévy processes [3] and the fact that the overshoot $K(x)$ has a weak limit under $P^{(\gamma)}$ follows from [4, Thm. 1]. The details of the proof are given in Appendix A.2.

Let $x > 0$ and denote by $\rho(x, \varepsilon)$ the first time that an excursion $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{E}$ enters the interval (x, ∞) :

$$(2.31) \quad \rho(x, \varepsilon) \doteq \inf\{s \geq 0 : \varepsilon(s) > x\}.$$

For brevity we sometimes write $\rho(x)$ instead of $\rho(x, \varepsilon)$. Since the expectation $E^{(\gamma)}[X_1]$ is strictly positive, under $P^{(\gamma)}$ the reflected process Y is transient and $\widehat{L}(\infty)$ is an exponentially distributed random variable, independent of the killed subordinator $\{(\widehat{L}^{-1}(t), \widehat{H}(t))\}_{t \in [0, \widehat{L}(\infty))}$. As a consequence, the excursion process $\varepsilon' = \{\varepsilon'(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$, defined by the formula in (2.2) for $t < \widehat{L}(\infty)$ and by $\varepsilon'(t) \doteq \partial$ otherwise, is under $P^{(\gamma)}$ a Poisson point process killed at an independent exponential time with mean $E^{(\gamma)}[\widehat{L}(\infty)]$. Put differently, ε' is given by (2.2) up to the first time it hits the set $\{\varepsilon \in \mathcal{E} : \zeta(\varepsilon) = \infty\}$. In the rest of the paper we will denote by $n^{(\gamma)}$ the excursion measure under $P^{(\gamma)}$ of the killed Poisson point process ε' .

Lemma 8. *For any $x > 0$ the random variable $\widehat{L}(\tau(x))$ is exponentially distributed under P (resp. $P^{(\gamma)}$) with parameter $n(\rho(x) < \zeta)$ (resp. $n^{(\gamma)}(\rho(x) < \zeta)$) and the following equality holds:*

$$P(Z(x) > y) = n(\varepsilon(\rho(x, \varepsilon)) - x > y | \rho(x) < \zeta) \quad \text{for any } y \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Proof. The definitions of the Poisson point process ε in (2.2) and the first-passage time $\rho(x, \varepsilon)$ in (2.31) imply the equality $\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) = H_A \doteq \inf\{t \geq 0 : \varepsilon(t) \in A\}$ where $A \doteq \{\varepsilon \in \mathcal{E} : \rho(x, \varepsilon) < \zeta(\varepsilon)\}$. The first statement in the lemma follows since H_A is exponentially distribution with parameter $n(A)$ (e.g. [2, Sec. O.5, Prop. O.2]). The second statement is a consequence of the fact that $\varepsilon(H_A)$

follows an n -uniform distribution (i.e. $P(\epsilon(H_A) \in B) = n(B|A)$ for any $B \in \mathcal{G}$, see e.g. [2, Sec. O.5, Prop. O.2]), taking B to be equal to $\{\varepsilon \in \mathcal{E} : \rho(x, \varepsilon) < \zeta(\varepsilon), \varepsilon(\rho(x, \varepsilon)) - x > y\}$. \square

Conversely, one may also express n as a ratio of expectations under the measure P . To derive such a representation, for any $x > 0$, define the random variable $K_F(x)$ by

$$(2.32) \quad K_F(x) \doteq \sum_g F(\epsilon_g) \mathbf{I}_{\{g < \tau(x)\}},$$

where the sum runs over all left-end points g of excursion intervals, $\epsilon_g \doteq \epsilon(\widehat{L}(g))$, and $F : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Borel-measurable and non-negative (note that $F \equiv 1$ implies $K_F(x) \equiv 1$ P - and $P^{(\gamma)}$ -almost surely).

Lemma 9. (i) Define $\widehat{V}(x) \doteq E[\widehat{L}(\tau(x))]$ and $\widehat{V}^{(\gamma)}(x) \doteq E^{(\gamma)}[\widehat{L}(\tau(x))]$. Then the following hold:

$$(2.33) \quad n(F) = \widehat{V}(x)^{-1} E[K_F(x)], \quad n^{(\gamma)}(F) = \widehat{V}^{(\gamma)}(x)^{-1} E^{(\gamma)}[K_F(x)].$$

In particular we have $\widehat{V}(x) \cdot n(\rho(x) < \zeta) = 1$ and $\widehat{V}^{(\gamma)}(x) \cdot n^{(\gamma)}(\rho(x) < \zeta) = 1$.

