

RARE TRANSITIONS IN NOISY HETEROCLINIC NETWORKS

YURI BAKHTIN, HONG-BIN CHEN, AND ZSOLT PAJOR-GYULAI

ABSTRACT. We study small white noise perturbations of planar dynamical systems with heteroclinic networks in the limit of vanishing noise. We show that the probabilities of transitions between various cells that the network tessellates the plane into decay as powers of the noise magnitude. We show that the most likely scenario for the realization of these rare transition events involves spending atypically long times in the neighborhoods of certain saddle points of the network. We describe the hierarchy of time scales and clusters of accessibility associated with these rare transition events. We discuss applications of our results to homogenization problems and to the invariant distribution asymptotics. At the core of our results are local limit theorems for exit distributions obtained via methods of Malliavin calculus.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. The setting, the motivation, and the goal of the paper.	2
1.2. The main result: the polynomial rates of rare transitions and the underlying slowdown mechanism.	4
1.3. The hierarchy of time scales and clusters of accessibility.	5
1.4. The structure of the paper.	6
2. The typical behavior	7
2.1. Notation	7
2.2. Exiting a neighborhood of a saddle	8
2.3. Dynamics along heteroclinic connections	13
2.4. A heteroclinic chain	14
3. Some notation and terminology	17
4. Two saddles	19
5. Heteroclinic chains of arbitrary length	29
5.1. Introduction	29
5.2. The new sequence of effective exponents and the main result	30
5.3. Proof of (5.5) of Theorem 5.1 (2)	32
5.4. Proof of (5.7) in Theorem 5.1 (2)	52
6. Long-term asymptotics of diffusions near heteroclinic networks	57
7. Proofs in rectified coordinates	61

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60J60, 60H07, 60H10, 60F99, 34E10.

Key words and phrases. Heteroclinic networks, exit problems, vanishing noise limit, rare events, polynomial decay, Malliavin calculus, saddle points, metastability, invariant distributions, hierarchy of timescales, homogenization.

7.1. Basic estimates	61
7.2. Estimating the stopped process N	64
7.3. The setting in rectified coordinates.	72
7.4. Proofs of lemmas <i>in rectified coordinates</i>	74
8. Proofs in the original coordinates	77
8.1. Diffusion along a heteroclinic orbit	77
8.2. Proofs of lemmas from Sections 4 and 5 in the original coordinates	83
8.3. Proof of Lemma 5.9	92
9. Gaussian approximation for the stopped process U^1	97
9.1. Approximation by the process stopped at a deterministic time	98
9.2. Gaussian approximation for the deterministically stopped process	99
10. Local limit theorems	103
10.1. Exit times	103
10.2. Atypical exit locations	104
10.3. Typical exit locations	114
11. Density estimates	117
11.1. General setting and main result	117
11.2. Preliminaries	119
11.3. Derivative estimates	122
11.4. Malliavin matrix estimates	131
11.5. Proof of Lemma 11.2	140
References	140

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The setting, the motivation, and the goal of the paper. In this paper, we study the long-term behavior of smooth dynamical systems with heteroclinic networks under small white noise perturbations.

Solutions of Itô SDEs like

$$(1.1) \quad dX_{\varepsilon,t} = b(X_{\varepsilon,t})dt + \varepsilon\sigma(X_{\varepsilon,t})dW_t,$$

in \mathbb{R}^d where W is the Wiener process with d independent components, have very simple asymptotic behavior in the vanishing noise limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ if considered on a finite time interval. Under very broad assumptions on the drift b and diffusion σ coefficients, they converge, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, to solutions of the deterministic ODE

$$(1.2) \quad \dot{X}_{0,t} = b(X_{0,t}).$$

However, the behavior of solutions of (1.1) on infinite time intervals or intervals growing to infinity as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, may drastically differ from that of solutions of (1.2).

The asymptotic properties depend crucially on the geometry of the phase portrait generated by b and typically do not depend much on σ once an assumption of boundedness and uniform ellipticity (nondegeneracy) of σ is made.

The most celebrated mathematical achievement in this area is the Freidlin–Wentzell theory of metastability and related concepts, studying the situation where the solution of (1.1) spends very long times near locally stable attractors making rare and rapid transitions between them. In chemistry and physics, the exponential in ε^{-2} growth of transition times is known as Kramers’ asymptotics [Kra40]. The classical mathematical reference for these asymptotic results and other vanishing noise problems is [FW12].

In this paper, we continue the study of SDE (1.1) in the vanishing noise limit that we began in [Bak11] (see also an informal exposition in [Bak10]), under the assumption that b generates a heteroclinic network.

A heteroclinic network is a feature of the phase portrait of a dynamical system consisting of multiple hyperbolic critical points (saddles) and heteroclinic orbits connecting them, see Figure 1 for an example of a planar heteroclinic network. A heteroclinic orbit, also called a heteroclinic connection, belongs to, or coincides with, the unstable manifold of one saddle and the stable manifold of another saddle.




FIGURE 1. A planar heteroclinic network and a heteroclinic chain escaping a cell.

It is natural to presume that a diffusion near such a heteroclinic network mimics the process of sequential random decision making: it spends a lot of time in a small neighborhood of a critical point where the drift is very small, until eventually the noise pushes the solution in one of the unstable directions (thus, a decision on the exit direction is made). From here, the drift takes over, carrying the solution away from the equilibrium along a heteroclinic orbit towards the next critical point. This picture resembles a random walk on the directed graph with vertices representing saddles and directed edges corresponding to heteroclinic connections.

However, it turns out that diffusion near a heteroclinic network in vanishing noise limit may and often does look drastically different from a Markovian random walk. In many instances, the outcome of the decision on the exit direction is influenced and even largely predetermined by the history of the process, thus exhibiting non-Markovian limiting behavior and departing from the random walk picture. A

rigorous mathematical theory of this was given in [Bak11] although non-rigorous approaches had existed before [SH90], [SA99], [ASK03].

More precisely, the typical behavior of diffusions with small noise near heteroclinic networks was described in [Bak11] for time scales logarithmic in the noise magnitude. In particular, that paper showed that the diffusion spends time of order $\log \varepsilon^{-1}$ near a saddle, travels along a heteroclinic orbit in time of order 1, then spends time of order $\log \varepsilon^{-1}$ near the next saddle, etc. Moreover, for any finite sequence of saddles and heteroclinic connections between them, the limiting probability of evolution along those connections was computed, in the limit of vanishing noise. These limiting probabilities often equal 0 or 1, which means that traveling along certain pathways through the graph of heteroclinic connections is extremely unlikely on the logarithmic time scale. This results in a limited vocabulary of observable pathways and, often, in heteroclinic cycling, where the process is trapped in a small region of the network and intermittently follows one of a few available cycles, occasionally switching between them.

The core of the analysis in [Bak11] is the study of exit problems for certain regions around the saddles and the connections, with scaling limit theorems for the exit time and location. It shows that certain transitions in noisy heteroclinic networks are unlikely and certain ones are typical. The typical ones completely define the limiting dynamics on timescales logarithmic in noise intensity. However, in order to study the behavior of the system over long or infinite time intervals, one must carry out a finer study of the unlikely transitions. This is exactly the goal of the present paper: to study the exit problems of [Bak11] in more detail and analyze the unlikely events responsible for the departure from the typical scenario described in this paper. This is the natural next step in the ambitious program to understand the limiting behavior of invariant distributions in the compact phase space case (on a torus) and homogenization and effective diffusivity for periodic heteroclinic networks.

1.2. The main result: the polynomial rates of rare transitions and the underlying slowdown mechanism. We restrict ourselves to dynamics in the Euclidean plane \mathbb{R}^2 or torus \mathbb{T}^2 . Working with other 2-dimensional manifolds, in charts, and with Stratonovich noise, is not much harder but would obscure our main points. We also expect the picture to be similar in higher dimensions, especially for heteroclinic networks of saddles with 1-dimensional unstable manifolds.

In two dimensions, heteroclinic networks admit a relatively simple description: under fairly general regularity assumptions they all can be viewed as locally finite collections of closed curves with simple mutual intersections and self-intersections, see Figure 1. They tessellate the plane into cells, the boundary of each cell being a union of several heteroclinic connections, which are either all oriented clockwise or all oriented counter-clockwise.

In this paper, we quantify rare transitions between neighboring cells and compute the asymptotic transition rates. More precisely, for each sequence of heteroclinic connections on the boundary of one cell, we compute the decay rate, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, of the probability of escaping the cell immediately after following that sequence. An example of such a transition is shown in Figure 1, where a chain of heteroclinic connections almost entirely belongs to the boundary of one cell and the last heteroclinic connection escapes from this cell.

Our main result (see Theorem 5.1 for a precise statement and Figure 7 for a more detailed illustration of the setting) is that, depending on the contraction and expansion rates near each saddle of the sequence, and on the character of the scaling of the distance from the initial condition to the network, three situations are possible. As $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the probability of escape either

- (1) converges to a positive constant (as described in [Bak11]), or
- (2) decays as $h\varepsilon^\theta(1 + o(1))$ for some numbers $\theta, h > 0$, or
- (3) decays faster than any power of ε .

Under several technical assumptions, Theorem 5.1 gives a detailed characterization of the conditions for each of these cases to occur, and in case 2 computes the scaling exponent θ , see (5.6). This exponent can also be defined as $\theta = 0$ for case 1 and as $\theta = \infty$ for case 3. Moreover, in case 3, we actually prove a more precise estimate: the probability of escape is bounded by $\exp[-(\log \varepsilon^{-1})^{1+\delta}] = \varepsilon^{(\log \varepsilon^{-1})^\delta}$ for some $\delta > 0$.

The case 2 is the central, most interesting, and hardest part of this paper. Compared to the results of [Bak11] where the analysis was performed at the level of weak convergence of appropriately scaled exit distributions, to obtain the power asymptotics in part 2, we need to study the exit distributions zooming into finer scales and proving local limit theorems. We are able to prove local equidistribution results by studying the densities of the distributions involved with the help of estimates from [BC14] based on Malliavin calculus. The approach developed in [BPG19a], [BPG20], [BC21b], [BC21a], [BPG19b] for exit problems near critical points of source type thus gets extended to the harder case of critical points of saddle type.

Our analysis also reveals the mechanism through which the rare transitions are realized. It turns out that imposing the condition on the process to leave the cell after passing a given saddle point effectively influences the behavior of the entire trajectory before the visit to that saddle point. The exit is prepared by getting atypically close to the network while visiting neighborhoods of preceding saddles. More precisely, there are certain slowdown saddles near which the process spends an abnormally long time thus extending the exposure to contraction towards the boundary of the cell in comparison with the typical scenario.

The exponent θ in the power asymptotics of our main result is determined by the contraction and expansion rates near all the saddles involved. However, the definition of θ is not straightforward. One must find all the slowdown saddles via a special procedure and take into account that each of them contributes a factor of order of a power of ε , with the exponent being a nontrivial nonlocal function of the entire sequence of corresponding contraction/expansion rates.

1.3. The hierarchy of time scales and clusters of accessibility. The polynomial decay rate of the escape probabilities in our main theorem suggests that the shortest time scale on which we can expect deviations from the typical behavior is of the order $\varepsilon^{-\theta}$ (up to a logarithmic factor) for some $\theta > 0$. Moreover, different transitions often have different associated exponents, implying an entire hierarchy of polynomially growing time scales on which more and more transitions become accessible for the dynamics and larger and larger clusters of points accessible at

those time scales emerge. Under the requirement that the network is stable (exponentially attracting nearby initial conditions in the absence of noise), the noisy dynamics can be described as a multiscale process dominated by transitions between clusters at various levels.

This is akin to metastable cycling described in [FW12] where rare transitions between metastable states are described at the level of large deviations. They occur on time scales of order $e^{\theta\varepsilon^{-2}}$ with $\theta > 0$ obtained by minimizing an appropriate action functional over paths connecting the metastable states involved.

The hierarchical structure of polynomial time scales and associated clusters emerging in our setting is discussed in Section 6. In that section, we also draw a connection to the general abstract picture of metastable cycling introduced in [FK17]. We study a concrete example of a heteroclinic network on the torus \mathbb{T}^2 which, if lifted to a \mathbb{Z}^2 -periodic cellular flow on \mathbb{R}^2 , allows for Gaussian limit theorems for sufficiently large time scales. These can be viewed as homogenization results on effective diffusivity for second order parabolic PDEs, with the scaling limit given by the heat equation. Such a result would be hard to obtain via PDE methods (see, however, the Appendix in [HIK⁺18]).

In addition, for the torus case, we show how to compute the limit of the invariant distribution for the diffusion process as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. It is always a mixture of Dirac masses at saddle points but the computation of the weights of individual atoms requires a multi-level iterative procedure based on the hierarchical structure.

We decided not to pursue rigorous exposition in Section 6, postponing that to a later publication.

1.4. The structure of the paper. In order to motivate and explain the new results, we have to start with recalling the results of [Bak11] in Section 2. For our new results, we need to supplement the scaling limits of Section 2 with more detailed analysis. Some useful terminology and notation is introduced in Section 3. In Section 4, we study a relatively simple case where an N-shaped heteroclinic chain (see Figure 6) is composed of two saddle points and three heteroclinic connections, the last one escaping from the cell making a “wrong turn”. Section 5 gives the main result for a chain of arbitrary length. After that, in Section 6, we give an informal discussion of the emerging hierarchy of clusters and time scales, and its implications.

We must comment on the style of our exposition. In Sections 2–5, we give complete rigorous statements of results but not all explanations are rigorous, some of them being heuristics for a simplified model case rather than complete proofs. These sections should be read first in order to understand the whole picture. The rigorous proofs of those statements in complete generality are given in Sections 7–11, with the most technical part on local limit theorems for exit densities being Sections 9–11.

Acknowledgments. We thank Mark Freidlin and Leonid Korolov for multiple stimulating discussions. Yuri Bakhtin thanks NSF for partial support via Award DMS-1811444. Zsolt Pajor-Gyulai is thankful to the Courant Institute where this work was initiated during his tenure as a Courant Instructor.

2. THE TYPICAL BEHAVIOR

The goal of this section is to recall the results of [Bak11] (see also [Bak10], [AMB11a], [AMB11b]) since they serve as an important starting point. We aim at a minimal description relevant for this paper, not a comprehensive one.

2.1. Notation. We denote the Borel σ -algebra on \mathbb{R} by \mathcal{B} . We call $\nu : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ a transition kernel if for each $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\nu(x, \cdot)$ is a Borel measure on \mathbb{R} , and for each $B \in \mathcal{B}$, $\nu(\cdot, B)$ is a Borel measurable function.

For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we use superscripts to denote the coordinates of points $x = (x^1, x^2, \dots, x^m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$. For $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^m$, we write

$$a \cdot b = \sum_{i=1}^m a^i b^i.$$

For $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, an \mathbb{R}^m -valued function f defined on an open set in \mathbb{R}^n is said to belong to C^k if f is continuously differentiable up to the k -th order. If, in addition, the partial derivatives of f of all orders up to k are bounded, it is said to belong to C_b^k . If, moreover, f is a bijection and $f^{-1} \in C_b^k$, then f is called a C_b^k -diffeomorphism.

Two vectors in \mathbb{R}^m are called collinear if one of them is a multiple of another. In particular, the zero vector is collinear with any other vector.

The Lebesgue measure on any Euclidean space is denoted by Leb .

The locally uniform convergence (i.e., uniform convergence on compact sets) is often abbreviated to convergence in LU-topology or simply in LU.

The symmetric difference between two sets A, B is denoted by $A \Delta B$.

For $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we write $a \wedge b = \min\{a, b\}$ and $a \vee b = \max\{a, b\}$.

Each statement involving signs \pm and \mp represents two statements: the first one where every \pm is replaced by $+$, every \mp by $-$; and the second one where every \pm is replaced by $-$, and every \mp by $+$.

For $a_-, a_0, a_+ \in \mathbb{R}$, we write

$$(2.1) \quad a_0 \succ_{\pm} a_{\pm}$$

if and only if $a_- \leq a_0 \leq a_+$.

We usually work with a complete probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ equipped with a filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ satisfying the usual conditions. We assume that this probability space is rich enough to support all r.v.'s (random variables) emerging in the paper. This is not necessary but makes notation a little lighter since we can use notation like $\mathbb{P}\{\xi \in [a, b]\}$ for a distributional limit ξ of r.v.'s ξ_ε defined on this probability space. At times it will be also convenient to use other probability spaces and measures. Irrespective of the details of the setting, we denote convergence of r.v.'s in distribution by \xrightarrow{d} and in probability by \xrightarrow{P} . By $W = (W^1, W^2)$ we denote the standard two-dimensional Wiener process, i.e., W^1 and W^2 are independent standard one-dimensional Wiener processes with respect to (\mathcal{F}_t) . All stochastic integrals are understood in the Itô sense.

We will denote by $g_c(x)$ the centered Gaussian density with variance $c > 0$:

$$(2.2) \quad g_c(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi c}} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2c}}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The associated distribution function is denoted by ψ_c :

$$(2.3) \quad \psi_c(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x g_c(x') dx', \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

We will often omit the dependence of $X_{\varepsilon,t}$, a solution of (1.1) on the noise magnitude ε . For example, the joint distribution of $((X_t)_{t \geq 0}, (W_t)_{t \geq 0})$ solving (1.1) conditioned on the initial value $X_0 = x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ will be denoted by \mathbf{P}^{x_0} with ε omitted.

When using the $o(\cdot)$ notation and its modifications, we mean taking limits as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, unless stated otherwise.

Throughout the paper we use C to denote various constants whose values may differ from instance to instance.

More notation and terminology is collected in Section 3.

2.2. Exiting a neighborhood of a saddle. Of course, the main strategy is to surround each saddle by a neighborhood and study the exit problems in each neighborhood and transitions between those neighborhoods along heteroclinic connections.

In this section, we consider a family of diffusions $(X_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$ near one saddle point in \mathbb{R}^2 . An archetypal and relatively simple situation is where the drift is linear and the noise is additive and diagonal:

$$(2.4) \quad dX_{\varepsilon,t}^1 = \lambda X_{\varepsilon,t}^1 dt + \varepsilon dW_t^1,$$

$$(2.5) \quad dX_{\varepsilon,t}^2 = -\mu X_{\varepsilon,t}^2 dt + \varepsilon dW_t^2,$$

where $\lambda, \mu > 0$. Here the origin is a hyperbolic fixed point for the associated deterministic linear dynamics. Its stable manifold coincides with the second coordinate axis, and the unstable one coincides with the first coordinate axis.

Our goal is to show that if the initial condition has a distributional scaling limit, then the exit distribution also has a distributional scaling limit, with a new exponent and limiting distribution.

Let us equip the system (2.4)–(2.5) with the following initial condition:

$$(2.6) \quad X_{\varepsilon,0}^1 = \varepsilon^\alpha \xi_\varepsilon,$$

$$(2.7) \quad X_{\varepsilon,0}^2 = L,$$

where $L \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, and $(\xi_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$ is a family of r.v.'s independent of the realization of the noise on $[0, \infty)$. Let us assume that as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, $\xi_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{d} \xi$ for some r.v. ξ . If $\alpha < 1$, we will additionally assume that

$$(2.8) \quad \mathbf{P}\{\xi = 0\} = 0.$$

Let us fix a threshold $R > 0$ and define the exit time from the domain

$$(2.9) \quad D = \{(x^1, x^2) : |x^1| < R\}.$$

by

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \tau_\varepsilon &= \inf\{t \geq 0 : |X_{\varepsilon,t}^1| \geq R\} \\ &= \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_{\varepsilon,t} \notin D\} = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_{\varepsilon,t} \in \partial D\} \end{aligned}$$

as the hitting time for $\partial D = \partial_+ \cup \partial_-$, where

$$(2.11) \quad \partial_\pm = \{x = (x^1, x^2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x^1 = \pm R\}.$$

The main result of [Kif81] states that $\tau_\varepsilon / (\frac{1}{\lambda} \log \varepsilon^{-1}) \xrightarrow{P} 1$ and the distribution of the exit location $X_\varepsilon(\tau_\varepsilon)$ asymptotically concentrates near the points of intersection of the unstable manifold with the boundary, i.e. points

$$q_\pm = (\pm R, 0).$$

Let us analyze the exit problem in more detail. We start by using Duhamel's principle:

$$(2.12) \quad X_{\varepsilon,t}^1 = e^{\lambda t} (X_{\varepsilon,0}^1 + \varepsilon U_t^1),$$

$$(2.13) \quad X_{\varepsilon,t}^2 = e^{-\mu t} (X_{\varepsilon,0}^2 + \varepsilon U_t^2) = e^{-\mu t} X_{\varepsilon,0}^2 + \varepsilon N_t^2,$$

where

$$(2.14) \quad \begin{aligned} U_t^1 &= \int_0^t e^{-\lambda s} dW_s^1, \\ U_t^2 &= \int_0^t e^{\mu s} dW_s^2, \\ N_t^2 &= e^{-\mu t} U_t^2 = \int_0^t e^{-\mu(t-s)} dW_s^2. \end{aligned}$$

The process (U_t^1, N_t^2) is Gaussian, so it easy to check that

$$(2.15) \quad (U_t^1, N_t^2) \xrightarrow{d} (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{N}), \quad t \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{N})$ is a centered Gaussian random vector with independent components and variances

$$(2.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{c}_1 &= \int_0^\infty e^{-2\lambda s} ds = (2\lambda)^{-1}, \\ \mathbf{c}_2 &= \int_{-\infty}^0 e^{2\mu s} ds = (2\mu)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

In fact, a.s.-convergence holds for the first component in (2.15).

The definition (2.10) and (2.12) imply

$$(2.17) \quad R = e^{\lambda \tau_\varepsilon} |X_{\varepsilon,0}^1 + \varepsilon U_{\tau_\varepsilon}^1|.$$

It is easy to check that $\tau_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{P} \infty$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Together with (2.15), this suggests (although more arguments are required for a rigorous proof):

$$(2.18) \quad (U_{\tau_\varepsilon}^1, N_{\tau_\varepsilon}^2) \xrightarrow{d} (\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{N}).$$

Therefore, expressing τ_ε from (2.17), we obtain

$$(2.19) \quad \tau_\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \frac{R}{|\varepsilon^\alpha \xi_\varepsilon + \varepsilon U_{\tau_\varepsilon}^1|} = \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \frac{R}{\varepsilon^\alpha |Z_\varepsilon|},$$

where

$$(2.20) \quad Z_\varepsilon = \xi_\varepsilon + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} U_{\tau_\varepsilon}^1.$$

Thus,

$$(2.21) \quad \tau_\varepsilon - \frac{\alpha}{\lambda} \log \varepsilon^{-1} = \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \frac{R}{|Z_\varepsilon|} \xrightarrow{d} \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \frac{R}{|Z|},$$

where

$$Z = \xi + \mathbf{1}_{\alpha=1} \mathcal{U}$$

is the distributional limit of Z_ε as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Hence, the exit typically happens around time $\frac{\alpha}{\lambda} \log \varepsilon^{-1}$.

We also notice that the direction of exit is given by

$$(2.22) \quad \text{sgn } X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon}^1 = \text{sgn } Z_\varepsilon,$$

with distributional limit $\text{sgn } Z$. In particular, the limiting probabilities of exit on the right (i.e., through $\{+R\} \times \mathbb{R}$) and on the left (i.e., through $\{-R\} \times \mathbb{R}$) are $p_+ = \mathbb{P}\{Z > 0\}$ and $p_- = \mathbb{P}\{Z < 0\}$. Note that $\mathbb{P}\{Z = 0\} = 0$: if $\alpha < 1$, this is a consequence of (2.8); and if $\alpha = 1$, then Z is absolutely continuous being a Gaussian convolution.

In particular, if $\alpha < 1$ and $\mathbb{P}\{\xi > 0\} = 1$, we have $p_+ = 1$ and $p_- = 0$ and if $\mathbb{P}\{\xi < 0\} = 1$, then $p_+ = 0$ and $p_- = 1$, i.e., the direction of exit is asymptotically deterministic as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

If the distribution of ξ is symmetric, then $p_+ = p_- = 1/2$.

To find out the asymptotics of the exit location distribution, we use (2.21) in (2.13):

$$(2.23) \quad X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon}^2 = e^{-\mu\tau_\varepsilon} X_{\varepsilon, 0}^2 + \varepsilon N_{\tau_\varepsilon}^2 = \varepsilon^{\alpha\rho} \frac{L}{R^\rho} |Z_\varepsilon|^\rho + \varepsilon N_{\tau_\varepsilon}^2,$$

where the stability index ρ measuring the strength of contraction relative to expansion near the saddle point is defined by

$$(2.24) \quad \rho = \mu/\lambda.$$

It plays a crucial role throughout the paper. Introducing

$$(2.25) \quad \alpha' = \alpha\rho \wedge 1,$$

we obtain

$$(2.26) \quad \frac{X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon}^2}{\varepsilon^{\alpha'}} \xrightarrow{d} \xi',$$

where

$$(2.27) \quad \xi' = \frac{L}{R^\rho} |Z|^\rho \mathbf{1}_{\alpha\rho \leq 1} + \mathcal{N} \mathbf{1}_{\alpha\rho \geq 1}.$$

It is important to distinguish between the cases where (i) $\alpha\rho < 1$, (ii) $\alpha\rho > 1$, and (iii) $\alpha\rho = 1$. If $\alpha\rho > 1$, then $\alpha' = 1$, $\xi' = \mathcal{N}$, and we can rewrite (2.26) informally as

$$X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon}^2 \stackrel{d}{\sim} \varepsilon \mathcal{N}.$$

We recall that \mathcal{N} is a symmetric Gaussian r.v. The scaling factor in front of \mathcal{N} is ε^1 , which is the same order of magnitude as the noise.

Note that the limiting behavior in this case does not depend on the initial condition, neither on L nor on (ξ_ε) , nor on $\alpha > \rho^{-1}$.

If $\alpha' = \alpha\rho < 1$, then $\xi' = \frac{L}{R^\rho} |Z|^\rho$, and we can rewrite (2.26) informally as

$$X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon}^2 \stackrel{d}{\sim} \varepsilon^{\alpha'} \frac{L}{R^\rho} |Z|^\rho.$$

The distribution of ξ' in this case is one-sided, i.e., it is concentrated on $(0, \infty)$ if $L > 0$ and on $-(0, \infty)$ if $L < 0$. Moreover, the noise magnitude ε is smaller than the scaling $\varepsilon^{\alpha'}$.

In the intermediate case, $\alpha\rho = 1$, both terms in (2.27) are nonzero, so we obtain an asymmetric distribution supported on the entire \mathbb{R} .

The drastic difference in the asymptotic behavior may be explained as follows. If $\alpha\rho > 1$, i.e., $\alpha/\lambda > 1/\mu$, the exit time of order $\frac{\alpha}{\lambda} \log \varepsilon^{-1}$ is long enough to allow the contraction (happening at exponential rate μ) to eliminate the dependence on the initial condition, whereas if $\rho\alpha < 1$, i.e., $\alpha/\lambda < 1/\mu$, this exit time is so short that the exit typically happens sooner than the contraction along the stable manifold towards the unstable one has taken place, hence the exit happens on the same side of the unstable manifold as the starting point. Let us also note that if the distribution of ξ is absolutely continuous (has a Lebesgue density), then so is the distribution of ξ' . Also, if $\alpha\rho \geq 1$, then the distribution of ξ' is absolutely continuous, being either Gaussian or a Gaussian convolution.

The analysis above is done for a simplified system at a heuristic level. A rigorous general version of the reasoning and results above may be found in [Bak11] and [AMB11a]. Let us give a summary, in the form of a theorem, of what we need to move on.




FIGURE 2. Dynamics near a saddle point

Let us first describe the setting and notation.

- (A) Let X_ε solve equation (1.1) in \mathbb{R}^2 . We assume that $b \in C_b^2$. We assume that $\sigma \in C_b^3$ and that it is uniformly elliptic: the eigenvalues of $\sigma(x)\sigma^*(x)$ are bounded away from zero. In particular, the flow $(\varphi^t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ generated by the vector field b is well defined by

$$(2.28) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt} \varphi^t x &= b(\varphi^t x), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \varphi^0 x &= x. \end{cases}$$

- (B) Suppose a simply connected domain D with a simple closed boundary ∂D contains O , a hyperbolic critical point of b with eigenvalues of the linearization of b at O being $\lambda > 0$ and $-\mu < 0$. (We refer to Sections 2.7 and 2.8 of [Per01] for the basics of local theory near hyperbolic critical points: the

Hadamard–Perron theorem, invariant stable/unstable manifolds, Hartman–Grobman theorem.) Let $x_0 \in D$ belong to the stable manifold \mathcal{W}^s of O

$$\mathcal{W}^s = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \varphi^t x = O \right\}.$$

Let v be a vector not collinear with $b(x_0)$ and such that $x_0 + [-1, 1]v \subset D$. Let \mathcal{W}^u be the unstable manifold

$$\mathcal{W}^u = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \varphi^t x = O \right\},$$

and assume that on both sides of O , it intersects ∂D at points q_{\pm} and there are no other points of intersection between q_+ and q_- .

Let us assume that there are vectors v_{\pm} such that $q_{\pm} + [-1, 1]v_{\pm} \subset \partial D$, and v_{\pm} is not collinear with $b(q_{\pm})$ (i.e., \mathcal{W}^u is transversal to ∂D at q_{\pm}). We also need to specify orientations for v and v_{\pm} . We choose v to point towards q_+ and v_{\pm} to point towards x_0 , see Figure 2. We also require that if $y \in [-1, 0) \cup (0, 1]$, then the trajectory $(\varphi^t(x_0 + yv))_{t \geq 0}$ exits D transversally to ∂D at $q_+ + \pi(y)v_+$ (if $y > 0$) or $q_- + \pi(y)v_-$ (if $y < 0$) for some $\pi(y) \in (-1, 1)$.

