

A PROBABILISTIC APPROACH TO THE LEADER PROBLEM IN RANDOM GRAPHS

LOUIGI ADDARIO-BERRY¹, SHANKAR BHAMIDI², AND SANCHAYAN SEN¹

ABSTRACT. Consider the classical Erdős-Rényi random graph process wherein one starts with an empty graph on n vertices at time $t = 0$. At each stage, an edge is chosen uniformly at random and placed in the graph. After the original fundamental work in [19], Erdős suggested that one should view the original random graph process as a “race of components”. This suggested understanding functionals such as the time for fixation of the identity of the maximal component, sometimes referred to as the “leader problem”. Using refined combinatorial techniques, Łuczak [25] provided a complete analysis of this question including the close relationship to the critical scaling window of the Erdős-Rényi process. In this paper, we abstract this problem to the context of the multiplicative coalescent which by the work of Aldous in [3] describes the evolution of the Erdős-Rényi random graph in the critical regime. Further, different entrance boundaries of this process have arisen in the study of heavy tailed network models in the critical regime with degree exponent $\tau \in (3, 4)$. The leader problem in the context of the Erdős-Rényi random graph also played an important role in the study of the scaling limit of the minimal spanning tree on the complete graph [2]. In this paper we provide a probabilistic analysis of the leader problem for the multiplicative coalescent in the context of entrance boundaries of relevance to critical random graphs. As a special case we recover Łuczak’s result in [25] for the Erdős-Rényi random graph.

1. INTRODUCTION

Since the foundational work of Erdős-Rényi [18, 19], asymptotics in the large network limit for random graph models in general, and the evolution of dynamical properties in particular have motivated an enormous amount of work in the ensuing decades. Let us briefly describe one of the motivating questions of this paper and then motivate renewed interest on this problem over the last few years. One of the main models studied in the original work of Erdős-Rényi in [18] is the following “random graph process” $\{G(n, M)\}_{M \geq 0}$ on $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. At “time” $M = 0$, start with the empty graph $G(n, 0)$. For $M \geq 1$, $G(n, M)$ is obtained from $G(n, M - 1)$ by choosing one of the $\binom{n}{2} - M + 1$ edges not present in $G(n, M)$ uniformly at random and placing this in the system. Write $\mathcal{C}_{(k)}(M)$ (respectively $|\mathcal{C}_{(k)}(M)|$) for the k -th largest component in $G(n, M)$ (respectively the size of this component), breaking ties arbitrarily. Here we have suppressed dependence on n to simplify notation.

In [19], the following “double jump” was identified where it was shown that for $M \ll n/2$ $|\mathcal{C}_{(1)}(M)| = O_P(\log n)$, if $M = n/2$, the so called **critical regime** then $|\mathcal{C}_{(1)}(M)| = \Theta_P(n^{2/3})$, whilst

¹DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, MCGILL UNIVERSITY, 805 SHERBROOKE STREET WEST, MONTREAL, QC, H3A 0B9, CANADA

²DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS AND OPERATIONS RESEARCH, 304 HANES HALL, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAPEL HILL, NC 27599

E-mail addresses: louigi.addario@mcgill.ca, bhamidi@email.unc.edu, sanchayan.sen1@gmail.com

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 60C05, 05C80.

Key words and phrases. Multiplicative coalescent, critical random graphs, Erdős-Rényi random graph, inhomogeneous random graphs, entrance boundary, Markov processes.

if $M = cn/2$ with $c > 1$ then $|\mathcal{C}_{(1)}(M)| \sim f(c)n$ for a deterministic function f satisfying $f(c) > 0$ for $c > 1$. This stimulated an enormous amount of work (see [12, 21, 25, 26] and the references therein) both in understanding what happens close to the critical regime and dynamic properties of the above construction wherein components merge via the addition of new edges. This resulted in the following fundamental result of Aldous [3]. Fix $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and consider the process of normalized component sizes close to the critical value arranged in decreasing order:

$$\bar{\mathbf{C}}_n(\lambda) = \left(n^{-2/3} \left| \mathcal{C}_{(k)} \left(n/2 + \lambda n^{2/3} \right) \right| \right)_{k \geq 1}$$

For any $p \geq 1$, consider the metric space,

$$l_1^p := \left\{ \mathbf{x} = (x_i : i \geq 1) : x_1 \geq x_2 \geq \dots \geq 0, \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} x_i^p < \infty \right\}, \quad (1.1)$$

equipped with the natural metric inherited from l_1^p .

Theorem 1.1 ([3]). *View the process $\{\bar{\mathbf{C}}_n(\lambda) : -\infty < \lambda < \infty\}$ as a Markov process on l_1^2 . Then as $n \rightarrow \infty$ the above process converges weakly to a Markov process on l_1^2 which is now referred to as the standard multiplicative coalescent.*

We will describe this result (as well as the entrance boundary of the Markov process) in more detail in the next Section; much more extensive discussions of this process and the relationship to the evolution of the Erdős-Rényi random graph can be found in [3]. We are now in a position to state the main problem motivating this paper.

Leader problem: Erdős suggested that one should view the original random graph process $\{G(n, M)\}_{M \geq 0}$ as a “race of components”. One fascinating aspect of this view was studied in [25]. First we need some definitions. For any graph G , call the maximal component $\mathcal{C}_{(1)} \subset G$, the leader of the graph (breaking ties arbitrarily). Now suppose we place a new edge e in the graph G and consider the resulting graph $G \cup \{e\}$. If e does not belong to $\mathcal{C}_{(1)}$ and results in merging two components in G such that the new component has size larger than $\mathcal{C}_{(1)}$ (resulting in a **new** maximal component), say that a *change of leader* has occurred and call the new maximal component of $G \cup \{e\}$ the leader of this graph. Now consider the Erdős-Rényi process $\{G(n, M)\}_{M \geq 0}$. Define,

$$L_{\text{er}}^{(n)} := \min\{s \geq 0 : \text{a change of leader does not occur in the process } \{G(n, M)\}_{M \geq s}\}. \quad (1.2)$$

Thus this is the last time a change in leader occurs in the evolution of the above process. Then Łuczak in [25, Theorem 7] showed that

$$\text{the sequence of random variables } \{n^{-2/3}(L_{\text{er}}^{(n)} - n/2)\}_{n \geq 1}, \text{ is tight.} \quad (1.3)$$

Aim of this paper: The original proof in [25] is highly intricate using careful and refined combinatorial analysis of the number of components of various complexities including trees of various sizes, coupled with a “symmetry rule” relating properties of the process below and above the critical threshold. These estimates are combined with a “scanning method” to prove (1.3). This paper is motivated by the following two threads:

- (i) In the last few years, a host of random graph models have been shown to belong to the Erdős-Rényi or more precisely, the multiplicative coalescent universality class [5–8, 10, 17, 20, 22, 29]. This includes the configuration model [11, 28], a large sub-class of the inhomogeneous random graph models as formulated in [13], and the so-called bounded size rules [30]. It is hard to generalize Łuczak’s result in (1.2) via the beautiful

counting arguments in [25]. Thus the aim of this paper is to give a short probabilistic proof of the above result that is robust and applies to the general setting of the multiplicative coalescent. The classical Erdős-Rényi case can be recovered from our result; however the techniques in this paper apply to a number of other entrance boundary conditions for the multiplicative coalescent that have arisen in the study of *heavy-tailed* critical random graphs [6, 17, 22].

- (ii) Coupled with renewed interest in the critical regime, the last few years have also witnessed an explosion in the study of various models of information propagation on network models. In this context one major model that has been explored in great detail is the minimal spanning tree (**MST**) problem [14, 15]. Here one typically starts with a network model in the supercritical regime (having a giant component). Each edge is assumed to have a random positive length sampled in an *iid* fashion across edges from a continuous distribution on $(0, \infty)$. The aim then is to understand the (metric) structure of the MST on the giant component; e.g. the typical distance between points on the MST. Till date the only rigorous result in this context is [2] where the following was shown:

Consider the MST \mathcal{M}_n on the complete graph \mathcal{K}_n and view this as a tree with edge length one. Rescale each edge of \mathcal{M}_n by $n^{-1/3}$ and view this as a compact metric space $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_n$. Then as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_n$ converges in the Gromov-Hausdorff sense to a limiting random compact metric space $\mathcal{M}_{(\infty)}$.

A key ingredient in the above proof is the following result shown in [1]: Consider the Erdős-Rényi random graph in the critical regime as in the setting of Theorem 1.1.

Fix $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $k \geq 1$. Consider $\mathcal{C}_{(k)}(\lambda)$ as a metric space where each edge has length one. Write $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{(k)(\lambda)}$ for the resulting metric space where each edge is rescaled by $n^{-1/3}$. Then there exist limiting random compact metric spaces $\mathbf{M}_{(k)}$ such that $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{(k)}(\lambda)$ converge in the Gromov-Hausdorff sense to $\mathbf{M}_{(k)}$.

The $n^{-1/3}$ scaling in each of these results is not a coincidence. One of the key ingredients in [2] is showing that the MST $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_n$ looks (in a strong sense) like the maximal component in the critical regime $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{(1)}(\lambda)$ “for a large λ ”. A key ingredient of this step is the leader result of Łuczak implying that for large λ , the identity of the maximal component does **not** change. Extending the above analysis to more general random graph models (including those with heavy tailed degrees) requires the extension of the leader result to more general settings, which is accomplished in this paper.

1.1. Notation. Throughout this paper, we make use of the following standard notation. We let \xrightarrow{d} denote convergence in distribution, and \xrightarrow{P} convergence in probability. For a sequence of random variables $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$, we write $X_n = o_p(b_n)$ when $|X_n|/b_n \xrightarrow{P} 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For a non-negative function $n \mapsto g(n)$, we write $f(n) = O(g(n))$ when $|f(n)|/g(n)$ is uniformly bounded, and $f(n) = o(g(n))$ when $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(n)/g(n) = 0$. Furthermore, we write $f(n) = \Theta(g(n))$ if $f(n) = O(g(n))$ and $g(n) = O(f(n))$. Throughout this paper, K, K' will denote positive constants that depend only on the sequence $\{c_i\}_{i \geq 1}$, and their values may change from line to line. Given two functions $f_1, f_2 : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, we write $f_1 \asymp f_2$ on $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ if

$$K' f_2(x) \leq f_1(x) \leq K f_2(x) \text{ for all } x \in A.$$

If A is not specified, then it will be understood that $A = [M, \infty)$ for some large $M > 0$. Similarly, for two sequences $\{a_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ and $\{b_n\}_{n \geq 1}$, $\{a_n\} \asymp \{b_n\}$ or simply $a_n \asymp b_n$ will mean that

$$C' b_n \leq a_n \leq C a_n \text{ for all } n \geq 1.$$

For any $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots) \in [0, \infty)^\mathbb{N}$ and $r \geq 1$, we will write $\sigma_r(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{i \geq 1} x_i^r \in [0, \infty]$ for the r -th moment of this sequence. We say that a sequence of events $(\mathcal{E}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ occurs with high probability (whp) when $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_n) \rightarrow 1$. Throughout this note $\alpha = 1/(\tau - 1)$.