(ii) The following holds $n^{(\gamma)}(F(\varepsilon) \mathbf{I}_{\{\rho(x, \varepsilon) < \zeta(\varepsilon)\}}) = n(e^{\gamma \varepsilon(\rho(x, \varepsilon))} F(\varepsilon) \mathbf{I}_{\{\rho(x, \varepsilon) < \zeta(\varepsilon)\}})$. Hence we have

$$(2.34) \quad n^{(\gamma)}(\rho(x, \varepsilon) < \zeta(\varepsilon)) = n(e^{\gamma \varepsilon(\rho(x, \varepsilon))} \mathbf{I}_{\{\rho(x, \varepsilon) < \zeta(\varepsilon)\}}).$$

(iii) For any $z \in (0, \infty)$ the following holds as $x \rightarrow \infty$:

$$(2.35) \quad n^{(\gamma)}(\rho(x, \varepsilon) < \zeta(\varepsilon)) \simeq \widehat{\phi}(\gamma) \quad \text{and} \quad e^{\gamma x} n(\varepsilon(\rho(z, \varepsilon)) > x, \rho(z, \varepsilon) < \zeta(\varepsilon)) = o(1).$$

Proof of Lemma 9. (i) The proof of (2.33) is identical under both measures. Hence we give the argument only under P . Note that for any left-end point g of an excursion interval the following equality holds: $F(\epsilon_g) \mathbf{I}_{\{g < \tau(x)\}} = F(\epsilon_g) \mathbf{I}_{\{g \leq \tau(x)\}}$. Since for every $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{E}$ the process $t \rightarrow F(\varepsilon) \mathbf{I}_{\{t \leq \tau(x)\}}$ is left-continuous and adapted, an application of the compensation formula of excursion theory for the Poisson point process ϵ defined in (2.2) to $K_F(x)$ (see e.g. [2, Cor. IV.11]) yields representation (2.33). The second statement follows by taking $F = \mathbf{I}_{\{\rho(x) < \zeta\}}$ in (2.33), since in that case $K_F(x) = \mathbf{I}_{\{\tau(x) < \infty\}}$.

(ii) Define $G(\varepsilon) \doteq F(\varepsilon) \mathbf{I}_{\{\rho(x, \varepsilon) < \zeta(\varepsilon)\}}$ and let $K_G(x)$ as in (2.32). The Esscher change of measure formula and the compensation formula in [2, Cor. IV.11] yield

$$(2.36) \quad E^{(\gamma)}[K_G(x)] = E \left[\int_0^\infty e^{\gamma X(t^-)} \mathbf{I}_{\{t \leq \tau(x)\}} d\widehat{L}(t) \right] n \left(e^{\gamma \varepsilon(\rho(x, \varepsilon))} F(\varepsilon) \mathbf{I}_{\{\rho(x, \varepsilon) < \zeta(\varepsilon)\}} \right).$$

A change of variable $t = \widehat{L}^{-1}(u)$ under the expectation on the right-hand side of (2.36), Fubini's theorem and $P^{(\gamma)}$ -a.s. equality $\{\widehat{L}^{-1}(u-) \leq \tau(x)\} = \{\widehat{L}^{-1}(u) \leq \tau(x)\}$ yield

$$E \left[\int_0^\infty e^{\gamma X(t^-)} \mathbf{I}_{\{t \leq \tau(x)\}} d\widehat{L}(t) \right] = E^{(\gamma)} \left[\int_0^{\widehat{L}(\infty)} \mathbf{I}_{\{\widehat{L}^{-1}(u-) \leq \tau(x)\}} du \right] = \widehat{V}^{(\gamma)}(x).$$

The final equality follows from $\{\widehat{L}^{-1}(u-) \leq \tau(x)\} = \{u \leq \widehat{L}(\tau(x))\}$. Equality in (2.33) under $P^{(\gamma)}$ applied to $K_G(x)$ and (2.36) now imply the formula in part (ii) of the lemma.