(C) The initial condition satisfies

$$(2.29) \quad X_{\varepsilon, 0} = x_0 + \varepsilon^{\alpha} \xi_{\varepsilon} v, \quad \varepsilon > 0,$$

for some $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and a family $(\xi_{\varepsilon})_{\varepsilon > 0}$ of r.v.'s satisfying $\varepsilon^{\alpha} |\xi_{\varepsilon}| \leq 1$ and measurable with respect to \mathcal{F}_0 (and thus independent of the noise realizations).

(D) As $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, ξ_{ε} converge in distribution to a r.v. ξ . If $\alpha < 1$, then ξ has no atom at 0, i.e., $\mathbb{P}\{\xi = 0\} = 0$.

Conditions (C) and (D) are tightly related to one another but in the coming sections it will be convenient to use them separately.

For each $\varepsilon > 0$, we define

$$\tau_{\varepsilon} = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_{\varepsilon, t} \in \partial D\}.$$

and

$$(2.30) \quad A_{\pm, \varepsilon} = \{X_{\varepsilon, \tau_{\varepsilon}} \in q_{\pm} + [-1, 1]v_{\pm}\}.$$

Theorem 2.1 ([Bak11],[AMB11a]). *Under assumptions (A), (B), (C), (D), let us introduce α' by (2.24)–(2.25) and define r.v.'s $(\xi'_{\varepsilon})_{\varepsilon > 0}$ on $A_{\pm, \varepsilon}$ by*

$$(2.31) \quad X_{\varepsilon, \tau_{\varepsilon}} = q_{\pm} + \varepsilon^{\alpha'} \xi'_{\varepsilon} v_{\pm},$$

and arbitrarily outside of $A_{+, \varepsilon} \cup A_{-, \varepsilon}$.

Then there is a r.v. ξ' with no atom at 0 and a partition into events A_{\pm} (i.e., A_+ and A_- are disjoint and $p_{\pm} = \mathbb{P}(A_{\pm})$ satisfy $p_+ + p_- = 1$), such that

(1) As $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$,

$$(\mathbf{1}_{A_{\varepsilon, +}}, \mathbf{1}_{A_{\varepsilon, -}}, \xi'_{\varepsilon}) \xrightarrow{d} (\mathbf{1}_{A_+}, \mathbf{1}_{A_-}, \xi').$$

(2) (a) If $\alpha' = \alpha\rho < 1$, then $\mathbb{P}\{\xi' > 0\} = 1$.

(b) If $\alpha\rho > 1$, then the distribution of ξ' is symmetric Gaussian.

(3) (a) If $\alpha < 1$ and $\mathbb{P}\{\xi > 0\} = 1$, then $p_+ = 1$, $p_- = 0$.

(b) If $\alpha < 1$ and $\mathbb{P}\{\xi < 0\} = 1$, then $p_+ = 0$, $p_- = 1$.

(c) If the distribution of ξ is symmetric, then $p_+ = p_- = 1/2$.

(4) As $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$,

$$(2.32) \quad \frac{\tau_\varepsilon}{\frac{\alpha}{\lambda} \log \varepsilon^{-1}} \xrightarrow{P} 1.$$

In fact, more precise asymptotics for the exit time similar to (2.21) is available but for our purposes, (2.32) is sufficient.

One can say that this lemma describes the asymptotics of the random Poincaré map defined by the system (2.4),(2.5) in the neighborhood of the origin. It claims that if the entrance point to the neighborhood satisfies the scaling relation (2.29), then as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the probabilities of exiting along the branches of the invariant manifold associated to the main eigenvalue of the linearization stabilize to limiting values p_+ and $p_- = 1 - p_+$. For each of the two points of concentration of the exit distribution, the random exit point in its vicinity satisfies a scaling relation of the same type (2.31), with new scaling $\varepsilon^{\alpha'}$ in front of a random vector $\xi'v_+$ on A_+ and $\xi'v_-$ on A_- .

To prove this theorem, one must apply a simplifying conjugacy. According to the Hartman–Grobman theorem, for every hyperbolic critical point, there is a continuous change of coordinates in a sufficiently small neighborhood conjugating the dynamics generated by (1.2) to linear dynamics. Typically, this conjugacy possesses more smoothness, so one can apply the Itô calculus and obtain, in new coordinates, a system similar to (2.4)–(2.5) but with small corrections and possibly non-diagonal diffusion matrix. This was studied in [Bak11]. In special resonant cases, conjugacy to a linear system is impossible, the appropriate normal form contains resonant monomials of higher order but they also can be controlled and that was done in [AMB11a].

2.3. Dynamics along heteroclinic connections. In principle, one can take the domain D to contain an arbitrarily large piece of the unstable manifold, and that is how we are going to proceed studying saddle after saddle. However, it is useful to remind that this is due to the fact that it typically takes nearly constant time to travel between neighborhoods of saddle points, and the character of the scaling does not change during this period. This is a special case of a more general and detailed theorem from [AMB11b]:

Theorem 2.2. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a domain with simple closed boundary ∂D . Suppose that $q \in D$ and assume that the solution of the deterministic equation (1.2) started at q reaches ∂D in finite time T at a point y . We assume that there is a vector u not collinear with $b(y)$ such that $y + [-1, 1]u \subset \partial D$.*

Let X_ε , $\varepsilon > 0$, solve the SDE (1.1) with initial condition

$$X_{\varepsilon,0} = q + \varepsilon^\alpha \xi_\varepsilon v,$$

where $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, v is a vector not collinear with $b(q)$ and r.v.'s ξ_ε converge in distribution to some ξ with no atom at 0. We assume that u and v point to the same side of the orbit of q , see Figure 3.

Let

$$\tau_\varepsilon = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_{\varepsilon,t} \in \partial D\}.$$

Then

$$\tau_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{P} T,$$




FIGURE 3. Exit problem along a heteroclinic connection away from saddle points.

and there are numbers $a, b > 0$ and r.v.'s $(\eta_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$ such that

$$\mathbf{P}\{X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon} = y + \varepsilon^\alpha \eta_\varepsilon u\} \rightarrow 1,$$

and

$$\eta_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{d} a\xi + bN\mathbf{1}_{\alpha=1}, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

where N is a standard Gaussian r.v. independent of ξ .

The main ingredient in the proof of this theorem is the linearization of the stochastic dynamics along the deterministic orbit of x_0 . We will use the same approach to prove Lemmas 8.3 and 8.5 extending Theorem 2.2.

2.4. A heteroclinic chain. We continue rewriting the results of [Bak11] in a convenient way, also preparing the ground for the new results. Now we can apply Theorem 2.1 iteratively and compute the asymptotic probability of traveling along each finite pathway through the graph of heteroclinic connections.

Let us describe the geometric setup first, see Figure 4.

- (E) There is a sequence of saddle points $O_0, O_1, O_2, \dots, O_n, O_{n+1}$ (in principle, one does not really need points O_0 and O_{n+1} but we include them for notational convenience) with eigenvalues of linearization at O_k being $\lambda_k > 0$ and $-\mu_k < 0$, stability index $\rho_k = \mu_k/\lambda_k$, and heteroclinic orbits $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n$ between them as on Figure 4, so that γ_k connects O_k to O_{k+1} for $k = 0, \dots, n$. These heteroclinic connections are said to form a *heteroclinic chain*.

For each $k = 0, \dots, n+1$, we plot a domain D_k containing O_k , so that for all $k = 0, \dots, n$, the following holds: $D_k \cap \gamma_k$ and $D_{k+1} \cap \gamma_k$ are connected sets; $D_k \cap D_{k+1} \cap \gamma_k \neq \emptyset$; ∂D_k intersects γ_k at a point x_k transversally, moreover, there is a vector v_k not collinear with $b(x_k)$ such that $x_k + [-1, 1]v_k \subset \partial D_k$. For $k \geq 1$ out of two possible directions for v_k we choose v_k to point towards γ_{k-1} . For $k = 0$, out of two possible directions for v_0 we choose v_0 to point towards γ_1 .

- (F) The diffusion starts near x_0 and, for some $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1]$ and r.v. $\xi_{0, \varepsilon}$, satisfies

$$(2.33) \quad X_{\varepsilon, 0} = x_0 + \varepsilon^{\alpha_0} \xi_{0, \varepsilon} v_0, \quad \varepsilon > 0.$$

- (G) As $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, $\xi_{0, \varepsilon}$ converges in distribution to a r.v. ξ_0 . If $\alpha_0 < 1$, then we require that $\mathbf{P}\{\xi_0 = 0\} = 0$.




FIGURE 4. A heteroclinic chain.

Let us define a sequence of stopping times $(\tau_\varepsilon^k)_{k=0,\dots,n}$ iteratively: we set $\tau_\varepsilon^0 = 0$ and then, sequentially, for $k = 1, \dots, n$, we set

$$(2.34) \quad \begin{aligned} \nu_\varepsilon^k &= \inf\{t \geq \tau_\varepsilon^{k-1} : X_\varepsilon(t) \in \partial D_k\}, \\ \tau_\varepsilon^k &= \begin{cases} \nu_\varepsilon^k, & \text{if } \nu_\varepsilon^k < \infty \text{ and } X_\varepsilon(\nu_\varepsilon^k) \in x_k + [-1, 1]v_k, \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Using the strong Markov property and Theorem 2.1 iteratively, we obtain sequences $(\alpha_k)_{k=0,\dots,n}$ of exponents, r.v.'s $(\xi_{k,\varepsilon})_{k=1,\dots,n}$; $\varepsilon > 0$, $(\xi_k)_{k=1,\dots,n}$ and events $(A_k)_{k=1,\dots,n}$ such that

$$(2.35) \quad X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^k} = x_k + \varepsilon^{\alpha_k} \xi_{k,\varepsilon} v_k, \quad \varepsilon > 0,$$

holds on

$$(2.36) \quad A_{k,\varepsilon} = \{\tau_\varepsilon^k < \infty\}$$

for $k = 0, 1, \dots, n$, and

$$(2.37) \quad (\mathbf{1}_{A_{k,\varepsilon}}, \mathbf{1}_{A_{k,\varepsilon}} \xi_{k,\varepsilon}) \xrightarrow{d} (\mathbf{1}_{A_k}, \mathbf{1}_{A_k} \xi_k), \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Due to (2.25), the sequence $(\alpha_k)_{k=0,\dots,n}$ of exponents satisfies a recursive relation

$$(2.38) \quad \alpha_k = (\alpha_{k-1} \rho_k) \wedge 1.$$

The relations (2.35), (2.37) and the definition (2.38) are really meaningful only if $p_k > 0$, where

$$(2.39) \quad p_k = P(A_k) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} P(A_{k,\varepsilon}),$$

is always well-defined.

However there are multiple situations where $p_k = 0$. In fact, it follows from Theorem 2.1 (2) that if for some k , $\alpha_k < 1$, then, conditioned on A_k , the distribution of ξ_k is concentrated on $(0, +\infty)$. Theorem 2.1 (3) implies now that if γ_{k-1} and γ_{k+1} are on the opposite sides of γ_k , i.e., the union of curves $\gamma_{k-1}, \gamma_k, \gamma_{k+1}$ is N-shaped (see, e.g., curves $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$ in Figure 4) then $p_k = 0$.

In other words, due to insufficient contraction near O_k (and the preceding saddles of the heteroclinic chain), the probability of crossing the heteroclinic connection γ_k while traveling along it from O_k to O_{k+1} is asymptotically zero, so while the diffusion near the heteroclinic chain experiences insufficient contraction (i.e., $\alpha_k < 1$ for exponents α_k defined via (2.38)) it will typically stay on one side of the heteroclinic chain. However, once a value $\alpha_k = 1$ is reached due to the presence of strong contraction (the stability index ρ_k is large enough to ensure $\alpha_{k-1} \rho_k \geq 1$), there is a nonvanishing positive chance to cross γ_k .

We can summarize the above as a theorem:

Theorem 2.3. *Under the conditions (A), (E), (F), (G), the following holds true:*

- (1) *The numbers $p_k, k = 1, \dots, n$, are well-defined by (2.39).*
- (2) *If $p_k = 0$ for some $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$, then $p_{k+1} = p_{k+2} = \dots = p_n = 0$.*
- (3) *Suppose $p_k > 0$ for some $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$.*
 - (a) *If $\alpha_k = 1$, then $0 < p_{k+1} < 1$.*
 - (b) *If $\alpha_k < 1$ and if γ_{k-1} and γ_{k+1} are on the same side of γ_k , then $p_{k+1} = p_k$.*
 - (c) *If $\alpha_k < 1$, and if γ_{k-1} and γ_{k+1} are on the opposite sides of γ_k , then $p_{k+1} = 0$.*
 - (d) *If $p_n > 0$, then, conditioned on $A_{n,\varepsilon}$,*

$$\frac{\tau_\varepsilon^n}{\chi \log \varepsilon^{-1}} \xrightarrow{P} 1, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

where

$$\chi = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha_{i-1}}{\lambda_i}.$$

Part 3d of Theorem 2.3 means that this theorem is relevant for time scales logarithmic in ε^{-1} . It describes typical and unlikely sequences of heteroclinic connections followed by the diffusion over those times. However, it does not describe the rate of the improbable transitions or the mechanism of their emergence and

thus implies little for longer time scales. The quantitative analysis of asymptotically improbable transitions described in part 3c of the theorem is the main goal of this paper.




FIGURE 5. In this example, the stability index at saddle O_k is ρ_k . The left and right cells are mirror images of each other, so ρ_2 is also the stability index at O'_2 and ρ_3 at O'_3 . Additionally, we assume $\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3 < 1$ but $\rho_0\rho_1\rho_2\rho_3 \geq 1$.

Let us briefly discuss an example depicted in Figure 5, two neighboring cells of a certain cellular flow. Assuming that $\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3 < 1$ but $\rho_0\rho_1\rho_2\rho_3 \geq 1$ and starting with $\alpha_0 = 1$, we obtain that the scaling exponents α_k after passing the neighborhood of a saddle point O_k are given by $\alpha_0 = 1$, $\alpha_1 = \rho_1$, $\alpha_2 = \rho_2\rho_1$, $\alpha_3 = \rho_3\rho_2\rho_1$ and then $\alpha_0 = 1$ again. As a result, on logarithmic time scales, it is unlikely for the diffusion to escape the union of two cells. Near O_1 , the diffusion may choose one of the outgoing connections, to O_2 or O'_2 , but once this choice is made, the next choices are predetermined with high probability, and diffusion visits sequentially either O_1, O_2, O_3, O_0 or O_1, O'_2, O'_3, O_0 . However at O_0 the contraction is strong enough to result in the exit exponent being 1 again and the scaling limit is symmetric Gaussian, so the process of making a choice of the exit direction at O_1 and then cycling through one of the sequences O_1, O_2, O_3, O_0 or O_1, O'_2, O'_3, O_0 , repeats, etc. This behavior, with the boundary γ_0 between these two cells being permeable and the boundary of the union of these cells impenetrable remains typical on the logarithmic time scales. The results that we obtain in this paper apply to this specific example, so we will be able to quantify the decay (as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$) of probabilities of exiting the union of these cells through connections $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma'_1, \gamma'_2, \gamma'_3$, (it turns out they decay as a power of ε), find the most likely exit scenarios and estimate the exit times. We will also be able to describe exit times and typical exit scenarios for pretty general cell complexes with boundaries composed of heteroclinic connections.

3. SOME NOTATION AND TERMINOLOGY

As we have seen, crossing the heteroclinic network may be a rare event. Which scenarios lead to those rare events and what can be said about the decay of their probabilities as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$? To answer this question, we need to distinguish between

various degrees of unlikeliness. We will mostly be interested in the events with probabilities that decay to 0 as a power of ε as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Some events are even more unlikely, with probabilities decaying faster than any power of ε . To describe these events, we will need to make sense of the claim that a r.v. is essentially of order ε^α , up to logarithmic corrections. In this short section, we introduce appropriate definitions and notations (see Section 2.1 for more notational agreements).

For $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\varkappa > 0$, $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\alpha \geq \beta$, we denote

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} l_\varepsilon &= \log \varepsilon^{-1}, \\ K_\varkappa(\varepsilon) &= [-l_\varepsilon^\varkappa, l_\varepsilon^\varkappa] \subset \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned}$$

If there is $\varkappa > 1$ such that $f(\varepsilon) = o(e^{-l_\varepsilon^\varkappa})$, $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we write $f(\varepsilon) = o_e(1)$. If $f(\varepsilon) = o_e(1)$, then $f(\varepsilon)$ converges to zero, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, faster than any power of ε because for all $\varkappa > 1$ and $p > 0$,

$$\frac{e^{-l_\varepsilon^\varkappa}}{\varepsilon^p} = e^{-l_\varepsilon^\varkappa + pl_\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

The following definitions describe certain properties of *families* of events indexed by $\varepsilon > 0$ but, for brevity, we abuse the terminology slightly and speak of events themselves.

We say that events $(A_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$ happen with high probability (w.h.p.) if $\mathbb{P}(A_\varepsilon(x)) = 1 - o_e(1)$. We say that events $(A_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$ happen with low probability (w.l.p.) if $\mathbb{P}(A_\varepsilon(x)) = o_e(1)$. We also call them high (respectively, low) probability events.

Suppose we have a family of events $(A_\varepsilon(x))_{x \in I_\varepsilon, \varepsilon > 0}$, and probability measures $(\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon^x)_{x \in I_\varepsilon, \varepsilon > 0}$ depending on $\varepsilon > 0$ and x ranging through some set I_ε which in turn depends on ε . We say that $A_\varepsilon(x)$ happen w.l.p. under \mathbb{P}_ε^x uniformly over I_ε if

$$\sup_{x \in I_\varepsilon} \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon^x(A_\varepsilon(x)) = o_e(1).$$

The complements of $A_\varepsilon(x)$ are then said to happen w.h.p. under \mathbb{P}_ε^x uniformly over I_ε .

We say that B_ε happens on A_ε w.h.p. if $A_\varepsilon \setminus B_\varepsilon$ happens w.l.p.

We say that $(\xi_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$ are of order ε^α if for some $\varkappa > 0$, $\xi_\varepsilon \in \varepsilon^\alpha [l_\varepsilon^{-\varkappa}, l_\varepsilon^\varkappa]$ w.h.p.

If for some α and all sufficiently large \varkappa , $\xi_\varepsilon > \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^{-\varkappa}$ w.h.p., we say that ξ_ε is of order at least ε^α .

If for some α and some $\varkappa > 0$, $\xi_\varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^\varkappa]$ w.h.p., we say that ξ_ε is of order at most ε^α .

If for some α and some $\varkappa > 0$, $\xi_\varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^{-\varkappa}]$ w.h.p., we say that the order of ξ_ε is below ε^α .

If for some α and all sufficiently large \varkappa , $\xi_\varepsilon > \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^\varkappa$ w.h.p., we say that the order of ξ_ε is above ε^α .

If in the definitions above “w.h.p.” is replaced by “a.s.”, the r.v.’s ξ_ε are said to be *strictly* of order ε^α , *strictly* of order below ε^α , etc.

Instead of “order ε^0 ”, we often say “order 1”.

If for some $\varkappa > 0$, $|\xi_\varepsilon| < l_\varepsilon^\varkappa$ w.h.p., we call r.v.’s ξ_ε tame.

If $(\xi_\varepsilon^x)_{x \in I_\varepsilon, \varepsilon > 0}$ is a family of r.v.'s also indexed by some parameter x and for some $\varkappa > 0$, $|\xi_\varepsilon^x| < l_\varepsilon^\varkappa$ w.h.p. uniformly in $x \in I_\varepsilon$, then we say that ξ_ε^x are uniformly tame in $x \in I_\varepsilon$.

We write $\xi_\varepsilon \stackrel{\text{w.h.p.}}{=} \xi'_\varepsilon$ if $\{\xi_\varepsilon \neq \xi'_\varepsilon\}$ is a low probability event. We write $A_\varepsilon \stackrel{\text{w.h.p.}}{=} A'_\varepsilon$ if $A_\varepsilon \Delta A'_\varepsilon$ is a low probability event. In addition, for events A, B , we write $A \stackrel{\text{P}}{=} B$ if $\text{P}(A \Delta B) = 0$.

4. TWO SADDLES

The results of Section 2 imply that the 2-dimensional diffusion near a heteroclinic network often tends to stay on one side of the network mostly exploring a single cell. In this section we consider a very short N -shaped heteroclinic chain composed of heteroclinic connections $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$, see Figure 6, and compute the asymptotics of the probabilities of $A_2 = \{\tau_\varepsilon^2 < \infty\}$, i.e., the probability that the diffusion starting near x_0 first exits from D_1 into $D_2 \setminus D_1$ through $x_1 + [-1, 1]v_1$ and then exits from D_2 into $D_3 \setminus D_2$ through $x_2 + [-1, 1]v_2$. For the latter, it needs to make a “wrong turn” near O_2 , so this may be a small probability event. Longer heteroclinic chains will be considered in the next section.




FIGURE 6. A short N -shaped heteroclinic chain: $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$.

Our analysis below shows that there are three main cases: (1) $\alpha_1 = 1$; (2) $\alpha_1 < 1$ and $\alpha_0 < 1$; (3) $\alpha_1 < 1$ and $\alpha_0 = 1$.

In the first case, the probability of following the connections $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$ has a positive limit, as we know from Section 2.

In the other two cases, $\alpha_1 < 1$, so the scaling limit along γ_1 is one-sided and the probability of following connections $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$ converges to 0. The typical exits from D_1 are too far from γ_1 which typically results in exits from D_2 in the direction opposite to γ_2 . The main question then is: how improbable are the exits from D_1 that are ε -close to γ_1 ? It turns out that if $\alpha_0 < 1$, this probability decays superpolynomially while if $\alpha_0 = 1$, it decays as a power of ε .

Before stating the main result of this section we must introduce an extra assumption that we will use.

- (H) For a saddle point with eigenvalues of linearization $\lambda > 0$ and $-\mu < 0$ there is an (open) neighborhood U of the saddle and an orientation-preserving C_b^5 -diffeomorphism f mapping U onto a neighborhood of $0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and conjugating the vector field b to the linear vector field $\bar{b}(x) = Ax$, where $A = \text{diag}(\lambda, -\mu)$ is a 2-by-2 diagonal matrix:

$$Df(x)b(x) = Af(x).$$

Here, Df denotes the derivative (Jacobian) of the map f . Shrinking U if necessary, we may assume that $x_0 + [-1, 1]v$ does not intersect the closure of U and that the trajectory $(\varphi^t x)_{t \geq 0}$ of every point $x \in U \setminus \mathcal{W}^s$ intersects $q_+ + (-1, 1)v_+$ or $q_- + (-1, 1)v_-$ transversally. We also note that if f is a linearizing conjugacy then so is cf for any $c > 0$. Thus, we can choose f to make $f(U)$ as large as needed.

We need the C_b^5 assumption on the linearizing change of coordinates to ensure that the second derivatives emerging in the Itô formula for this linearization are C_b^3 , which is required for our Malliavin calculus techniques to work in Section 11. A sufficient condition for existence of such a smooth linearization is that $b \in C^\infty$ and there are no resonances between λ and $-\mu$, i.e., neither of them can be represented as $\alpha\lambda - \beta\mu$ with some $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2$ satisfying $\alpha + \beta \geq 2$ (see the discussion in [AMB11a, Section 4]). We believe that our conclusions still hold true even without this restriction, say, for area-preserving flows, where $\lambda = \mu$. When such resonances are present, one has to control the emerging resonant monomial terms in the normal form and extend the results of [AMB11a]. We think that this is possible in our setting but we do not pursue this generality here. We also note that (H) implies $b \in C_b^4$ because $b(x) = Df^{-1}(y)\bar{b}(y)$ for $y = f(x)$. This is a stronger smoothness requirement on b than stated in (A).

In the remaining part of this paper, we will require that a smooth linearization exists locally near each saddle point of the heteroclinic chain:

- (I) The conjugacy condition (H) holds near each saddle point O_1, \dots, O_n .

Let us state the main result of this section. It will be generalized to longer heteroclinic chains in the next one.

Theorem 4.1. *Assume the setting described by conditions (A), (E), (F), (G), (I) with $n = 2$ and with γ_0 and γ_2 on different sides of γ_1 , see Figure 6. Assume that $p_1 > 0$ (in the case of $\alpha < 1$, this means that $\mathbf{P}\{\xi_0 > 0\} > 0$.)*

Recall that $\alpha_1 = \alpha_0\rho_1 \wedge 1$ according to (2.38).

- (1) *Suppose $\alpha_1 = 1 \leq \alpha_0\rho_1$. Then $p_2 > 0$.*
(2) *Suppose $\alpha_1 = \rho_0 < 1$ and $\alpha_0 = 1$. In addition, we assume that $\xi_{0,\varepsilon}$ is tame. Then there is a number $h > 0$ such that*

$$(4.1) \quad \mathbf{P}(A_{2,\varepsilon}) = h\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\rho_1}-1} (1 + o(1)), \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

In this case, conditioned on $A_{2,\varepsilon}$,

$$(4.2) \quad \frac{\tau_{2,\varepsilon}}{(\frac{1}{\mu_1} + \frac{1}{\lambda_2}) \log \varepsilon^{-1}} \xrightarrow{P} 1, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

(3) Suppose $\alpha_1 = \alpha_0 \rho_1 < 1$ and $\alpha_0 < 1$. In addition, assume that $\xi_{0,\varepsilon}$ is of order 1. Then $A_{2,\varepsilon}$ happen w.l.p.

Without making an assumption on the order of $\xi_{0,\varepsilon}$ in part 3, we may end up with a situation where other orders of magnitude are present with small probabilities that may still dominate the picture.

We will derive this theorem from a sequence of lemmas studying both, the exit from D_1 and then the exit from D_2 , in more detail than in Section 2. However, within this section, we only give heuristic arguments for these lemmas and only for the case of the simpler case of the linear system (2.4)–(2.5) in the strip D given by (2.9), with initial conditions (2.6)–(2.7). We will refer to this as *the model case*.

The full generality needs rigorous proofs taking into account the nonlinear geometry and correction terms, some of which present massive technical difficulties and will be given in Sections 7–11.

For the model case, we will need the following auxiliary result on processes defined in (2.14) and the exit time τ_ε defined in (2.10), which is an easy consequence of the exponential martingale inequality (see Lemma 7.1). More general results with rigorous proofs are Lemmas 7.2 and 7.4.

Lemma 4.1. *Consider the diffusion in a neighborhood of a saddle in the model case. Then the r.v.'s $\sup_{t \in [0, \tau_\varepsilon]} |U_t^1|$, $\sup_{t \in [0, \tau_\varepsilon]} |N_t^2|$, and τ_ε , are uniformly tame over all initial conditions and there is a constant C such that, for every $\varkappa > 0$ and every $\alpha \in (0, 1]$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha x v} \left\{ \sup_{[0, \tau_\varepsilon]} |U_t^1| > z \right\} &\leq C e^{-z^2/C}, \quad z > 0. \\ \sup_{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha x v} \left\{ |N_{\tau_\varepsilon}^2| > z \right\} &\leq C e^{-z^2/C}, \quad z > 0. \end{aligned}$$

We begin with the following general statement which is a more precise version of one of the claims of Theorem 2.1. We recall that events $A_{\pm, \varepsilon}$ were defined in (2.30).

Lemma 4.2. *Under assumptions (A), (B), (C), and (H), if ξ_ε is tame, then $A_{+, \varepsilon} \cup A_{-, \varepsilon}$ happen w.h.p. and $\xi_\varepsilon^!$ defined on this event uniquely via (2.31) is tame.*

Moreover, for every $\varkappa > 0$,

$$(4.3) \quad \sup_{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha x v} ((A_{+, \varepsilon} \cup A_{-, \varepsilon})^c) = o_\varepsilon(1),$$

and there is $\varkappa' > 0$ such that

$$(4.4) \quad \sup_{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha x v} \left(\left\{ X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon} \notin q_\pm + \varepsilon^{\alpha'} K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon) v_\pm \right\} \cap A_{\pm, \varepsilon} \right) = o_\varepsilon(1).$$

Remark 4.1. In fact, a stronger claim holds under the conditions of this lemma: the order of the maximum (over times $t \leq \tau_\varepsilon$) distance from $X_{\varepsilon, t}$ to the heteroclinic network is at most ε^β for some positive β .

HEURISTICS FOR THE MODEL CASE: Here, we consider only the case of the linear system (2.4)–(2.5) with initial conditions (2.6)–(2.7). Lemma 4.1 implies that $|Z_\varepsilon|$ given in (2.20) is of order at most 1. Therefore we obtain that the absolute values of both terms in (2.23) are of order at most $\varepsilon^{\alpha'}$, which implies our first two claims. Relation (4.4) follows from a similar argument with ξ_ε replaced by $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$. \square

As we know, the exit from D_1 happens near γ_1 . Which exit locations contribute most to $\mathbb{P}(A_{2,\varepsilon})$? The next lemma applied to diffusion in D_2 shows that the contribution from the exits that are not ε -close to γ_1 , decays superpolynomially.

In the rest of this section, under assumptions **(A)**, **(B)**, for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $\mathbb{Q}^x = \mathbb{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon xv}$ the distribution of the diffusion with initial condition

$$(4.5) \quad X_{\varepsilon,0} = x_0 + \varepsilon xv.$$

We recall that, according to our convention from Section 2.1, we still denote a generic probability measure by \mathbb{P} when working with r.v.'s whose distribution is unambiguously clear from the context.

Lemma 4.3. *Let us assume conditions **(A)**, **(B)**, and **(H)**. Then $A_{-, \varepsilon}$ happen w.l.p. under \mathbb{Q}^x , uniformly in $x \in [l_\varepsilon^\varkappa, \varepsilon^{-1}]$, for sufficiently large \varkappa .*

HEURISTICS FOR THE MODEL CASE: In the model case (2.4)–(2.5), the proof is straightforward. Using (2.22) and (2.20) with $\alpha = 1$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{Q}^x(A_{-, \varepsilon}) = \mathbb{Q}^x \{ \text{sgn } X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon}^1 = -1 \} \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, \tau_\varepsilon]} |U_t^1| > l_\varepsilon^\varkappa \right\} = o_\varepsilon(1)$$

for sufficiently large \varkappa due to Lemma 4.1. \square

This lemma means that, conditionally on the exit from D_1 at distance from γ_1 being of order above ε^1 , the probability of $A_{\varepsilon, -}$ decays to zero superpolynomially.