1.2. Organization of the paper. We start with a precise description of the multiplicative coalescent and our main results in Section 2. Our main results are stated in Section 3. Section 4 contain all the proofs.

2. MODEL FORMULATION AND ASSUMPTIONS

We start by giving a precise description of the multiplicative coalescent. We will work with $\mathbf{x}^{(n)} = (x_1^{(n)}, x_2^{(n)}, \dots, x_n^{(n)})$, $n \geq 1$, satisfying $x_1^{(n)} \geq x_2^{(n)} \geq \dots \geq x_n^{(n)} > 0$ and one of the following two conditions:

Condition I. (Pure Brownian limit regime) As $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\frac{x_1^{(n)}}{\sigma_2(\mathbf{x}^{(n)})} \rightarrow 0, \quad \frac{\sigma_3(\mathbf{x}^{(n)})}{\sigma_2(\mathbf{x}^{(n)})^3} \rightarrow 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_2(\mathbf{x}^{(n)}) \rightarrow 0. \quad (2.1)$$

Condition II τ . (Pure jump limit regime) There exists $\mathbf{c} = (c_1 \geq c_2 \geq \dots)$ such that as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{x_j^{(n)}}{\sigma_2(\mathbf{x}^{(n)})} &\rightarrow c_j \text{ for each } j \geq 1, \\ \frac{\sigma_3(\mathbf{x}^{(n)})}{\sigma_2(\mathbf{x}^{(n)})^3} &\rightarrow \sum_{j \geq 1} c_j^3, \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_2(\mathbf{x}^{(n)}) \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

Additionally,

$$c_i \asymp \frac{1}{i^{1/(\tau-1)}} = \frac{1}{i^\alpha} \text{ for some } \tau \in (3, 4) \text{ (or equivalently } \alpha \in (1/3, 1/2)). \quad (2.3)$$

The scalings in the assumptions follow [3, 4]. Corollary 3.4 shows how to recover the original result in [25] via a proper choice of the weight sequence.

Remark 1. Limiting sequences \mathbf{c} of the form (2.3) are of particular interest to us as they describe the scaling limit of standard random graph models with degree exponent $\tau \in (3, 4)$, see [6, 16, 22]. The assumption $\tau \in (3, 4)$ (equivalently $\alpha \in (1/3, 1/2)$) in Condition II τ implies that $\mathbf{c} \in \ell_\downarrow^3 \setminus \ell_\downarrow^2$, which by [4] is necessary for the existence of a scaling limit of the maximal components. The reason for the terminology “pure Brownian limit” and “pure jump” following [4] can be found in Section 4. Briefly: under Condition I, the maximal components of the multiplicative coalescent (defined below) at any fixed time converge to the excursions from zero of reflected inhomogeneous Brownian motion; whilst under condition II, the same objects are described via excursions of a so-called “Levy process without replacement”.

Remark 2. Many standard sequences of weights can be rescaled to satisfy one of the two above conditions. An important example is the case of uniformly elliptic and bounded weights: $x_i^{(n)} \in [a, b]$ for all $n \geq 1$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$, where $a > 0$. Then the rescaled weights

$$\bar{x}_i^{(n)} := c x_i^{(n)}, \quad c = \frac{\sigma_3(\mathbf{x}^{(n)})^{1/3}}{\sigma_2(\mathbf{x}^{(n)})}$$

satisfy Condition I.

We will start with a system of particles with weights given by \mathbf{x} , and let them evolve like the multiplicative coalescent. In words, this is a Markov process such that starting at any state $\mathbf{z} := (z_1, z_2, \dots) \in l_1^2$, where we view z_i as the “weight” of cluster i , any two “clusters” i and j merge at rate $z_i \cdot z_j$ into a new cluster of size $z_i + z_j$ resulting in the new state $\mathbf{z}^{(i+j)} \in l_1^2$. The generator of this Markov process \mathcal{A} is given by

$$\mathcal{A}g(\mathbf{z}) = \sum_i \sum_{j>i} z_i z_j (g(\mathbf{z}^{(i+j)}) - g(\mathbf{z})). \quad (2.4)$$

For any connected component \mathcal{C} , its size is given by $\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{C}) := \sum_{v \in \mathcal{C}} x_v$. We will denote the graph at time t by $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and the sizes of its components by $\text{MC}(\mathbf{x}, t)$, i.e.,

$$\text{MC}(\mathbf{x}, t) = (\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{C}) : \mathcal{C} \text{ component in } \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x}, t)). \quad (2.5)$$

The component containing x_v in $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{C}(x_v; \mathbf{x}, t)$. When the initial sequence $\mathbf{x}^{(n)}$ is clear from the context, we will simply write $\mathbf{X}^{(n)}(t)$ instead of $\text{MC}(\mathbf{x}^{(n)}, t)$. Its component sizes in decreasing order will be denoted by $X_1^{(n)}(t) \geq X_2^{(n)}(t) \geq \dots$. The following general convergence result concerning the multiplicative coalescent was shown by Aldous and Limic [4].

Theorem 2.1 ([4]). *Fix $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, and consider the multiplicative coalescent run with initial condition $\mathbf{x}^{(n)}$. Then under Condition I (resp. Condition $\text{II}\tau$), there exists a limit random vector $\boldsymbol{\gamma}(\lambda)$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathcal{C}}(\lambda)$) such that $\mathbf{X}^{(n)}([\sigma_2]^{-1} + \lambda) \xrightarrow{d} \boldsymbol{\gamma}(\lambda)$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathcal{C}}(\lambda)$) as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Here, convergence in distribution is with respect to l_1^2 topology.*

Explicit description of the limits are given in Section 4.3 under Condition I and Section 4.4 under Condition $\text{II}\tau$. The exact form of these limits are not important at this stage, rather the above result will explain the time scaling in our main result below.

Remark 3. As described below Proposition 4 in [3] (and used explicitly in our proof of Corollary 3.4 below), taking $x_i^{(n)} = n^{-2/3}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ gives back the Erdős-Rényi random graph in the critical regime.

3. MAIN RESULTS

We can now state our main results.

Theorem 3.1. *For each $n \geq 1$, start with a system of particles with weights $\mathbf{x}^{(n)}$ and let it evolve like the multiplicative coalescent. Let $L^{(n)} := \inf \{t \geq 0 : \text{a change of leader does not occur after time } t\}$, and let*

$$M_n := L^{(n)} - (\sigma_2(\mathbf{x}^{(n)}))^{-1}.$$

- (a) *If $\{\mathbf{x}^{(n)}\}_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies either Condition I or Condition $\text{II}\tau$ for some $\tau \in (3, 4)$, then M_n^+ is tight.*
- (b) *If $\{\mathbf{x}^{(n)}\}_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies Condition I, then M_n^- is tight.*

Under Condition $\text{II}\tau$ we make the following conjecture.

Conjecture 3.2 (Born winner/silver spoon regime). *Suppose $\{\mathbf{x}^{(n)}\}_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies Condition $\text{II}\tau$ for some $\tau \in (3, 4)$, and let M_n be as in Theorem 3.1. Then $M_n^- \xrightarrow{P} \infty$.*

*Further, let \mathcal{W}_n denote the event that the component containing $x_1^{(n)}$ is **always** the leader, i.e., the identity of the leader never changes. Then, if $c_1 > c_2$, we conjecture that under Condition $\text{II}\tau$, $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}_n) > 0$.*

In contrast, under Condition I, the following result holds.

Theorem 3.3. *Consider the setting of Theorem 3.1, and let $N^{(n)}$ denote the number of times the leader changes in $[0, (\sigma_2(\mathbf{x}^{(n)}))^{-1}]$. Then under Condition I, $N^{(n)} \xrightarrow{P} \infty$.*

We can recover the result for the classical Erdős-Rényi random graph from Theorem 3.1.

Corollary 3.4. *Consider the Erdős-Rényi process $\{G(n, M)\}_{M \geq 0}$, and let $L_{\text{er}}^{(n)}$ be as in (1.2). Then $n^{-2/3}(L_{\text{er}}^{(n)} - n/2)$ is tight.*

4. PROOFS

For a fixed $t > 0$ and a weight sequence $\mathbf{z} := (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)$, recall the definition of the graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{z}, t)$ in the definition of the multiplicative coalescent in Section 2. The graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{z}, t)$ can be constructed as follows: for each $i \neq j \in [n]$, place an edge between i and j with probability $1 - \exp(-tz_i z_j)$, independent across edges. The following is a simple lemma that leverages this construction.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$, $t > 0$, and assume that $t\sigma_2(\mathbf{z}) < 1$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{C}(z_j; \mathbf{z}, t))] \leq \frac{z_j}{1 - t\sigma_2(\mathbf{z})}.$$