(iii) By Lemma 8 the random variable $\widehat{L}(\tau(x))$ is exponentially distributed under $P^{(\gamma)}$ with parameter $n^{(\gamma)}(\rho(x) < \zeta)$. Hence $n^{(\gamma)}(\rho(x) < \zeta) = -\log P^{(\gamma)}(\widehat{L}(\tau(x)) > 1)$ and the dominated convergence theorem implies $\lim_{x \uparrow \infty} n^{(\gamma)}(\rho(x) < \zeta) = -\log P^{(\gamma)}(\widehat{L}(\infty) > 1) = -\log P^{(\gamma)}(\widehat{L}^{-1}(1) < \infty)$, which is equal to $\widehat{\phi}^{(\gamma)}(0) = \widehat{\phi}(\gamma)$ by the elementary equality $\widehat{\phi}^{(\gamma)}(u) = \widehat{\phi}(\gamma + u)$, $u \geq 0$. Chebyshev's inequality and part (ii) of the lemma imply $e^{\gamma x} n(\varepsilon(\rho(z, \varepsilon)) > x, \rho(z, \varepsilon) < \zeta(\varepsilon)) \leq n(e^{\gamma \varepsilon(\rho(z, \varepsilon))} \mathbf{I}_{\{\varepsilon(\rho(z, \varepsilon)) > x, \rho(z, \varepsilon) < \zeta(\varepsilon)\}}) = n^{(\gamma)}(\varepsilon(\rho(z, \varepsilon)) > x, \rho(z, \varepsilon) < \zeta(\varepsilon))$. The final expression tends to zero as $x \uparrow \infty$ by the dominated convergence theorem and the lemma follows. \square

We now apply Lemma 9 to establish the asymptotic behaviour of certain integrals against the excursion measure as $x \rightarrow \infty$. Lemma 8, in combination with Proposition 10 below, implies the identity in (1.2) thus concluding the proof of Theorem 1.

Proposition 10. *Let $u \geq 0$. Then, as $x \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$(2.37) \quad n(e^{-u(\varepsilon(\rho(x)) - x)} | \rho(x) < \zeta) \longrightarrow C(u) \cdot C_\gamma^{-1} = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma + u} \cdot \frac{\phi(u)}{\phi(0)}.$$

Remark. Recall the result of Doney & Maller [6, Thm. 1] (C_γ is defined in (1.3)):

$$(2.38) \quad n(\rho(x) < \zeta) \simeq C_\gamma \widehat{\phi}(\gamma) e^{-\gamma x} \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof of Proposition 10. Fix $M > 0$ and recall that, under the probability measure $n(\cdot | \rho(M) < \zeta)$, the coordinate process has the same law as the first excursion of Y away from zero with height larger than M . For any $x > M$, the following identity holds:

$$(2.39) \quad n(e^{-u(\varepsilon(\rho(x)) - x)} | \rho(x) < \zeta) = n(e^{-u(\varepsilon(\rho(x)) - x)} \mathbf{I}_{\{\rho(x) < \zeta\}} | \rho(M) < \zeta) \frac{n(\rho(M) < \zeta)}{n(\rho(x) < \zeta)}.$$

The definitions of the point process ε in (2.2) and of the compensator measure n , together with the strong Markov property under the probability measure $n(\cdot | \rho(M) < \zeta)$, imply that $\varepsilon \circ \theta_{\rho(M)}$ has the same law as the process X with entrance law $n(\varepsilon(\rho(M, \varepsilon)) \in dz | \rho(M) < \zeta)$ and killed at the epoch of the first passage into the interval $(-\infty, 0]$. We therefore find

$$(2.40) \quad \begin{aligned} n(e^{-u(\varepsilon(\rho(x, \varepsilon)) - x)} \mathbf{I}_{\{\rho(x) < \zeta\}} | \rho(M) < \zeta) &= n \left(e^{-u(\varepsilon(\rho(M, \varepsilon)) - x)} \mathbf{I}_{\{\varepsilon(\rho(M, \varepsilon)) > x\}} | \rho(M) < \zeta \right) \\ &+ \int_{[M, x]} E_z \left[e^{-uK(x)} \mathbf{I}_{\{T(x) < \widehat{T}(0)\}} \right] n(\varepsilon(\rho(M, \varepsilon)) \in dz | \rho(M) < \zeta), \end{aligned}$$