The next lemma means that conditionally on the exit from D_1 at distance from γ_1 being of order at most ε^1 , those probabilities converge to a positive limit. This gives slightly more detail than Theorem 2.1.

Lemma 4.4. *Assume conditions **(A)**, **(B)**, and **(H)**. Then, there is $s > 0$ such that for every $\varkappa > 0$*

$$\sup_{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)} |\mathbb{Q}^x(A_{-, \varepsilon}) - \psi_s(-x)| = o(\varepsilon^\delta),$$

for some $\delta > 0$, where $K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$ is defined in (3.1) and ψ_s is defined in (2.3).

HEURISTICS FOR THE MODEL CASE: For the system (2.4)–(2.5), we recall that the direction of exit is determined by the sign of $Z_\varepsilon = x + U_{\tau_\varepsilon}^1 \xrightarrow{d} x + \mathcal{U}$. Defining s to be \mathbf{c}_1 , the variance of \mathcal{U} , see (2.16), we obtain

$$\mathbb{Q}^x(A_{-, \varepsilon}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{U} < -x\} = \psi_s(-x).$$

\square

These lemmas, especially Lemma 4.3, show that in the case where $\alpha_1 < 1$, we need to study how the diffusion is set up to be at distance of order at most ε^1 from γ_1 when exiting D_1 , even if this means an atypical scenario near O_1 .

It turns out that the probability of such a scenario differs drastically between the situations where $\alpha_0 < 1$ and $\alpha_0 = 1$. We address them in the following two lemmas.

First, we address the situation where the entrance distribution is concentrated at scale ε^α with $\alpha < 1$ and $\alpha\rho < 1$.

Lemma 4.5. *Under conditions (A), (B), (C), and (H), let us assume that*

$$(4.6) \quad \alpha < 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha\rho < 1,$$

and that ξ_ε is of order 1. Then

$$X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon} = q_+ + \varepsilon^{\alpha\rho} \xi'_\varepsilon v_+,$$

where ξ'_ε is of order 1.

HEURISTICS FOR THE MODEL CASE: First, due to Lemma 4.3, the exit happens through ∂_+ (see the definition (2.11)), w.h.p., uniformly over values of x of order above 1.

We can rewrite (2.23) as

$$(4.7) \quad X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon}^2 = \varepsilon^{\alpha\rho} \left(\frac{L}{R^\rho} |Z_\varepsilon|^\rho + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha\rho} N_{\tau_\varepsilon}^2 \right).$$

Recalling (2.20) and using Lemma 4.1, we obtain that Z_ε is of order 1. Applying Lemma 4.1 to the right-hand side of (4.7), we now obtain the statement of the lemma. \square

Thus, under (4.6), the exit at scale at most ε^1 is extremely unlikely. Let us consider the remaining case where $\alpha = 1$, which is actually the most interesting and technical part of our program. The lemma we are about to state describes exits at scale ε^β , where $\beta \in (\rho, 1]$. In this section, we are mostly interested in $\beta = 1$ but we will need this lemma in full generality in the next section when considering longer heteroclinic chains.

We denote by \mathcal{M} the set of all nonzero absolutely continuous measures ν on \mathbb{R} satisfying

$$(4.8) \quad \nu((0, \infty)) > 0,$$

$$(4.9) \quad \nu((-\infty, z]) \leq C(1 + z^C), \quad z \geq 0,$$

$$(4.10) \quad \frac{d\nu}{d\text{Leb}}(z) \leq C(1 + |z|^C), \quad z \in \mathbb{R},$$

for some $C > 0$. The elements of \mathcal{M} are called (absolutely continuous) measures of polynomial growth.

Lemma 4.6. *Under conditions (A), (B), and (H), suppose*

$$\alpha = 1, \quad \alpha\rho = \rho < 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \beta \in (\rho, 1].$$

Then the following holds:

(1) *There are constants $c, \delta > 0$, and $\nu \in \mathcal{M}$, such that for all $\varkappa, \varkappa' > 0$,*

$$\sup_{\substack{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon), \\ [a, b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)}} \left| \varepsilon^{-(\frac{\beta}{\rho}-1)} \mathbf{Q}^x \{ X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon} \in q_+ + \varepsilon^\beta [a, b] v_+ \} - g_c(x) \nu([a, b]) \right| = o(\varepsilon^\delta).$$

(2) *For every $\varkappa, \varkappa' > 0$,*

$$(4.11) \quad \sup_{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{Q}^x \left\{ \left| \frac{\tau_\varepsilon}{\frac{\beta}{\mu} l_\varepsilon} - 1 \right| > \delta, A_{+, \varepsilon}, X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon} \in q_+ + \varepsilon^\beta (-\infty, l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'}] v_+ \right\} = O\left(\varepsilon^{\frac{\beta(1+\delta)}{\rho}-1}\right).$$

(3) For any $\varkappa > 0$ and any $\varkappa' > \frac{1}{2}$,

$$\sup_{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)} \mathbb{Q}^x \left(A_{+, \varepsilon} \cap \left\{ X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon} \notin q_+ + \varepsilon[-l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'}, +\infty)v_+ \right\} \right) = o_\varepsilon(1).$$

Note that, in (1), due to $\varepsilon^\beta l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'} \leq 1$ for small ε , we have $\{X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon} \in q_+ + \varepsilon^\beta[a, b]v_+\} \subset A_{+, \varepsilon}$ uniformly in $[a, b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)$ for sufficiently small ε .

In comparison with other results given in this section, a complete proof of this local limit theorem requires a lot of technical work involving multiple approximations, techniques based on Malliavin calculus, an iteration scheme similar to those of [BPG19a], [BPG20], [BC21b], [BC21a] helping to gradually extend the analysis of the diffusion to longer and longer times, and detailed analysis of tails of exit times.

Let us stress that although the natural scale for $X_\varepsilon(\tau_\varepsilon)$ is ε^α with $\alpha < 1$, Lemma 4.6 shows that the distribution of $X_\varepsilon(\tau_\varepsilon)$ has local regularity (approximate equidistribution) at smaller scales down to order ε^1 and thus can be viewed as a local limit theorem.

Note that the limit $g_c(x)\nu([a, b])$ in the local limit theorem (part 1 of Lemma 4.6) is a product of two factors depending only on the initial condition x and the exit location $[a, b]$ respectively. This indicates an asymptotic loss of memory that will be useful in the proof of Theorem 4.1 and in the analysis of longer heteroclinic chains.

Together, Lemma 4.6 (1) and (2) imply that for every fixed x , under \mathbb{Q}^x conditioned on $A_{+, \varepsilon} \cap \{X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon} \in q_+ + \varepsilon^\beta(-\infty, l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'}]v_+\}$, we have

$$\frac{\tau_\varepsilon}{\frac{\beta}{\mu} l_\varepsilon} \xrightarrow{P} 1, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

A rigorous proof of Lemma 4.6 is given in Section 8. It requires a lot of preparatory work in Sections 7–11.

HEURISTICS FOR THE MODEL CASE: Using (2.23), we can write

$$(4.12) \quad \mathbb{Q}^x \{X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon} \in q_+ + \varepsilon^\beta[a, b]v_+\} = \mathbb{Q}^x \left\{ \varepsilon^\rho \frac{L}{R^\rho} |Z_\varepsilon|^\rho + \varepsilon N_{\tau_\varepsilon}^2 \in \varepsilon^\beta[a, b] \right\},$$

where, similarly to (2.20),

$$Z_\varepsilon = x + U_{\tau_\varepsilon}^1.$$

Since the exit happens near q_+ , i.e., through ∂_+ , we have $Z_\varepsilon > 0$ on our event.

Due to (2.15), we only make a small error computing instead

$$(4.13) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left\{ \varepsilon^\rho \frac{L}{R^\rho} (x + \mathcal{U})^\rho + \varepsilon \mathcal{N} \in \varepsilon^\beta[a, b], x + \mathcal{U} > 0 \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left\{ (x + \mathcal{U})^\rho \in \frac{R^\rho}{L} \varepsilon^{\beta-\rho} [a - \varepsilon^{1-\beta} \mathcal{N}, b - \varepsilon^{1-\beta} \mathcal{N}], x + \mathcal{U} > 0 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

If $\beta = 1$, the right-hand side equals

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathcal{U} \in \frac{R}{L^{1/\rho}} \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\rho}-1} [((a - \mathcal{N}) \vee 0)^{1/\rho}, ((b - \mathcal{N}) \vee 0)^{1/\rho}] - x \right\},$$

and, using the independence and Gaussianity of \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{N} , for small ε , due to $\frac{1}{\rho} - 1 > 0$, we can approximate this probability by

$$g_{c_1}(x) \frac{R}{L^{1/\rho}} \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\rho}-1} \mathbb{E} \left(((b - \mathcal{N}) \vee 0)^{1/\rho} - ((a - \mathcal{N}) \vee 0)^{1/\rho} \right),$$

where \mathbf{c}_1 is the variance of \mathcal{U} given in (2.16). Defining $\nu \in \mathcal{M}$ by

$$\nu((-\infty, z]) = \frac{R}{L^{1/\rho}} \mathbf{E}((z - \mathcal{N}) \vee 0)^{1/\rho}, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}.$$

we complete the proof of part (1) for $\beta = 1$.

In the case of $\beta \in (\rho, 1)$, the right-hand side of (4.13) can be approximated by

$$(4.14) \quad \approx \mathbf{P} \left\{ \mathcal{U} \in \frac{R}{L^{1/\rho}} \varepsilon^{\frac{\beta}{\rho}-1} [(a \vee 0)^{1/\rho}, (b \vee 0)^{1/\rho}] - x \right\}.$$

Since $\frac{\beta}{\rho} - 1 > 0$, this probability can be approximated for small ε by

$$g_{\sigma_{\mathcal{U}}^2}(x) \frac{R}{L^{1/\rho}} \varepsilon^{\frac{\beta}{\rho}-1} ((b \vee 0)^{1/\rho} - (a \vee 0)^{1/\rho}).$$

Now it remains to define $\nu \in \mathcal{M}$ by

$$\nu((-\infty, z]) = \frac{R}{L^{1/\rho}} (z \vee 0)^{1/\rho}, \quad z \in \mathbb{R},$$

and part (1) for $\beta \in (\rho, 1)$ follows.

To prove part (3), we similarly compute for large \varkappa' :

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P} \left\{ \varepsilon^\rho \frac{L}{R^\rho} (x + \mathcal{U})^\rho + \varepsilon \mathcal{N} \notin \varepsilon[-l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'}, +\infty), x + \mathcal{U} > 0 \right\} \\ &= \mathbf{P} \left\{ (x + \mathcal{U})^\rho \leq \frac{R^\rho}{L} \varepsilon(-l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'} - \mathcal{N}), x + \mathcal{U} > 0 \right\} \\ &\leq \mathbf{P} \left\{ -l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'} - \mathcal{N} > 0 \right\} = \mathbf{P} \{ \mathcal{N} < -l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'} \} = o_\varepsilon(1). \end{aligned}$$

To prove part (2), we note that up to small errors, similarly to (4.12) and (4.14),

$$\left\{ X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon} \in q_+ + \varepsilon^\beta (-\infty, l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'}) v_+ \right\} \approx \left\{ 0 < x + \mathcal{U} \leq \frac{R}{L^{1/\rho}} \varepsilon^{\frac{\beta}{\rho}-1} ((l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'} - \varepsilon^{1-\beta} \mathcal{N}) \vee 0)^{1/\rho} \right\},$$

and on the latter event

$$(4.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \tau_\varepsilon &= \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \frac{R}{\varepsilon |Z_\varepsilon|} \approx \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \frac{R}{\varepsilon |x + \mathcal{U}|} \\ &\geq \frac{\beta}{\mu} l_\varepsilon + \frac{1}{\mu} \log \frac{L}{l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'} - \varepsilon^{1-\beta} \mathcal{N}}, \end{aligned}$$

and $l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'} - \varepsilon^{1-\beta} \mathcal{N} > 0$. Thus, on this event, $\tau_\varepsilon < (1 - \delta) \frac{\beta}{\mu} l_\varepsilon$ implies

$$\varepsilon^{1-\beta} \mathcal{N} - l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'} < -L \varepsilon^{-\beta \delta},$$

which is a low probability event. For a matching upper bound on τ_ε , we note that

$$\mathbf{P} \left\{ \tau_\varepsilon > (1 + \delta) \frac{\beta}{\mu} l_\varepsilon \right\} \approx \mathbf{P} \left\{ |x + \mathcal{U}| < R \varepsilon^{\frac{\beta(1+\delta)}{\rho}-1} \right\} = O \left(\varepsilon^{\frac{\beta(1+\delta)}{\rho}-1} \right).$$

These estimates imply (4.11). \square

This lemma providing the power asymptotics $\varepsilon^{\frac{\beta}{\rho}-1}$ for the probability of the unlikely event of approaching the outgoing heteroclinic connection at distance of order below ε^β , also describes the mechanism responsible for creating these events.

We see that the exit time needed to realize the rare event is about $\frac{\beta}{\mu} l_\varepsilon$ which, due to $\rho = \mu/\lambda < 1$, is much longer than the typical exit times concentrating near $\frac{1}{\lambda} l_\varepsilon$, see the limit theorem in (2.21) or the more general claim (4) of Theorem 2.1. We

saw before that those typical exit times are not long enough for the contraction to bring the diffusion close enough to the unstable manifold. However, if the diffusion happens to be exposed to contraction while withstanding the repulsion out of a neighborhood of a saddle for a longer period $\sim \frac{\beta}{\mu} l_\varepsilon$ (this is a rare event with probability of order $\varepsilon^{\frac{\beta}{\rho}-1}$ as we just computed), then this is enough for the diffusion to approach the unstable heteroclinic connection at a distance of order at most ε^β .

We give a more precise study of tails of the exit times in Section 10. For the proof of Theorem 4.1 we only need one more estimate on the exit time, which can be viewed as a stronger version of Theorem 2.1 (4).

Lemma 4.7. *Under conditions (A), (B), and (H), for each $\delta > 0$,*

$$\sup_{x \in K_{\mathcal{K}}(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{Q}^x \left\{ \left| \frac{\tau_\varepsilon}{\frac{1}{\lambda} l_\varepsilon} - 1 \right| > \delta \right\} = O(\varepsilon^\delta).$$

HEURISTICS FOR THE MODEL CASE: Using the expression (4.15), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Q}^x \left\{ \tau_\varepsilon < \frac{1-\delta}{\lambda} l_\varepsilon \right\} &\approx \mathbf{Q}^x \{ |x + \mathcal{U}| > \varepsilon^{-\delta} R \} = o_\varepsilon(1), \\ \mathbf{Q}^x \left\{ \tau_\varepsilon > \frac{1+\delta}{\lambda} l_\varepsilon \right\} &\approx \mathbf{Q}^x \{ |x + \mathcal{U}| < \varepsilon^\delta R \} = O(\varepsilon^\delta), \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $x \in K_{\mathcal{K}}(\varepsilon)$. □

With Lemmas 4.2–4.7 at hand, we can give a rigorous proof of Theorem 4.1.

PROOF OF THEOREM 4.1: Part 1 follows from part 3a of Theorem 2.3. Part 3 is a consequence of Lemmas 4.3 and 4.5.

To prove part 2, we will combine Lemmas 4.6 and 4.4. First, we write

$$\mathbf{P}(A_{2,\varepsilon}) = \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{P}(A_{2,\varepsilon} | X_{\varepsilon,\tau_\varepsilon^1})] = I_1 + I_2,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{P}(A_{2,\varepsilon} | X_{\varepsilon,\tau_\varepsilon^1}) \mathbf{1}_{\{X_{\varepsilon,\tau_\varepsilon^1} \in x_1 + \varepsilon K_{\mathcal{K}'}(\varepsilon)v_1\}}], \\ I_2 &= \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{P}(A_{2,\varepsilon} | X_{\varepsilon,\tau_\varepsilon^1}) \mathbf{1}_{\{X_{\varepsilon,\tau_\varepsilon^1} \notin x_1 + \varepsilon K_{\mathcal{K}'}(\varepsilon)v_1\}}]. \end{aligned}$$

We can also write

$$I_1 = I_{11} + I_{12}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_{11} &= \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{P}(A_{2,\varepsilon} | X_{\varepsilon,\tau_\varepsilon^1}) \mathbf{1}_{\{X_{\varepsilon,0} \in x_0 + \varepsilon K_{\mathcal{K}}(\varepsilon)v; X_{\varepsilon,\tau_\varepsilon^1} \in x_1 + \varepsilon K_{\mathcal{K}'}(\varepsilon)v_1\}}], \\ I_{12} &= \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{P}(A_{2,\varepsilon} | X_{\varepsilon,\tau_\varepsilon^1}) \mathbf{1}_{\{X_{\varepsilon,0} \notin x_0 + \varepsilon K_{\mathcal{K}}(\varepsilon)v; X_{\varepsilon,\tau_\varepsilon^1} \in x_1 + \varepsilon K_{\mathcal{K}'}(\varepsilon)v_1\}}]. \end{aligned}$$

Let us prove that the leading term I_{11} satisfies

$$(4.16) \quad I_{11} = \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\rho}-1} (h + o(1)),$$

where

$$(4.17) \quad h = \mathbf{E}[g_c(\xi_0)] \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi_s(-z) \nu(dz).$$

Since g_c (given in (2.2)) and ψ_s (given in (2.3)) are positive everywhere, and since $\nu \in \mathcal{M}$, we have $h \in (0, \infty)$.

Let us introduce additional notation. Extending the definition of \mathbf{Q}^x as the distribution associated with the initial condition given by (4.5), we will denote by \mathbf{Q}_i^x , $i = 1, 2$, the distribution of the diffusion with initial condition

$$X_{\varepsilon,0} = x_{i-1} + \varepsilon x v_{i-1}.$$

For brevity, we write $\nu_x(dz) = g_c(x)\nu(dz)$, where the measure $\nu \in \mathcal{M}$ and constant $c > 0$ are introduced in Lemma 4.6 applied to the diffusion near the saddle point O_1 , and

$$\nu_{x,\varepsilon}(dz) = \varepsilon^{-\left(\frac{1}{\rho}-1\right)} \mathbf{Q}_1^x \{X_{\varepsilon,\tau_\varepsilon^1} \in x_1 + \varepsilon(dz) v_1\}.$$

Using this notation, we can rewrite

$$(4.18) \quad II_1 = \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\rho}-1} \mathbf{E} \mathbf{1}_{\xi_{0,\varepsilon} \in K_{\mathcal{K}}(\varepsilon)} \int_{K_{\mathcal{K}'}(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{Q}_2^z(A_{2,\varepsilon}) \nu_{\xi_{0,\varepsilon},\varepsilon}(dz).$$

Let us show that the following is $o(1)$ uniformly over $x \in K_{\mathcal{K}}(\varepsilon)$:

$$(4.19) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{K_{\mathcal{K}'}(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{Q}_2^z(A_{2,\varepsilon}) \nu_{x,\varepsilon}(dz) - \int_{K_{\mathcal{K}'}(\varepsilon)} \psi_s(-z) \nu_x(dz) \right| \\ & \leq \left| \int_{K_{\mathcal{K}'}(\varepsilon)} \psi_s(-z) (\nu_{x,\varepsilon}(dz) - \nu_x(dz)) \right| + \left| \int_{K_{\mathcal{K}'}(\varepsilon)} (\mathbf{Q}_2^z(A_{2,\varepsilon}) - \psi_s(-z)) \nu_{x,\varepsilon}(dz) \right| \\ & = II_1 + II_2. \end{aligned}$$

To estimate II_1 , we first note that $z \mapsto \psi_s(-z)$ is decreasing and takes values in $[0, 1]$. Hence, setting $n_\varepsilon = \lfloor \varepsilon^{-\delta/2} \rfloor + 1$ with δ given in Lemma 4.6 (1), we can find, for $1 \leq i \leq n_\varepsilon$, closed intervals $E_i \subset K_{\mathcal{K}'}(\varepsilon)$ with disjoint interiors whose union is $K_{\mathcal{K}'}(\varepsilon)$ such that $\psi_s(-z) \in [\frac{i-1}{n_\varepsilon}, \frac{i}{n_\varepsilon}]$ for $z \in E_i$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{E_i} \psi_s(-z) (\nu_{x,\varepsilon}(dz) - \nu_x(dz)) \right| \\ & \leq \max \left\{ \left| \frac{i}{n_\varepsilon} \nu_{x,\varepsilon}(E_i) - \frac{i-1}{n_\varepsilon} \nu_x(E_i) \right|, \left| \frac{i}{n_\varepsilon} \nu_x(E_i) - \frac{i-1}{n_\varepsilon} \nu_{x,\varepsilon}(E_i) \right| \right\} \\ & \leq \max \left\{ \left| \frac{i}{n_\varepsilon} \nu_{x,\varepsilon}(E_i) - \frac{i}{n_\varepsilon} \nu_x(E_i) \right|, \left| \frac{i-1}{n_\varepsilon} \nu_x(E_i) - \frac{i-1}{n_\varepsilon} \nu_{x,\varepsilon}(E_i) \right| \right\} + \frac{1}{n_\varepsilon} \nu_x(E_i) \\ & \leq |\nu_{x,\varepsilon}(E_i) - \nu_x(E_i)| + \frac{1}{n_\varepsilon} \nu_x(E_i). \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$II_1 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n_\varepsilon} |\nu_{x,\varepsilon}(E_i) - \nu_x(E_i)| + \frac{1}{n_\varepsilon} \nu_x(K_{\mathcal{K}'}(\varepsilon)).$$

Now, using Lemma 4.6 (1), the boundedness of g_c , and the fact that $\nu \in \mathcal{M}$, we conclude that $II_1 = o(1)$ uniformly in $x \in K_{\mathcal{K}}(x)$. To estimate II_2 , we note that Lemma 4.4 and Lemma 4.6 (1) imply that, for some $\delta, \delta' > 0$,

$$II_2 \leq o(\varepsilon^\delta) \nu_{x,\varepsilon}(K_{\mathcal{K}'}(\varepsilon)) \leq o(\varepsilon^\delta) \left(\nu_x(K_{\mathcal{K}'}(\varepsilon)) + o(\varepsilon^{\delta'}) \right) = o(1),$$

where the last equality is due to $\nu_x = g_c(x)\nu$, the boundedness of g_c and the fact that $\nu \in \mathcal{M}$. Hence, the last term in (4.19) is $o(1)$. Using this, (4.18), and our definition of ν_x , we obtain

$$I_{11} = \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p}-1}(h_\varepsilon + o(1)),$$

where

$$h_\varepsilon = \mathbb{E} \left[g_c(\xi_{0,\varepsilon}) \mathbf{1}_{\xi_{0,\varepsilon} \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)} \right] \int_{K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)} \psi_s(-z) \nu(dz).$$

Using the tameness of $\xi_{0,\varepsilon}$ and the boundedness of g_c , we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[g_c(\xi_{0,\varepsilon}) \mathbf{1}_{\xi_{0,\varepsilon} \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)} \right] = \mathbb{E}[g_c(\xi_{0,\varepsilon})] + o_\varepsilon(1)$$

for sufficiently large \varkappa . Using the convergence of $\xi_{0,\varepsilon}$ in distribution to ξ_0 (see **(G)**), we have $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}[g_c(\xi_{0,\varepsilon})] = \mathbb{E}[g_c(\xi_0)]$. Using the exponential decay of $\psi_s(-z)$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$ (see the definition of ψ_s in (2.3)), and the polynomial growth of ν given in (4.9), we can see that the integral in the definition of h_ε converges to the integral in the definition of h as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Hence, we have $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} h_\varepsilon = h$, and thus (4.16) follows.

The proof of (4.1) will be complete if we show that I_{12} and I_2 are $o_\varepsilon(1)$. Since $|\xi_{0,\varepsilon}|$ is of order at most 1, we obtain $I_{12} = o_\varepsilon(1)$ for sufficiently large \varkappa . To estimate I_2 , we write

$$I_2 \leq I_{21} + I_{22},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_{21} &= \mathbb{P} \left(A_{2,\varepsilon} \cap \{X_{\varepsilon,\tau_\varepsilon^1} \in x_1 + \varepsilon(-\infty, -l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa}]v_1\} \right), \\ I_{22} &= \mathbb{P} \left(A_{2,\varepsilon} \cap \{X_{\varepsilon,\tau_\varepsilon^1} \in x_1 + \varepsilon(l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa}, \infty)v_1\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

For sufficiently large \varkappa , $I_{21} = o_\varepsilon(1)$ due to Lemma 4.6(3), and $I_{22} = o_\varepsilon(1)$ due to Lemma 4.3, so (4.1) follows, with h given in (4.17).

Now, we turn to (4.2). For $\delta > 0$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left\{ |\tau_\varepsilon^2 - (\mu_1^{-1} + \lambda_2^{-1})l_\varepsilon| > 2\delta l_\varepsilon, A_{2,\varepsilon} \right\} \\ (4.20) \quad & \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ |\tau_\varepsilon^1 - \mu_1^{-1}l_\varepsilon| > \delta l_\varepsilon, A_{2,\varepsilon} \right\} + \mathbb{P} \left\{ |\tau_\varepsilon^2 - \tau_\varepsilon^1 - \lambda_2^{-1}l_\varepsilon| > \delta l_\varepsilon, A_{2,\varepsilon} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

To bound the first term in (4.20), we use the assumption that $\xi_{0,\varepsilon}$ is tame, and apply Lemma 4.3 to the diffusion near O_2 and Lemma 4.6 (3) to the diffusion near the saddle point O_1 to see that for all sufficiently large $\varkappa > 0$,

$$(4.21) \quad X_{\varepsilon,\tau_1} \in x_1 + \varepsilon[-l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa}, l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa}]v_1$$

on $A_{2,\varepsilon}$ except for an exceptional set of low probability. Then, due to (4.11) and the tameness of $\xi_{0,\varepsilon}$, the first term in (4.20) is $o(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p_1}-1})$. Due to (4.21), the second term can be bounded from above by

$$o_\varepsilon(1) + \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P} \left(|\tau_\varepsilon^2 - \tau_\varepsilon^1 - \lambda_2^{-1}l_\varepsilon| > \delta l_\varepsilon, A_{2,\varepsilon} \middle| X_{\varepsilon,\tau_1} \right) \mathbf{1}_{X_{\varepsilon,\tau_1} \in q_+ + \varepsilon[-l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa}, l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa}]v_1} \right].$$

Now combining Lemma 4.7 and Lemma 4.6 (1), we can see that the second term in (4.20) is $o(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p_1}-1})$. Hence, (4.2) follows from these and (4.1). \square

5. HETEROCLINIC CHAINS OF ARBITRARY LENGTH

5.1. Introduction. The goal of this section is to give a rigorous statement of our main result described briefly in Section 1.2, give some intuition behind it, and a combination of heuristic and rigorous arguments. Sections 7–11 contain the proofs adding rigor to the heuristic arguments.

Our main result concerns the decay rates (as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$) for probabilities to follow arbitrarily long heteroclinic chains of the kind shown in Figure 7, where curves $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{n-1}$ belong to the boundary of one cell (of arbitrary orientation, clockwise or counterclockwise, see Figure 1), and γ_n does not belong to that boundary, “making a wrong turn”. We call such a heteroclinic chain a cell escape chain.

The setting for this section is described by conditions **(A)**, **(E)**, **(F)**, **(G)**, **(I)**, and the requirement that $(\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n)$ is a cell escape chain. We recall (2.36), the definition of the event $A_{n,\varepsilon}$ describing sequential exits from domains D_1, D_2, \dots, D_n . In the case of a cell escape chain, it is natural to say that on $A_{n,\varepsilon}$ the diffusion escapes from the cell along the sequence $(\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n)$. However, it is important to distinguish between the escape and the first exit. In principle, it is possible for the diffusion to cross γ_k for some $k < n$ (thus exiting the cell) and still follow the remaining heteroclinic connections of the chain closely.

Similarly to the case of short heteroclinic chains considered in the previous section, we will describe conditions under which, in the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the probability of $A_{n,\varepsilon}$ either converges to a positive number, or decays to 0, either as a power of ε or faster than any power of ε , see Theorem 5.1.




FIGURE 7. A cell escape heteroclinic chain is almost entirely, except the last heteroclinic connection, a part of the boundary of one cell.

Let us discuss the ideas behind our approach first. To study the decay of $P(A_{n,\varepsilon})$ we need to supplement results of Sections 2, 4 with more precise analysis of how the distance from the diffusing particle to the heteroclinic chain changes upon passing near a saddle point. More precisely, we need to quantify how probable or improbable transitions between various orders of magnitude are.

We already know that some transitions are typical, some are unlikely, and probabilities of some transitions decay as a power of ε .

In addition to this, we will also prove (see Lemma 5.2) that if $\alpha \leq 1$, $\alpha\rho \leq 1$ (so that $\alpha' = \alpha\rho$), and the distance from the starting point of diffusion to the

heteroclinic chain is of order above ε^α , then the exit from the neighborhood of the saddle happens w.h.p. on the same side of the chain, at distance of order above $\varepsilon^{\alpha\rho}$. Iterating this statement, we can work with a sequence of exponents $(\bar{\alpha}_i)_{i \geq \kappa}$ for some $\kappa \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$, such that if the distance from the exit point from a neighborhood of a saddle point O_i , to the heteroclinic connection is above order $\varepsilon^{\bar{\alpha}_i}$, then w.h.p. the same holds for exit locations for all saddle points $O_{i'}$ with $i' > i$ (see Lemma 5.3). Requiring that $\bar{\alpha}_{n-1} = 1$ (this fixes a concrete sequence $(\bar{\alpha}_i)$) and using the fact that if the diffusion enters the neighborhood of O_n at distance of order above ε^1 , then w.h.p. it exits on the same side of the heteroclinic chain (see Lemma 4.3) and thus the cell escape does not happen, we can conclude that conditioned on one of those events of exiting too far from the network, the escape event happens with low probability. This allows to conclude that by restricting the diffusion to exit all saddles O_i through a window of size of order $\varepsilon^{\bar{\alpha}_i}$, we only make a tiny (“low probability”) error when computing $P(A_{n,\varepsilon})$ (see Lemma 5.7).