Proof: Using the above description of $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{z}, t)$ and the simple inequality $1 - \exp(-x) \leq x$ for $x \geq 0$, we see that for $i \neq j$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(z_i \in \mathcal{C}(z_j; \mathbf{z}, t)) &\leq \sum_{k \geq 0} \sum_{j_1} \dots \sum_{j_k} (tz_j z_{j_1}) \times (tz_{j_1} z_{j_2}) \times \dots \times (tz_{j_{k-1}} z_{j_k}) \times (tz_{j_k} z_i) \\ &= tz_i z_j \sum_{k \geq 0} (t\sigma_2(\mathbf{z}))^k = \frac{tz_i z_j}{1 - t\sigma_2(\mathbf{z})}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{C}(z_j; \mathbf{z}, t))) \leq z_j + \frac{z_j t\sigma_2(\mathbf{z})}{1 - t\sigma_2(\mathbf{z})} = \frac{z_j}{1 - t\sigma_2(\mathbf{z})},$$

as desired. ■

4.1. Proof of Theorem 3.1(a). The following two propositions form the heart of the proof.

Proposition 4.2. *Consider a system of particles with weights $\mathbf{Z}(0) := (z_0(0), z_1(0), \dots, z_n(0))$, where the particle with size $z_0(0)$ is “tagged,” and $z_1(0) \geq \dots \geq z_n(0)$. Let the system evolve like the multiplicative coalescent, and let*

$$\mathbf{Z}(t) = (z_0(t), z_1(t), \dots)$$

be the sizes of components at time t , where $z_0(t)$ is the size of the component containing $z_0(0)$ and the remaining component sizes are arranged in increasing order with $z_1(t) \geq z_2(t) \geq \dots$. Let f be the function given by

$$f(\mathbf{z}) := \frac{z_0^2}{\sigma_2(\mathbf{z})}$$

acting on nonnegative vectors $\mathbf{z} = (z_0, z_1, \dots)$ of finite length. Then $\{f(\mathbf{Z}(t)) : t \geq 0\}$ is a submartingale. As a consequence, if $f(\mathbf{Z}(0)) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$, then

$$\mathbb{P}(z_0(t) < \max_{i \geq 1} z_i(t) \text{ for some } t \geq 0) \leq 5\varepsilon. \quad (4.1)$$

Proposition 4.3. Assume that $\mathbf{x}^{(n)}$ satisfies either Condition I or Condition II τ for some $\tau \in (3, 4)$. Then for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\lambda_\varepsilon > 0$ depending only on ε and the sequence $\{\mathbf{x}^{(n)}\}_{n \geq 1}$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{(X_1^{(n)}(t_{\lambda_\varepsilon}))^2}{\sigma_2(\mathbf{X}^{(n)}(t_{\lambda_\varepsilon}))} \geq 1 - \varepsilon\right) \geq 1 - \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1, \quad (4.2)$$

where $t_\lambda = \lambda + [\sigma_2(\mathbf{x}^{(n)})]^{-1}$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$.

Completing the proof of Theorem 3.1(a): The result follows upon combining Propositions 4.2 and 4.3. \blacksquare

4.2. Proof of Proposition 4.2. Recall the generator \mathcal{A} of the multiplicative coalescent as defined in (2.4), and $\mathbf{z} = (z_0, z_1, \dots)$ have finite length. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}f(\mathbf{z}) &= \sum_{i \geq 1} z_0 z_i \left(\frac{(z_0 + z_i)^2}{\sigma_2(\mathbf{z}) + 2z_0 z_i} - \frac{z_0^2}{\sigma_2(\mathbf{z})} \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \geq 1} \sum_{j > i} z_i z_j \left(\frac{z_0^2}{\sigma_2(\mathbf{z}) + 2z_i z_j} - \frac{z_0^2}{\sigma_2(\mathbf{z})} \right) =: T_1 + T_2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

For convenience, we will write σ_2 for $\sigma_2(\mathbf{z})$ throughout the rest of this proof. Now

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &= \sum_{i \geq 1} \frac{z_0 z_i}{\sigma_2(\sigma_2 + 2z_0 z_i)} \left((z_0^2 + z_i^2 + 2z_0 z_i) \sigma_2 - z_0^2 (\sigma_2 + 2z_0 z_i) \right) \\ &= \sum_{i \geq 1} \frac{z_0 z_i}{\sigma_2(\sigma_2 + 2z_0 z_i)} \left(z_i^2 \sigma_2 + 2z_0 z_i (\sigma_2 - z_0^2) \right) \\ &= z_0 \sum_{i \geq 1} \frac{z_i^3}{\sigma_2 + 2z_0 z_i} + 2z_0^2 \sum_{i \geq 1} \frac{z_i^2 (\sum_{j \geq 1} z_j^2)}{\sigma_2(\sigma_2 + 2z_0 z_i)}. \end{aligned}$$

Using $2z_0 z_i \leq \sigma_2$, we get

$$T_1 \geq z_0 \sum_{i \geq 1} \frac{z_i^3}{\sigma_2 + 2z_0 z_i} + \frac{z_0^2}{\sigma_2^2} \times \left(\sum_{i \geq 1} z_i^2 \right)^2. \quad (4.4)$$

Next

$$-T_2 = z_0^2 \sum_{i \geq 1} \sum_{j > i} \frac{2z_i^2 z_j^2}{\sigma_2(\sigma_2 + 2z_i z_j)} \leq z_0^2 \sum_{i \geq 1} \sum_{j > i} \frac{2z_i^2 z_j^2}{\sigma_2^2} \leq \frac{z_0^2}{\sigma_2^2} \times \left(\sum_{i \geq 1} z_i^2 \right)^2. \quad (4.5)$$

Combining (4.3), (4.4), and (4.5) yields $\mathcal{A}f \geq 0$, which shows that $\{f(\mathbf{Z}(t)) : t \geq 0\}$ is a submartingale.

To prove (4.1), define the stopping time

$$T = \inf \{s \geq 0 : f(\mathbf{Z}(s)) \leq 4/5\},$$

where infimum of an empty set is understood to be $+\infty$. Further, since $f(\mathbf{Z}(t))$ is a bounded submartingale, $f(\mathbf{Z}(\infty)) := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} f(\mathbf{Z}(t))$ exists almost surely. Thus when $f(\mathbf{Z}(0)) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$,

$$1 - \varepsilon \leq \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{Z}(T))] \leq \frac{4}{5} \mathbb{P}(f(\mathbf{Z}(T)) \leq 4/5) + \mathbb{P}(f(\mathbf{Z}(T)) > 4/5).$$

This shows that $\mathbb{P}(T = \infty) \geq 1 - 5\varepsilon$. Since $f(\mathbf{Z}(t)) > 4/5$ implies that $z_0(t) > 2 \max_{i \geq 1} z_i(t)$, (4.1) follows. \blacksquare

4.3. Proof of Proposition 4.3 when Condition I is satisfied. Fix $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and let

$$W_\lambda(s) = B(s) + \lambda s - s^2/2, \quad s \geq 0, \quad (4.6)$$

where $B(\cdot)$ is a standard Brownian motion. Let $\overline{W}_\lambda(\cdot)$ denote the reflected version of the process at zero namely,

$$\overline{W}_\lambda(s) = W_\lambda(s) - \min_{0 \leq u \leq s} W_\lambda(u), \quad s \geq 0. \quad (4.7)$$

Let $\gamma_i(\lambda)$, $i \geq 1$, be the excursions of the reflected process from zero such that, $|\gamma_1(\lambda)| > |\gamma_2(\lambda)| > \dots$. Aldous in [3] showed that $\boldsymbol{\gamma}(\lambda) := (|\gamma_i(\lambda)| : i \geq 1) \in l_1^2$. Further, if a weight sequence $\mathbf{x}^{(n)}$ satisfies Condition I, then by [3, Proposition 4],

$$\text{MC}(\mathbf{x}^{(n)}, \lambda + [\sigma_2(\mathbf{x}^{(n)})]^{-1}) \xrightarrow{d} \boldsymbol{\gamma}(\lambda) \text{ on } l_1^2. \quad (4.8)$$

Now for any $\lambda \geq 2$,

$$\lambda t - t^2/2 \geq \lambda \quad \text{for } t \in (2, 2\lambda - 2).$$

Further,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 2\lambda} |B(t)| \geq \lambda\right) \leq C \exp(-\lambda/4), \quad \text{for all } \lambda \geq 2.$$

Hence, for all $\lambda \geq 2$,

$$\mathbb{P}(|\gamma_1(\lambda)| \geq 2\lambda - 4) \geq \mathbb{P}(W_\lambda(t) > 0 \text{ for } t \in (2, 2\lambda - 2)) \geq 1 - C \exp(-\lambda/4). \quad (4.9)$$

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and using (4.9), choose $\lambda'_\varepsilon > 8$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(|\gamma_1(\lambda'_\varepsilon)| \leq 2\lambda'_\varepsilon - 4) \leq \varepsilon. \quad (4.10)$$

Now to prove this result for a general initial weight sequence $\mathbf{x}^{(n)}$ satisfying Condition I, we start by specializing to the Erdős-Rényi random graph in the critical regime so as to derive properties of the limit distributional limit $\boldsymbol{\xi}(\lambda)$. Thus let $\mathcal{C}_{n,i}(\lambda)$ be the i th largest component of the Erdős-Rényi random graph $G(n, n^{-1} + \lambda n^{-4/3})$. Using (4.8), choose $n_0(\varepsilon)$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(n/2 \geq |\mathcal{C}_{n,1}(\lambda'_\varepsilon)| \geq (2\lambda'_\varepsilon - 4)n^{2/3}\right) \geq 1 - 2\varepsilon \quad \text{for all } n \geq n_0(\varepsilon). \quad (4.11)$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i \geq 2} |\gamma_i(\lambda'_\varepsilon)|^2 > 1\right) &\leq \liminf_n \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i \geq 2} |\mathcal{C}_{n,i}(\lambda'_\varepsilon)|^2 > n^{4/3}\right) \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon + \liminf_n \sum_{\star} \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i \geq 2} |\mathcal{C}_{n,i}(\lambda'_\varepsilon)|^2 > n^{4/3} \mid \mathcal{C}_{n,1}(\lambda'_\varepsilon) = H\right) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{n,1}(\lambda'_\varepsilon) = H), \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

where \sum_{\star} denotes sum over all connected subgraphs H of the complete graph K_n such that

$$(2\lambda'_\varepsilon - 4)n^{2/3} \leq |V(H)| \leq n/2. \quad (4.13)$$

Define the event $E(n, p, m)$ as follows:

$$E(n, p, m) := \{\text{size of the largest component of } G(n, p) \text{ is smaller than } m\}.$$