where $K(x) = X(T(x)) - x$. By the second equality in (2.35) of Lemma 9, we have as $x \uparrow \infty$:

$$e^{\gamma x} n \left(e^{-u(\varepsilon(\rho(M, \varepsilon)) - x)} \mathbf{I}_{\{\varepsilon(\rho(M, \varepsilon)) > x\}} | \rho(M) < \zeta \right) \leq e^{\gamma x} \frac{n(\varepsilon(\rho(M, \varepsilon)) > x, \rho(M, \varepsilon) < \zeta(\varepsilon))}{n(\rho(M) < \zeta)} = o(1).$$

This estimate, spatial homogeneity of X and equations (2.39) and (2.40) yield as $x \rightarrow \infty$:

$$(2.41) \quad \begin{aligned} n(e^{-u(\varepsilon(\rho(x, \varepsilon)) - x)} | \rho(x) < \zeta) \\ = o(1) + \int_{[M, x]} E \left[e^{-uK(x-z)} \mathbf{I}_{\{T(x-z) < \widehat{T}(z)\}} \right] \frac{n(\varepsilon(\rho(M, \varepsilon)) \in dz, \rho(M) < \zeta)}{n(\rho(x) < \zeta)}. \end{aligned}$$

Formula (2.30) of Proposition 7 implies the following equality:

$$(2.42) \quad E \left[e^{-uK(x-z)} \mathbf{I}_{\{T(x-z) < \widehat{T}(z)\}} \right] = C(u) e^{-\gamma x} (1 - G(z) + R(x-z)) e^{\gamma z},$$

where $G, R : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are bounded functions such that $G(z) = E[e^{\gamma X(\widehat{T}(z))}]$ and $\lim_{x' \rightarrow \infty} R(x') = 0$. Therefore the equality in (2.41), the asymptotic behaviour of $n(\rho(x) < \zeta)$ given in (2.38) and Lemma 9 (ii) imply the following identity as $x \rightarrow \infty$:

$$(2.43) \quad n(e^{-u(\varepsilon(\rho(x,\varepsilon)) - x)} | \rho(x) < \zeta) = A_\gamma(u) n^{(\gamma)}(\varepsilon(\rho(M, \varepsilon)) \in [M, x], \rho(M, \varepsilon) < \zeta(\varepsilon)) + o(1) \\ + A_\gamma(u) n^{(\gamma)}([R(x - \varepsilon(\rho(M, \varepsilon))) - G(\varepsilon(\rho(M, \varepsilon)))] I_{\{\varepsilon(\rho(M, \varepsilon)) \in [M, x], \rho(M, \varepsilon) < \zeta(\varepsilon)\}}),$$

where $A_\gamma(u) \doteq C(u)/(C_\gamma \widehat{\phi}(\gamma))$. By (2.43) the limit $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} n(e^{-u(\varepsilon(\rho(x,\varepsilon)) - x)} | \rho(x) < \zeta)$ exists and the dominated convergence theorem yields

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} n(e^{-u(\varepsilon(\rho(x,\varepsilon)) - x)} | \rho(x) < \zeta) = A_\gamma(u) \left(n^{(\gamma)}(\rho(M) < \zeta) - n^{(\gamma)}(G(\varepsilon(\rho(M, \varepsilon))) I_{\{\rho(M, \varepsilon) < \zeta(\varepsilon)\}}) \right).$$

Since this equality holds for any $M > 0$ and the left-hand side does not depend on M , if the right-hand side has a limit as $M \rightarrow \infty$, then the equality also holds in this limit. Note that (2.35) of Lemma 9 (iii) implies $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} n^{(\gamma)}(\rho(M) < \zeta) = \widehat{\phi}(\gamma)$. Since $G(z) = E[e^{\gamma X(\widehat{T}(z))}]$ it holds $G(\varepsilon(\rho(M, \varepsilon))) \leq e^{-\gamma M}$ and an application of the dominated convergence theorem yields (2.37). \square

APPENDIX A. ADDITIONAL PROOFS

A.1. Proof of Corollary 2. (i) The duality lemma for Lévy processes implies that $X^*(t) = \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} X(s)$ and $Y(t)$ have the same law for any fixed $t \geq 0$. Since, by As. 1, $E[X(1)] < 0$ and the process $\{X^*(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ is non-decreasing, it converges a.s. as $t \uparrow \infty$ to $X^*(\infty) \doteq \sup_{s \geq 0} X(s)$. Therefore $Y(t)$ converges weakly to the law $Y(\infty)$ of $X^*(\infty)$, characterised by its Laplace transform $E[e^{-uY(\infty)}] = \phi(0)/\phi(u)$, $u \in \mathbb{R}_+$ (see [2, p. 163]). The joint Laplace transform of $(Y(\infty), Z(\infty))$ now follows from the asymptotic independence in Theorem 1.