We will see that once the diffusion exits are restricted to those windows, all transitions after the saddle point κ can be classified into two types: transitions from scale ε^α to scale $\varepsilon^{\alpha\rho}$ for $\alpha < 1$ and $\alpha\rho \leq 1$; transitions from scale ε^1 to scale ε^β with $\beta \in (\rho, 1]$. A transition of the former type is typical, i.e., it gets realized with probability converging to 1. The probability of a transition of the latter type decays as a power of ε . Thus it is plausible that the probability to realize all of those transitions behaves as the product of these powers of ε , i.e., it is a power of ε itself. However, in order to make this argument rigorous and prove that the escape probability equals $h\varepsilon^\theta(1 + o(1))$ for some constant $h > 0$ (see (5.5)) we have to study scaling limits of transition kernels between those windows and obtain results in a form that allows for iterative analysis of convolutions of those kernels (see Lemmas 5.8, 5.10, 5.11), with limiting measures defined as certain nonlinear transformations of Gaussian distributions.

5.2. The new sequence of effective exponents and the main result. To state the main result (Theorem 5.1 below) we need to define a new sequence of exponents $(\bar{\alpha}_i)$ agreeing with the original sequence (α_i) up to a certain index κ and describing the scales $\varepsilon^{\bar{\alpha}_k}$ on which the distributions of $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^k}$ concentrate in order to realize the “wrong turn”, i.e., the event $A_{n,\varepsilon}$. The definition of the new sequence $(\bar{\alpha}_i)$ may seem unintuitive at the first sight but it follows the logic described in Section 5.1, and in Lemma 5.7 we will give an approximation to the escape or “wrong turn” event of interest $A_{n,\varepsilon}$ in terms of $(\bar{\alpha}_i)$. Namely, we will show that on $A_{n,\varepsilon}$ (up to an exceptional low probability event), for all $i \geq \kappa$, the diffusion exits the saddle O_i at distance of order at most $\varepsilon^{\bar{\alpha}_i}$ from its unstable manifold. Then the main task will be to analyze the convolutions of the transition kernels from scale $\varepsilon^{\bar{\alpha}_i}$ to scale $\varepsilon^{\bar{\alpha}_{i+1}}$ over all $i \geq \kappa$.

Let us recall that given $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1]$, the exponents $(\alpha_k)_{k=0}^n$ are computed iteratively using (2.38). Let

$$(5.1) \quad \kappa = \max\{k : 0 \leq k \leq n-1, \alpha_k = 1\}.$$

If $\alpha_i < 1$ for all $i = 0, \dots, n-1$, then κ is not defined.

If $0 \leq k < j \leq n - 1$, we define

$$\rho_{kj} = \prod_{i=k+1}^j \rho_i.$$

Agreeing that a product over an empty set equals 1, we also set $\rho_{kk} = 1$ for all k . We call $k \in \{\kappa + 1, \dots, n - 1\}$ and its associated saddle O_k *binding* if $\rho_{kj} < 1$ for all $j \in \{k + 1, \dots, n - 1\}$. For $k = n - 1$, the latter set is empty and the condition is trivially true, so $n - 1$ is always binding. Let us denote the set of all binding indices by H .

We will also need the sets

$$(5.2) \quad H' = H \cup \{\kappa\} \setminus \{n - 1\},$$

$$(5.3) \quad J = H' + 1 = \{k + 1 : k \in H'\}.$$

As we will see, in order to realize $A_{n,\varepsilon}$, up to a low probability event, the diffusion must stay ε^1 -close to the heteroclinic connection upon passing near each binding saddle, and near each saddle $i \in J$ it must spend abnormally long time getting from scale ε^1 to scale $\varepsilon^{\bar{\alpha}_i}$ with $\bar{\alpha}_i \in (\rho_i, 1]$. These are the saddles that Lemma 4.6 will be applied to. They may be called *the slowdown saddle points*.

For $i \in \{\kappa + 1, \dots, n - 1\}$, let $k(i) = \min\{k \in H : k \geq i\}$. We define the new exponents $\bar{\alpha}_i$ by

$$(5.4) \quad \bar{\alpha}_i = \begin{cases} \rho_{i,k(i)}^{-1}, & \kappa + 1 \leq i \leq n - 1, \\ \alpha_i, & i \leq \kappa. \end{cases}$$

It is not explicit in the definition but the sequence $(\bar{\alpha}_i)$ is uniquely defined by the sequence (α_i) . Lemma 5.1 contains this claim and other properties of (α_i) and H . Figure 8 gives an example of (α_i) and the associated $(\bar{\alpha}_i)$.

Having defined H and $(\bar{\alpha}_i)$, we are ready to state the main result of the paper.

Theorem 5.1. *Let us assume the setting defined by conditions **(A)**, **(E)**, **(F)**, **(G)**, and **(I)**. Let us also assume that the heteroclinic chain is a cell escape chain shown on Figure 7.*

*Let $\xi_{0,\varepsilon}$ be tame and, if $\alpha_0 < 1$, let $\mathbf{P}\{\xi_0 > 0\} > 0$ (we recall that $\xi_{0,\varepsilon}$ is used to define the initial condition in (2.33) of **(F)** and ξ_0 is the distributional limit of $\xi_{0,\varepsilon}$ from **(G)**).*

Then the following holds true:

- (1) *If $\kappa = n - 1$, i.e., $\alpha_{n-1} = 1$, then there is $p_n > 0$ such that $\mathbf{P}(A_{n,\varepsilon}) \rightarrow p_n$.*
- (2) *If $\kappa < n - 1$, then there is a constant $h > 0$ such that*

$$(5.5) \quad \mathbf{P}(A_{n,\varepsilon}) = h\varepsilon^\theta(1 + o(1)), \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

where

$$(5.6) \quad \theta = \sum_{i \in J} \left(\frac{\bar{\alpha}_i}{\rho_i} - 1 \right) > 0.$$

In this case, conditioned on $A_{n,\varepsilon}$,

$$(5.7) \quad \frac{\tau_\varepsilon^n}{\bar{\chi} \log \varepsilon^{-1}} \xrightarrow{P} 1, \quad \varepsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

where

$$(5.8) \quad \bar{\chi} = \sum_{i \notin J} \frac{\bar{\alpha}_{i-1}}{\lambda_i} + \sum_{i \in J} \frac{\bar{\alpha}_i}{\mu_i}.$$

(3) If $\alpha_i < 1$ for all $i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$ (i.e., κ is not defined) and $\xi_{0,\varepsilon}$ is of order 1, then $A_{n,\varepsilon}$ happens with low probability.




FIGURE 8. The lower graph is an example of the sequence $(\alpha_i)_{i=1}^{n-1}$. The upper one is the corresponding $(\bar{\alpha}_i)_{i=1}^{n-1}$. The two sequences coincide up to κ . The tickmarks on the horizontal axis show the binding points (elements of H) and κ . The bold dots show the record values of the sequence (α_i) inspected from $n-1$ down to $\kappa+1$. The vertical lines pass through binding points and the associated record values. Note that the values of $\bar{\alpha}_i$ corresponding to those records are equal to 1. Various properties of the set H and the sequence $(\bar{\alpha}_i)_{i=1}^{n-1}$ are discussed in Lemma 5.1.

Remark 5.1. Let us compare this with Theorem 4.1 on two saddles, where $n = 2$. If $\alpha_1 = 1$, then $\kappa = 1 = n-1$, and we obtain the equivalence between part 1 of Theorem 5.1 and part 1 of Theorem 4.1. If both $\alpha_0 < 1$ and $\alpha_1 < 1$, then κ is not defined, and part 3 of Theorem 5.1 coincides with part 3 of Theorem 4.1. Finally, if $\alpha_0 = 1$ and $\alpha_1 < 1$, then $\kappa = 0 < n-1$, $H = \{1\}$, $J = \{1\}$, $\bar{\alpha}_1 = 1$, $\theta = 1/\rho_1 - 1$, so Theorem 5.1 (2) coincides with Theorem 4.1 (2).

Remark 5.2. Theorem 5.1 (1) is a specific case of Theorem 2.3. Part 3 follows by induction from Lemma 4.5.

Remark 5.3. The requirement that $\mathbb{P}\{\xi_0 = 0\} = 0$ in condition **(G)** for the case where $\alpha_0 < 1$ allows to avoid the situation where the distribution of the initial condition for the diffusion has a macroscopic component concentrated at scales smaller than ε^{α_0} . However, one can modify our proof and show that even in that situation, in the case $\kappa < n-1$, under natural additional assumptions, (5.5) holds with the same θ given by (5.6). A step in that direction is Lemma 5.13.

5.3. Proof of (5.5) of Theorem 5.1 (2). Here, we give a proof of Theorem 5.1 (2) that is partially rigorous and partially heuristic. The heuristic arguments will be replaced by rigorous ones in Sections 7–11. Also, the proof of Lemma 5.9 is postponed to Section 8.

The main point in the proof is to show that the event $A_{n,\varepsilon}$ is realized, up to small probability events, by transitions described by local limit theorems of Lemma 4.6 that involve spending abnormal time near *slowdown* saddle points and typical transitions (described by Theorem 2.1) near all other saddle points.

5.3.1. *Properties of the new exponent sequence.* First, we collect various properties of the set H of binding points and the exponents $(\bar{\alpha}_i)$ in Lemma 5.1 below, illustrated by Figure 8 Parts 2, 3, and 4 of the lemma can be viewed as alternative definitions of H describing it as the set of record points of the sequence $(\rho_{i,n-1})_{i=n-1,n-2,\dots,\kappa+1}$. Parts 6 and 7 can be viewed as alternative definitions of $(\bar{\alpha}_i)_{i=0,\dots,n-1}$. Part 10 will allow us to apply Lemma 4.6 to the diffusion near slowdown saddle points.

Lemma 5.1. *Let us assume that κ is well-defined.*

- (1) For all $i \in \{\kappa + 1, \dots, n - 1\}$, $\alpha_i = \alpha_{i-1}\rho_i < 1$.
(2) For $i \in \{\kappa + 1, \dots, n - 1\}$, $i \in H$ iff
- $$(5.9) \quad \rho_{i,n-1} < \rho_{j,n-1}, \quad j \in \{i + 1, \dots, n - 1\}.$$
- (3) The set H can be constructed via the following algorithm:
- initialize $H := \{n - 1\}$, $j := n - 1$;
 - repeat the following cycle until the stop condition is met:
 - $A := \{i \in \{\kappa + 1, \dots, j - 1\} : \rho_{i,n-1} < \rho_{j,n-1}\}$;
 - if $A = \emptyset$, then stop;
 - else redefine $j := \max A$ and $H := H \cup \{j\}$.
- (4) For $i \in \{\kappa + 1, \dots, n - 2\}$, $i \in H$ iff
- $$(5.10) \quad \rho_{i,k(i+1)} < 1.$$
- (5) For $i \in \{\kappa + 1, \dots, n - 2\}$, $\bar{\alpha}_{i+1}/\rho_{i+1} > 1$ iff $i \in H$.
(6) For $i > \kappa$, one can define $\bar{\alpha}_i$ recursively via $\bar{\alpha}_{n-1} = 1$ and then for $i = n - 2, n - 3, \dots, \kappa + 1$ setting
- $$(5.11) \quad \bar{\alpha}_i = \begin{cases} 1, & i \in H, \\ \bar{\alpha}_{i+1}/\rho_{i+1}, & i \notin H. \end{cases}$$
- (7) One can define $\bar{\alpha}_i$ for $i > \kappa$ recursively via $\bar{\alpha}_{n-1} = 1$ and then for $i = n - 2, n - 3, \dots, \kappa + 1$ setting
- $$\bar{\alpha}_i = (\bar{\alpha}_{i+1}/\rho_{i+1}) \wedge 1.$$
- In particular, for all i , we have $\bar{\alpha}_i \leq 1$.
- (8) For all $i \in \{\kappa, \dots, n - 2\}$, $\bar{\alpha}_i\rho_{i+1} \leq 1$.
(9) For all $i \in \{\kappa + 1, \dots, n - 1\}$, $\bar{\alpha}_i = \alpha_i/\alpha_{\kappa(i)} > \alpha_i$.
(10) If $i \in H'$, then $\bar{\alpha}_{i+1} \in (\rho_{i+1}, 1]$.
(11) The sequence (α_i) defines the set H and the sequence $(\bar{\alpha}_i)$ uniquely.

PROOF: Part 1 follows from the definition of κ and (2.38). Part 2 holds since $\rho_{ij} = \rho_{i,n-1}/\rho_{j,n-1}$, so (5.9) is equivalent to $\rho_{ij} < 1$. This part describes H as the set of record points of the the sequence $(\rho_{i,n-1})$ explored from $n - 1$ down to $\kappa + 1$.

This is made precise in the obvious algorithm described in part 3. It discovers the record points one by one. Let us just comment that at any point of execution of this algorithm, j is the latest found record point of $(\rho_{i,n-1})_{i=n-1,n-2,\dots,\kappa+1}$ and H

is the set of all already discovered record points. The algorithm stops when no new record points can be found.

Part 4 follows, since (5.10) means that i is the next record point discovered by the algorithm after discovering $k(i+1)$.

Part 5 follows from part 4 since

$$\bar{\alpha}_{i+1}/\rho_{i+1} = \rho_{i+1, k(i+1)}^{-1}/\rho_{i+1} = \rho_{i, k(i+1)}^{-1}.$$

Part 6 directly follows from (5.4) and the last display. Indeed, if $i \in H$, then $k(i) = i$ and thus $\bar{\alpha}_i = 1$ due to (5.4). If $i \notin H$, then $k(i) > i$ and $k(i) = k(i+1)$. Hence, $\bar{\alpha}_i = \rho_{i, k(i+1)}^{-1} = \bar{\alpha}_{i+1}/\rho_{i+1}$ due to (5.4).

Part 7 follows from parts 6, 5 and the definition (5.4)

For $i > \kappa$, part 8 follows directly from part 7. To prove it for $i = \kappa < n-1$, it suffices to notice that $\alpha_\kappa = \bar{\alpha}_\kappa = 1$ and $1 > \alpha_{\kappa+1} = \alpha_\kappa \rho_{\kappa+1} = \rho_{\kappa+1}$.

To prove the identity in part 9, we note that it is trivially true for $i \in H$ and then parts 1 and 6 allow to extend it by induction to the remaining values of i . The inequality then also follows since due to part 1, $\alpha_{k(i)} < 1$.

According to part 7, $\bar{\alpha}_i \leq 1$ for all i . This and part 5 imply part 10 holds for $i \in H \setminus \{n-1\}$. For $i = \kappa$, since $\alpha_\kappa = \bar{\alpha}_\kappa = 1$ and $\rho_{\kappa+1} < 1$, part 9 implies $\bar{\alpha}_{\kappa+1} > \alpha_{\kappa+1} = \rho_{\kappa+1}$, completing the proof of part 10.

Let us prove part 11. Since the condition $\rho_{kj} < 1$ for all $j > k$ is equivalent to $\alpha_j < \alpha_k$ for all $j > k$, we conclude that H is uniquely defined by (α_i) . Therefore, the values $(k(i))_{i > \kappa}$ are also uniquely defined by (α_i) . Now our claim follows from the identity in part 9. \square

5.3.2. Preliminaries for analysis of transitions. To make our proof of Theorem 5.1 work, we actually need a better understanding of the typical case discussed in Theorem 2.1. In particular, we need to control the tails of the distributions involved and to deal with measures from \mathcal{M} instead of probability distributions.

Lemma 5.2. *Let us assume (A), (B), (C), (H), and suppose $\alpha \leq 1$ and $\alpha\rho \leq 1$. Suppose that in (2.29), ξ_ε is of order above 1. On $A_{+, \varepsilon}$, we define ξ'_ε by (2.31). Then ξ'_ε is of order above 1. Moreover, this is true uniformly in initial conditions. More precisely, for every $\varkappa' > 0$ and sufficiently large $\varkappa > 0$,*

$$\sup_{x \in (l_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon^{-\alpha}}^{\varkappa}, \varepsilon^{-\alpha}] } \mathbb{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha x v} \left\{ \xi'_\varepsilon \leq l_{\varepsilon}^{\varkappa'}, A_{+, \varepsilon} \right\} = o_\varepsilon(1).$$

HEURISTICS FOR THE MODEL CASE: Recalling (2.23), we obtain

$$(5.12) \quad X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon}^2 = \varepsilon^{\alpha\rho} \frac{L}{R^\rho} |\xi_\varepsilon + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} U_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon}^1|^\rho + \varepsilon U_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon}^2.$$

Using Lemma 4.1, we obtain that the first term is of order above $\varepsilon^{\alpha\rho}$. Using this lemma once again, we obtain that the entire expression is of order above $\varepsilon^{\alpha\rho}$, so ξ'_ε is of order above 1. \square

On $A_{k, \varepsilon}$ defined in (2.36), $k \in 1, \dots, n-1$, we can define η_k via

$$X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^k} = x_k + \eta_{k, \varepsilon} v_k, \quad \varepsilon > 0.$$

Using the definition of τ_ε^k in (2.34), we have $\eta_{k, \varepsilon} \in [-1, 1]$. The difference with (2.35) is that there is no scaling factor in front of $\eta_{k, \varepsilon}$.

Lemma 5.3. *Let (A), (E), (F), (G), (I) hold. Let us assume that $i \geq \kappa$. If $\eta_{i,\varepsilon}$ is of order above $\varepsilon^{\bar{\alpha}_i}$, then $\eta_{n-1,\varepsilon}$ is of order above ε^1 . Moreover, this is true uniformly in initial conditions. More precisely, for every $\varkappa_{n-1} > 0$ and sufficiently large $\varkappa_i > 0$, it holds for every $\tilde{\varkappa}_0$ that*

$$\sup_{x \in K_{\tilde{\varkappa}_0}(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha x v} \{ \eta_{i,\varepsilon} > \varepsilon^{\bar{\alpha}_i} l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa_i}, \eta_{n-1,\varepsilon} \leq \varepsilon l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa_{n-1}}, A_{n-1,\varepsilon} \} = o_\varepsilon(1).$$

We will also introduce \varkappa_0 later. It will be useful to distinguish between $\tilde{\varkappa}_0$ and \varkappa_0 in case $\kappa = 0$.

PROOF: First we use part 6 of Lemma 5.1 in order to apply Lemma 5.2 iteratively to saddles $k(i), k(i) - 1, \dots, i + 2, i + 1$ concluding that, for every $\varkappa_{k(i)}$ and sufficiently large \varkappa_i , we have $\eta_{k(i),\varepsilon} > \varepsilon^1 l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa_{k(i)}}$ w.h.p. on the event $\{ \eta_{i,\varepsilon} > \varepsilon^{\bar{\alpha}_i} l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa_i}, A_{n-1,\varepsilon} \}$. Then, applying Lemma 5.2 iteratively to saddles $n - 1, n - 2, \dots, k(i) + 2, k(i) + 1$ and adjusting \varkappa_k 's iteratively if necessary, we derive $\eta_{n-1,\varepsilon} > \varepsilon^{\rho_{k(i),n-1}} l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa_n}$ w.h.p. on the same event for every $\varkappa_n > 0$ and sufficiently large \varkappa_i . The proof is completed by taking into account that $k(i) \in H$ so that $\rho_{k(i),n-1} < 1$. \square

5.3.3. *Restricting the cell escape event to scales defined by exponents $(\bar{\alpha}_i)$.* Our next local goal is Lemma 5.7 allowing to restrict further analysis to scales defined by exponents $(\bar{\alpha}_i)$.

Lemma 5.4. *Under conditions (A), (E), (I), we have that, for all $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ and every $\varkappa_0 > 0$, there is $\varkappa_k > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{x \in K_{\varkappa_0}(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^{\alpha_0} x v_0} \{ X_\varepsilon(\tau_\varepsilon^k) \notin x_k + \varepsilon^{\alpha_k} K_{\varkappa_k}(\varepsilon) v_k, A_{k,\varepsilon} \} = o_\varepsilon(1).$$

PROOF: This follows from an iterative application of Lemma 4.2. \square

Lemma 5.5. *Under assumptions (A), (B), and (H), for every $\varkappa > 0$, for every $\beta \in [0, 1]$, and for every $\varkappa' > \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{1}_{\beta=1}$, we have*

$$\sup_{x \in K_\varkappa(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha x v} \{ X_\varepsilon(\tau_\varepsilon) \in q_+ + \varepsilon^\beta (-\infty, -l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'}) v_+, A_{+,\varepsilon} \} = o_\varepsilon(1).$$

HEURISTICS FOR THE MODEL CASE: Using the notation (2.35), the formula for one-step transition (5.12) in the model case, and (2.18), we can approximate the probability above by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^{\alpha_0} x v_0} \left\{ \varepsilon^{\alpha_0 \rho_1} L R^{-\rho_1} |x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha_0} \mathcal{U}|^{\rho_1} + \varepsilon \mathcal{N} < -\varepsilon^\beta l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'} \right\} \\ \leq \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^{\alpha_0} x v_0} \left\{ |\mathcal{N}| \geq \varepsilon^{\beta-1} l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'} \right\} = o_\varepsilon(1) \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa_0}(\varepsilon)$. \square

Lemma 5.6. *Under conditions (A), (E), (I) for every $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$, every $\varkappa_0 > 0$, every $\beta \in [0, 1]$, and every $\varkappa > \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{1}_{\beta=1}$, we have*

$$\sup_{x \in K_{\varkappa_0}(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^{\alpha_0} x v_0} \{ X_\varepsilon(\tau_\varepsilon^k) \in x_k + \varepsilon^\beta (-\infty, -l_\varepsilon^\varkappa) v_k, A_{k,\varepsilon} \} = o_\varepsilon(1).$$

PROOF: The claim follows from Lemma 5.5 and an iterative application of Lemma 5.4. \square

Combining Lemmas 4.3, 5.3 and 5.6, we obtain the following claim:

Lemma 5.7. *Let us denote, for $k \geq \kappa$, and $\varkappa, \varepsilon > 0$,*

$$(5.13) \quad \bar{A}_{k,\varkappa,\varepsilon} = A_{k,\varepsilon} \cap \{X_{\varepsilon,\tau_\varepsilon^k} \in x_k + \varepsilon^{\bar{\alpha}k} K_\varkappa(\varepsilon)v_k\}.$$

There is sequence of positive constants $(\varkappa'_k)_{k \in \{\kappa\} \cup H \cup J}$ such that, for every sequence $(\varkappa_k)_{k \in \{\kappa\} \cup H \cup J}$ satisfying $\varkappa_k \geq \varkappa'_k$ for every k , it holds for every $\tilde{\varkappa}_0 > 0$ that, uniformly in $x \in K_{\tilde{\varkappa}_0}(\varepsilon)$,

$$(5.14) \quad \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^{\alpha_0} x v}(A_{n,\varepsilon}) = \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^{\alpha_0} x v} \left(A_{n,\varepsilon} \cap \bigcap_{k \in \{\kappa\} \cup H \cup J} \bar{A}_{k,\varkappa_k,\varepsilon} \right) + o_\varepsilon(1).$$

PROOF: Lemma 4.3 implies that $\eta_{n-1,\varepsilon} \leq \varepsilon l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'_{n-1}}$ w.h.p. on $A_{n,\varepsilon}$ for some $\varkappa'_{n-1} > 0$. This and Lemma 5.3 yield that, on $A_{n,\varepsilon} \cap \{\eta_{n-1,\varepsilon} \leq \varepsilon l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'_{n-1}}\}$, we have $\eta_{i,\varepsilon} \leq \varepsilon^{\bar{\alpha}_i} l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'_i}$ w.h.p. for some $\varkappa'_i > 0$. We can make \varkappa'_i larger to ensure $\varkappa'_i > \frac{1}{2}$. Lemma 5.6 implies $\eta_{i,\varepsilon} \geq -\varepsilon l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'_i}$ w.h.p. These all hold uniformly in $x \in K_{\tilde{\varkappa}_0}$. Combining these estimates, we obtain (5.14) for (\varkappa'_k) . Since the main term on the right of (5.14) is also smaller than the left-hand side, we conclude that (5.14) holds for larger \varkappa_k . \square

Remark 5.4. The proof shows that the lemma would still hold if we changed the definition of $\bar{A}_{k,\varkappa,\varepsilon}$ to $\bar{A}_{k,\varkappa,\varepsilon} = A_{k,\varepsilon} \cap \{X_\varepsilon(\tau_\varepsilon^k) \in x_k + [-\varepsilon l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa}, \varepsilon^{\bar{\alpha}k} l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa}]v_k\}$. We use a symmetric set $K_\varkappa(\varepsilon)$ in (5.13) for brevity, which will eventually be useful in lengthy estimates involving iterated integration.

The significance of this lemma is that one can compute the probability on the r.h.s. approximately, using the strong Markov property and the fact that for $k > \kappa$,

$$\mathbf{P}(\bar{A}_{k,\varkappa,\varepsilon} | \bar{A}_{k-1,\varkappa,\varepsilon}) = \begin{cases} c_k + o(1), & k \notin J, \\ c_k \varepsilon^{\frac{\bar{\alpha}_k}{\rho_k} - 1} (1 + o(1)), & k \in J, \end{cases}$$

for constants $c_k > 0$. This leads to polynomial decay rates.

To make this plan rigorous, we need a detailed study of appropriately rescaled kernels describing sequential transitions that the process undergoes between times τ_ε^{k-1} and τ_ε^k for all k , and convolutions of those kernels. This is the material of the next three subsections.

5.3.4. A basic estimate on transition kernel convolutions.

Lemma 5.8. *Let $\nu_\varepsilon, \bar{\nu}_\varepsilon, \mu_\varepsilon, \bar{\mu}_\varepsilon$ be transition kernels indexed by $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and let $\varkappa, \varkappa', \varkappa'' > 0$. Suppose*

(h1) *there is $\delta > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{\substack{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon), \\ [a,b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)}} |\nu_\varepsilon(x, [a, b]) - \bar{\nu}_\varepsilon(x, [a, b])| = o(\varepsilon^\delta);$$

(h2) there is $\delta' > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{\substack{y \in K_{\mathcal{X}'}(\varepsilon), \\ [a, b] \subset K_{\mathcal{X}''}(\varepsilon)}} |\mu_\varepsilon(y, [a, b]) - \bar{\mu}_\varepsilon(y, [a, b])| = o(\varepsilon^{\delta'});$$

(h3) there is $p \geq 0$ such that

$$\sup_{x \in K_{\mathcal{X}}(\varepsilon)} \bar{\nu}_\varepsilon(x, K_{\mathcal{X}'}(\varepsilon)) \leq l_\varepsilon^p;$$

(h4) there is $p' \geq 0$ such that for all sufficiently small ε and every $[a, b] \subset K_{\mathcal{X}''}(\varepsilon)$, there are two monotone real-valued functions $\phi_{+, \varepsilon}, \phi_{-, \varepsilon}$ bounded by $l_\varepsilon^{p'}$ in absolute value and such that

$$\bar{\mu}_\varepsilon(\cdot, [a, b]) = \phi_{+, \varepsilon}(\cdot) + \phi_{-, \varepsilon}(\cdot).$$

Then, there is $\delta'' > 0$ such that

(5.15)

$$\sup_{\substack{x \in K_{\mathcal{X}}(\varepsilon), \\ [a, b] \subset K_{\mathcal{X}''}(\varepsilon)}} \left| \int_{K_{\mathcal{X}'}(\varepsilon)} \nu_\varepsilon(x, dy) \mu_\varepsilon(y, [a, b]) - \int_{K_{\mathcal{X}'}(\varepsilon)} \bar{\nu}_\varepsilon(x, dy) \bar{\mu}_\varepsilon(y, [a, b]) \right| = o(\varepsilon^{\delta''}).$$

Remark 5.5. Condition (h4) is very close to a total variation bound but it is convenient for us to work with the decomposition into monotone functions directly.

PROOF: For $[a, b] \subset K_{\mathcal{X}''}(\varepsilon)$, we write

$$\phi_\varepsilon(y) = \mu_\varepsilon(y, [a, b]), \quad \bar{\phi}_\varepsilon(y) = \bar{\mu}_\varepsilon(y, [a, b]).$$

We want to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{K_{\mathcal{X}'}(\varepsilon)} \phi_\varepsilon(y) \nu_\varepsilon(x, dy) - \int_{K_{\mathcal{X}'}(\varepsilon)} \bar{\phi}_\varepsilon(y) \bar{\nu}_\varepsilon(x, dy) \right| \\ & \leq \left| \int_{K_{\mathcal{X}'}(\varepsilon)} (\phi_\varepsilon(y) - \bar{\phi}_\varepsilon(y)) \nu_\varepsilon(x, dy) \right| + \left| \int_{K_{\mathcal{X}'}(\varepsilon)} \bar{\phi}_\varepsilon(y) (\nu_\varepsilon(x, dy) - \bar{\nu}_\varepsilon(x, dy)) \right| \\ & = \text{I} + \text{II} \end{aligned}$$

uniformly over $x \in K_{\mathcal{X}}(\varepsilon)$ and $[a, b] \in K_{\mathcal{X}''}(\varepsilon)$. Using (h1) and (h3), we have

$$\sup_{x \in K_{\mathcal{X}}(\varepsilon)} \nu_\varepsilon(x, K_{\mathcal{X}'}(\varepsilon)) \leq 2l_\varepsilon^p$$

for sufficiently small ε . This and (h2) yield that, for some $\delta_1 > 0$, $\text{I} = o(\varepsilon^{\delta_1})$ uniformly in x and $[a, b]$.