Fix a connected subgraph H of K_n that satisfies (4.13) and let $m = |V(H)|$. Then conditional on $\{\mathcal{C}_{n,1}(\lambda'_\varepsilon) = H\}$, $G(n, n^{-1} + \lambda'_\varepsilon n^{-4/3}) \setminus \mathcal{C}_{n,1}(\lambda'_\varepsilon)$ has the same law (after a relabeling of vertices) as $G(n - m, n^{-1} + \lambda'_\varepsilon n^{-4/3})$ conditional on $E(n - m, n^{-1} + \lambda'_\varepsilon n^{-4/3}, m)$. Letting

$$n_1 = n - m, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{n_1} - \frac{\mu}{n_1^{4/3}} = \frac{1}{n} + \frac{\lambda'_\varepsilon}{n^{4/3}},$$

and using (4.13), we see that

$$\mu = \left(\frac{1}{n_1} - \frac{1}{n} - \frac{\lambda'_\varepsilon}{n^{4/3}} \right) n_1^{4/3} \geq \left(\frac{2\lambda'_\varepsilon - 4}{n_1 n^{1/3}} - \frac{\lambda'_\varepsilon}{n^{4/3}} \right) n_1^{4/3} \geq \frac{(\lambda'_\varepsilon - 4)n_1^{1/3}}{n^{1/3}} \geq \beta \lambda'_\varepsilon,$$

where $\beta := 2^{-4/3}$. Hence

$$\mathbb{P}\left(E(n_1, n^{-1} + \lambda'_\varepsilon n^{-4/3}, m)\right) \geq \mathbb{P}\left(|\mathcal{C}_{n_1,1}(-\beta \lambda'_\varepsilon)| \leq m\right)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i \geq 2} |\mathcal{C}_{n,i}(\lambda'_\varepsilon)|^2 > n^{4/3} \mid \mathcal{C}_{n,1}(\lambda'_\varepsilon) = H\right) \leq \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i \geq 1} |\mathcal{C}_{n,i}(-\beta \lambda'_\varepsilon)|^2 > n^{4/3}\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(|\mathcal{C}_{n,1}(-\beta \lambda'_\varepsilon)| \leq m\right)}. \quad (4.14)$$

Now

$$\frac{1}{n^{4/3}} \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{i \geq 1} |\mathcal{C}_{n,i}(-\beta \lambda'_\varepsilon)|^2\right) = \frac{n_1}{n^{4/3}} \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{C}(V_{n_1}; -\beta \lambda'_\varepsilon)|,$$

where $V_{n_1} \sim \text{Uniform}[n_1]$, and $\mathcal{C}(V_{n_1}; -\beta \lambda'_\varepsilon)$ is the component of V_{n_1} in $G(n_1, n_1^{-1} - \beta \lambda'_\varepsilon n_1^{-4/3})$. Since $|\mathcal{C}(V_{n_1}; -\beta \lambda'_\varepsilon)|$ is upper bounded by the total progeny of a Galton-Watson tree with a $\text{Binomial}(n_1, n_1^{-1} - \beta \lambda'_\varepsilon n_1^{-4/3})$ offspring distribution,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(|\mathcal{C}_{n,1}(-\beta \lambda'_\varepsilon)| \geq m\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i \geq 1} |\mathcal{C}_{n,i}(-\beta \lambda'_\varepsilon)|^2 > n^{4/3}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{n_1}{n^{4/3}} \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{C}(V_{n_1}; -\beta \lambda'_\varepsilon)| \leq \frac{n_1}{n^{4/3}} \times \frac{n_1^{1/3}}{\beta \lambda'_\varepsilon} \leq \frac{1}{\beta \lambda'_\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (4.14) and (4.12), we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i \geq 2} |\gamma_i(\lambda'_\varepsilon)|^2 > 1\right) \leq 2\varepsilon + C/\lambda'_\varepsilon. \quad (4.15)$$

Now let us consider the multiplicative coalescent started with a general weight sequence $\mathbf{x}^{(n)}$ satisfying Condition I. Combining (4.8) with (4.10) and (4.15), we see that (4.2) holds for all $n \geq n_0''$, where n_0'' depends only on ε and the sequence $\{\mathbf{x}^{(n)}\}_{n \geq 1}$. This completes the proof.

4.4. Proof of Proposition 4.3 when Condition II τ is satisfied for some $\tau \in (3, 4)$. Throughout this section ξ_1, ξ_2, \dots will be independent random variables with $\xi_i \sim \text{Exp}(c_i)$. Let

$$V_c(s) := \sum_{i \geq 1} c_i (\mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i \leq s\}} - c_i s), \quad \text{and} \quad W_{\lambda,c}(s) := \lambda s + V_c(s), \quad s \geq 0. \quad (4.16)$$

Let $\overline{W}_{\lambda,c}(\cdot)$ be the corresponding reflected process at zero, defined as in (4.7) but now with $W_{\lambda,c}(\cdot)$ as in (4.16). Let $\gamma_{i,c}(\lambda)$, $i \geq 1$, denote the corresponding excursions of $\overline{W}_{\lambda,c}$ from zero with $|\gamma_{1,c}(\lambda)| > |\gamma_{2,c}(\lambda)| > \dots$. Under Condition II τ , by the general theory developed for the entrance boundary of the multiplicative coalescent [4, Proposition 7], for each fixed $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_c(\lambda) := (|\gamma_{i,c}(\lambda)|, i \geq 1) \in l_1^2$ and

$$\mathbf{X}^{(n)}\left(\lambda + 1/\sigma_2(\mathbf{x}^{(n)})\right) \xrightarrow{w} \boldsymbol{\gamma}_c(\lambda), \quad (4.17)$$

with respect to l_1^2 topology.

Lemma 4.4. *Assume that \mathbf{c} is as in (2.3). Then there exist positive constants λ_0 , $C_{4.18}$, and $C'_{4.18}$ that depend only on the sequence $\{c_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ such that for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\gamma_{1,\mathbf{c}}(\lambda)| \leq C_{4.18} \lambda^{\frac{1}{\tau-3}}\right) \leq \exp\left(-C'_{4.18} \frac{\lambda^{\frac{\tau-1}{2(\tau-3)}} \log \log \lambda}{\sqrt{\log \lambda}}\right). \quad (4.18)$$

Further, there exist positive constants δ and $C_{4.19}$ that depend only on the sequence $\{c_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ such that for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i \in \gamma_{1,\mathbf{c}}(\lambda)} c_i^2 \leq (1+\delta)\lambda\right) \leq C_{4.19} \lambda^{-\frac{\tau-1}{\tau-3}}. \quad (4.19)$$

We now finish the proof of proof of Proposition 4.3 assuming Lemma 4.4.

Completing the proof of Proposition 4.3: Write $\sigma_2 = \sigma_2(\mathbf{x}^{(n)})$ for simplicity, and recall that $t_\lambda = \lambda + [\sigma_2]^{-1}$. Let $\mathcal{C}_{n,i}(\lambda)$ be the component of $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x}^{(n)}, t_\lambda)$ having the i th largest mass $X_i^{(n)}(t_\lambda)$. Then by [9, Lemma 5.5], for $i \geq 1$,

$$\sum_{v \in \mathcal{C}_{n,i}(\lambda)} x_v^2 / \sigma_2^2 \xrightarrow{w} \sum_{v \in \gamma_{i,\mathbf{c}}(\lambda)} c_v^2. \quad (4.20)$$

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Using (4.20) and Lemma 4.4, we can choose $\lambda_\varepsilon > 0$ and $n_0(\varepsilon) \geq 1$ such that with probability $\geq 1 - \varepsilon$,

$$X_1^{(n)}(t_{\lambda_\varepsilon}) \geq C_{4.18} \lambda_\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\tau-3}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{v \in \mathcal{C}_{n,1}(\lambda_\varepsilon)} x_v^2 / \sigma_2^2 \geq (1+\delta)\lambda_\varepsilon. \quad (4.21)$$

Let E be the event in (4.21). Define

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(n)} := (x_v : v \notin \mathcal{C}_{n,1}(\lambda_\varepsilon)), \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\sigma}_2 := \sigma_2(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(n)}) = \sigma_2 - \sum_{v \in \mathcal{C}_{n,1}(\lambda_\varepsilon)} x_v^2.$$

Writing $\lambda_\varepsilon + [\sigma_2]^{-1} = -\lambda' + [\hat{\sigma}_2]^{-1}$, it follows that on the event E ,

$$\lambda' = \frac{\sigma_2 - \hat{\sigma}_2}{\sigma_2 \hat{\sigma}_2} - \lambda_\varepsilon \geq \frac{(1+\delta)\sigma_2^2 \lambda_\varepsilon}{\sigma_2 \hat{\sigma}_2} - \lambda_\varepsilon \geq \delta \lambda_\varepsilon. \quad (4.22)$$

Write

$$\hat{t}_\lambda = \lambda + [\hat{\sigma}_2]^{-1}, \quad \hat{\mathbb{P}}[\cdot] = \mathbb{P}[\cdot | \mathcal{C}_{n,1}(\lambda_\varepsilon)], \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\mathbb{E}}[\cdot] = \mathbb{E}[\cdot | \mathcal{C}_{n,1}(\lambda_\varepsilon)].$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbb{E}}\left[\sigma_2\left(\text{MC}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(n)}, \hat{t}_{-\delta\lambda_\varepsilon})\right)\right] &= \sum_{v \notin \mathcal{C}_{n,1}(\lambda_\varepsilon)} x_v \hat{\mathbb{E}}\left[\mathcal{W}\left(\mathcal{C}(x_v; \hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(n)}, \hat{t}_{-\delta\lambda_\varepsilon})\right)\right] \\ &\leq \sum_{v \notin \mathcal{C}_{n,1}(\lambda_\varepsilon)} x_v \frac{x_v}{1 - \hat{\sigma}_2 \hat{t}_{-\delta\lambda_\varepsilon}} = \frac{1}{\delta \lambda_\varepsilon}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

where the second step uses Lemma 4.1. For $x \geq 0$, define the event

$$F(x) := \{\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{C}) \leq x \text{ for all component } \mathcal{C} \text{ in } \mathcal{G}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(n)}, t_{\lambda_\varepsilon})\}.$$

Note that conditional on $\mathcal{C}_{n,1}(\lambda_\varepsilon)$, the graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x}^{(n)}, t_{\lambda_\varepsilon}) \setminus \mathcal{C}_{n,1}(\lambda_\varepsilon)$ has the same distribution as $\mathcal{G}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(n)}, t_{\lambda_\varepsilon})$ conditional on $F(X_1^{(n)}(t_{\lambda_\varepsilon}))$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{1}_E \times \hat{\mathbb{P}}\left(\sum_{i \geq 2} X_i^{(n)}(t_{\lambda_\varepsilon})^2 \geq 1\right) &= \mathbb{1}_E \times \hat{\mathbb{P}}\left(\sigma_2\left(\text{MC}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(n)}, t_{\lambda_\varepsilon})\right) \geq 1 \mid F(X_1^{(n)}(t_{\lambda_\varepsilon}))\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{1}_E \times \frac{\hat{\mathbb{P}}\left(\sigma_2\left(\text{MC}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}^{(n)}, t_{\lambda_\varepsilon})\right) \geq 1\right)}{\hat{\mathbb{P}}\left(F(C_{4.18}\lambda_\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\tau-3}})\right)} \leq \frac{1/(\delta\lambda_\varepsilon)}{1 - 1/(\delta\lambda_\varepsilon)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last step uses (4.22) and (4.23). Hence, for all $n \geq n_0(\varepsilon)$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i \geq 2} X_i^{(n)}(t_{\lambda_\varepsilon})^2 \geq 1\right) \leq \varepsilon + \frac{1/(\delta\lambda_\varepsilon)}{1 - 1/(\delta\lambda_\varepsilon)}.$$

The rest is routine. ■

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of Lemma 4.4. We will make use of the following tail bounds.