(ii) The Wiener-Hopf factorisation of X [2, p. 166] implies the following identity for some $k \in (0, \infty)$:

$$(A.1) \quad -\log E[e^{\theta X(1)}] = k\phi(-\theta)\widehat{\phi}(\theta), \quad \theta \in \mathbb{C}, \Re(\theta) = 0.$$

By analytic continuation and As. 1, identity (A.1) holds for all $\theta \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\Re(\theta) \in [0, \gamma)$. Furthermore, continuity implies that (A.1) remains valid for $\theta = \gamma$. As \widehat{H} is a non-zero subordinator (recall $E[X(1)] < 0$), we have $\widehat{\phi}(\gamma) > 0$ and hence $\phi(-\gamma) = 0$.

By Thm. 1, eq. (1.2), the Laplace transform of $x \mapsto P(Z(\infty) > x)$ is $(1 - \frac{\gamma}{\phi(0)}\phi(v)/(v + \gamma))/v$. The Lévy-Khinchin formula for ϕ and integration by parts imply $\phi(v) = \phi(0) + v(m + \int_0^\infty e^{-vy} \overline{\nu}_H(x) dx)$ for any $v \geq -\gamma$. Since $\phi(-\gamma) = 0$, we have $\int_0^\infty e^{\gamma y} \overline{\nu}_H(y) dy = \phi(0)/\gamma - m$. A direct Laplace inversion, based on this representation of ϕ , implies the first formula in part (ii) of the corollary. The atom at zero is obtained by taking the limit in (1.2) of Theorem 1 as $v \rightarrow \infty$.

(iii) Since ϕ is strictly concave with $\phi(-\gamma) = 0$, the right-derivative of ϕ at $-\gamma$ satisfies $\phi'(-\gamma) > 0$ and the constant C_γ in (1.3) is well-defined. By Lemma 3(i), proved in Appendix A.3, we have $\ell \in (0, \infty)$. It follows from [6, Thm. 1] that if t and x tend to infinity and $te^{-\gamma x} \rightarrow \lambda$, for some $\lambda > 0$, then $M(t, x) \xrightarrow{D} M(\infty)$, where the limit follows a Gumbel distribution,

$$(A.2) \quad P(M(\infty) < z) = \exp\left(-\ell C_\gamma \widehat{\phi}(\gamma) \lambda e^{-\gamma z}\right), \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathbb{R}.$$

For completeness, we give below a short proof of (A.2) based on [6, Thm. 1]. The joint Fourier-Laplace transform in Corollary 2 now follows from Theorem 1 and a direct calculation using (A.2).

To establish (A.2) we show that, as $t \wedge x \rightarrow \infty$ and $te^{-\gamma x} \rightarrow \lambda > 0$, the following holds

$$(A.3) \quad P(Y^*(t) - x < z) = \exp(-t\ell\lambda(x+z)) + o(1) \quad \text{for any } z \in \mathbb{R},$$

where $\lambda(x) = n(\rho(x) < \zeta)$. Since (2.38) implies $t\lambda(x+z) \rightarrow C_\gamma \widehat{\phi}(\gamma) \lambda e^{-\gamma z}$ as $t \wedge x \rightarrow \infty$ and $te^{-\gamma x} \rightarrow \lambda$, the limit in (A.2) follows from (A.3).