It remains to estimate II . We use (h4) to decompose $\bar{\phi}_\varepsilon$ into a sum of two monotone functions $\phi_{\pm, \varepsilon}$ with values bounded in absolute value by $l_\varepsilon^{p'}$. For δ from condition (h1), setting

$$(5.16) \quad n_\varepsilon = \lfloor \varepsilon^{-\delta/2} \rfloor + 1,$$

we can decompose $K_{\mathcal{X}'}(\varepsilon)$ into a union of closed intervals

$$E_{\varepsilon, i}^\pm, \quad i = -n_\varepsilon + 1, -n_\varepsilon + 2, \dots, n_\varepsilon,$$

with disjoint interiors such that $\phi_{\pm,\varepsilon} \in [\frac{i-1}{n_\varepsilon}l_\varepsilon^{p'}, \frac{i}{n_\varepsilon}l_\varepsilon^{p'}]$ on $E_{\varepsilon,i}^\pm$. Then, using the monotonicity of $\phi_{\pm,\varepsilon}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{E_{\varepsilon,i}^\pm} \phi_{\pm,\varepsilon}(y) (\nu_\varepsilon(x, dy) - \bar{\nu}_\varepsilon(x, dy)) \right| \\ & \leq \max \left\{ \left| \frac{i}{n_\varepsilon} l_\varepsilon^{p'} \nu_\varepsilon(x, E_{\varepsilon,i}^\pm) - \frac{i-1}{n_\varepsilon} l_\varepsilon^{p'} \bar{\nu}_\varepsilon(x, E_{\varepsilon,i}^\pm) \right|, \left| \frac{i}{n_\varepsilon} l_\varepsilon^{p'} \bar{\nu}_\varepsilon(x, E_{\varepsilon,i}^\pm) - \frac{i-1}{n_\varepsilon} l_\varepsilon^{p'} \nu_\varepsilon(x, E_{\varepsilon,i}^\pm) \right| \right\} \\ & \leq l_\varepsilon^{p'} |\nu_\varepsilon(x, E_{\varepsilon,i}^\pm) - \bar{\nu}_\varepsilon(x, E_{\varepsilon,i}^\pm)| + \frac{1}{n_\varepsilon} l_\varepsilon^{p'} \bar{\nu}_\varepsilon(x, E_{\varepsilon,i}^\pm). \end{aligned}$$

Summing up these estimates over all i , we obtain

$$\text{II} \leq \left(\sum_{\bullet \in \{+, -\}} \sum_{i=-n_\varepsilon+1}^{n_\varepsilon} l_\varepsilon^{p'} |\nu_\varepsilon(x, E_{\varepsilon,i}^\bullet) - \bar{\nu}_\varepsilon(x, E_{\varepsilon,i}^\bullet)| \right) + 2 \frac{l_\varepsilon^{p'}}{n_\varepsilon} \bar{\nu}_\varepsilon(x, K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)).$$

Due to (h1), (h3) and the definition of n_ε in (5.16), this is bounded by

$$4(\varepsilon^{-\frac{\delta}{2}} + 1)l_\varepsilon^{p'} o(\varepsilon^\delta) + 2l_\varepsilon^{p'+p} \varepsilon^{\frac{\delta}{2}} = o(\varepsilon^{\delta_2})$$

for some $\delta_2 > 0$ uniformly for $x \in K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)$. \square

5.3.5. Typical transitions. We begin with a result on the one-step typical transition. Its proof is postponed to Section 8.3.

Lemma 5.9. *Suppose that conditions (A), (B), (C), (H) hold. Let $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $\alpha' = (\alpha\rho) \wedge 1$. Let*

$$m = \begin{cases} 3, & \rho < 1, \\ 4, & \rho \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Then there are:

- an m -dimensional centered Gaussian vector N ,
- deterministic continuous functions $\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}, \Phi_{2,\varepsilon} : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ indexed by $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

such that

(1) for every $\varkappa, \varkappa' > 0$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{\substack{x \in K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon), \\ [a,b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)}} \left| \mathbb{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha x v} \left\{ X_\tau \in q_+ + \varepsilon^{\alpha'} [a, b] v_+ \right\} - \mathbb{P} \left\{ \Phi_{1,\varepsilon}(x, N) \in [a, b], \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}(x, N) \geq 0 \right\} \right| = o(\varepsilon^\delta);$$

(2) there are constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ and vectors $u_1 \in \{0\}^2 \times (0, \infty)^{m-2}$, $u_2 \in (0, \infty)^2 \times \{0\}^{m-2}$ such that, for $i = 1, 2$, $\Phi_{i,\varepsilon}$ converges in LU , as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, to a continuous function Φ_i , defined for all $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m$, by

$$\Phi_1(x, y) = (1 - \mathbf{1}_{\rho > 1, \alpha\rho > 1})c_1 |\Phi_2(x, y)|^\rho + \mathbf{1}_{\alpha' = 1} u_1 \cdot y,$$

$$\Phi_2(x, y) = c_2 x + \mathbf{1}_{\alpha = 1} u_2 \cdot y;$$

these functions Φ_i , $i = 1, 2$, satisfy the following:

- if $\alpha = 1$, then for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$,
 - $\text{Leb}\{y : \Phi_i(x, y) = 0\} = 0$, $i = 1, 2$,
 - $\text{Leb}\{y : \Phi_1(x, y) \wedge \Phi_2(x, y) \geq 0\} > 0$;
- if $\alpha < 1$, then
 - $\text{Leb}\{y : \Phi_i(x, y) = 0\} = 0$ for all $x \neq 0$, $i = 1, 2$,

- $\text{Leb}\{y : \Phi_1(x, y) \wedge \Phi_2(x, y) \geq 0\} > 0$ for all $x > 0$,
- $\text{Leb}\{y : \Phi_2(x, y) \geq 0\} = 0$ for all $x < 0$;
- (3) for every $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and every $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, the function $\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}(\cdot, y)$ is nondecreasing on $\{x : \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}(x, y) \geq 0\}$ and the function $\Phi_{2,\varepsilon}(\cdot, y)$ is nondecreasing on \mathbb{R} ;
- (4) for every $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}$ and every $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ sufficiently small, the function

$$x \mapsto \mathbf{P}\{\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}(x, N) \in [a, b], \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}(x, N) \geq 0\}$$

can be written as a sum of two monotone functions $\phi_{+,\varepsilon}$ and $\phi_{-,\varepsilon}$, both with values in $[-1, 1]$;

- (5) for each $\varkappa > 0$ and sufficiently large $\varkappa' > 0$,

$$\sup_{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{P}\{\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}(x, N) \notin K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)\} = o_\varepsilon(1);$$

- (6) if $\alpha\rho \leq 1$, then there are constants $C, R, p, q > 0$ such that,

$$|\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}(x, y)| \geq C|x|^p, \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon \in (0, 1), |x| \geq R, |y|_\infty \leq |x|^q,$$

where $|y|_\infty = \max\{|y^i| : i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}\}$.

We will use the above lemma to prove the following result on the typical sequential transitions not involving slowdown saddle points.

Lemma 5.10. *Suppose that conditions (A), (E), (F), (G), (I) hold.*

Then for each $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$, there are

- $m_k \in \mathbb{N}$ and an m_k -dimensional centered Gaussian vector N_k ,
- deterministic continuous functions $\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k, \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}^k : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{m_k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ indexed by $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

such that the following holds:

- (1) for every $\varkappa > 0$ and sufficiently large $\varkappa' > 0$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that

$$(5.17) \quad \sup_{\substack{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon), \\ [a,b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)}} \left| \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^{\alpha_0} x v_0} \{X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^k} \in x_k + \varepsilon^{\alpha_k} [a, b] v_k\} \right. \\ \left. - \mathbf{P}\{\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k(x, N_k) \in [a, b], \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}^k(x, N_k) \geq 0\} \right| = o(\varepsilon^\delta);$$

- (2) for $i = 1, 2$, $\Phi_{i,\varepsilon}^k$ converges in LU, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, to a continuous function Φ_i^k satisfying the following:

- if $\alpha_0 = 1$, then for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$;
- $\text{Leb}\{y : \Phi_i^k(x, y) = 0\} = 0$ for $i = 1, 2$,
- $\text{Leb}\{y : \Phi_1^k(x, y) \wedge \Phi_2^k(x, y) \geq 0\} > 0$,
- if $\alpha_0 < 1$, then
- $\text{Leb}\{y : \Phi_i^k(x, y) = 0\} = 0$ for all $x \neq 0$, $i = 1, 2$,
- $\text{Leb}\{y : \Phi_1^k(x, y) \wedge \Phi_2^k(x, y) \geq 0\} > 0$ for all $x > 0$,
- $\text{Leb}\{y : \Phi_2^k(x, y) \geq 0\} = 0$ for all $x < 0$;

- (3) for every $y \in \mathbb{R}^{m_k}$ and every $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, the functions $\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k(\cdot, y)$ and $\Phi_{2,\varepsilon}^k(\cdot, y)$ are nondecreasing on $\{x : \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}^k(x, y) \geq 0\}$;
- (4) for every $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}$ and every $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ sufficiently small, the function

$$x \mapsto \mathbf{P}\{\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k(x, N_k) \in [a, b], \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}^k(x, N_k) \geq 0\}$$

can be written as a sum of two monotone functions $\phi_{+,\varepsilon}$ and $\phi_{-,\varepsilon}$, both with values in $[-1, 1]$;

(5) for each $\varkappa > 0$ and sufficiently large $\varkappa' > 0$,

$$\sup_{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{P}\{\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k(x, N_k) \notin K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)\} = o_\varepsilon(1);$$

(6) if

$$\alpha_i \rho_{i+1} \leq 1, \quad \text{for all } i \in \{0, 1, \dots, k-1\},$$

then there are positive constants C, R, p, q such that, uniformly in ε ,

$$|\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k(x, y)| \geq C|x|^p, \quad \text{for all } |x| \geq R, |y|_\infty \leq |x|^q,$$

where $|y|_\infty = \max\{|y^i| : i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m_k\}\}$.

Remark 5.6. In the proof of this lemma, we actually give an explicit recursive definition of functions $\Phi_{i,\varepsilon}^k$ and Φ_i^k based on compositions of functions $\Phi_{i,\varepsilon}$, Φ_i introduced in Lemma 5.9, see (5.18), (5.19), (5.20).

PROOF: The base case $k = 1$ is covered by Lemma 5.9. Now, let us assume that the lemma holds for k and prove it for $k + 1$. Using the induction hypothesis (1) and defining

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_\varepsilon(x, dy) &= \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^{\alpha_0} x v_0} \{X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^k} \in x_k + \varepsilon^{\alpha_k}(dy)v_k\}, \\ \bar{\nu}_\varepsilon(x, dy) &= \mathbf{P}\{\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k(x, N_k) \in dy, \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}^k(x, N_k) \geq 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

we have that the Lemma 5.8 (h1) is satisfied for sufficiently large \varkappa' . Since $\bar{\nu}(x, \cdot)$ is always a sub-probability measure, Lemma 5.8 (h3) also holds. Let us fix any $\varkappa'' > 0$. Applying Lemma 5.9 to the saddle O_{k+1} , we can find $m' \in \mathbb{N}$, an m' -dimensional centered Gaussian vector N' and functions $\Phi'_{1,\varepsilon}, \Phi'_{2,\varepsilon} : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{m'} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying properties described in that lemma such that the measures

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_\varepsilon(y, dz) &= \mathbf{P}\{X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^{k+1}} \in x_{k+1} + \varepsilon^{\alpha_{k+1}}(dz)v_{k+1} \mid X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^k} = x_k + \varepsilon^{\alpha_k} y v_k\}, \\ \bar{\mu}_\varepsilon(y, dz) &= \mathbf{P}\{\Phi'_{1,\varepsilon}(y, N') \in dz, \Phi'_{2,\varepsilon}(y, N') \geq 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

satisfy Lemma 5.8 (h2) and (h4). Hence, we can invoke Lemma 5.8 to see that $\nu_\varepsilon, \bar{\nu}_\varepsilon, \mu_\varepsilon, \bar{\mu}_\varepsilon$ satisfy (5.15).

Now, we proceed to derive part (1). Using Lemma 5.4 and adjusting \varkappa' if necessary, we can rewrite the first integral in (5.15) as

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)} \nu_\varepsilon(x, dy) \mu_\varepsilon(y, [a, b]) \\ &= \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^{\alpha_0} x v_0} \{X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^{k+1}} \in x_{k+1} + \varepsilon^{\alpha_{k+1}}[a, b]v_{k+1}, X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^k} \in x_k + \varepsilon^{\alpha_k} K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)v_k\} \\ &= \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^{\alpha_0} x v_0} \{X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^{k+1}} \in x_{k+1} + \varepsilon^{\alpha_{k+1}}[a, b]v_{k+1}\} + o_\varepsilon(1) \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$ and $[a, b] \subset K_{\varkappa''}(\varepsilon)$. This is the first term in (5.17) for $k+1$.

Let us now treat the second integral in (5.15). Using the induction assumption (5), we can rewrite it as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{K_{\mathcal{Z}'}(\varepsilon)} \bar{v}_\varepsilon(x, dy) \bar{\mu}_\varepsilon(y, [a, b]) \\ &= \mathbf{P} \left\{ \Phi'_{1,\varepsilon}(\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k(x, N_k), N') \in [a, b], \quad \Phi'_{2,\varepsilon}(\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k(x, N_k), N') \geq 0, \right. \\ & \quad \left. \Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k(x, N_k) \in K_{\mathcal{Z}'}(\varepsilon), \quad \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}^k(x, N_k) \geq 0 \right\} \\ &= \mathbf{P} \left\{ \Phi'_{1,\varepsilon}(\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k(x, N_k), N') \in [a, b], \quad \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}^k(x, N_k) \wedge \Phi'_{2,\varepsilon}(\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k(x, N_k), N') \geq 0 \right\} \\ & \quad + o_\varepsilon(1), \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $x \in K_{\mathcal{Z}}(\varepsilon)$ and $[a, b] \subset K_{\mathcal{Z}'}(\varepsilon)$. For $(x, (y, y')) \in \mathbb{R} \times (\mathbb{R}^{m_k} \times \mathbb{R}^{m'})$, we define

$$(5.18) \quad \Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^{k+1}(x, (y, y')) = \Phi'_{1,\varepsilon}(\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k(x, y), y'),$$

$$(5.19) \quad \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}^{k+1}(x, (y, y')) = \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}^k(x, y) \wedge \Phi'_{2,\varepsilon}(\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k(x, y), y').$$

We set $m_{k+1} = m_k + m'$ and define $N_{k+1} = (N_k, N')$. The second integral in (5.15) becomes

$$\mathbf{P} \left\{ \Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^{k+1}(x, N_{k+1}) \in [a, b], \quad \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}^{k+1}(x, N_{k+1}) \geq 0 \right\} + o_\varepsilon(1),$$

where the main term is exactly the expression appearing in (5.17) for $k+1$. This completes our verification of part (1) for $k+1$.

Now, we turn to (2). For brevity, we write $\bar{y} = (y, y')$. In view of (5.18) and (5.19), using the continuity and the LU convergence of $\Phi'_{i,\varepsilon}$ and $\Phi_{i,\varepsilon}^k$ for $i = 1, 2$ (due to Lemma 5.9 (2) and the induction hypothesis (2)), we can easily derive the LU convergence of $\Phi_{i,\varepsilon}^{k+1}$, for $i = 1, 2$ and that the limits are given by

$$\begin{aligned} (5.20) \quad & \Phi_1^{k+1}(x, \bar{y}) = \Phi'_1(\Phi_1^k(x, y), y') \\ & = (1 - \mathbf{1}_{\rho_{k+1} > 1, \alpha_k \rho_{k+1} > 1}) c_1 \left| c_2 \Phi_1^k(x, y) + \mathbf{1}_{\alpha_k = 1} u_2 \cdot y' \right|^{\rho_{k+1}} + \mathbf{1}_{\alpha_{k+1} = 1} u_1 \cdot y', \\ & \Phi_2^{k+1}(x, \bar{y}) = \Phi_2^k(x, y) \wedge (c_2 \Phi_1^k(x, y) + \mathbf{1}_{\alpha_k = 1} u_2 \cdot y'), \end{aligned}$$

for constants c_1, c_2 and vectors u_1, u_2 given in Lemma 5.9 (2), where Φ_i^k is the limit of $\Phi_{i,\varepsilon}^k$. Moreover, due to Lemma 5.9 (2), for all possible values of α_k and ρ_{k+1} , we have

$$\text{Leb}\{y' : \Phi'_1(x, y')\} = 0, \quad \text{if } x \neq 0,$$

which along with (5.20) implies

$$\text{Leb}\{\bar{y} : \Phi_1^{k+1}(x, \bar{y}) = 0, \Phi_1^k(x, y) \neq 0\} = 0.$$

Then, (2) follows from the induction assumptions, the orthogonality between u_1 and u_2 , and

$$\begin{aligned} \{\bar{y} : \Phi_1^{k+1}(x, \bar{y}) = 0\} &\subset \{\bar{y} : \Phi_1^{k+1}(x, \bar{y}) = 0, \Phi_1^k(x, y) \neq 0\} \cup \{\bar{y} : \Phi_1^k(x, y) = 0\}, \\ \{\bar{y} : \Phi_1^{k+1}(x, \bar{y}) \geq 0\} &\supset \{\bar{y} : u_1 \cdot y' \geq 0\}, \\ \{\bar{y} : \Phi_2^{k+1}(x, \bar{y}) = 0\} &\subset \{\bar{y} : \Phi_2^k(x, y) = 0\} \cup \{\bar{y} : u_2 \cdot y' = -c_2 \Phi_1^k(x, y)\} \cup \{\bar{y} : \Phi_1^k(x, y) = 0\}, \\ \{\bar{y} : \Phi_2^{k+1}(x, \bar{y}) \geq 0\} &\supset \{\bar{y} : \Phi_1^k(x, y) \wedge \Phi_2^k(x, y) \geq 0\} \cap \{\bar{y} : u_2 \cdot y' \geq 0\}, \\ \{\bar{y} : \Phi_2^{k+1}(x, \bar{y}) \geq 0\} &\subset \{\bar{y} : \Phi_2^k(x, y) \geq 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us verify (3). Fix (y, y') and ε . Due to (5.19), on the set

$$A = \{x : \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}^{k+1}(x, (y, y')) \geq 0\},$$

we have

$$(5.21) \quad \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}^k(x, y) \geq 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi'_{2,\varepsilon}(\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k(x, y), y') \geq 0.$$

Due to the induction assumption (3), the first inequality in (5.21) implies that

$$(5.22) \quad x \mapsto \Phi_{i,\varepsilon}^k(x, y) \text{ is nondecreasing on } A, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Lemma 5.9 (3) states that $\Phi'_{2,\varepsilon}(\cdot, y')$ is nondecreasing on \mathbb{R} . This along with (5.19) and (5.22) yields that $\Phi_{2,\varepsilon}^{k+1}(\cdot, (y, y'))$ is nondecreasing on A .

Lemma 5.9 (3) also gives that $\Phi'_{1,\varepsilon}(\cdot, y')$ is nondecreasing on $\{z : \Phi'_{2,\varepsilon}(z, y') \geq 0\}$. From this, the definition of $\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^{k+1}$ in (5.18), the second inequality in (5.21), and (5.22), we can deduce that $\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^{k+1}(\cdot, (y, y'))$ is nondecreasing on A . This completes the verification of (3) for $k+1$.

Setting

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{+,\varepsilon}(x) &= \mathbb{P}\{\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^{k+1}(x, N_{k+1}) \geq a, \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}^{k+1}(x, N_{k+1}) \geq 0\}, \\ \phi_{-,\varepsilon}(x) &= -\mathbb{P}\{\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^{k+1}(x, N_{k+1}) > b, \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}^{k+1}(x, N_{k+1}) \geq 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

we can see that (4) for $k+1$ follows from (3) for $k+1$ proved above.

Let us verify (5). For any $\varkappa'' > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^{k+1}(x, N_{k+1}) \notin K_{\varkappa''}(\varepsilon)\} &= \mathbb{P}\{\Phi'_{1,\varepsilon}(\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k(x, N_k), N') \notin K_{\varkappa''}(\varepsilon)\} \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\{\Phi'_{1,\varepsilon}(\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k(x, N_k), N') \notin K_{\varkappa''}(\varepsilon), \Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k(x, N_k) \in K_{\varkappa''}(\varepsilon)\} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}\{\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k(x, N_k) \notin K_{\varkappa''}(\varepsilon)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Due to the induction assumption (5), the last term is $o_e(1)$ uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$ for large \varkappa'' . Choosing \varkappa' sufficiently large and using (5) in Lemma 5.9, we can see that the first term after the inequality sign is $o_e(1)$. Thus, (5) holds for $k+1$.

Let us verify (6). Applying Lemma 5.9 (6) to $\Phi'_{1,\varepsilon}$, we can find constants C', R', p', q' such that

$$|\Phi'_{1,\varepsilon}(x', y')| \geq C'|x'|^{p'}$$

for

$$(5.23) \quad |x'| \geq R', \quad |y'|_{\infty} \leq |x'|^{q'}.$$

Using the induction assumption (6) for k , we get that, for $C, R, p, q > 0$,

$$(5.24) \quad |\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k(x, y)| \geq C|x|^p$$

for $|x| \geq R$ and $|y|_\infty \leq |x|^q$. This still holds if we make $R > 1$ larger and q smaller. We can do so to ensure $C|x|^p \geq R'$ and $|x|^q \leq (C|x|^p)^{q'}$ whenever $|x| \geq R$. This along with (5.24) allows us to see that whenever $|x| \geq R$ and $|y|_\infty, |y'|_\infty \leq |x|^q$, (5.23) is satisfied with x' replaced by $\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k(x, y)$. Therefore, we obtain that

$$|\Phi'_{1,\varepsilon}(\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k(x, y), y')| \geq CC'|x|^{pp'}$$

as desired, for $|x| > R$ and $|(y, y')|_\infty \leq |x|^q$. The left-hand side of the above display is exactly $\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^{k+1}(x, (y, y'))$ due to (5.18). This completes the verification of (6) for $k + 1$. \square

5.3.6. *Transitions near binding saddle points.* For each $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$, we define

$$(5.25) \quad \theta_k = \sum_{j: j \leq k, j \in J} \left(\frac{\bar{\alpha}_j}{\rho_j} - 1 \right).$$

Due to the definition of J in (5.3),

$$(5.26) \quad \theta_k = 0, \quad k \leq \kappa.$$

For $k \in \{\kappa, \dots, n-1\}$, $\varepsilon > 0$, and a Borel set $E \subset \mathbb{R}$, we denote

$$(5.27) \quad B_{k,\varepsilon,E} = A_{k,\varepsilon} \cap \{X_{\varepsilon,\tau^k} \in x_k + \varepsilon^{\bar{\alpha}_k} E v_k\}.$$

For these k and ε , and for every vector $(\varkappa) = (\varkappa_i)_{i \in \{\kappa\} \cup H \cup J}$ we define a transition kernel $\nu_{k,\varepsilon}(\cdot, \cdot) = \nu_{k,(\varkappa),\varepsilon}(\cdot, \cdot)$ by

$$(5.28) \quad \nu_{k,(\varkappa),\varepsilon}(x, E) = \varepsilon^{-\theta_k} \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^{\alpha_0} x v_0} \left(B_{k,\varepsilon,E} \cap \bigcap_{i \in (\{\kappa\} \cup H \cup J) \cap \{0, 1, \dots, k\}} \bar{A}_{i,\varkappa_i,\varepsilon} \right).$$

Note that we can rewrite

$$(5.29) \quad \bigcap_{i \in (\{\kappa\} \cup H \cup J) \cap \{0, 1, \dots, k\}} \bar{A}_{i,\varkappa_i,\varepsilon} = \bigcap_{i \in H' \cap \{0, \dots, k-1\}} (\bar{A}_{i,\varkappa_i,\varepsilon} \cap \bar{A}_{i+1,\varkappa_{i+1},\varepsilon}).$$

For $k \in \{\kappa + 1, \dots, n-1\}$, we set

$$(5.30) \quad \underline{k} = \max\{j \in J : j \leq k\}.$$

We recall that the collection \mathcal{M} of measures is defined by (4.8)–(4.10).

Lemma 5.11. *Suppose conditions (A), (E), (F), (G), (I) hold and assume that κ is well-defined. Then, there is a family of transition kernels $\bar{\nu}_{k,\varepsilon}$ indexed by $k \in \{\kappa + 1, \dots, n-1\}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ with the following property: for every $\varkappa_0 > 0$ and every vector $(\varkappa'_k)_{k \in \{\kappa\} \cup H \cap J}$ of positive numbers, there are $(\varkappa_k)_{k \in \{\kappa\} \cup H \cap J}$ satisfying $\varkappa_k > \varkappa'_k$ for each k , and a constant $\delta > 0$, such that for each k ,*

$$(5.31) \quad \sup_{\substack{x \in K_{\varkappa_0}(\varepsilon), \\ [a,b] \subset K_{\varkappa_k}(\varepsilon)}} |\nu_{k,\varepsilon}(x, [a, b]) - \bar{\nu}_{k,\varepsilon}(x, [a, b])| = o(\varepsilon^\delta),$$

and

$$(5.32) \quad \bar{\nu}_{k,\varepsilon}(x, dy) = h_{k,\varepsilon}(x) \zeta_{k,\varepsilon}(dy),$$

where

- (i) the measurable functions $h_{k,\varepsilon} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ indexed by $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ are bounded uniformly in ε , and converge as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ to a bounded continuous function
- $h_k : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ in LU on \mathbb{R} , if $\alpha_0 = 1$,
 - $h_k : \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ in LU on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, satisfying $h_k = 0$ on $(-\infty, 0)$ and $h_k > 0$ on $(0, \infty)$, if $\alpha_0 < 1$;
- (ii) if $k = \underline{k}$, then $\varsigma_{k,\varepsilon} = \varsigma_k$ is independent of ε for some $\varsigma_k \in \mathcal{M}$;
- (iii) if $k > \underline{k}$, then $\varsigma_{k,\varepsilon}$ is given by

$$(5.33) \quad \varsigma_{k,\varepsilon}(dy) = \int_{K_{\varkappa_{\underline{k}}(\varepsilon)}} \varsigma_k(dz) \mathbf{P} \left\{ \Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k(z, N_k) \in dy, \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}^k(z, N_k) \geq 0 \right\},$$

where

- the Borel measure ς_k does not depend on ε and satisfies

$$(5.34) \quad \varsigma_k \in \mathcal{M},$$

- N_k is an m_k -dimensional centered Gaussian vector for some m_k ,
- functions $\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k, \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}^k : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{m_k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are the functions given by Lemma 5.10 applied to the transition from the vicinity of $x_{\underline{k}}$ at scale $\bar{\alpha}_{\underline{k}}$ to the vicinity of x_k at scale $\bar{\alpha}_k$, and thus satisfy properties (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) in Lemma 5.10.

Remark 5.7. In fact, for ς_k in (5.33), we always have $\varsigma_k = \varsigma_{\underline{k}}$, which will be clear from the proof. Since $\Phi_{i,\varepsilon}^k$ and N_k account for the transition from the vicinity of $x_{\underline{k}}$ to that of x_k , a more accurate but heavier notation would be $\Phi_{i,\varepsilon}^{k \rightarrow k}$ and $N_{\underline{k} \rightarrow k}$. Hence, it would be more precise to rewrite (5.33) as

$$\varsigma_{k,\varepsilon}(dy) = \int_{K_{\varkappa_{\underline{k}}(\varepsilon)}} \varsigma_{\underline{k}}(dz) \mathbf{P} \left\{ \Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^{k \rightarrow k}(z, N_{\underline{k} \rightarrow k}) \in dy, \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}^{k \rightarrow k}(z, N_{\underline{k} \rightarrow k}) \geq 0 \right\}.$$

For brevity, however, we stick to the notation of the lemma.

PROOF: In this proof, we will use Lemmas 4.6, 5.1, 5.8, and 5.10. Among them, only Lemmas 4.6 and 5.10 impose restrictions on \varkappa 's, but both of them allow us to choose \varkappa_k arbitrarily large. Hence, whenever these two lemmas are applied in this proof, we choose the relevant \varkappa_k sufficiently large to ensure $\varkappa_k > \varkappa'_k$. With this clarified, we will omit mentioning this technicality for brevity.

We will use induction, sequentially showing that the result holds for all $k \in \{\kappa + 1, \dots, j\}$, where j runs through elements of H .

Basis of induction. We first verify that our claim holds for $j = \min H$. Due to the definition of \underline{k} in (5.30), we have

$$(5.35) \quad \underline{k} = \kappa + 1.$$

We split the argument into four steps. Step 1: we use Lemma 5.10 on typical transitions to approximate the distribution of $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_{\varepsilon}^{\kappa}}$. Step 2: to approximate the distribution of $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_{\varepsilon}^{\kappa+1}}$, we apply Lemma 4.6 to atypical transitions from $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_{\varepsilon}^{\kappa}}$ to $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_{\varepsilon}^{\kappa+1}}$. Step 3: if $j > \kappa + 1$, we approximate the distribution of $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_{\varepsilon}^k}$ applying Lemma 5.10 to typical transitions from $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_{\varepsilon}^{\kappa+1}}$ to $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_{\varepsilon}^k}$. Step 4: for approximations obtained in Steps 2 and 3, we verify their properties claimed in the lemma.

Step 1. We study the distribution of $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^\kappa}$. Recalling that $\bar{\alpha}_\kappa = \alpha_\kappa = 1$ and rewriting (5.28) with k replaced by κ :

$$\nu_{\kappa, \varepsilon}(x, dy) = \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^{\alpha_0} x v_0} \{ \tau_\varepsilon^\kappa < \infty, X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^\kappa} \in x_\kappa + \varepsilon^1(dy) v_n \},$$

setting

$$\bar{\nu}_{\kappa, \varepsilon}(x, dy) = \mathbf{P} \{ \Phi_{1, \varepsilon}^\kappa(x, N_\kappa) \in dy, \Phi_{2, \varepsilon}^\kappa(x, N_\kappa) \geq 0 \},$$

and applying Lemma 5.10 to these measures, we see that they satisfy conditions (h1) and (h3) of Lemma 5.8.