Lemma 4.5. *Assume that \mathbf{c} is as in (2.3) and define*

$$Z_u^{(1)} := \sup_{s \in [0, u]} \left| \sum_{i \geq 1} c_i (\mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i \leq s\}} - \mathbb{P}(\xi_i \leq s)) \right| \quad \text{and} \quad Z_u^{(2)} := \sup_{s \in [0, u]} \left| \sum_{i \geq 1} c_i^2 (\mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i \leq s\}} - \mathbb{P}(\xi_i \leq s)) \right|.$$

Then there exist constants $C_{4.24}, C'_{4.24}, C_{4.25}, C'_{4.25}$ that depend only on the sequence $\{c_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ such that for every $u \geq \max\{c_1, e\}$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(Z_u^{(1)} \geq x(u^{\tau-3} \log u)^{1/2}\right) \leq \exp\left(-C_{4.24} x \log \log x\right) \quad \text{for all } x \geq C'_{4.24}, \quad \text{and} \quad (4.24)$$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(Z_u^{(2)} \geq x(\log u)^{1/2}\right) \leq \exp\left(-C_{4.25} x \log \log x\right) \quad \text{for all } x \geq C'_{4.25}. \quad (4.25)$$

Before starting the proof, we make note of the following asymptotics which are simple consequences of (2.3):

$$(i) \quad \text{For any } k \geq 2 \text{ and } j \geq 1, \quad \sum_{i=j}^{\infty} c_i^k (1 - e^{-c_i s}) \asymp s j^{-\frac{k+2-\tau}{\tau-1}} \quad \text{on } 0 \leq s \leq 1/c_j; \quad (4.26)$$

$$(ii) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_i^2 (1 - e^{-c_i s}) \asymp s^{\tau-3} \quad \text{on } s \geq 1/c_1; \quad (4.27)$$

$$(iii) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_i (c_i s - 1 + e^{-c_i s}) \asymp s^{\tau-2} \quad \text{on } s \geq 1/c_1. \quad (4.28)$$

Proof of (4.24): Let $\mathbb{Q}_u := \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, u]$, and define

$$Z_{u,n}^{(1)} := \sup_{q \in \mathbb{Q}_u} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n c_i (\mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i \leq q\}} - \mathbb{P}(\xi_i \leq q)) \right|.$$

Then note that it is enough to prove (4.24) with $Z_{u,n}^{(1)}$ in place of $Z_u^{(1)}$.

Next, $Z_{u,n}^{(1)} \leq U_{u,n} + V_{u,n}$, where

$$U_{u,n} := \sup_{q \in \mathbb{Q}_u} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i (\mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i \leq q\}} - \mathbb{P}(\xi_i \leq q)) \right), \quad \text{and} \quad V_{u,n} := \sup_{q \in \mathbb{Q}_u} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i (\mathbb{P}(\xi_i \leq q) - \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i \leq q\}}) \right). \quad (4.29)$$

For each $q \in \mathbb{Q}_u$, define

$$R_q^i(y) := \left(u^{\tau-3} \log u \right)^{-1/2} c_i (\mathbb{1}_{\{y \leq q\}} - (1 - e^{-c_i q})), \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Then by (4.27),

$$\sup_{q \in \mathbb{Q}_t} \text{Var} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n R_q^i(\xi_i) \right) \leq K / \log u.$$

Hence, by standard concentration inequalities for supremum of empirical processes (see, e.g., [23, Theorem 1.1 (b)]), (4.24) holds with $U_{u,n}$ in place of $Z_u^{(1)}$ provided we can show that

$$\mathbb{E}(U_{u,n}) \leq K(u^{\tau-3} \log u)^{1/2}. \quad (4.30)$$

An identical treatment will yield a similar tail bound for $V_{u,n}$, which combined with the tail bound for $U_{u,n}$ will result in the desired tail bound for $Z_{u,n}^{(1)}$. Thus, the following lemma completes the proof of (4.24). \blacksquare

Lemma 4.6. *Let $U_{u,n}$ be as in (4.29). Then there exists a constant K depending only on the sequence $\{c_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}(U_{u,n}) \leq K(u^{\tau-3} \log u)^{1/2}, \text{ for all } u \geq \max\{c_1, e\}.$$

Proof: Let $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n$ be i.i.d. with $\mathbb{P}(\varepsilon_1 = 1) = 1/2 = \mathbb{P}(\varepsilon_1 = -1)$, and let (ξ'_1, \dots, ξ'_n) be an independent copy of (ξ_1, \dots, ξ_n) . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[U_{u,n}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{q \in \mathbb{Q}_u} \mathbb{E}_{\xi} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i (\mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i \leq q\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi'_i \leq q\}}) \right) \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \mathbb{E}_{\xi} \left[\sup_{q \in \mathbb{Q}_u} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i (\mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i \leq q\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi'_i \leq q\}}) \right) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{q \in \mathbb{Q}_u} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i (\mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i \leq q\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi'_i \leq q\}}) \right) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{\xi}[\cdot] := \mathbb{E}[\cdot | \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n]$. Introducing the Rademacher variables $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[U_{u,n}] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{q \in \mathbb{Q}_u} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i \varepsilon_i (\mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i \leq q\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi'_i \leq q\}}) \right) \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{q \in \mathbb{Q}_u} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i \varepsilon_i \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i \leq q\}} \right) \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{q \in \mathbb{Q}_u} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i (-\varepsilon_i) \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi'_i \leq q\}} \right) \right] \\ &= 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{q \in \mathbb{Q}_u} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i \varepsilon_i \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i \leq q\}} \right) \right] = 2 \mathbb{E} \mathbb{E}_{\xi} \left[\sup_{q \in \mathbb{Q}_u} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i \varepsilon_i \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i \leq q\}} \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.31)$$

Define

$$\mathbf{f}_q := (c_1 \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_1 \leq q\}}, \dots, c_n \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_n \leq q\}}) \text{ for } q \in \mathbb{Q}_u, \text{ and let } \Delta_u := \left(\sum_{i \geq 1} c_i^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i \leq u\}} \right)^{1/2}.$$

Note that Δ_u is finite almost surely since $\mathbf{c} \in \ell^3$. For $\eta > 0$, define

$$N(\eta) := \max \left\{ \#\{q_1, \dots, q_r\} : \|\mathbf{f}_{q_i} - \mathbf{f}_{q_j}\|_{\ell^2} > \eta \text{ for any } 1 \leq i \neq j \leq r \right\}.$$

Then standard chaining inequalities imply (see, for example, [27, Lemma 6.1] or [24])

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi} \left[\sup_{q \in \mathbb{Q}_u} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i \varepsilon_i \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i \leq q\}} \right) \right] \leq 3 \Delta_u \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{-j} \left(\log N(2^{-j-1} \Delta_u) \right)^{1/2}.$$

Combined with (4.31), this gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[U_{u,n}] &\leq 6 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{-j} \left[\mathbb{E}(\Delta_u^2) \right]^{1/2} \left[\mathbb{E} \left(\log N(2^{-j-1} \Delta_u) \right) \right]^{1/2} \\ &\leq K \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{-j} u^{(\tau-3)/2} \left[\mathbb{E} \left(\log N(2^{-j-1} \Delta_u) \right) \right]^{1/2}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.32)$$

where the last step uses (4.27). Let $k(j, u)$ be such that

$$\sum_{i \geq k(j, u)} c_i^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i \leq u\}} \leq \frac{\Delta_u^2}{2^{2j+6}} < \sum_{i \geq k(j, u)+1} c_i^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i \leq u\}},$$

and let $\xi_{(1)} < \dots < \xi_{(k(j, u)-1)}$ be the order statistics from ξ_i , $1 \leq i \leq k(j, u) - 1$. Then for any $q_1, \dots, q_{k(j, u)} \in \mathbb{Q}_u$ satisfying

$$q_1 < \xi_{(1)} < q_2 < \xi_{(2)} < \dots < q_{k(j, u)-1} < \xi_{(k(j, u)-1)} < q_{k(j, u)},$$

the set $\{\mathbf{f}_{q_i} : 1 \leq i \leq k(j, u)\}$ is a $2^{-j-2} \Delta_u$ -covering of $\{\mathbf{f}_q : q \in \mathbb{Q}_u\}$. Hence,

$$N(2^{-j-1} \Delta_u) \leq k(j, u). \quad (4.33)$$

Let $x_{j, u}$ be the smallest number such that

$$u c_{\exp(x_{j, u})} \leq 1, \quad u \leq \exp\left(\frac{x_{j, u}(4-\tau)}{4(\tau-1)}\right), \quad \text{and} \quad 2^{2j+7} \left(u \sum_{i \geq \exp(x_{j, u})} c_i^2 (1 - e^{-c_i u}) \right)^{1/2} \leq 1. \quad (4.34)$$

Observe that by (4.26), and (2.3),

$$x_{j, u} \leq K(j + \log u). \quad (4.35)$$

Now

$$\mathbb{E}[\log k(j, u)] \leq x_{j, u} + \int_{x_{j, u}}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(k(j, u) > e^x) dx. \quad (4.36)$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(k(j, u) > e^x) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i \geq [e^x]} c_i^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i \leq u\}} > \frac{1}{2^{2j+6}} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_i^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i \leq u\}} \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i \geq [e^x]} c_i^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i \leq u\}} \geq 2 \sum_{i \geq [e^x]} c_i^2 (1 - \exp(-c_i u)) \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}\left(2 \sum_{i \geq [e^x]} c_i^2 (1 - \exp(-c_i u)) \geq \frac{1}{2^{2j+6}} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_i^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i \leq u\}} \right) =: T_1 + T_2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.37)$$