To complete the proof we now verify the claim in (A.3). Note that $\tau(x+z) \rightarrow \infty$ P -a.s. as $x \rightarrow \infty$ and, as shown in the proof of Lemma 3, the law of large numbers implies that $\widehat{L}(t)/t \rightarrow \ell$ P -a.s. as $t \rightarrow \infty$, where $\ell = 1/E[\widehat{L}^{-1}(1)]$ (recall from Lemma 3 (i) that $0 < \ell < \infty$). Therefore $\widehat{L}(\tau(x+z))/\tau(x+z)$ tends to ℓ P -a.s as $x \rightarrow \infty$. In particular, for any $\delta > 0$, we have

$$P(\widehat{L}(\tau(x+z))/\tau(x+z) \in (\ell - \delta, \ell + \delta)) = 1 + o(1) \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence as $t \wedge x \rightarrow \infty$ the following holds

$$\begin{aligned} P(Y^*(t) < x+z) &= P(\tau(x+z) > t, \widehat{L}(\tau(x+z))/\tau(x+z) \geq \ell - \delta) + o(1) \\ &\leq P(\widehat{L}(\tau(x+z)) > t(\ell - \delta)) + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, it follows that as $t \wedge x \rightarrow \infty$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(Y^*(t) < x+z) &\geq P(\widehat{L}(\tau(x+z)) > \widehat{L}(t), \widehat{L}(t) \leq t(\ell + \delta)) \\ &\geq P(\widehat{L}(\tau(x+z)) > t(\ell + \delta), \widehat{L}(t) \leq t(\ell + \delta)) = P(\widehat{L}(\tau(x+z)) > t(\ell + \delta)) + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 8 the random variable $\widehat{L}(\tau(x+z))$ is exponentially distributed with parameter $\lambda(x)$ and hence we find

$$\exp(-(\ell + \delta)t\lambda(x+z)) + o(1) \leq P(Y^*(t) < x+z) \leq \exp(-(\ell - \delta)t\lambda(x+z)) + o(1).$$

Since this result holds for any $\delta > 0$, the equality in (A.3) follows. \square

A.2. Proof of Proposition 7. (i) Recall that $T(x)$ and $\widehat{T}(x)$ are defined in (2.16) and that, under As. 1, [3] shows that Cramér's estimate remains valid for the Lévy process X (C_γ defined in (1.3)):

$$(A.4) \quad P(T(y) < \infty) \simeq C_\gamma e^{-\gamma y} \quad \text{as } y \rightarrow \infty.$$

By the strong Markov property and spatial homogeneity of X it follows that

$$(A.5) \quad P(T(x) < \widehat{T}(z)) = P(T(x) < \infty) - \int_{(-\infty, -z]} P_y(T(x) < \infty) P(X(\widehat{T}(z)) \in dy, \widehat{T}(z) < T(x)).$$

The translation invariance of X and Cramér's estimate (A.4) imply the following equality

$$(A.6) \quad P_y(T(x) < \infty) = C_\gamma e^{-\gamma x} e^{\gamma y} (1 + r(x - y)) \quad \text{for all } x > y,$$

where $\lim_{x' \rightarrow \infty} r(x') = 0$. Equality (A.6) applied to the identity in (A.5) yields

$$(A.7) \quad C_\gamma^{-1} e^{\gamma x} P(T(x) < \widehat{T}(z)) = 1 - E \left[e^{\gamma X(\widehat{T}(z))} \mathbf{I}_{\{\widehat{T}(z) < T(x)\}} \right] \\ + r(x) - E \left[e^{\gamma X(\widehat{T}(z))} r(x - X(\widehat{T}(z))) \mathbf{I}_{\{\widehat{T}(z) < T(x)\}} \right].$$

Since $X(\widehat{T}(z)) \leq -z < 0$ on the event $\{\widehat{T}(z) < \infty\}$, which satisfies $P(\widehat{T}(z) < \infty) = 1$ by As. 1, the dominated convergence theorem implies

$$E \left[e^{\gamma X(\widehat{T}(z))} \right] = E \left[e^{\gamma X(\widehat{T}(z))} \mathbf{I}_{\{\widehat{T}(z) < T(x)\}} \right] + o(1) \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty.$$

An application of the dominated convergence theorem to the second expectation on the right-hand side of equality (A.7), together with the fact that r vanishes in the limit as $x \rightarrow \infty$, proves the first statement in the proposition.