Step 2. We study the distribution of $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^{\kappa+1}}$. Note that $\alpha_\kappa = 1$ due to the definition of κ in (5.1). Applying Lemma 4.6 to the transition from $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^\kappa}$ to $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^{\kappa+1}}$, we have that for some $c_{\kappa+1} \geq 0$ and

$$(5.36) \quad \bar{\mu}_{\kappa+1} \in \mathcal{M},$$

the kernels given by

$$(5.37) \quad \mu_{\kappa+1, \varepsilon}(x, dy) = \varepsilon^{-\left(\frac{\bar{\alpha}_{\kappa+1}}{\rho_{\kappa+1}} - 1\right)} \mathbf{P}^{x_\kappa + \varepsilon x v_\kappa} \left\{ \tau_\varepsilon^{\kappa+1} < \infty, X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^{\kappa+1}} \in x_{\kappa+1} + \varepsilon^{\bar{\alpha}_{\kappa+1}}(dy) v_{\kappa+1} \right\},$$

$$(5.38) \quad \bar{\mu}_{\kappa+1, \varepsilon}(x, dy) = g_{c_{\kappa+1}}(x) \bar{\mu}_{\kappa+1}(dy)$$

satisfy condition (h2) of Lemma 5.8. Note that in fact $\bar{\mu}_{\kappa+1, \varepsilon}$ does not depend on ε . Due to (5.36) and property (4.9) enjoyed by measures in \mathcal{M} , for every $\varkappa_{\kappa+1} > 0$, there is $p > 0$ such that

$$(5.39) \quad \bar{\mu}_{\kappa+1}(K_{\varkappa_{\kappa+1}}(\varepsilon)) \leq l_\varepsilon^p,$$

Using this and the fact that $g_{c_{\kappa+1}}$ is a Gaussian density (see (2.2)), we derive that condition (h4) of Lemma 5.8 also holds for $\bar{\mu}_{\kappa+1, \varepsilon}$. In fact, we can explicitly decompose $g_{c_{\kappa+1}}(x)$ into a sum of two bounded monotone functions:

$$(5.40) \quad \begin{aligned} g_{c_{\kappa+1}}(x) &= g_{c_{\kappa+1}}^+(x) + g_{c_{\kappa+1}}^-(x) \\ &= (g_{c_{\kappa+1}}(x) \mathbf{1}_{x < 0} + g_{c_{\kappa+1}}(0) \mathbf{1}_{x \geq 0}) + (g_{c_{\kappa+1}}(x) \mathbf{1}_{x \geq 0} - g_{c_{\kappa+1}}(0) \mathbf{1}_{x \geq 0}). \end{aligned}$$

Having checked all the conditions of Lemma 5.8 for $\nu_{\kappa, \varepsilon}, \bar{\nu}_{\kappa, \varepsilon}, \mu_{\kappa+1, \varepsilon}, \bar{\mu}_{\kappa+1, \varepsilon}$, we can now apply it and obtain that, for any $\varkappa_\kappa > 0$, the kernels given by

$$(5.41) \quad \begin{aligned} \nu_{\kappa+1, \varepsilon}(x, dy) &= \int_{K_{\varkappa_\kappa}(\varepsilon)} \nu_{\kappa, \varepsilon}(x, dz) \mu_{\kappa+1, \varepsilon}(z, dy), \\ \bar{\nu}_{\kappa+1, \varepsilon}(x, dy) &= \int_{K_{\varkappa_\kappa}(\varepsilon)} \bar{\nu}_{\kappa, \varepsilon}(x, dz) \bar{\mu}_{\kappa+1, \varepsilon}(z, dy) \end{aligned}$$

also satisfy condition (h1) of Lemma 5.8. In particular, (5.31) with $k = \kappa + 1$ holds for $\nu_{\kappa+1, \varepsilon}, \bar{\nu}_{\kappa+1, \varepsilon}$.

For later use, we note that $\bar{\nu}_{\kappa+1, \varepsilon}$ satisfies condition (h3) of Lemma 5.8, as a result of (5.39), the boundedness of $g_{c_{\kappa+1}}$, and the fact that $\bar{\nu}_{\kappa, \varepsilon}(x, dy)$ is a sub-probability measure.

Step 3. If $k \in \{\kappa + 2, \dots, j\}$ for $j = \min H$, then, to study the distribution $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^k}$, we need to study the transition from $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^{\kappa+1}}$ to $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^k}$. The scaling upon the exit from saddle $O_{\kappa+1}$ described by (5.37) is $\varepsilon^{\bar{\alpha}_{\kappa+1}}$. Since there are no elements of H between κ and j , part 6 of Lemma 5.1 guarantees that $\bar{\alpha}_k = \bar{\alpha}_{k-1} \rho_k \leq 1$ for all

$k \in \{\kappa + 2, \dots, j\}$ and, moreover, $\bar{\alpha}_j = 1$. Therefore, the dynamics of exponents $\bar{\alpha}_k$ for these saddles is described by (2.25), i.e. the evolution is typical and described by Lemma 5.10. Applying parts (1) and (4) of this lemma to the dynamics starting near $x_{\kappa+1}$, we see that the kernels given by

$$(5.42) \quad \begin{aligned} \mu_{k,\varepsilon}(x, dy) &= \mathbf{P}^{x_{\kappa+1} + \varepsilon^{\bar{\alpha}_{\kappa+1}} x v_{\kappa+1}} \left\{ \tau_\varepsilon^k < \infty, X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^k} \in x_k + \varepsilon^{\bar{\alpha}_k}(dy) v_k \right\}, \\ \bar{\mu}_{k,\varepsilon}(x, dy) &= \mathbf{P}\{\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k(x, N_k) \in dy, \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}^k(x, N_k) \geq 0\} \end{aligned}$$

for $k \in \{\kappa + 2, \dots, j\}$ satisfy conditions (h2) and (h4) of Lemma 5.8.

This, along with the conclusions from Step 2, allows to apply Lemma 5.8 to $\nu_{\kappa+1,\varepsilon}$, $\bar{\nu}_{\kappa+1,\varepsilon}$, $\mu_{k,\varepsilon}$, $\bar{\mu}_{k,\varepsilon}$ and obtain that, for some $\varkappa_{\kappa+1} > 0$, the kernels given by

$$(5.43) \quad \begin{aligned} \nu_{k,\varepsilon}(x, dy) &= \int_{K_{\varkappa_{\kappa+1}}(\varepsilon)} \nu_{\kappa+1,\varepsilon}(x, dz) \mu_{k,\varepsilon}(z, dy), \\ \bar{\nu}_{k,\varepsilon}(x, dy) &= \int_{K_{\varkappa_{\kappa+1}}(\varepsilon)} \bar{\nu}_{\kappa+1,\varepsilon}(x, dz) \bar{\mu}_{k,\varepsilon}(z, dy) \end{aligned}$$

satisfy condition (h1) of Lemma 5.8, which yields the desired result (5.31). Combining this with Step 2, we can conclude that (5.31) holds for $k \leq j$.

Step 4. We verify that $\nu_{k,\varepsilon}$ and $\bar{\nu}_{k,\varepsilon}$ are of the desired form as in (5.28) and (5.32), respectively.

First, we verify this for $\nu_{k,\varepsilon}$. We can check, using the definition (5.25), that $\theta_k = \frac{\bar{\alpha}_{\kappa+1}}{\rho_{\kappa+1}} - 1$ for all $k \in \{\kappa + 1, \dots, \min H\}$. Tracing the definitions of these kernels, we can see that, in agreement with (5.28) (and (5.29)),

$$\nu_{k,\varepsilon}(x, [a, b]) = \varepsilon^{-\theta_k} \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^{\alpha_0} x v_0} (B_{k,\varepsilon,[a,b]} \cap \bar{A}_{\kappa,\varkappa_{\kappa+1},\varepsilon} \cap \bar{A}_{\kappa+1,\varkappa_{\kappa+1},\varepsilon}).$$

Next, we verify the decomposition (5.32) for $\bar{\nu}_{k,\varepsilon}$ along with (i), (ii), (iii).

For all $k \in \{\kappa + 1, \dots, j\}$, we set

$$(5.44) \quad \varsigma_k = \bar{\mu}_{\kappa+1} \in \mathcal{M}$$

and

$$(5.45) \quad h_{k,\varepsilon}(x) = \mathbf{E} \left[g_{c_{\kappa+1}} \left(\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^\kappa(x, N_\kappa) \right) \mathbf{1}_{\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^\kappa(x, N_\kappa) \in K_{\varkappa_{\kappa+1}}(\varepsilon), \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}^\kappa(x, N_\kappa) \geq 0} \right].$$

Recalling $\underline{k} = \kappa + 1$ from (5.35), we thus have $\zeta_k = \zeta_{\underline{k}}$ and $h_{k,\varepsilon} = h_{\underline{k},\varepsilon}$ for all $k \in \{\kappa + 1, \dots, j\}$.

For $k = \kappa + 1$ (equivalently, $k = \underline{k}$), relation (5.32) follows from (5.38) and (5.41), and property (ii) follows from (5.44).

For $k \in \{\kappa + 2, \dots, j\}$, we define $\varsigma_{k,\varepsilon}$ by (5.33) and (5.44). Due to $\underline{k} = \kappa + 1$, relation (5.32) for these values of k follows now from (5.38), (5.41), (5.42), (5.43), (5.44), (5.45). We also obtain (5.34) from (5.44). Since $N_k, \Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k, \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}^k$ were introduced through the application of Lemma 5.10, they also have the desired properties. Therefore, (iii) holds.

It remains to verify (i). It is clear that $h_{k,\varepsilon}$ is bounded uniformly in ε . Let us show that they converge in LU and the limit is strictly positive everywhere. Setting

$$(5.46) \quad \tilde{h}_{k,\varepsilon}(x) = \mathbf{E} \left[g_{c_{\kappa+1}} \left(\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^\kappa(x, N_\kappa) \right) \mathbf{1}_{\Phi_{2,\varepsilon}^\kappa(x, N_\kappa) \geq 0} \right],$$

and using the fact that $g_{c_{\kappa+1}}$ is a Gaussian density and Lemma 5.10 (5), we obtain

$$\|h_{k,\varepsilon} - \tilde{h}_{k,\varepsilon}\|_\infty = o_\varepsilon(1).$$

Hence, it suffices to show that $\tilde{h}_{k,\varepsilon}$ satisfies the desired properties. Recalling the decomposition in (5.40), we define

$$\tilde{h}_{k,\varepsilon}^\pm(x) = \mathbf{E} \left[g_{c_{\kappa+1}}^\pm \left(\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^\kappa(x, N_\kappa) \right) \mathbf{1}_{\Phi_{2,\varepsilon}^\kappa(x, N_\kappa) \geq 0} \right]$$

satisfying

$$\tilde{h}_{k,\varepsilon}(x) = \tilde{h}_{k,\varepsilon}^+(x) + \tilde{h}_{k,\varepsilon}^-(x).$$

Let us first show that $\tilde{h}_{k,\varepsilon}^\pm$ converges pointwise, and then upgrade this to convergence in LU. Fix any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ if $\alpha_0 = 1$, or $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ if $\alpha_0 < 1$. Using the convergence of $\Phi_{i,\varepsilon}^\kappa$ given in Lemma 5.10 (2), we have that $g_{c_{\kappa+1}}^\pm \left(\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^\kappa(x, N_\kappa) \right)$ converges a.s. Using the property of the limit Φ_2^κ of $\Phi_{2,\varepsilon}^\kappa$ described in Lemma 5.10 (2), we get that $\Phi_2^\kappa(x, N_\kappa) \neq 0$ a.s. and thus $\mathbf{1}_{\Phi_{2,\varepsilon}^\kappa(x, N_\kappa) \geq 0}$ converges a.s. Then, in view of (5.46), the bounded convergence theorem yields that $\tilde{h}_{k,\varepsilon}^\pm$ converges pointwise to

$$h_k^\pm : x \mapsto \mathbf{E} \left[g_{c_{\kappa+1}}^\pm \left(\Phi_1^\kappa(x, N_\kappa) \right) \mathbf{1}_{\Phi_2^\kappa(x, N_\kappa) \geq 0} \right].$$

It is clear that h_k^\pm is bounded, and the continuity of h_k^\pm follows from the properties of Φ_i^κ in Lemma 5.10 (2). Since $\pm g_{c_{\kappa+1}}^\pm$ is nondecreasing, using Lemma 5.10 (3), we can see that $\pm \tilde{h}_{k,\varepsilon}^\pm(x)$ is nondecreasing, which upgrades the pointwise convergence to LU convergence on \mathbb{R} if $\alpha_0 = 1$ or on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ if $\alpha_0 < 1$.

Combining this with the above displays, we obtain the LU convergence of $h_{k,\varepsilon}$ to

$$h_k : x \mapsto \mathbf{E} \left[g_{c_{\kappa+1}} \left(\Phi_1^\kappa(x, N_\kappa) \right) \mathbf{1}_{\Phi_2^\kappa(x, N_\kappa) \geq 0} \right] = h_k^+(x) + h_k^-(x).$$

Since $g_{c_{\kappa+1}}$ is positive everywhere, Lemma 5.10 (2) implies that this expectation is positive for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ if $\alpha_0 = 1$, and all $x \in (0, \infty)$ if $\alpha_0 < 1$; it is identical zero for all $x \in (-\infty, 0)$ if $\alpha_0 < 1$. The boundedness and continuity of h_k follows from those properties for h_k^\pm . This completes the verification of properties of $h_{k,\varepsilon}$.

This completes the proof of the basis case, i.e., for $k \in \{\kappa + 1, \dots, \min H\}$.

Induction step. Let us assume that the desired result holds for all $\kappa + 1, \kappa + 2, \dots, j$ for some $j \in H$. Let $\bar{j} = \min\{i \in H : i > j\}$. Our goal is to extend the result to values $k \in \{j + 1, \dots, \bar{j}\}$. Note that

$$(5.47) \quad \underline{k} = j + 1.$$

The argument is very similar to that for the base case. We split it into three steps. Step 1: we use Lemma 4.6 on atypical transitions to obtain an approximation for the distribution of $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^{j+1}}$. Step 2: if $k > j + 1$, we approximate the distribution of $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^k}$ applying Lemma 5.10 on typical transitions to the transition from $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^{j+1}}$ to $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^k}$. Step 3: for the approximations obtained in Steps 1 and 2, we verify the properties claimed in the lemma.

Step 1. We study the distribution of $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^{j+1}}$ through the transition from $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^j}$ to $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^{j+1}}$. Using the induction assumption (in particular, (5.31)), we have that $\nu_{j,\varepsilon}$ given in (5.28) and some measure $\bar{\nu}_{j,\varepsilon}$ of the form (5.32) satisfy Lemma 5.8 (h1). In

addition, $\bar{\nu}_{j,\varepsilon}$ satisfies Lemma 5.8 (h3) due to the uniform boundedness of $h_{j,\varepsilon}$, (5.32) and (5.34) (see the property (4.9) for measures in \mathcal{M}).

Due to (5.11), $\bar{\alpha}_j = 1$. Now applying Lemma 4.6, we obtain that the kernels $\mu_{j+1,\varepsilon}, \bar{\mu}_{j+1,\varepsilon}$ given by

(5.48)

$$\mu_{j+1,\varepsilon}(x, dy) = \varepsilon^{-\left(\frac{\bar{\alpha}_{j+1}}{\rho_{j+1}} - 1\right)} \mathbf{P}^{x_j + \varepsilon x v_j} \left\{ \tau_\varepsilon^{j+1} < \infty, X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^{j+1}} \in x_{j+1} + \varepsilon^{\bar{\alpha}_{j+1}}(dy) v_{j+1} \right\},$$

(5.49)

$$\bar{\mu}_{j+1,\varepsilon}(x, dy) = g_{c_{j+1}}(x) \bar{\mu}_{j+1}(dy),$$

satisfy Lemma 5.8 (h2) and that

$$(5.50) \quad \bar{\mu}_{j+1} \in \mathcal{M}.$$

Similarly to the argument used to derive (5.39), we have that for every $\varkappa > 0$ there is $p > 0$ such that

$$(5.51) \quad \bar{\mu}_{j+1}(K_\varkappa(\varepsilon)) \leq l_\varepsilon^p.$$

Using a decomposition similar to (5.40), we can verify that $\bar{\mu}_{j+1,\varepsilon}$ satisfies Lemma 5.8 (h4).

Hence, we are now allowed to apply Lemma 5.8 to $\nu_{j,\varepsilon}, \bar{\nu}_{j,\varepsilon}, \mu_{j+1,\varepsilon}, \bar{\mu}_{j+1,\varepsilon}$ to see that the kernels $\nu_{j+1,\varepsilon}, \bar{\nu}_{j+1,\varepsilon}$ given by

$$(5.52) \quad \nu_{j+1,\varepsilon}(x, dy) = \int_{K_{\varkappa_j}(\varepsilon)} \nu_{j,\varepsilon}(x, dz) \mu_{j+1,\varepsilon}(z, dy),$$

$$(5.53) \quad \bar{\nu}_{j+1,\varepsilon}(x, dy) = \int_{K_{\varkappa_j}(\varepsilon)} \bar{\nu}_{j,\varepsilon}(x, dz) \bar{\mu}_{j+1,\varepsilon}(z, dy),$$

satisfy Lemma 5.8 (h1). One can easily check that this definition of $\nu_{j+1,\varepsilon}$ coincides with (5.28) for $j+1$. Since we have shown that $\bar{\nu}_{j,\varepsilon}$ satisfies Lemma 5.8 (h3), displays (5.49), (5.51) and the boundedness of the Gaussian density $g_{c_{j+1}}$ imply that $\bar{\nu}_{j+1,\varepsilon}$ satisfies (h3).

Step 2. For $k \in \{j+2, \dots, \bar{j}\}$, we study the distribution of $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^k}$ through the transition from $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^{j+1}}$ to $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^k}$. The scaling upon the exit from saddle O_{j+1} described by (5.48) is $\varepsilon^{\bar{\alpha}_{j+1}}$. Since there are no elements of H between j and k , part 6 of Lemma 5.1 guarantees that $\bar{\alpha}_k = \bar{\alpha}_{k-1} \rho_k \leq 1$ for all $k \in \{j+2, \dots, \bar{j}\}$ and, moreover, $\bar{\alpha}_{\bar{j}} = 1$. Therefore, the dynamics of exponents $\bar{\alpha}_k$ for these saddles is described by (2.25), i.e. the evolution is typical and described by Lemma 5.10.

Applying parts (1) and (4) of this lemma to the dynamics starting near x_{j+1} shows that kernels given by

$$(5.54) \quad \mu_{k,\varepsilon}(x, dy) = \mathbf{P}^{x_{j+1} + \varepsilon^{\bar{\alpha}_{j+1}} x v_{j+1}} \left\{ \tau_\varepsilon^k < \infty, X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^k} \in x_k + \varepsilon^{\bar{\alpha}_k}(dy) v_k \right\}$$

$$(5.55) \quad \bar{\mu}_{k,\varepsilon}(x, dy) = \mathbf{P}\{\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k(x, N_k) \in dy, \Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k(x, N_k) \geq 0\},$$

for $k \in \{j+2, \dots, \bar{j}\}$, satisfy Lemma 5.8 (h2) and (h4). This and the result in Step 1 allow us to apply Lemma 5.8 to $\nu_{j+1,\varepsilon}, \bar{\nu}_{j+1,\varepsilon}, \mu_{k,\varepsilon}, \bar{\mu}_{k,\varepsilon}$ to get that, for any

$\varkappa_{j+1} > 0$, the kernels $\bar{\nu}_{k,\varepsilon}, \nu_{k,\varepsilon}$ defined by

$$(5.56) \quad \nu_{k,\varepsilon}(x, dy) = \int_{K_{\varkappa_{j+1}}(\varepsilon)} \nu_{j+1,\varepsilon}(x, dz) \mu_{k,\varepsilon}(z, dy),$$

$$(5.57) \quad \bar{\nu}_{k,\varepsilon}(x, dy) = \int_{K_{\varkappa_{j+1}}(\varepsilon)} \bar{\nu}_{j+1,\varepsilon}(x, dz) \bar{\mu}_{k,\varepsilon}(z, dy),$$

satisfy (5.31). This, along with Step 1, completes the verification of (5.31) for $k \in \{j+1, \dots, \bar{j}\}$.

Step 3. We show that $\nu_{k,\varepsilon}$ and $\bar{\nu}_{k,\varepsilon}$ coincide with those given by (5.28) and (5.32).

First, we verify that $\nu_{k,\varepsilon}$ of (5.56) coincides with (5.28). Using the expressions for $\nu_{k,\varepsilon}$ in (5.56), for $\nu_{j+1,\varepsilon}$ in (5.52), for $\mu_{k,\varepsilon}$ in (5.54), for $\mu_{j+1,\varepsilon}$ in (5.48), and $\nu_{j,\varepsilon}$ in (5.28), we can compute that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{k,\varepsilon}(x, [a, b]) &= \int_{K_{\varkappa_j}(\varepsilon)} \nu_{j,\varepsilon}(x, dz') \int_{K_{\varkappa_{j+1}}(\varepsilon)} \mu_{j+1,\varepsilon}(z', dz) \mu_{k,\varepsilon}(z, [a, b]) \\ &= \varepsilon^{-\theta_k - (\frac{\bar{\alpha}_{j+1}}{\rho_{j+1}} - 1)} \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^{\alpha_0} x v_0} \left(\bigcap_{i \in H' \cap \{0, \dots, j-1\}} (\bar{A}_{i, \varkappa_i, \varepsilon} \cap \bar{A}_{i+1, \varkappa_{i+1}, \varepsilon}) \cap B_{j, \varepsilon, K_{\varkappa_j}(\varepsilon)} \right) \\ &\quad \cap \left\{ \tau_\varepsilon^k < \infty, X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^{j+1}} \in x_{j+1} + \varepsilon^{\bar{\alpha}_{j+1}} K_{\varkappa_{j+1}}(\varepsilon) v_{j+1}, X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^k} \in x_k + \varepsilon^{\bar{\alpha}_k} [a, b] v_k \right\} \end{aligned}$$

The right-hand side of this display coincides with the right-hand side of (5.28) (for k in the range that we are considering). To see this, we need to note a few things. First, we use the definition of θ_j in (5.25) and the fact that there are no elements of H between j and k to see that $\theta_k = \theta_j + \frac{\bar{\alpha}_{j+1}}{\rho_{j+1}} - 1$. Next, due to the (5.13) and (5.27), we have $B_{j, \varepsilon, K_{\varkappa_j}(\varepsilon)} = \bar{A}_{j, \varkappa_j, \varepsilon}$. Also, the event in the last line of the last display is exactly $\bar{A}_{j+1, \varkappa_{j+1}, \varepsilon} \cap B_{k, \varepsilon, [a, b]}$. Finally, we have

$$H' \cap \{0, \dots, k-1\} = (H' \cap \{0, \dots, j-1\}) \cup \{j\}.$$

Applying these observations to the last display together with (5.29), we complete the proof of (5.28).

Let us check the properties of $\bar{\nu}_{k,\varepsilon}$ claimed in Lemma 5.11, namely, decomposition (5.32) along with (i), (ii), (iii). Recall $\underline{k} = j+1$ as in (5.47).

If $k = j+1$ (equivalently, $k = \underline{k}$), then, using the expressions for $\bar{\nu}_{j+1,\varepsilon}$ in (5.53), $\bar{\mu}_{j+1,\varepsilon}$ in (5.49), and $\bar{\nu}_{j,\varepsilon}$ in (5.32) (applied to j), we can see that (5.32) holds for

$$(5.58) \quad h_{k,\varepsilon}(x) = \left(\int_{K_{\varkappa_j}(\varepsilon)} \varsigma_{j,\varepsilon}(dz') g_{c_{j+1}}(z') \right) h_{j,\varepsilon}(x),$$

and $\varsigma_{k,\varepsilon} = \bar{\mu}_{j+1} \in \mathcal{M}$ (due to (5.50)), verifying (ii).

If $k \in \{j+2, \dots, \bar{j}\}$, then, using the expressions for $\bar{\nu}_{k,\varepsilon}$ in (5.57), $\bar{\nu}_{j+1,\varepsilon}$ in (5.53), $\bar{\mu}_{k,\varepsilon}$ in (5.55), $\bar{\mu}_{j+1,\varepsilon}$ in (5.49), and $\bar{\nu}_{j,\varepsilon}$ in (5.32) (applied to j), we can see that (5.32) holds for $h_{k,\varepsilon}$ defined in (5.58) and

$$\varsigma_{k,\varepsilon}(dy) = \int_{K_{\varkappa_{j+1}}(\varepsilon)} \bar{\mu}_{j+1}(dz) \mathbf{P}\{\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k(z, N_k) \in dy, \Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^k(z, N_k) \geq 0\}.$$

Since $\underline{k} = j + 1$ in this case, we can set $\varsigma_k = \bar{\mu}_{j+1}$ to guarantee (5.33). Now (5.34) follows from (5.50). The random vector N_k and the map $\Phi_{i,\varepsilon}^k$ were introduced in Step 2 through the application of Lemma 5.10. Thus they possess the desired properties automatically. Hence, we have verified (iii).

It remains to show (i), which will follow from the induction assumption on $h_{j,\varepsilon}$ once we show that

$$(5.59) \quad \int_{K_{\varkappa_j}(\varepsilon)} \varsigma_{j,\varepsilon}(dz') g_{c_{j+1}}(z')$$

is bounded uniformly in ε and converges as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ to a positive constant. To that end, we expand (5.59) using the induction assumption on $\varsigma_{k,\varepsilon}$:

$$(5.60) \quad \int_{K_{\varkappa_j}(\varepsilon)} \varsigma_j(dz) \mathbb{E} \left[g_{c_{j+1}} \left(\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^j(z, N_j) \right) \mathbf{1}_{\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^j(z, N_j) \in K_{\varkappa_j}(\varepsilon), \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}^j(z, N_j) \geq 0} \right].$$

Since part (6) of Lemma 5.10 holds for $\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^j$, the fact that $g_{c_{j+1}}$ is a Gaussian density and the Gaussianity of N_j imply

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[g_{c_{j+1}} \left(\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^j(z, N_j) \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[g_{c_{j+1}} \left(\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^j(z, N_j) \right) \left(\mathbf{1}_{|z| < R} + \mathbf{1}_{|z| \geq R, |N_j|_\infty \leq |z|^q} + \mathbf{1}_{|z| \geq R, |N_j|_\infty > |z|^q} \right) \right] \\ &\leq C \left(\mathbf{1}_{|z| < R} + e^{-c|z|^{2p}} + e^{-c|z|^{2q}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

for some $C, c > 0$. Using this and (4.9) enjoyed by ς_j (due to (5.34)), the boundedness of the expression in (5.59) is immediate. Moreover, the integrand in (5.60) is dominated by a function integrable with respect to ς_j . Since in the limit, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, $K_{\varkappa_j}(\varepsilon)$ and $K_{\varkappa_j}(\varepsilon)$ expand to cover the entire \mathbb{R} , we can use arguments similar to those in Step 4 of the basis case to conclude that the integrand converges pointwise everywhere. Therefore, the dominated convergence theorem gives the convergence of (5.59) to

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \varsigma_j(dz) \mathbb{E} \left[g_{c_{j+1}} \left(\Phi_1^j(z, N_j) \right) \mathbf{1}_{\Phi_2^j(z, N_j) \geq 0} \right].$$

The induction assumption guarantees that $\varsigma_j \in \mathcal{M}$. In particular, (4.8) holds for ς_j . Thus, to show the positivity of the above integral, it suffices to show the integrand is positive for every $z \in (0, \infty)$. In turn, this follows since the Gaussian density $g_{c_{j+1}}$ is positive and the condition on Φ_2^j in part (2) of Lemma 5.10 holds. Hence, the expression in (5.59) converge pointwise everywhere to a function that is positive everywhere, and so does $h_{j,\varepsilon}$. Using monotonicity similarly to Step 4 of the base case, we upgrade pointwise convergence to LU convergence.

This completes the proof of the induction step and of the entire Lemma 5.11. \square

5.3.7. *Proof of (5.5).* Since $\bar{\alpha}_{n-1} = 1$ (see Lemma 5.1 (6)), we set

$$\phi_\varepsilon(x) = \mathbf{P}^{x_{n-1} + \varepsilon x v_{n-1}}(A_{n,\varepsilon}).$$

We start by choosing \varkappa_0 and \varkappa_k 's used in the definition for $\nu_{n-1,\varepsilon} = \nu_{n-1,(\varkappa),\varepsilon}$ given in (5.28). First, we use the tameness of $\xi_{0,\varepsilon}$ to choose \varkappa_0 sufficiently large enough to ensure $\mathbf{P}\{|\xi_{0,\varepsilon}| > l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa_0}\} = o_\varepsilon(1)$. Then, we choose \varkappa_k in $\nu_{n-1,\varepsilon}$ large to ensure that Lemmas 5.7 and 5.11 are applicable. We note that if $\kappa = 0$, then \varkappa_0 is used

in the definition of $\nu_{n-1,\varepsilon}$. In this case, we simply make the previously chosen \varkappa_0 larger, and adjust the others accordingly.

Using Lemma 5.7 with $\tilde{\varkappa}_0$ replaced by \varkappa_0 therein, we have, uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa_0}(\varepsilon)$,

$$(5.61) \quad \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^{\alpha_0} x v_0}(A_{n,\varepsilon}) = \varepsilon^{\theta_{n-1}} \int_{K_{\varkappa_{n-1}}(\varepsilon)} \nu_{n-1,\varepsilon}(x, dy) \phi_\varepsilon(y) + o_\varepsilon(1),$$

for $\nu_{n-1,\varepsilon}$ given in (5.28) and θ_{n-1} defined in (5.25). In fact, $\theta_{n-1} = \theta$, where the latter is defined in (5.6).