To bound T_1 , we write

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i \geq [e^x]} c_i^2 \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i \leq u\}} - (1 - \exp(-c_i u)) \right) \geq \sum_{i \geq [e^x]} c_i^2 (1 - \exp(-c_i u)) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\text{Var}\left(\sum_{i \geq [e^x]} c_i^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i \leq u\}} \right)}{\left(\sum_{i \geq [e^x]} c_i^2 (1 - \exp(-c_i u)) \right)^2} \leq K \frac{u \exp\left(-x(6-\tau)/(\tau-1)\right)}{u^2 \exp\left(-x(8-2\tau)/(\tau-1)\right)} = \frac{K}{u} \exp\left(-\frac{x(\tau-2)}{\tau-1}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.38)$$

where the penultimate step uses (4.26) and the fact that for $x \geq x_{j,u}$, $uc_{[e^x]} \leq 1$ by (4.34). To bound T_2 , note that for any $x \geq x_{j,u}$,

$$2^{2j+7} \left(\sum_{i \geq [e^x]} c_i^2 (1 - \exp(-c_i u)) \right)^{1/2} \leq u^{-1/2}.$$

by (4.34). Hence,

$$2^{2j+7} \left(\sum_{i \geq [e^x]} c_i^2 (1 - \exp(-c_i u)) \right) \leq u^{-1/2} \left(\sum_{i \geq [e^x]} c_i^2 (1 - \exp(-c_i u)) \right)^{1/2} \leq K \exp \left(-\frac{x(4-\tau)}{2(\tau-1)} \right),$$

where the last step uses (4.26). Writing $y = \exp \left(\frac{x(4-\tau)}{2(\tau-1)} \right)$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} T_2 &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(y \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_i^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i \leq u\}} \leq K \right) \leq e^K \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(-y \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_i^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i \leq u\}} \right) \right] \\ &= e^K \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} \left[e^{-c_i u} + (1 - e^{-c_i u}) \exp(-y c_i^2) \right] = e^K \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} \left[1 - (1 - e^{-c_i u}) (1 - \exp(-y c_i^2)) \right] \\ &\leq e^K \exp \left(-\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (1 - e^{-c_i u}) (1 - \exp(-y c_i^2)) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.39)$$

Let i_0 be the smallest integer such that $y c_{i_0}^2 \leq 1$. This also implies that $u c_{i_0} \leq 1$ by (4.34). Note that, by (2.3),

$$i_0 \asymp y^{(\tau-1)/2}. \quad (4.40)$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (1 - e^{-c_i u}) (1 - \exp(-y c_i^2)) &\geq \sum_{i=i_0}^{\infty} (1 - e^{-c_i u}) (1 - \exp(-y c_i^2)) \\ &\asymp y \sum_{i=i_0}^{\infty} c_i^2 (1 - e^{-c_i u}) \asymp y u i_0^{(\tau-4)/(\tau-1)} \asymp y u y^{(\tau-4)/2} = u y^{(\tau-2)/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the third step uses (4.26), and the fourth step is a consequence of (4.40). Combining this with (4.39), we have

$$T_2 \leq K \exp \left(-K' u \exp \left(\frac{x(4-\tau)(\tau-2)}{4(\tau-1)} \right) \right). \quad (4.41)$$

We complete the proof of Lemma 4.6 by combining (4.32), (4.33), (4.36), (4.37), (4.38), (4.41), with (4.35). ■

Proof of (4.25): The proof is similar to the proof of (4.24). Note that, in this case, the definition of Δ_u should be modified as follows:

$$\Delta_u := \left(\sum_{i \geq 1} c_i^4 \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i \leq u\}} \right)^{1/2}.$$

Thus $\mathbb{E}[\Delta_u^2] \leq \sum_{i \geq 1} c_i^4 < \infty$, as $\mathbf{c} \in \ell^3$. This explains the factor $(\log u)^{1/2}$ in (4.25) (instead of $(u^{\tau-3} \log u)^{1/2}$ appearing in (4.24)). We omit the details to avoid repetition. ■

Define the functions $\phi, \psi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$\phi(s) := \sum_{i \geq 1} c_i^2 \left(\frac{c_i s - 1 + e^{-c_i s}}{c_i s} \right), \quad \text{and} \quad \psi(s) := \sum_{i \geq 1} c_i^2 (1 - e^{-c_i s}).$$

Observe that for each $\lambda > 0$, the function $\Phi_\lambda(s) := \lambda s - s\phi(s)$ is concave and has a unique positive zero, which we denote by $s_0(\lambda)$. Further, $s_0(\lambda)$ is strictly increasing on $(0, \infty)$, and $s_0(\lambda) \uparrow \infty$ as $\lambda \uparrow \infty$.

Lemma 4.7. *Let $\phi(\cdot)$, $\psi(\cdot)$, and $s_0(\cdot)$ be as above. Then the following hold.*

(a) $s_0(\lambda) \asymp \lambda^{1/(\tau-3)}$ on $[1/c_1, \infty)$.

(b) *There exists $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for all $\eta \in (0, \eta_0]$,*

$$\sup_{s \in [2/c_1, \infty)} \frac{\phi(\eta s)}{\phi(s)} \leq \sup_{s \in [2/c_1, \infty)} \frac{\phi((1-\eta)s)}{\phi(s)} =: 1 - \varepsilon_\eta,$$

where $\varepsilon_\eta > 0$. Clearly, $\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon_\eta = 0$.

(c) *There exist $\delta_0 > 0$ and $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$,*

$$\psi(s_0(\lambda)) \geq (1 + \delta_0)\lambda.$$

(d) *For all $s > 0$ and $\eta \in (0, 1)$, $\psi((1-\eta)s) \geq (1-\eta)\psi(s)$. Further, if*

$$g(\eta) := \sup_{s \geq 1/c_1} \frac{\psi(\eta s)}{\psi(s)},$$

then $g(\eta) \rightarrow 0$ as $\eta \rightarrow 0$.

Proof: Note that $\lambda = \phi(s_0(\lambda)) \asymp (s_0(\lambda))^{\tau-3}$, where the final step uses (4.28). This proves (a).

Next, a direct calculation shows that the function $u \mapsto (u - 1 + e^{-u})/u$ is increasing on \mathbb{R} . This proves the claim

$$\sup_{s \in [2/c_1, \infty)} \frac{\phi(\eta s)}{\phi(s)} \leq \sup_{s \in [2/c_1, \infty)} \frac{\phi((1-\eta)s)}{\phi(s)}$$

for $0 < \eta < 1/2$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\phi(s)}{\phi((1-\eta)s)} - 1 &= \frac{(1-\eta) \sum_{i \geq 1} c_i (c_i s - 1 + e^{-c_i s}) - \sum_{i \geq 1} c_i (c_i (1-\eta)s - 1 + e^{-c_i (1-\eta)s})}{(1-\eta)s \cdot \phi((1-\eta)s)} \\ &\geq \frac{\sum_{i \geq 1} c_i (\eta(1 - e^{-c_i s}) + e^{-c_i s} - e^{-c_i (1-\eta)s})}{K s^{\tau-2}} = \frac{\sum_{i \geq 1} c_i \int_{1-\eta}^1 (1 - e^{-c_i s} - c_i s e^{-c_i s u}) du}{K s^{\tau-2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.42)$$

where the second step makes use of (4.28) and is valid whenever $c_1(1-\eta)s \geq 1$. Choose $\eta_0 > 0$ small so that for all $u \in [1-\eta_0, 1]$, $1 - e^{-x} - x e^{-xu} > 0$ whenever $x > 0$. Now it is easy to see that,

$$K s^{\tau-2} \leq \sum_{i \geq 1} c_i (1 - e^{-c_i s} - c_i s e^{-c_i s u}) \leq K' s^{\tau-2}$$

uniformly for $u \in [1-\eta_0, 1]$ and $s \geq 2/c_1$. This last observation combined with (4.42) shows that

$$\sup_{s \in [2/c_1, \infty)} \left(\phi((1-\eta)s) / \phi(s) \right) < 1,$$

which completes the proof of (b).

Since $1 - e^{-u} \geq (u - 1 + e^{-u})/u$ for $u \in (0, \infty)$, it immediately follows that $\psi(s) \geq \phi(s)$ for $s \geq 0$. Now

$$\frac{\psi(s)}{\phi(s)} - 1 = \frac{1}{\phi(s)} \sum_{i \geq 1} c_i^2 \left(\frac{1 - e^{-c_i s}}{c_i s} - e^{-c_i s} \right) \geq \frac{K s^{\tau-3}}{\phi(s)}$$

when $s \geq 1/c_1$. Since $\phi(s) \asymp s^{\tau-3}$ on $[1/c_1, \infty)$, it follows that there exist $\delta_0 > 0$ and $s_\star > 0$ such that $\psi(s) \geq (1 + \delta_0)\phi(s)$ for all $s \geq s_\star$, which in turn implies the existence of a λ_0 such that

$$\psi(s_0(\lambda)) \geq (1 + \delta_0)\phi(s_0(\lambda)) = (1 + \delta_0)\lambda$$

for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$. This proves (c).