(ii) Recall that the Laplace exponent ϕ of the increasing ladder-height process H is a strictly concave function that satisfies $\phi(-\gamma) = 0$ so that the right-derivative $\phi'(-\gamma)$ is strictly positive. Under the measure $P^{(\gamma)}$ the identity $\phi^{(\gamma)}(\gamma + u) = \phi(u)$ holds for any $u \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and hence, since $\phi'(-\gamma) = E^{(\gamma)}[X_1] > 0$, X drifts to $+\infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, i.e. $P^{(\gamma)}(T(x) < \infty) = 1$ for any $x > 0$. Therefore, under As. 1, under $P^{(\gamma)}$ the ladder-height process H is a non-lattice subordinator with $E^{(\gamma)}[H(1)] \in (0, \infty)$. Since the overshoot $K(x)$ is equal to that of H over x , [4, Thm. 1] implies that the weak limit $K(x) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} K(\infty)$, as $x \rightarrow \infty$, exists. Since $x \mapsto e^{-ux}$ is uniformly continuous on \mathbb{R}_+ , [5, p. 16, Thm. 2.1] implies $\lim_{x \uparrow \infty} E^{(\gamma)}[e^{-uK(x)}] = E^{(\gamma)}[e^{-uK(\infty)}]$ for any fixed $u \geq 0$. A version of the Wiener-Hopf factorisation of X (see e.g. [2, p.183]) under the measure $P^{(\gamma)}$ yields

$$(A.8) \quad \int_0^\infty q e^{-qx} E^{(\gamma)} \left[e^{-uK(x)} \right] dx = \frac{q}{\phi(q - \gamma)} \cdot \frac{\phi(q - \gamma) - \phi(u - \gamma)}{q - u} \quad \text{for any } q, u > 0.$$

Since the function $x \mapsto E^{(\gamma)}[e^{-uK(x)}]$ is bounded, the dominated convergence theorem implies that in the limit as $q \downarrow 0$ we get $E^{(\gamma)}[e^{-uK(\infty)}] = \phi(u - \gamma)/(u\phi'(-\gamma))$. The Esscher change of measure formula implies the following for any $u \geq 0$ ($C(u)$ is defined in (2.30)):

$$(A.9) \quad E[e^{-uK(x)} \mathbf{I}_{\{T(x) < \infty\}}] = e^{-\gamma x} \cdot E^{(\gamma)}[e^{-(\gamma+u)K(x)}] \simeq C(u) e^{-\gamma x} \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty.$$

Furthermore, since the expectation in (A.9) is bounded as $x \rightarrow \infty$, there exists a bounded function $R : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that $E[e^{-uK(x)} \mathbf{I}_{\{T(x) < \infty\}}] = C(u)e^{-\gamma x}(1 + R(x))$ for $x > 0$, and $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} R(x) = 0$. The strong Markov property at $\widehat{T}(z)$ and an argument analogous to the one used in the proof of Proposition 7(i) (cf. (A.7)) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & C(u)^{-1} e^{\gamma x} E[e^{-uK(x)} \mathbf{I}_{\{T(x) < \widehat{T}(z)\}}] \\ &= 1 - E[e^{\gamma X(\widehat{T}(z))} \mathbf{I}_{\{\widehat{T}(z) < T(x)\}}] + R(x) - E[e^{\gamma X(\widehat{T}(z))} R(x - X(\widehat{T}(z))) \mathbf{I}_{\{\widehat{T}(z) < T(x)\}}], \end{aligned}$$

which implies equivalence (2.30). \square

A.3. Proof of Lemma (3)(i). By analytical continuation and As. 1 it follows that identity (A.1) remains valid for all $\theta \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\Re(\theta) \in [0, \gamma)$. Therefore on the event $\{H(1) < \infty\}$ the random variable $H(1)$ admits finite exponential moments and in particular $E[H(1) \mathbf{I}_{\{H(1) < \infty\}}] < \infty$. Since $E[X(1)] \in (-\infty, 0)$, the ladder-height process of the dual process $\widehat{X} = -X$ satisfies $P(\widehat{H}(1) < \infty) = 1$. Furthermore, we have $P(H(1) < \infty) < 1$. Definition (2.1) of ϕ , its analogue for $\widehat{\phi}$, the Wiener-Hopf factorisation in (A.1) and the dominated convergence theorem imply that the following identity holds for all $\theta \in (0, \gamma)$:

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{E[X(1)e^{\theta X(1)}]}{kE[e^{\theta X(1)}]} &= \frac{E[H(1)e^{\theta H(1)} \mathbf{I}_{\{H(1) < \infty\}}]}{E[e^{\theta H(1)} \mathbf{I}_{\{H(1) < \infty\}}]} \log E[e^{-\theta \widehat{H}(1)}] \\ &\quad - \frac{E[\widehat{H}(1)e^{-\theta \widehat{H}(1)}]}{E[e^{-\theta \widehat{H}(1)}]} \log E[e^{\theta H(1)} \mathbf{I}_{\{H(1) < \infty\}}] . \end{aligned}$$

As. 1 implies that in the limit as $\theta \rightarrow 0$ this equality yields $E[\widehat{H}(1)] \in (0, \infty)$.

The inequality $|\widehat{X}(t \wedge \widehat{L}^{-1}(1))| \leq \widehat{H}(1) + X^*(\infty)$ holds for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Cramér's estimate (A.4) implies that $X^*(\infty)$ is integrable. Since $\{\widehat{X}(t) - tE[\widehat{X}(1)]\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a martingale we have

$$E[\widehat{X}(t \wedge \widehat{L}^{-1}(1))] = E[\widehat{X}(1)] E[t \wedge \widehat{L}^{-1}(1)] \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

The dominated and monotone convergence theorems applied to each side of this equality respectively imply Wald's identity for the $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ -stopping time $\widehat{L}^{-1}(1)$: $E[\widehat{H}(1)] = -E[X(1)] E[\widehat{L}^{-1}(1)]$. In particular we obtain $\ell^{-1} = E[\widehat{L}^{-1}(1)] \in (0, \infty)$, proving Lemma (3)(i). \square

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Asmussen. *Applied probability and queues*, volume 51 of *Applications of Mathematics (New York)*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 2003. Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability.
- [2] J. Bertoin. *Lévy processes*, volume 121 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.
- [3] J. Bertoin and R. A. Doney. Cramér's estimate for Lévy processes. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, 21(5):363–365, 1994.
- [4] J. Bertoin, K. Van Harn, and F.W. Steutel. Renewal theory and level passage by subordinators. *Stat. Prob. Lett.*, 45(1):65–69, 1999.

- [5] P. Billingsley. *Convergence of probability measures*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics: Probability and Statistics. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, second edition, 1999. A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- [6] R. A. Doney and R. A. Maller. Cramér's estimate for a reflected Lévy process. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 15(2):1445–1450, 2005.
- [7] P. Embrechts, C. Klüppelberg, and T. Mikosch. *Modelling Extremal Events for Insurance and Finance*. Springer, Berlin, 1997.
- [8] P. Greenwood and J. Pitman. Fluctuation identities for Lévy processes and splitting at the maximum. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.*, 12(4):893–902, 1980.
- [9] O. Hadjiladis and J. Večeř. Drawdowns preceding rallies in the Brownian motion model. *Quant. Finance*, 6(5):403–409, 2006.
- [10] K. Itô. Poisson point processes attached to Markov processes. In *Proceedings of the Sixth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability (Univ. California, Berkeley, Calif., 1970/1971), Vol. III: Probability theory*, pages 225–239, Berkeley, Calif., 1972. Univ. California Press.
- [11] S. Karlin and A. Dembo. Limit distributions of maximal segmental score among Markov-dependent partial sums. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.*, 24(1):113–140, 1992.
- [12] A. Mijatović and M. Pistorius. On the drawdown of completely asymmetric Lévy processes. *Stochastic Processes and Applications*, 122(11):3812–3836, 2012.
- [13] G.V. Moustakides. Optimality of the CUSUM procedure in continuous time. *Ann. Statist.*, 32(1):302–315, 2004.
- [14] N. U. Prabhu. *Stochastic storage processes*, volume 15 of *Applications of Mathematics (New York)*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1998. Queues, insurance risk, dams, and data communication.
- [15] A. N. Shiryaev. Minimax optimality of the method of cumulative sums (CUSUM) in the continuous time case. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk*, 51(4(310)):173–174, 1996.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, IMPERIAL COLLEGE LONDON

E-mail address: a.mijatovic@imperial.ac.uk

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, IMPERIAL COLLEGE LONDON

E-mail address: m.pistorius@imperial.ac.uk