The limiting behavior of the right-hand side of (5.61), can be analyzed using Lemma 5.8. The latter is actually targeted at transition kernel convolutions but we can make it work for this simpler case.

Applying Lemma 5.11, we have that $\nu_{n-1,\varepsilon}$ and $\bar{\nu}_{n-1,\varepsilon}$ (given in (5.32)) satisfy Lemma 5.8 (h1). Due to (5.33) and (5.34), Lemma 5.8 (h3) is satisfied by $\bar{\nu}_{n-1,\varepsilon}$. Lemma 4.4 implies that, for some constant $s > 0$, kernels given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{n,\varepsilon}(x, dy) &= \phi_\varepsilon(x) \delta_0(dy), \\ \bar{\mu}_{n,\varepsilon}(x, dy) &= \psi_s(-x) \delta_0(dy), \end{aligned}$$

where δ_0 is the Dirac mass at 0 (any probability measure that does not depend on ε would work equally well) and ψ_s is given in that lemma, satisfy Lemma 5.8 (h2). Due to the definition of ψ_s in (2.3), Lemma 5.8 (h4) is satisfied by $\bar{\mu}_{n,\varepsilon}$, as ψ_s is monotone. Therefore, we can apply Lemma 5.8 to $\nu_{n-1,\varepsilon}, \bar{\nu}_{n-1,\varepsilon}, \mu_{n,\varepsilon}, \bar{\mu}_{n,\varepsilon}$ to see that

$$(5.62) \quad \sup_{x \in K_{\varkappa_0}(\varepsilon)} \left| \int_{K_{\varkappa_{n-1}}(\varepsilon)} \nu_{n-1,\varepsilon}(x, dy) \phi_\varepsilon(y) - \int_{K_{\varkappa_{n-1}}(\varepsilon)} \bar{\nu}_{n-1,\varepsilon}(x, dy) \psi_s(-y) \right| = o(\varepsilon^\delta)$$

for some $\delta > 0$. In view of (5.61), it remains to verify that the second integral in the above display converges to a positive constant as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

The expression for $\bar{\nu}_{n-1,\varepsilon}$ in (5.32) (for $k = n - 1$) allows us to compute that, for some $\varkappa'_{n-1} > 0$,

$$(5.63) \quad \begin{aligned} &\int_{K_{\varkappa_{n-1}}(\varepsilon)} \bar{\nu}_{n-1,\varepsilon}(x, dy) \psi_s(-y) = h_{n-1,\varepsilon}(x) \\ &\times \int_{K_{\varkappa'_{n-1}}(\varepsilon)} \varsigma_{n-1}(dz) \mathbf{E} \left[\psi_s \left(-\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^{n-1}(z, N_{n-1}) \right) \mathbf{1}_{\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^{n-1}(z, N_{n-1}) \in K_{\varkappa_{n-1}}(\varepsilon), \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}^{n-1}(z, N_{n-1}) \geq 0} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.11 ensures that $h_{n-1,\varepsilon}$ is bounded uniformly in ε and that $h_{n-1,\varepsilon}$ converges in LU to some positive bounded continuous function on \mathbb{R} if $\alpha_0 = 1$; or a nonnegative bounded continuous function on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, which is positive on $(0, \infty)$, if $\alpha_0 < 1$. The argument we used to derive the convergence of (5.60) yields the convergence of the integral on the right-hand side of (5.63) to a positive constant. Hence, the left-hand side of (5.63), viewed as a function of x , is bounded uniformly in ε and converges in LU to some bounded continuous function $\bar{h} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ if $\alpha_0 = 1$, or $\bar{h} : \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, satisfying $\bar{h} > 0$ on $(0, \infty)$, if $\alpha_0 < 1$.

This along with (5.61) and (5.62) implies that the function

$$(5.64) \quad \bar{h}_\varepsilon : x \mapsto \varepsilon^{-\theta_{n-1}} \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^{\alpha_0} x v_0}(A_{n,\varepsilon}) \mathbf{1}_{x \in K_{\varkappa_0}(\varepsilon)}$$

is bounded uniformly in ε , and converges in LU to \bar{h} as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. We have

$$(5.65) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(A_{n,\varepsilon}) &= \mathbf{E} \left[\mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^{\alpha_0} \xi_{0,\varepsilon} v_0}(A_{n,\varepsilon}) \right] = \mathbf{E} \left[\mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^{\alpha_0} \xi_{0,\varepsilon} v_0}(A_{n,\varepsilon}) \mathbf{1}_{\xi_{0,\varepsilon} \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)} \right] + \Delta_\varepsilon \\ &= \varepsilon^{\theta_{n-1}} \mathbf{E} \bar{h}_\varepsilon(\xi_{0,\varepsilon}) + \Delta_\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(5.66) \quad 0 \leq \Delta_\varepsilon \leq \mathbf{P}\{\xi_{0,\varepsilon} \notin K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)\}.$$

Due to the tameness of $\xi_{0,\varepsilon}$, we have $\Delta_\varepsilon = o_\varepsilon(1)$, so

$$\mathbf{P}(A_{n,\varepsilon}) = \varepsilon^{\theta_{n-1}} \mathbf{E} \bar{h}_\varepsilon(\xi_{0,\varepsilon}) + o_\varepsilon(1).$$

It remains to verify

$$(5.67) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{E} \bar{h}_\varepsilon(\xi_{0,\varepsilon}) = \mathbf{E} \bar{h}(\xi_0) > 0.$$

First, we consider the case $\alpha_0 = 1$. We start with the upper bound

$$(5.68) \quad \begin{aligned} &|\mathbf{E} \bar{h}_\varepsilon(\xi_{0,\varepsilon}) - \mathbf{E} \bar{h}(\xi_0)| \leq |\mathbf{E} \bar{h}_\varepsilon(\xi_{0,\varepsilon}) - \mathbf{E} \bar{h}(\xi_{0,\varepsilon})| + |\mathbf{E} \bar{h}(\xi_{0,\varepsilon}) - \mathbf{E} \bar{h}(\xi_0)| \\ &\leq \mathbf{E} [|\bar{h}_\varepsilon(\xi_{0,\varepsilon}) - \bar{h}(\xi_{0,\varepsilon})| \mathbf{1}_{|\xi_{0,\varepsilon}| \leq R}] + C \mathbf{P}\{|\xi_{0,\varepsilon}| > R\} + |\mathbf{E} \bar{h}(\xi_{0,\varepsilon}) - \mathbf{E} \bar{h}(\xi_0)| \end{aligned}$$

which holds for some $C > 0$ and all $R > 0$. The second term on the right-hand side can be made arbitrarily small, uniformly in small ε , by choosing R sufficiently large. The third term decays to zero as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ due to condition **(G)**. The first term in (5.68) converges to 0 due to the LU convergence proved above. Hence, we conclude that (5.67) holds and the right-hand side is positive due to the positivity of \bar{h} .

The argument is similar for $\alpha_0 < 1$. The estimate (5.68) is replaced by

$$\begin{aligned} &|\mathbf{E} \bar{h}_\varepsilon(\xi_{0,\varepsilon}) - \mathbf{E} \bar{h}(\xi_0)| \\ &\leq \mathbf{E} [|\bar{h}_\varepsilon(\xi_{0,\varepsilon}) - \bar{h}(\xi_{0,\varepsilon})| \mathbf{1}_{|\xi_{0,\varepsilon}| \in [\delta, R]}] + C \mathbf{P}\{|\xi_{0,\varepsilon}| \notin [\delta, R]\} + |\mathbf{E} \bar{h}(\xi_{0,\varepsilon}) - \mathbf{E} \bar{h}(\xi_0)|. \end{aligned}$$

Here the second term can be made arbitrarily small by choosing sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ and sufficiently large $R > 0$. The first term converges to 0 due to the LU convergence of \bar{h}_ε to \bar{h} . To deduce the convergence of the last term to 0, besides the weak convergence of $\xi_{0,\varepsilon}$ to ξ_0 , we also use the fact that the only discontinuity point 0 of \bar{h} is not an atom of the distribution of ξ_0 . We also note that the right-hand side of (5.67) is positive because of our assumption $\mathbf{P}\{\xi_0 > 0\} > 0$ and the fact that $\bar{h} > 0$ on $(0, \infty)$ and non-negative elsewhere. This completes the proof of (5.5) of Theorem 5.1 (2). \square

5.4. Proof of (5.7) in Theorem 5.1 (2). We need the following lemma describing the typical exit time near a saddle point where the initial condition is of order ε^α for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Here, we recall that Lemma 4.7 describes the typical exit time for $\alpha = 1$.

Lemma 5.12. *Under conditions (A), (B), and (H), for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and every $\varkappa, \delta > 0$, there is $\delta' > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha x v_0} \left\{ \left| \frac{\tau_\varepsilon}{\frac{\alpha}{\lambda} l_\varepsilon} - 1 \right| > \delta \right\} \leq \mathbf{1}_{|x| \leq \varepsilon^{\delta'}} + o_\varepsilon(1).$$

holds uniformly in $x \in K_\varkappa(\varepsilon)$.

HEURISTICS FOR THE MODEL CASE: Due to (2.18), (2.19), (2.20), we have $\tau_\varepsilon \approx \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \frac{R}{|\varepsilon^\alpha x + \varepsilon \mathcal{U}|}$. Thus, uniformly in $x \in K_\varkappa(\varepsilon)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha x v_0} \left\{ \tau_\varepsilon < \frac{\alpha - \delta}{\lambda} l_\varepsilon \right\} &\approx \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha x v_0} \{|x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{U}| > \varepsilon^{-\delta} R\}, \\ \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha x v_0} \left\{ \tau_\varepsilon > \frac{\alpha + \delta}{\lambda} l_\varepsilon \right\} &\approx \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha x v_0} \{|x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{U}| < \varepsilon^\delta R\}. \end{aligned}$$

The first display is $o_\varepsilon(1)$ due to the Gaussianity of \mathcal{U} and $x \in K_\varkappa(\varepsilon)$. The Gaussianity of \mathcal{U} yields that the second display is bounded above by $\mathbf{1}_{|x| \leq \varepsilon^{\delta'}} + o_\varepsilon(1)$ for some $\delta' > 0$. \square

Slightly extending the proof of (5.5) in Theorem 5.1, we obtain the following lemma, where the scaling limit assumption (G) is replaced by the tameness of the initial condition:

Lemma 5.13. *Under conditions (A), (E), (F), and (I), if $\kappa < n - 1$, then, for each $\varkappa_0 > 0$ and for θ defined in (5.6),*

$$\sup_{x \in K_{\varkappa_0}(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^{\alpha_0} x v_0}(A_{n, \varepsilon}) = O(\varepsilon^\theta).$$

PROOF: In our proof of (5.5) in Theorem 5.1, for an arbitrary initial condition $\xi_{0, \varepsilon}$, we obtained (5.65), an expression for $\mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^{\alpha_0} x v_0}(A_{n, \varepsilon})$ in terms of a function \bar{h}_ε defined in (5.64) and a small correction Δ_ε . To finish the proof, it now suffices to recall that we showed that \bar{h}_ε is bounded uniformly in ε and to note that (5.66) implies that for $\xi_{0, \varepsilon} = x \in K_\varkappa(\varepsilon)$, $\Delta_\varepsilon = 0$. \square

Now, we are ready to prove (5.7) in Theorem 5.1. For brevity, we write

$$\chi_i = \begin{cases} \frac{\bar{\alpha}_i - 1}{\lambda_i}, & i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus J, \\ \frac{\bar{\alpha}_i}{\mu_i}, & i \in J. \end{cases}$$

Comparing this with (5.8), we have $\bar{\chi} = \sum_{i=1}^n \chi_i$. We also set $\tau_\varepsilon^0 = 0$. Let $\delta > 0$, and we have

$$\mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^{\alpha_0} x v_0} \{ |\tau_\varepsilon^n - \bar{\chi} l_\varepsilon| > n \delta l_\varepsilon, A_{n, \varepsilon} \} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n P_i,$$

where

$$P_i = P_i(x) = \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^{\alpha_0} x v_0} \{ |\tau_\varepsilon^i - \tau_\varepsilon^{i-1} - \chi_i l_\varepsilon| > \delta l_\varepsilon, A_{n, \varepsilon} \}.$$

Due to (5.5), it suffices to show that for all i , $P_i = o(\varepsilon^\theta)$ uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa_0}(\varepsilon)$ for θ from (5.6). Using Lemma 5.7 and the strong Markov property, for \varkappa_k 's chosen

as in the proof of Theorem 5.1 (5.5), we have, uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa_0}(\varepsilon)$,

$$\begin{aligned} P_i &= \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha x v} \left\{ D_\varepsilon \cap A_{n,\varepsilon} \cap \bigcap_{k \in \{\kappa\} \cup H \cup J} \bar{A}_{k,\varkappa_k,\varepsilon} \right\} + o_\varepsilon(1) \\ (5.69) \quad &= \mathbf{E}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^{\alpha_0} x v_0} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\bar{A}_{\leq i-1, (\varkappa), \varepsilon}} \mathbf{E} \left[\mathbf{1}_{D_\varepsilon \cap \bar{A}_{i, \varkappa_i, \varepsilon}} \mathbf{P} \left(A_{n,\varepsilon} \cap \bar{A}_{\geq i+1, (\varkappa), \varepsilon} \mid X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^i} \right) \Big| X_{\varepsilon, \tau_{i-1}^\varepsilon} \right] \right] + o_\varepsilon(1), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} D_\varepsilon &= \{ |\tau_\varepsilon^i - \tau_\varepsilon^{i-1} - \chi_i l_\varepsilon| > \delta l_\varepsilon \}, \\ \bar{A}_{\leq i-1, (\varkappa), \varepsilon} &= \bigcap_{\substack{k \leq i-1 \\ k \in \{\kappa\} \cup H \cup J}} \bar{A}_{k,\varkappa_k,\varepsilon}, \\ \bar{A}_{\geq i+1, (\varkappa), \varepsilon} &= \bigcap_{\substack{k \geq i+1 \\ k \in \{\kappa\} \cup H \cup J}} \bar{A}_{k,\varkappa_k,\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

To estimate (5.69), we consider three transitions separately: from $X_{\varepsilon,0}$ to $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^{i-1}}$, from $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^{i-1}}$ to $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^i}$, and from $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^i}$ to $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^n}$. We will apply Lemma 5.10 or Lemma 5.11 to the first part, Lemma 4.6 (2) to the second part, and Lemma 5.13 to the third part.

First, we consider the third part, i.e., the transition from $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^i}$ to $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^n}$. Let us first assume $i \leq n-1$. Our goal is to apply Lemma 5.13 to the diffusion along the heteroclinic chain $(O_i, \gamma_i, O_{i+1}, \dots, \gamma_{n-1}, O_n, \gamma_{n+1}, O_{n+1})$ with initial condition belonging to $I_\varepsilon = x_i + \varepsilon^{\bar{\alpha}_i} K_{\varkappa_i}(\varepsilon) v_i$. This initial condition is, in fact, given by $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^i}$; it belongs to I_ε on $\bar{A}_{i, \varkappa_i, \varepsilon}$, see the definition of the latter in (5.13).

To apply Lemma 5.13, we need to introduce a new sequence of exponents playing the role of $(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1})$ in Theorem 5.1 and Lemma 5.13, where the role of α_0 is played by $\bar{\alpha}_i$, and compute all the other elements of the construction of the exponent θ .

So we define a new sequence $(\tilde{\alpha}_j)_{j \in \{i, \dots, n\}}$ recursively by $\tilde{\alpha}_i = \bar{\alpha}_i$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_{j+1} = \tilde{\alpha}_j \rho_{j+1} \wedge 1$. We set $\tilde{\kappa} = \max\{j : i \leq j \leq n-1, \tilde{\alpha}_j = 1\}$, then we define the set \tilde{H} of binding indices for this stage of evolution. Similarly to (5.2), (5.3), (5.4), we define \tilde{H}', \tilde{J} and a new sequence $(\bar{\alpha}_j)_{j=i}^{n-1}$. Using Lemma 5.1 (6), we see that

$$\tilde{\kappa} \leq n-1, \quad \tilde{H} = H \cap \{i, \dots, n-1\}, \quad \tilde{J} = J \cap \{i+1, \dots, n\},$$

and the new $(\bar{\alpha}_j)_{j=i}^{n-1}$ is simply the restriction of $(\bar{\alpha}_j)_{j=0}^{n-1}$ to $j \in \{i, \dots, n-1\}$.

Therefore, applying Lemma 5.13 to this stage of evolution we see that, uniformly on the event $\bar{A}_{i, \varkappa_i, \varepsilon}$, we have $\mathbf{P} \left(A_{n,\varepsilon} \cap \bar{A}_{\geq i+1, (\varkappa), \varepsilon} \mid X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^i} \right) = O(\varepsilon^{\tilde{\theta}})$ where

$$\tilde{\theta} = \sum_{j \in \tilde{J}} \left(\frac{\bar{\alpha}_j}{\rho_j} - 1 \right) = \sum_{j \in J \cap \{i+1, \dots, n\}} \left(\frac{\bar{\alpha}_j}{\rho_j} - 1 \right).$$

Therefore, (5.69) can be continued as

$$P_i = O(\varepsilon^{\tilde{\theta}}) \mathbf{E}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^{\alpha_0} x v_0} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\bar{A}_{\leq i-1, (\varkappa), \varepsilon}} \mathbf{P} \left(D_\varepsilon \cap \bar{A}_{i, \xi, \varepsilon} \mid X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^{i-1}} \right) \right] + o_\varepsilon(1).$$

If $i = n$, then \tilde{J} is empty and the above bound is still valid with $\tilde{\theta} = 0$. To see this, we simply apply $\mathbf{P}(A_{n,\varepsilon} \cap \bar{A}_{\geq n+1, \varkappa, \varepsilon} \mid X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^n}) \leq 1$ in (5.69).

Next, we study the transition from $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^{i-1}}$ to $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^i}$. If $i-1 \in \{\kappa\} \cup H$, we apply Lemma 4.6 (2). If $i-1 \notin \{\kappa\} \cup H$, we apply Lemma 4.7 for $\bar{\alpha}_{i-1} = 1$ or Lemma 5.12 for $\bar{\alpha}_{i-1} < 1$. Then, the last display implies that, uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa_0}(\varepsilon)$,

(5.70)

$$P_i = O(\varepsilon^{\theta'}) \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^{\alpha_0} x v_0} \left(\varepsilon^{-\bar{\alpha}_{i-1}} \left| X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^{i-1}} - x_{i-1} \right| \leq \varepsilon^{\delta'}, \bar{A}_{\leq i-1, (\varkappa), \varepsilon} \right) + o_e(1),$$

if $i-1 \notin \{\kappa\} \cup H$, and $\bar{\alpha}_{i-1} < 1$;

(5.71)

$$P_i = o(\varepsilon^{\theta' + \delta_i}) \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^{\alpha_0} x v_0} (\bar{A}_{\leq i-1, (\varkappa), \varepsilon}) + o_e(1), \quad \text{otherwise,}$$

for some $\delta_i > 0$. Here

$$\theta' = \sum_{j \in J \cap \{i, i+1, \dots, n\}} \left(\frac{\bar{\alpha}_j}{\rho_j} - 1 \right) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\theta} + \frac{\bar{\alpha}_i}{\rho_i} - 1, & \text{if } i-1 \in \{\kappa\} \cup H, \\ \tilde{\theta}, & \text{if } i-1 \notin \{\kappa\} \cup H. \end{cases}$$

Lastly, we study the transition from $X_{\varepsilon, 0}$ to $X_{\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon^{i-1}}$. Recalling the definition of θ_{i-1} in (5.25) and that of θ in (5.6), we obtain $\theta_{i-1} + \theta' = \theta$. If $i-1 \leq \kappa$ (implying $\theta_{i-1} = 0$ by (5.26) and thus $\theta' = \theta$), we apply Lemma 5.10 to $k = i-1$. If $i-1 > \kappa$, we apply Lemma 5.11. Then, we obtain the following results.

First we estimate (5.70). Under the condition $i-1 \notin \{\kappa\} \cup H$ and $\bar{\alpha}_{i-1} < 1$, the main term in (5.70) can be bounded from above by

$$O(\varepsilon^\theta) \mathbf{P}\{\Phi_{1, \varepsilon}^{i-1}(x, N_{i-1}) \in |v_{i-1}|^{-1}[-\varepsilon^{\delta'}, \varepsilon^{\delta'}]\}, \quad \text{if } i-1 < \kappa,$$

$$O(\varepsilon^\theta) \bar{\nu}_{i-1, \varepsilon}(x, |v_{i-1}|^{-1}[-\varepsilon^{\delta'}, \varepsilon^{\delta'}]), \quad \text{if } i-1 > \kappa.$$

Next, we estimate (5.71). When $i-1 \leq \kappa$, we bound the probability in (5.71) by 1 and thus the main term in (5.71) is $o(\varepsilon^\theta)$. When $i-1 > \kappa$, using Lemma 5.11 and (5.28), we can bound the probability on the r.h.s. of (5.71) by $\varepsilon^{\theta_{i-1}} (\bar{\nu}_{i-1, \varepsilon}(x, K_{\varkappa_{i-1}}(\varepsilon)) + o(\varepsilon^\delta))$ for some $\delta > 0$, uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa_0}(\varepsilon)$. Recalling the expression for $\bar{\nu}_{i-1, \varepsilon}$ in (5.43), the boundedness of $h_{i-1, \varepsilon}$ in Lemma 5.11 (i), the expression for $\varsigma_{i-1, \varepsilon}$ in Lemma 5.11 (ii) and (iii) where ς_{i-1} satisfies (4.9) due to $\varsigma_{i-1} \in \mathcal{M}$, we can see that $\bar{\nu}_{i-1, \varepsilon}(x, K_{\varkappa_{i-1}}(\varepsilon)) \leq l_\varepsilon^p$ for some $p > 0$. We can conclude that the main term in (5.71) is $o(\varepsilon^{\theta' + \theta_{i-1}}) = o(\varepsilon^\theta)$.

Hence, in view of the tameness of $\xi_{0, \varepsilon}$, to prove (5.7), it suffices to verify:

$$(5.72) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{P}\{\Phi_{1, \varepsilon}^{i-1}(\xi_{0, \varepsilon}, N_{i-1}) \in |v_{i-1}|^{-1}[-\varepsilon^{\delta'}, \varepsilon^{\delta'}]\} = 0,$$

$$(5.73) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{E} \bar{\nu}_{i-1, \varepsilon}(\xi_{0, \varepsilon}, |v_{i-1}|^{-1}[-\varepsilon^{\delta'}, \varepsilon^{\delta'}]) = 0.$$

To prove (5.72), we will show that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{E} w_\varepsilon(\xi_{0, \varepsilon}) = 0$ for

$$w_\varepsilon(x) = \mathbf{P}\{\Phi_{1, \varepsilon}^{i-1}(x, N_{i-1}) \in |v_{i-1}|^{-1}[-\varepsilon^{\delta'}, \varepsilon^{\delta'}]\}.$$

Denoting

$$v_\eta(x) = \mathbf{P}\{\Phi_1^{i-1}(x, N_{i-1}) \in [-2\eta, 2\eta]\},$$

we use Lemma 5.10 (2) to obtain

$$(5.74) \quad \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} v_\eta(x) = 0,$$

for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$ if $\alpha_0 = 1$ or for every $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ if $\alpha_0 < 1$. Due to our assumption on ξ_0 , this implies

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} v_\eta(\xi_0) \stackrel{a.s.}{=} 0.$$

For each $\eta \in (0, 1)$, let $\zeta_\eta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a smooth bump function that is constantly 1 on $[-\eta, \eta]$ and supported on $[-2\eta, 2\eta]$. Hence, setting

$$u_\eta(x) = \mathbf{E}\zeta_\eta \circ \Phi_1^{i-1}(x, N_{i-1}),$$

we obtain that $u_\eta(\xi_0)$ converges to 0 a.s. as $\eta \rightarrow 0$, which implies $\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{E}u_\eta(\xi_0) = 0$. Now, fixing any $\delta > 0$, we choose η sufficiently small so that

$$(5.75) \quad \mathbf{E}u_\eta(\xi_0) \leq \delta.$$

Setting

$$u_{\eta,\varepsilon}(x) = \mathbf{E}\zeta_\eta \circ \Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^{i-1}(x, N_{i-1}),$$

we want to estimate

$$|\mathbf{E}u_{\eta,\varepsilon}(\xi_{0,\varepsilon}) - \mathbf{E}u_\eta(\xi_0)| \leq |\mathbf{E}u_{\eta,\varepsilon}(\xi_{0,\varepsilon}) - \mathbf{E}u_\eta(\xi_{0,\varepsilon})| + |\mathbf{E}u_\eta(\xi_{0,\varepsilon}) - \mathbf{E}u_\eta(\xi_0)|.$$

Since u_η is bounded and continuous (due to the continuity of Φ_1^{i-1} ensured by Lemma 5.10), and since $\xi_{0,\varepsilon} \xrightarrow{d} \xi_0$, the second term on the right can be made arbitrarily small for sufficiently small ε . To treat the first term, we bound it by

$$\mathbf{E}|u_{\eta,\varepsilon}(\xi_{0,\varepsilon}) - \mathbf{E}u_\eta(\xi_{0,\varepsilon})| \mathbf{1}_{|\xi_{0,\varepsilon}| \leq R} + 2\mathbf{P}\{|\xi_{0,\varepsilon}| > R\}.$$

Due to the LU convergence of $\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^{i-1}$ given in Lemma 5.10 (2), and the smoothness of ζ_η , we see that $u_{\eta,\varepsilon}$ converges in LU to u_η . Hence, choosing R large and then ε sufficiently small, the above can be made arbitrarily small. In view of (5.75), we can conclude that $\mathbf{E}u_{\eta,\varepsilon}(\xi_{0,\varepsilon}) \leq 2\delta$ for sufficiently small ε .

Since $\delta > 0$ is arbitrary and $\mathbf{E}w_\varepsilon(\xi_{0,\varepsilon}) \leq \mathbf{E}u_{\eta,\varepsilon}(\xi_{0,\varepsilon})$ for sufficiently small ε , we can thus conclude (5.72).

Now, we turn to (5.73). Using (5.32) and (i) in Lemma 5.11, the expectation in (5.73) is bounded by a constant times

$$E_\varepsilon = \mathbf{E}\varsigma_{i-1,\varepsilon}(|v_{i-1}|^{-1}[-\varepsilon^{\delta'}, \varepsilon^{\delta'}]).$$

If $\varsigma_{i-1,\varepsilon}$ is given by Lemma 5.11 (ii), i.e., it does not depend on ε and belongs to \mathcal{M} (thus being absolutely continuous), then $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} E_\varepsilon = 0$. If $\varsigma_{i-1,\varepsilon}$ is given by Lemma 5.11 (iii), then

$$E_\varepsilon \leq \int \varsigma_{i-1}(dz) \mathbf{P}\{\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^{i-1}(z, N_{i-1}) \in [-\eta, \eta]\}$$

for every $\eta \in (0, 1)$ and sufficiently small ε . Due to Lemma 5.10 (6), there is $q > 0$ such that the following holds for all sufficiently large L : if $|z| > L$ and $|N_{i-1}|_\infty \leq |z|^q$, then $|\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^{i-1}(z, N_{i-1})| \geq 1 > \eta$. Hence,

$$E_\varepsilon \leq \int_{|z| \leq L} \varsigma_{i-1}(dz) \mathbf{P}\{\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^{i-1}(z, N_{i-1}) \in [-\eta, \eta]\} + \int_{|z| > L} \varsigma_{i-1}(dz) \mathbf{P}\{|N_{i-1}|_\infty > |z|^q\}.$$

Due to the Gaussian tail of N_{i-1} and property (4.9) enjoyed by ς_{i-1} , the second term on the right-hand side can be made arbitrarily small by choosing L sufficiently large. Noting that

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{P}\{\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}^{i-1}(z, N_{i-1}) \in [-\eta, \eta]\} \leq \mathbf{P}\{\Phi_1^{i-1}(z, N_{i-1}) \in [-2\eta, 2\eta]\},$$

using Fatou's lemma, (5.74), and choosing η to be small we obtain that the first term can be made arbitrarily small as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. This completes our proof. \square

6. LONG-TERM ASYMPTOTICS OF DIFFUSIONS NEAR HETEROCLINIC NETWORKS

In this section, we use the main result of Section 5 to discuss — briefly and informally, without any attempt at rigor — the behavior of diffusions near heteroclinic networks over long periods of time.

We will work with a specific example but the picture of hierarchy of clusters and timescales that we describe holds for arbitrary planar stable heteroclinic networks. The periodic structure of our example allows to approach the question of homogenization.

Combining the vector field shown in Figure 5 with its own reflection we obtain a vector field on the torus \mathbb{T}^2 shown on Figure 9. One can also view this vector field as \mathbb{Z}^2 -periodic with a square fundamental domain, and lift the diffusion from \mathbb{T}^2 to its universal cover, \mathbb{R}^2 .




FIGURE 9. An example on \mathbb{T}^2 or, by \mathbb{Z}^2 -periodicity, on \mathbb{R}^2

On the torus, points O_0, O'_0 are identified, and so are O_2, O'_2 , and O_3, O'_3, O''_3, O'''_3 .

We already know that under the assumptions on stability indices $\rho_0, \rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3$ made in Section 2, for small ε , the diffusion started near the connection γ_0 stays within the union of two cells on both sides of γ_0 at least for times comparable with l_ε , circulating near the boundaries of these two cells and making occasional transitions between them upon passing the neighborhood of O_0 . The exit distribution upon passing O_0 is symmetric Gaussian, scaling as ε^1 , and the next distributions from O_1, O_2 (or O'_2), O_3 (or O'_3) scale as $\varepsilon^{\rho_1}, \varepsilon^{\rho_1\rho_2}, \varepsilon^{\rho_1\rho_2\rho_3}$, respectively, and the scaling limit distributions are one-sided.