Since $1 - \exp(-(1 - \eta)s) \geq (1 - \eta)(1 - e^{-s})$, it follows that $\psi((1 - \eta)s) \geq (1 - \eta)\psi(s)$. To prove the last claim, note that

$$g(\eta) \leq \sup_{\eta c_1 s \geq 1} \frac{\psi(\eta s)}{\psi(s)} + \sup_{1 \leq c_1 s \leq 1/\eta} \frac{\psi(\eta s)}{\psi(s)} \leq K \left(\eta^{\tau-3} + \sup_{1 \leq c_1 s \leq 1/\eta} \frac{\eta s}{s^{\tau-3}} \right) \leq K \left(\eta^{\tau-3} + \frac{\eta^{\tau-3}}{c_1^{4-\tau}} \right),$$

where the second step uses (4.26) and (4.27). This completes the proof of (d). \blacksquare

We now turn to

Proof of Lemma 4.4: Let δ_0 , λ_0 , and $g(\cdot)$ be as in Lemma 4.7. Choose $\eta \in (0, 1/2)$ such that

$$(1 - \eta - g(\eta))(1 + \delta_0) > 1 + \delta_0/2. \quad (4.43)$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_\lambda((1 - \eta)s_0(\lambda)) &= (1 - \eta)s_0(\lambda) \left[\lambda - \phi((1 - \eta)s_0(\lambda)) \right] \\ &\geq (1 - \eta)s_0(\lambda) \left[\lambda - (1 - \varepsilon_\eta)\phi(s_0(\lambda)) \right] = (1 - \eta)s_0(\lambda) \lambda \varepsilon_\eta \geq K_\eta \lambda^{\frac{\tau-2}{\tau-3}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second step uses Lemma 4.7 (b) and the last step uses Lemma 4.7 (a). Similarly $\Phi_\lambda(\eta s_0(\lambda)) \geq K_\eta \lambda^{\frac{\tau-2}{\tau-3}}$. Since $\Phi_\lambda(\cdot)$ is concave, it follows that

$$\Phi_\lambda(s) \geq K_\eta \lambda^{\frac{\tau-2}{\tau-3}}, \quad \text{for } \eta s_0(\lambda) \leq s \leq (1 - \eta)s_0(\lambda). \quad (4.44)$$

Recall the definitions of $W_{\lambda, c}(\cdot)$ and $Z_u^{(1)}$ from (4.16) and Lemma 4.5 respectively. Then

$$Z_{s_0(\lambda)}^{(1)} = \sup_{s \leq s_0(\lambda)} \left| W_{\lambda, c}(s) - \Phi_\lambda(s) \right|. \quad (4.45)$$

Using (4.44), (4.45), and applying (4.24) with $u = s_0(\lambda)$ and $x = \theta \lambda^{\frac{\tau-1}{2(\tau-3)}} (\log \lambda)^{-1/2}$ where $\theta > 0$ is very small, we see that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(W_{\lambda, c}(s) > 0 \text{ for all } \eta s_0(\lambda) \leq s \leq (1 - \eta)s_0(\lambda) \right) \geq 1 - \exp(-C f_1(\lambda)), \quad (4.46)$$

where $f_1(\lambda) = \lambda^{\frac{\tau-1}{2(\tau-3)}} \log \log \lambda / \sqrt{\log \lambda}$. Let $\gamma_\star (= \gamma_\star(\lambda))$ be the excursion of the reflected process $\overline{W}_{\lambda, c}(\cdot)$ alive at $s = s_0(\lambda)/2$. Then (4.46) shows that γ_\star is alive when $\eta s_0(\lambda) \leq s \leq (1 - \eta)s_0(\lambda)$ with probability at least $1 - \exp(-C f_1(\lambda))$. Combining this with Lemma 4.7(a) proves (4.18).

Now, with probability at least $1 - \exp(-C f_1(\lambda))$,

$$\sum_{i \in \gamma_\star} c_i^2 \geq Y := \sum_{i \geq 1} c_i^2 \mathbb{1} \{ \eta s_0(\lambda) \leq \xi_i \leq (1 - \eta)s_0(\lambda) \}.$$

Further, $|Y - \psi((1 - \eta)s_0(\lambda)) + \psi(\eta s_0(\lambda))| \leq 2Z_{s_0(\lambda)}^{(2)}$. Using Lemma 4.7(c-d) and (4.43), it follows that

$$\sum_{i \in \gamma_\star} c_i^2 \geq (1 + \delta_0/2)\lambda - 2Z_{s_0(\lambda)}^{(2)} \quad (4.47)$$

with probability at least $1 - \exp(-Cf_1(\lambda))$. Using the tail bound (4.25) with $x = \theta\lambda/\sqrt{\log\lambda}$ (where $\theta > 0$ is very small), we see that there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i \in \gamma_\star} c_i^2 \leq (1 + \delta_0/4)\lambda\right) \leq \exp(-Kf_2(\lambda)) \quad (4.48)$$

for all $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$, where $f_2(\lambda) := \lambda \log \log \lambda / \sqrt{\log \lambda}$.

Recall the breadth-first exploration of the graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x}^{(n)}, t)$ from [4]. Then [9, Lemma 5.4] implies that the component $\mathcal{C}_\star^{(n)} (= \mathcal{C}_\star^{(n)}(\lambda))$ of $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x}^{(n)}, t_\lambda)$ being explored at time $s_0(\lambda)/2$ satisfies

$$\left(\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{C}_\star^{(n)}), \sum_{v \in \mathcal{C}_\star^{(n)}} \frac{(x_v^{(n)})^2}{\sigma_2(\mathbf{x}^{(n)})^2}\right) \xrightarrow{w} \left(|\gamma_\star|, \sum_{i \in \gamma_\star} c_i^2\right).$$

Thus, there exists $n_0 = n_0(\lambda)$ such that for all $n \geq n_0$, $\mathbb{P}(E^{(n)c}) \leq 2\exp(-Kf_2(\lambda))$, where

$$E^{(n)} = \left\{ \sum_{v \in \mathcal{C}_\star^{(n)}} \frac{(x_v^{(n)})^2}{\sigma_2(\mathbf{x}^{(n)})^2} \geq \lambda(1 + \frac{\delta_0}{4}), \text{ and } \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{C}_\star^{(n)}) \geq (1 - 2\eta)s_0(\lambda) \right\}.$$

Now, by an argument identical to the one given around (4.23), it follows that

$$\mathbb{1}_{E^{(n)}} \cdot \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{S}^{(n)}} \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{C})^2 \geq x \mid \mathcal{F}\right) \leq \frac{4}{\delta_0 x \lambda},$$

where $\mathcal{S}^{(n)}$ is the set of components explored after exploring $\mathcal{C}_\star^{(n)}$, and \mathcal{F} is the sigma-field generated by the exploration process up to the exploration of $\mathcal{C}_\star^{(n)}$. Taking $x = \theta' \lambda^{\frac{2}{\tau-3}}$ (where $\theta' > 0$ is very small) and using Lemma 4.7(a), we see that $\mathcal{C}_\star^{(n)} = \mathcal{C}_1^{(n)}(\lambda)$ with probability at least $K\lambda^{-\frac{\tau-1}{\tau-3}}$, where $\mathcal{C}_1^{(n)}(\lambda)$ is the component such that $\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{C}_1^{(n)}(\lambda))$ is the largest among all components. This in turn implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i \in \gamma_{1,c}(\lambda)} c_i^2 < \lambda(1 + \frac{\delta_0}{4})\right) &\leq \liminf_n \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{v \in \mathcal{C}_1^{(n)}(\lambda)} \frac{(x_v^{(n)})^2}{\sigma_2(\mathbf{x}^{(n)})^2} < \lambda(1 + \frac{\delta_0}{4})\right) \\ &\leq \liminf_n \left[\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{v \in \mathcal{C}_\star^{(n)}} \frac{(x_v^{(n)})^2}{\sigma_2(\mathbf{x}^{(n)})^2} \leq \lambda(1 + \frac{\delta_0}{4})\right) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_\star^{(n)} \text{ is not } \mathcal{C}_1^{(n)}(\lambda)) \right] \leq K\lambda^{-\frac{\tau-1}{\tau-3}}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of (4.19). ■

4.5. Proof of Corollary 3.4: Consider the modified Erdős-Rényi process $\overline{G}(n, M)$, where at each step, edges are sampled uniformly and with replacement, i.e., multiple edges are allowed. A simple computation shows that the number of multiple edges created up to $M \leq n$ is tight. Thus, it is enough to show that $n^{-2/3}(\overline{L}_{\text{er}}^{(n)} - n/2)$ is tight, where \overline{L}_{er} denotes the last time the leader changes in $\overline{G}(n, M)$.

Consider the weight sequence $\mathbf{x}^{(n)}$ where $x_i^{(n)} = n^{-2/3}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Then $\mathbf{x}^{(n)}$ satisfies Condition I and $\sigma_2(\mathbf{x}^{(n)}) = n^{-1/3}$. To each pair (i, j) , $1 \leq i < j \leq n$, associate a Poisson process \mathcal{N}_{ij} having rate $n^{-4/3}$. Let

$$\mathcal{N} = \bigcup_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \mathcal{N}_{ij} = \{\tau_1 < \tau_2 < \dots\}.$$

Then \mathcal{N} has rate $\lambda := (n-1)/(2n^{1/3})$. Construct the random graph process $\{\overline{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{x}^{(n)}, t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ as follows: For each $k \geq 1$, if $\tau_k \in \mathcal{N}_{ij}$, then connect i and j by an edge at time τ_k . Clearly

$\{\bar{G}(n, M)\}_{M \geq 1}$ has the same distribution as $\{\bar{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{x}^{(n)}, \tau_M)\}_{M \geq 1}$. Let $L^{(n)}$ be the last time the leader changes in $\bar{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{x}^{(n)}, \cdot)$. For any $y > 0$, define $M(y) = \lfloor n/2 + yn^{2/3} \rfloor$. Then,

$$\mathbb{P}(\bar{L}_{\text{er}}^{(n)} \geq M(y)) = \mathbb{P}(L^{(n)} \geq \tau_{M(y)}). \quad (4.49)$$

Since, for any fixed $y > 0$,

$$\tau_{M(y)} = \lambda^{-1} M(y) + \Theta_P(\lambda^{-1} \sqrt{M(y)}) = n^{1/3} + 2y + \Theta_P(n^{-1/6}) = [\sigma_2(\mathbf{x}^{(n)})]^{-1} + 2y + \Theta_P(n^{-1/6}),$$

an application of Theorem 3.1 shows that $n^{-2/3}(\bar{L}_{\text{er}}^{(n)} - n/2)^+$ is tight. An identical argument will yield tightness of $n^{-2/3}(\bar{L}_{\text{er}}^{(n)} - n/2)^-$. This completes the proof.

4.6. Proof of Theorem 3.1(b). Fix $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and recall the inhomogeneous Brownian motion $W_\lambda(\cdot)$ in (4.6), the corresponding reflected process $\bar{W}_\lambda(\cdot)$ in (4.7) and the decreasing sequence of excursions $\xi(\lambda)$ arising of normalized limits of component sizes in (4.8). We will need some properties of these distributional limits.

By [4, Proposition 18 and Eqn (80)], for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we can choose $\lambda_\varepsilon > 0$ such that with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon$, the following three assertions hold simultaneously:

$$\lambda_\varepsilon \sum_{i \geq 1} |\gamma_i(-\lambda_\varepsilon)|^2 \geq 1/2, \quad \left| \frac{1}{\sum_{i \geq 1} |\gamma_i(-\lambda_\varepsilon)|^2} - \lambda_\varepsilon \right| \leq 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_\varepsilon \times |\gamma_1(-\lambda_\varepsilon)| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Writing $t_\lambda = \lambda + [\sigma_2(\mathbf{x}^{(n)})]^{-1}$ and using (4.8), we can choose $n_0(\varepsilon)$ such that for all $n \geq n_0(\varepsilon)$,

$$\lambda_\varepsilon \sigma_2(\mathbf{X}^{(n)}(t_{-\lambda_\varepsilon})) \geq 1/2, \quad \left| \frac{1}{\sigma_2(\mathbf{X}^{(n)}(t_{-\lambda_\varepsilon}))} - \lambda_\varepsilon \right| \leq 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_\varepsilon \times X_1^{(n)}(t_{-\lambda_\varepsilon}) \leq \varepsilon \quad (4.50)$$

with probability $\geq 1 - 2\varepsilon$.

Let us now describe the core idea in words. Using the above estimates and Lemma 4.1, we will show that the maximal component at time $t_{-\lambda_\varepsilon}$ cannot become too “large” by time t_{-2} . Further by (4.8), the maximal component at time t_{-2} is reasonably large. This implies that there has had to have been a leader change whp in the interval $[t_{-\lambda_\varepsilon}, t_{-2}]$. We now make this idea precise. Let $\mathbf{X}^{(n)}(t_{-\lambda_\varepsilon}) =: \mathbf{z} = (z_1 \geq z_2 \geq \dots)$ and suppose we start the multiplicative coalescent with this as the initial sequence. Run this process for $\lambda_\varepsilon - 2$ units of time. Using Lemma 4.1, on the event (4.50),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{C}(z_1; \mathbf{z}, \lambda_\varepsilon - 2)) \mid \mathbf{z}) &\leq \frac{z_1}{1 - (\lambda_\varepsilon - 2)\sigma_2(\mathbf{z})} \\ &= \frac{z_1}{\sigma_2(\mathbf{z})} \times \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\sigma_2(\mathbf{z})} - \lambda_\varepsilon + 2} \leq \frac{z_1}{\sigma_2(\mathbf{z})} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\lambda_\varepsilon \sigma_2(\mathbf{z})} \leq 2\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for all $\delta > 0$ and $n \geq n_0(\varepsilon)$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{C}(z_1; \mathbf{z}, \lambda_\varepsilon - 2)) \geq \delta) \leq 2\varepsilon(1 + 1/\delta). \quad (4.51)$$

However by (4.8) for all $\eta > 0$, there exists $\delta_\eta > 0$ and $n_1(\eta) \geq 1$ such that for all $n \geq n_1(\eta)$,

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1^{(n)}(t_{-2}) \geq \delta_\eta) \geq 1 - \eta. \quad (4.52)$$

Combining (4.51) and (4.52), we see that for all $n \geq n_0(\varepsilon) \vee n_1(\eta)$,

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n^- \geq \lambda_\varepsilon) \leq \eta + 2\varepsilon(1 + 1/\delta_\eta).$$

We take $\varepsilon = \eta\delta_\eta$ to get the desired result.

4.7. Proof of Theorem 3.3: The proof of Theorem 3.1(b) shows that for any $\eta > 0$, we can choose $\lambda_\eta^{(1)} > 0$ large so that $\mathbb{P}(\text{a change of leader occurs between times } t = t_{-\lambda_\eta^{(1)}} \text{ and } t = 0) \geq 1 - \eta$. By repeating the same argument, we can choose $\lambda_\eta^{(1)} < \lambda_\eta^{(2)} < \lambda_\eta^{(3)} \dots$ such that for $j \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{a change of leader occurs between times } t = t_{-\lambda_\eta^{(j+1)}} \text{ and } t = t_{-\lambda_\eta^{(j)}}) \geq 1 - \eta/2^j.$$

It thus follows that for any $j \geq 1$ and $\eta > 0$,

$$\limsup_n \mathbb{P}(N^{(n)} \leq j) \leq 2\eta,$$

which completes the proof. ■

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

LAB was partially supported by NSERC Discovery Grant 341845. SB was partially supported by NSF grants DMS-1613072, DMS-1606839 and ARO grant W911NF-17-1-0010. SS was partially supported by a CRM-ISM fellowship.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Addario-Berry, N. Broutin, and C. Goldschmidt, *The continuum limit of critical random graphs*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **152** (2012), no. 3-4, 367–406. MR2892951
- [2] L. Addario-Berry, N. Broutin, C. Goldschmidt, and G. Miermont, *The scaling limit of the minimum spanning tree of the complete graph*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.1664 (2013).
- [3] D. Aldous, *Brownian excursions, critical random graphs and the multiplicative coalescent*, Ann. Probab. **25** (1997), no. 2, 812–854. MR1434128 (98d:60019)
- [4] D. Aldous and V. Limic, *The entrance boundary of the multiplicative coalescent*, Electron. J. Probab. **3** (1998), No. 3, 59 pp. (electronic). MR1491528 (99d:60086)
- [5] S. Bhamidi, R. van der Hofstad, and J. S. H. van Leeuwaarden, *Scaling limits for critical inhomogeneous random graphs with finite third moments*, Electronic Journal of Probability **15** (2010), no. 54, 1682.
- [6] S. Bhamidi, R. van der Hofstad, and J. S. H. van Leeuwaarden, *Novel scaling limits for critical inhomogeneous random graphs*, Ann. Probab. **40** (2012), no. 6, 2299–2361. MR3050505
- [7] S. Bhamidi, N. Broutin, S. Sen, and X. Wang, *Scaling limits of random graph models at criticality: Universality and the basin of attraction of the Erdős-Rényi random graph*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.3417 (2014).
- [8] S. Bhamidi, A. Budhiraja, and X. Wang, *The augmented multiplicative coalescent, bounded size rules and critical dynamics of random graphs*, Probability Theory and Related Fields **160** (2014), no. 3-4, 733–796.
- [9] S. Bhamidi, R. v. d. Hofstad, and S. Sen, *The multiplicative coalescent, inhomogeneous continuum random trees, and new universality classes for critical random graphs*, To appear in Probability Theory and Related Fields arXiv:1508.04645 (2015).
- [10] S. Bhamidi, S. Sen, and X. Wang, *Continuum limit of critical inhomogeneous random graphs*, To appear in Probability Theory and Related Fields arXiv:1404.4118 (2014).
- [11] B. Bollobás, *A probabilistic proof of an asymptotic formula for the number of labelled regular graphs*, European Journal of Combinatorics **1** (1980), no. 4, 311–316.
- [12] B. Bollobás, *Random graphs*, Second, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 73, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001. MR1864966 (2002j:05132)
- [13] B. Bollobás, S. Janson, and O. Riordan, *The phase transition in inhomogeneous random graphs*, Random Structures Algorithms **31** (2007), no. 1, 3–122. MR2337396 (2008e:05124)
- [14] L. A. Braunstein, S. V. Buldyrev, R. Cohen, S. Havlin, and H. E. Stanley, *Optimal paths in disordered complex networks*, Physical review letters **91** ((2003)), no. 16, 168701.
- [15] L. A. Braunstein, Z. Wu, Y. Chen, S. V. Buldyrev, T. Kalisky, S. Sreenivasan, R. Cohen, E. Lopez, S. Havlin, and H. E. Stanley, *Optimal path and minimal spanning trees in random weighted networks*, International Journal of Bifurcation and Chaos **17** (2007), no. 07, 2215–2255.
- [16] S. Dhara, R. v. d. Hofstad, J. v. Leeuwaarden, and S. Sen, *Heavy-tailed configuration models at criticality*, arxiv preprint arXiv:1612.00650 (2016).

- [17] S. Dhara, R. v. d. Hofstad, J. v. Leeuwaarden, and S. Sen, *Critical window for the configuration model: finite third moment degrees*, Electronic Journal of Probability **22** (2017), no. 16, 1–33.
- [18] P. Erdős and A. Rényi, *On random graphs. I*, Publ. Math. Debrecen **6** (1959), 290–297. MR0120167
- [19] P. Erdős and A. Rényi, *On the evolution of random graphs*, Magyar Tud. Akad. Mat. Kutató Int. Közl. **5** (1960), 17–61. MR0125031
- [20] R. v. d. Hofstad, *Critical behavior in inhomogeneous random graphs*, Random Structures & Algorithms **42** (2013), no. 4, 480–508.
- [21] S. Janson, T. Łuczak, and A. Ruciński, *Random graphs*, Vol. 45, John Wiley & Sons, 2011.
- [22] A. Joseph et al., *The component sizes of a critical random graph with given degree sequence*, The Annals of Applied Probability **24** (2014), no. 6, 2560–2594.
- [23] T. Klein and E. Rio, *Concentration around the mean for maxima of empirical processes*, Ann. Probab. **33** (2005), no. 3, 1060–1077. MR2135312 (2006c:60022)
- [24] M. Ledoux and M. Talagrand, *Probability in Banach spaces*, Classics in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2011. Isoperimetry and processes, Reprint of the 1991 edition. MR2814399
- [25] T. Łuczak, *Component behavior near the critical point of the random graph process*, Random Structures & Algorithms **1** (1990), no. 3, 287–310.
- [26] T. Łuczak, B. Pittel, and J. C. Wierman, *The structure of a random graph at the point of the phase transition*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **341** (1994), no. 2, 721–748.
- [27] P. Massart, *Concentration inequalities and model selection*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1896, Springer, Berlin, 2007. Lectures from the 33rd Summer School on Probability Theory held in Saint-Flour, July 6–23, 2003, With a foreword by Jean Picard. MR2319879
- [28] M. Molloy and B. Reed, *A critical point for random graphs with a given degree sequence*, Random structures & algorithms **6** (1995), no. 2-3, 161–180.
- [29] O. Riordan, *The phase transition in the configuration model*, Combinatorics, Probability and Computing **21** (2012), no. 1-2, 265–299.
- [30] J. Spencer and N. Wormald, *Birth control for giants*, Combinatorica **27** (2007), no. 5, 587–628.