However, the elliptic diffusion on the torus must have an invariant distribution absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure, so the process must

eventually visit arbitrarily small neighborhoods of all points of the torus escaping from the pair of cells and realizing a rare transition or a sequence of those, on time scales longer than logarithmic.

Theorem 5.1 explains how cell escapes get realized. If we start at distance of order ε from γ_0 , then it is easy to see that $\bar{\alpha}_1 = \bar{\alpha}_2 = \bar{\alpha}_3 = 1$, so the escape through γ_1 (or γ'_1), γ_2 (or γ'_2), γ_3 (or γ'_3) happens with probability of order $\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\rho_1}-1}$, $\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\rho_1}+\frac{1}{\rho_2}-2}$, $\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\rho_1}+\frac{1}{\rho_2}+\frac{1}{\rho_2}-3}$, respectively. If the escape attempt is unsuccessful, the process typically returns to a neighborhood of the connection γ_0 , passing it at a distance of order ε . To see a successful escape one needs to make about $\varepsilon^{-(\frac{1}{\rho_1}-1)}$, $\varepsilon^{-(\frac{1}{\rho_1}+\frac{1}{\rho_2}-2)}$, $\varepsilon^{-(\frac{1}{\rho_1}+\frac{1}{\rho_2}+\frac{1}{\rho_2}-3)}$ attempts, respectively. Each of them takes time of order l_ε . Therefore, by a time $t(\varepsilon)$ satisfying

$$(6.1) \quad l_\varepsilon \ll t(\varepsilon) \ll \varepsilon^{-(\frac{1}{\rho_1}-1)}l_\varepsilon,$$

it is likely for the diffusion to visit small neighborhoods of all the saddle points multiple times but it is unlikely to see any transitions between cells except crossing γ_0 and γ'_0 (let us call them transitions of type 0). Moreover, one can easily compute the limit of the empirical measure of the process

$$\nu_{t(\varepsilon)}(A) = \frac{1}{t(\varepsilon)} \int_0^{t(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{1}_{X_{\varepsilon,s} \in A} ds.$$

Since during one cycle, X_ε spends time of order $\frac{\alpha_i-1}{\lambda_i}l_\varepsilon$ near a saddle O_i and the time it takes to travel between those saddles is of order of constant, we obtain that the limit is given by

$$(6.2) \quad m_0\delta_{O_0} + m_1\delta_{O_1} + m_2\delta_{O_2} + m_3\delta_{O_3}.$$

Here

$$m_0 = \frac{\rho_1\rho_2\rho_3}{\lambda_0 Z}, \quad m_1 = \frac{1}{\lambda_1 Z}, \quad m_2 = \frac{\rho_1}{\lambda_2 Z}, \quad m_3 = \frac{\rho_1\rho_2}{\lambda_3 Z},$$

with Z being the normalizing constant

$$Z = \frac{1}{\lambda_1} + \frac{\rho_1}{\lambda_2} + \frac{\rho_1\rho_2}{\lambda_3} + \frac{\rho_1\rho_2\rho_3}{\lambda_0}.$$

By a time $t(\varepsilon)$ satisfying

$$(6.3) \quad \varepsilon^{-(\frac{1}{\rho_1}-1)}l_\varepsilon \ll t(\varepsilon) \ll \varepsilon^{-(\frac{1}{\rho_1}+\frac{1}{\rho_2}-2)}l_\varepsilon,$$

it is likely to see a growing number of transitions through connections γ_1, γ'_1 (let us call them transitions of type 1) but no other new transitions. So the process circulates within the pair of cells for a long time making only transitions of type 0, then, at a random time, via a transition of type 1, escapes to the neighboring pair of cells, where the same process begins anew, etc. For these times $t(\varepsilon)$, the process is still confined, with high probability, to the 4-cell cluster composed of two 2-cell clusters. At longer time scales though, for $t(\varepsilon)$ satisfying

$$(6.4) \quad \varepsilon^{-(\frac{1}{\rho_1}+\frac{1}{\rho_2}-2)}l_\varepsilon \ll t(\varepsilon) \ll \varepsilon^{-(\frac{1}{\rho_1}+\frac{1}{\rho_2}+\frac{1}{\rho_2}-3)}l_\varepsilon,$$

we will see multiple transitions through $\gamma_2, \gamma'_2, \gamma''_2, \gamma'''_2$ (transitions of type 2) but still, typically, no transitions through $\gamma_3, \gamma'_3, \gamma''_3, \gamma'''_3$ (transitions of type 3). Between those transitions of type 2, there will be multiple transitions of type 1, and between those there will be multiple transitions of type 0. If one views the diffusion as a

process on \mathbb{R}^2 , then the entire infinite strip composed of 4-cell complexes separated by heteroclinic connections of type 2, is accessible for the diffusion for these times.

For times $t(\varepsilon)$ satisfying

$$(6.5) \quad t(\varepsilon) \geq \varepsilon^{-\left(\frac{1}{\rho_1} + \frac{1}{\rho_2} + \frac{1}{\rho_2} - 3\right)} l_\varepsilon,$$

transitions of type 3 finally become typical, making all cells in the entire \mathbb{R}^2 accessible for the diffusion.

In effect, we have the following hierarchy of clusters: singular cells, 2-cell complexes, 4-cell complexes, strips of cells, the entire plane. Each cluster is equipped with a range of time scales on which the diffusion is typically confined to it. One can deduce from Theorem 5.1 that such a picture, in fact, emerges for a broad class of planar heteroclinic networks under a stability assumption. In our example, viewed as a diffusion on the torus, due to the symmetry of the model, one can actually claim that for times belonging to any of the scales described by any of the relations (6.1), (6.3), (6.4), (6.5), the limit of the empirical distribution as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ is the same and given by (6.2). In particular, it also gives the limit of the invariant measure for the Markov semigroup associated with SDE (1.1). In general, though, the limiting empirical distribution for each cluster (or timescale) of the hierarchy can be computed by averaging the limiting distributions associated with the subordinate clusters.

The hierarchical structure that we are describing is reminiscent of the hierarchy of cycles in the Freidlin–Wentzell theory of metastability. One key difference though is that in the metastability theory, transitions happen at times exponential in ε^{-2} whereas in our picture the transition times are polynomial.

Metastable cycling was studied in [FK17] in the more abstract setting of a Markov chain on a graph where probabilities of various transitions depend on a small parameter ε and are of different order of magnitude. It was shown under mild regularity assumptions that there is a sequence of time scales

$$1 \equiv T_0(\varepsilon) \ll T_1(\varepsilon) \ll \dots \ll T_N(\varepsilon) \ll T_{N+1}(\varepsilon) \equiv \infty$$

and a family of measures (μ_i^j) called metastable distributions such that if $t(\varepsilon)$ satisfies $T_i(\varepsilon) \ll t(\varepsilon) \ll T_{i+1}(\varepsilon)$ for some i , then the process equilibrates to one of μ_i^j over time $t(\varepsilon)$. Here i enumerates timescales and j enumerates clusters, i.e., elements of the partition of the state space associated with a particular timescale.

Although our setting is described by the construction of [FK17] only approximately, we still can draw a connection. The timescales are given by $T_i(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon^{-\theta_i} l_\varepsilon$ for $i \geq 1$ and an increasing sequence of exponents θ_i determined by the network geometry and contraction/expansion rates near all saddles. Each saddle point produces four graph vertices, one per incident cell. Edges of the graph correspond to heteroclinic connections. The diffusion spends a logarithmic in ε^{-1} time near each saddle point, so one can say that for times $t(\varepsilon)$ satisfying $T_0 \equiv 1 \ll t(\varepsilon) \ll T_1(\varepsilon) = l_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^0 l_\varepsilon$ (i.e., $\theta_1 = 0$), the empirical measure equilibrates to the delta measure at one of the saddles. The next level clusters are composed of vertices/saddles on the boundary of cells that are mutually accessible in logarithmic times. At time scales between $T_1(\varepsilon) = l_\varepsilon$ and $T_2(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon^{-\theta_2} l_\varepsilon$, the diffusion equilibrates to a mixture of the delta measures at those saddle points. For longer time scales, similarly to our cellular flow example, more and more transitions become available, so more massive clusters emerge and the metastable distributions at each

level are mixtures of metastable distributions a level below. Imposing additional recurrence conditions, one can use the top level of the hierarchy to claim convergence of stationary distributions of the diffusion to a limiting measure and describe the mixing properties.

In general, diffusions near planar noisy heteroclinic networks can exhibit a variety of behaviors. In our relatively simple cellular flow example, the vector field and the heteroclinic network are \mathbb{Z}^2 -periodic, so at the time scales (6.4) and (6.5), one can approximate the diffusion with a symmetric random walk on \mathbb{Z}^1 and \mathbb{Z}^2 respectively (just recording the \mathbb{Z}^2 coordinates of the cell occupied by the process), obtaining Gaussian approximations. One can conjecture a Central Limit Theorem for the regime (6.4): there is a constant $c^2 > 0$ (the effective diffusivity) such that

$$\frac{X_{\varepsilon, t(\varepsilon)}^1}{\left(\frac{t(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^{-(\frac{1}{\rho_1} + \frac{1}{\rho_2} - 2)} l_\varepsilon}\right)^{1/2}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, c^2),$$

and, moreover, for each $T > 0$, the process

$$Z_{\varepsilon, s} = \frac{X_{\varepsilon, st(\varepsilon)}^1}{\left(\frac{t(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^{-(\frac{1}{\rho_1} + \frac{1}{\rho_2} - 2)} l_\varepsilon}\right)^{1/2}}, \quad s \in [0, T],$$

converges in distribution to a Brownian motion on $[0, T]$. In the regime (6.5), a Gaussian scaling limit also should hold, albeit two components must scale differently: defining the diagonal scaling matrix D_ε by

$$D_\varepsilon = \frac{l_\varepsilon}{t(\varepsilon)} \text{diag} \left(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\rho_1} + \frac{1}{\rho_2} - 2}, \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\rho_1} + \frac{1}{\rho_2} + \frac{1}{\rho_3} - 3} \right),$$

we conjecture that $\sqrt{D_\varepsilon} X_{\varepsilon, t(\varepsilon)}$ converges in distribution to a centered Gaussian vector with independent components.

These statements can also be reformulated in terms of homogenization for a Fokker–Planck PDE with small diffusion but it seems that it is harder to obtain such a result by PDE methods.

We expect similar but perhaps more sophisticated scaling limits to hold for more complex heteroclinic networks.

An important feature of the example considered in this section is the stability of the network. Due to the relation $\rho_0 \rho_1 \rho_2 \rho_3 > 1$, one typically has to wait for the first departure from a small neighborhood of the network for a very long time. In general, although the process travels over large scales only when close to the network, one also has to take into account the time spent away from the network. This leads to a subordinated Brownian limit in the Hamiltonian dynamics case where the network is given by a level set of the Hamiltonian, see [HKPG16] and [HIK⁺18].

For general systems with multiple attractors, departures from the heteroclinic network towards other attractors may also be an intrinsic part of the picture thus giving rise to longer (Kramers–Freidlin–Wentzel) characteristic time scales. This is related to the concept of excitability, see, e.g., [AP16].

7. PROOFS IN RECTIFIED COORDINATES

In Sections 7–11, we give rigorous proofs of all lemmas that were studied heuristically in preceding sections.

Using assumption **(H)** in a neighborhood of a saddle point, changing coordinates by the conjugacy f introduced in **(H)**, we can begin our program with studying the process $Y_{\varepsilon,t} = f(X_{\varepsilon,t})$, in a setting that is simpler than general, where the domain is a small rectangle containing the saddle point at the origin and the drift is linear up to a $O(\varepsilon^2)$ correction. We collect useful preliminary results on processes related to $Y_{\varepsilon,t}$ in Sections 7.1 and 7.2. We will describe the setting in more detail in Section 7.3. In this simpler setting, in Section 7.4, we will use local limit theorems from Sections 9 and 10 to give rigorous proofs of the lemmas that were only proved heuristically in Sections 4 and 5. We will prove them in full generality in Section 8.

7.1. Basic estimates. Let $\lambda > 0 > -\mu$ and let $F_1^1, F_2^1, F_1^2, F_2^2, G^1, G^2 : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous and bounded. We assume that the matrix $F(x) = (F_l^k(x))_{k,l=1}^2$ is uniformly elliptic (see condition **(A)**). For each $\varepsilon > 0$, we consider the SDE

$$(7.1) \quad \begin{aligned} dY_t^1 &= \lambda Y_t^1 dt + \varepsilon F_t^1(Y_t) dW_t^l + \varepsilon^2 G^1(Y_t) dt, \\ dY_t^2 &= -\mu Y_t^2 dt + \varepsilon F_t^2(Y_t) dW_t^l + \varepsilon^2 G^2(Y_t) dt, \end{aligned}$$

where (W_t, \mathcal{F}_t) is a standard 2-dimensional Wiener process, and the Einstein convention of summation over repeated indices is used. In Section 7.3 we show that $Y_{\varepsilon,t} = f(X_{\varepsilon,t})$ solves an equation of this form with coefficients F and G that we compute.

Starting with this section, we will often suppress the dependence of various processes on ε , e.g., $Y_t = Y_{\varepsilon,t}$ in (7.1).

The joint distribution of $((Y_t)_{t \geq 0}, (W_t)_{t \geq 0})$ given that $Y_0 = y \in \mathbb{R}^2$ will be denoted by \mathbf{P}^y . We also follow the convention of Section 2.1 denoting various probability measures by \mathbf{P} if the joint distribution of r.v.'s involved is unambiguously defined. The expectation w.r.t. \mathbf{P}^y is denoted by \mathbf{E}^y .

Let us define

$$(7.2) \quad \begin{aligned} V_t^1 &= \int_0^t e^{-\lambda s} G^1(Y_s) ds, & V_t^2 &= \int_0^t e^{\mu s} G^2(Y_s) ds, \\ M_t^1 &= \int_0^t e^{-\lambda s} F_s^1(Y_s) dW_s^l, & M_t^2 &= \int_0^t e^{\mu s} F_s^2(Y_s) dW_s^l, \\ U_t^i &= M_t^i + \varepsilon V_t^i, \quad i = 1, 2, \\ S_t &= e^{-\mu t} M_t^2 = e^{-\mu t} \int_0^t e^{\mu s} F_s^2(Y_s) dW_s^l, \\ N_t &= N_t^2 = e^{-\mu t} U_t^2 = S_t + \varepsilon e^{-\mu t} V_t^2. \end{aligned}$$

This notation and Duhamel's formula allow to write the solutions of (7.1):

$$(7.3) \quad Y_t^1 = e^{\lambda t} (Y_0^1 + \varepsilon U_t^1) = e^{\lambda t} (Y_0^1 + \varepsilon M_t^1 + \varepsilon^2 V_t^1),$$

$$(7.4) \quad Y_t^2 = e^{-\mu t} Y_0^2 + \varepsilon N_t = e^{-\mu t} (Y_0^2 + \varepsilon U_t^2) = e^{-\mu t} Y_0^2 + \varepsilon S_t + \varepsilon^2 e^{-\mu t} V_t^2.$$

In this section we prove various useful estimates on processes introduced in (7.2).

Let us first state the following well-known exponential martingale inequality (see, e.g., Problem 12.10 in [Bas11]):

Lemma 7.1. *Let M_t be a continuous local martingale satisfying $M_0 = 0$, with quadratic variation process $\langle M \rangle_t$. Then, for any $a, b > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{t \geq 0} |M_t| \geq a; \langle M \rangle_\infty \leq b \right\} \leq 2e^{-a^2/(2b)}.$$

Lemma 7.2. *Processes introduced in (7.2) satisfy the following:*

- (1) *There is a constant $C > 0$ such for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $r > 0$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$, the process M^1 , defined in (7.2), satisfies*

$$\mathbb{P}^y \left\{ \sup_{t \geq 0} |M_t^1| \geq r \right\} \leq 2e^{-r^2/C}.$$

In particular, $\sup_{t \geq 0} |M_t^1|$ are tame under \mathbb{P}^y , uniformly over $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

- (2) *There is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and all $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$,*

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} |V_t^1| < C, \quad \mathbb{P}^y\text{-a.s.}$$

$$\sup_{t \geq T} |V_t^1 - V_T^1| < Ce^{-\lambda T}, \quad T \geq 0, \quad \mathbb{P}^y\text{-a.s.}$$

and

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} e^{-\mu t} |V_t^2| < C, \quad \mathbb{P}^y\text{-a.s.}$$

- (3) *There are constants $C, c > 0$ such for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, $r > c$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$, the process U^1 , defined in (7.2), satisfies*

$$\mathbb{P}^y \left\{ \sup_{t \geq 0} |U_t^1| \geq r \right\} \leq 2e^{-r^2/C}.$$

In particular, under \mathbb{P}^y , $\sup_{t \geq 0} |U_t^1|$ is tame uniformly in $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$, and, uniformly in $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, has bounded moments of all orders.

- (4) *There is $C > 0$ such that for all $\Delta > 0$, all $\varepsilon > 0$, all $r > 0$, all $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$.*

$$\sup_{T \geq 0} \mathbb{P}^y \left\{ \sup_{t \in [T, T+\Delta]} |S_t| \geq r \right\} \leq 4([\Delta] + 1)e^{-r^2/C}.$$

- (5) *There are $C, c > 0$ such that for all $\Delta > 0$, all $\varepsilon > 0$, all $r > c$, all $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$,*

$$(7.5) \quad \sup_{T \geq 0} \mathbb{P}^y \left\{ \sup_{t \in [T, T+\Delta]} |N_t| \geq r \right\} \leq 4([\Delta] + 1)e^{-r^2/C}.$$

In particular, for every $p \geq 1$ and every $\Delta \geq 0$, there is a constant $C > 0$ such that the following holds for every $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$, every $T \geq 0$ and every $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$:

$$(7.6) \quad \mathbb{E}^y \sup_{t \in [T, T+\Delta]} |N_t|^p \leq C.$$

- (6) *For each $\beta > 0$, there are $C, c > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}^y \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, \zeta]} |N_t| > r \right\} \leq C(\beta l_\varepsilon + 1)e^{-r^2/C} + \mathbb{P}^y \{ \zeta \geq \beta l_\varepsilon \}$$

holds for every stopping time ζ , every $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, every $r > c$, and every $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

(7) For any $\Delta > 0$, there is $C > 0$ such that if deterministic times $(t_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0}$, stopping times $(\tau_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0}$, events $(B_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0}$, and parameter $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ satisfy

$$(7.7) \quad \mathbf{P}^y(B_\varepsilon \cap \{\tau_\varepsilon \notin [t_\varepsilon, t_\varepsilon + \Delta]\}) = 0, \quad \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0), \quad y \in I_\varepsilon,$$

then the following estimate holds:

$$\mathbf{P}^y(B_\varepsilon \cap \{|S_{\tau_\varepsilon}| > r\}) \leq C e^{-r^2/C}, \quad \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0), \quad r > 0, \quad y \in I_\varepsilon.$$

PROOF: Part 1 is directly implied by the exponential martingale inequality of Lemma 7.1 and the boundedness of F . Part 2 follows from the boundedness of G . Part 3 follows from parts 1 and 2. To prove part 4, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{T \geq 0} \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ \sup_{t \in [T, T+\Delta]} |S_t| \geq r \right\} &\leq \sup_{T \geq 0} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}: k \leq \Delta} \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ \sup_{t \in [T+k, T+k+1]} |S_t| \geq r \right\} \\ &\leq ([\Delta] + 1) \sup_{u \geq 0} \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ \sup_{t \in [u, u+1]} |S_t| \geq r \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ \sup_{t \in [u, u+1]} |S_t| \geq r \right\} &\leq \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ e^{-\mu u} |M_u^2| \geq r/2 \right\} \\ &\quad + \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ e^{-\mu u} \sup_{t \in [u, u+1]} \left| \int_u^t e^{\mu s} F^2(Y_s) dW_s \right| \geq r/2 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and each term on the right-hand side may be estimated by $2e^{-r^2/C}$ for some C and all u, r, ε due to the exponential martingale inequality and boundedness of F , so our claim follows.

Part 5 follows from parts 4, 2 (we integrate by parts with respect to r to obtain (7.6).)

To prove part 6, we apply (7.5) to each term in the sum on the r.-h.s of

$$\mathbf{P}^y \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, \zeta]} |N_t| > r \right\} \leq \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ \zeta \geq \beta l_\varepsilon \right\} + \sum_{n=0}^{[\beta l_\varepsilon]} \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ \sup_{t \in [n, n+1]} |N_t| > r \right\}.$$

To prove part 7, we use (7.7) and write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}^y(B_\varepsilon \cap \{|S_{\tau_\varepsilon}| > r\}) &= \mathbf{P}^y(B_\varepsilon \cap \{|S_{\tau_\varepsilon}| > r\} \cap \{\tau_\varepsilon \in [t_\varepsilon, t_\varepsilon + \Delta]\}) \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ \sup_{t \in [t_\varepsilon, t_\varepsilon + \Delta]} |S_t| > r \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

so our claim follows from part 4. \square

Let us give a useful identity for the (non-Markov) process S_t defined in (7.2). It can be viewed as a generalization of the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck semigroup property.

Due to the strong uniqueness of solutions of SDEs, for \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable Y_0 , we can write

$$(7.8) \quad S_t = S_t(Y_0, dW),$$

where by dW . we mean the collection of increments $(W_t - W_0)_{t \geq 0}$. Let Θ^t denote the time shift of the Wiener path:

$$\Theta^t W_s = W_{t+s} - W_t, \quad s \geq 0,$$

so that for any stopping time τ , the random shift $\Theta^\tau W$ is also a Wiener process.

Lemma 7.3. *If stopping times τ, τ' satisfy $\tau' \geq \tau \geq 0$, then, with probability 1,*

$$(7.9) \quad S_{\tau'}(Y_0, dW.) = e^{-\mu(\tau' - \tau)} S_\tau(Y_0, dW.) + S_{\tau' - \tau}(Y_\tau, d(\Theta^\tau W)).$$

PROOF: For deterministic times τ and τ' , (7.9) is a result of a direct computation which is a simple version of the reasoning below. For arbitrary stopping times, we need to be more careful. Let us introduce two auxiliary SDE's,

$$(7.10) \quad dS_t = -\mu S_t dt + F^2(Y_t) dW_t,$$

$$(7.11) \quad d\widetilde{W}_t = dW_t.$$

The system of autonomous SDEs (7.1),(7.10),(7.11) generates unique strong solutions, a strong Markov semigroup, and an adapted flow of solution maps

$$(Y, S, \widetilde{W})_t((Y, S, \widetilde{W})_0, dW.).$$

By Duhamel's principle, we have that for any random initial conditions $(Y, S, W)_0$, with probability 1,

$$(7.12) \quad S_t((Y, S, \widetilde{W})_0, dW.) = e^{-\mu t} S_0 + e^{-\mu t} \int_0^t e^{\mu s} F^2\left(Y_s\left((Y, S, \widetilde{W})_0, dW.\right)\right) dW_s, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Comparing this to (7.8), we see that, with probability 1,

$$(7.13) \quad S_t((Y_0, 0, 0), dW.) = S_t(Y_0, dW.), \quad t \geq 0.$$

Combining (7.12) with the strong Markov property, we obtain that if τ is a stopping time, then with probability 1, we have, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\tau+t}\left((Y, S, \widetilde{W})_0, dW.\right) &= S_t\left((Y, S, \widetilde{W})_\tau\left((Y, S, \widetilde{W})_0, dW.\right), d(\Theta^\tau W).\right) \\ &= e^{-\mu t} S_\tau\left((Y, S, \widetilde{W})_0, dW.\right) \\ &\quad + e^{-\mu t} \int_0^t e^{\mu s} F\left(Y_s\left((Y, S, \widetilde{W})_\tau\left((Y, S, \widetilde{W})_0, dW.\right), d(\Theta^\tau W).\right)\right) d\Theta^\tau W_s. \end{aligned}$$

Now, plugging in the values $t = \tau' - \tau$, $S_0 = \widetilde{W}_0 = 0$ and using (7.13) to interpret both sides of this identity, we obtain (7.9). \square

7.2. Estimating the stopped process N . Let $L, L' > 0$ satisfy $L' > L$. Recall the definition of ρ in (2.24). Throughout this section we assume that constants α, ρ, θ satisfy

$$(7.14) \quad \alpha \in (0, 1], \quad 0 \leq \theta < \frac{1}{2} \wedge \frac{\alpha}{1 + \rho^{-1}}.$$

We also fix $r > 0$ and define

$$(7.15) \quad \tau = \tau_{r, \theta, \varepsilon} = \inf \{t > 0 : Y_t \notin [-r\varepsilon^\theta, r\varepsilon^\theta] \times [-L', L']\},$$

$$(7.16) \quad \zeta = \zeta_{r, \theta, \varepsilon} = \inf \{t > 0 : Y_t \notin [-r\varepsilon^\theta, r\varepsilon^\theta] \times \mathbb{R}\}.$$




FIGURE 10. Narrow channels around the invariant manifolds.

We will be later interested in a specific case of the exit time for Y from

$$(7.17) \quad \Pi = [-R, R] \times [-L', L']$$

for some $R > 0$. This time is denoted by $\tau_\Pi = \tau_{\Pi, \varepsilon}$ and satisfies

$$(7.18) \quad \tau_\Pi = \tau_{R, 0, \varepsilon}.$$

For $\theta = 0$, $r = R$, we have $\tau = \tau_\Pi$.

Let us fix an arbitrary β satisfying

$$(7.19) \quad \theta < \beta < \frac{1}{2} \wedge \frac{\alpha}{1 + \rho^{-1}}.$$

For small ε , we introduce domains

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_1 &= \Pi_{1, \varepsilon} = [-\varepsilon^\beta, \varepsilon^\beta] \times [\varepsilon^\beta, L'], \\ \Pi_2 &= \Pi_{2, \varepsilon} = [-\varepsilon^\beta, \varepsilon^\beta] \times \mathbb{R}, \\ \Pi_3 &= \Pi_{3, \varepsilon} = [-r\varepsilon^\theta, r\varepsilon^\theta] \times [-3\varepsilon^\beta, 3\varepsilon^\beta], \end{aligned}$$

shown in Figure 10. Let us also define $D_\varepsilon = \Pi_{1, \varepsilon} \cup \Pi_{3, \varepsilon}$ and

$$(7.20) \quad \bar{\tau} = \bar{\tau}_{r, \theta, \varepsilon} = \inf\{t \geq 0 : Y_t \notin D_\varepsilon\}.$$

and observe that $\bar{\tau} \leq \tau \leq \zeta$. Defining (note that $\alpha > \beta$)

$$I_\varepsilon = [-\varepsilon^\alpha, \varepsilon^\alpha] \times \{L\},$$

we can state the main result of this section:

Lemma 7.4. *Let $\tau, \zeta, \bar{\tau}$ be given in (7.15), (7.16), (7.20), respectively. If (7.14) and (7.19) hold, then there are constants $C, \varepsilon_0 > 0$ and a family of events $(B_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$ such that the following holds:*

(1)

$$\sup_{y \in I_\varepsilon} \mathbf{P}^y(B_\varepsilon^c) = o_\varepsilon(1);$$

on B_ε , we have

$$Y_{\bar{\tau}} \in \{-r\varepsilon^\theta, r\varepsilon^\theta\} \times [-3\varepsilon^\beta, 3\varepsilon^\beta]$$

(i.e., the exit happens through the lateral sides of Π_3), and

$$(7.21) \quad \sup_{y \in I_\varepsilon} \mathbf{P}^y(B_\varepsilon \cap \{|N_{\bar{\tau}}| > z\}) \leq Ce^{-z^2/C}, \quad \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0), \quad z > 0.$$

In particular, $N_{\bar{\tau}}$ is tame under \mathbf{P}^y , uniformly in $y \in I_\varepsilon$.

(2) $\bar{\tau}$ is tame under \mathbf{P}^y , uniformly in $y \in I_\varepsilon$.(3) On B_ε , $\tau = \bar{\tau} = \zeta$, so $\tau, N_\tau, \zeta, N_\zeta$ are also tame under \mathbf{P}^y , uniformly in $y \in I_\varepsilon$.

Most of the conclusions of this lemma do not depend on a particular choice of β satisfying (7.19). Also, if (7.14) holds, then one can make α smaller still retaining this condition. Thus, recalling the definition of $K_\varkappa(\varepsilon)$ in (3.1), we obtain the following immediate consequence of Lemma 7.4:

Lemma 7.5. *Let (7.14) hold, $\varkappa > 0$, and τ, ζ be given in (7.15), (7.16), respectively. Then, under \mathbf{P}^y , $\tau = \zeta$ w.h.p. uniformly in $y \in (\varepsilon^\alpha K_\varkappa(\varepsilon)) \times \{L\}$ and*

$$\sup_{y \in (\varepsilon^\alpha K_\varkappa(\varepsilon)) \times \{L\}} \mathbf{P}^y\{|N_\tau| > l_\varepsilon\} = o_\varepsilon(1),$$

To prove Lemma 7.4, we need an auxiliary result. Our goal is to split the evolution until $\bar{\tau}$ into three parts. Let us define

$$\tau^1 = \inf\{t \geq 0 : Y \notin \Pi_1\},$$

$$\tilde{\tau}^2 = \inf\{t \geq \tau^1 : Y \notin \Pi_2\}, \quad \tau^2 = \inf\{t \geq 0 : Y \notin \Pi_2\},$$

$$\tilde{\tau}^3 = \inf\{t \geq \tau^2 : Y \notin \Pi_3\}, \quad \tau^3 = \inf\{t \geq 0 : Y \notin \Pi_3\},$$

(all these times are a.s.-finite due to the ellipticity of the noise) and

$$I_\varepsilon^1 = [-\varepsilon^\beta, \varepsilon^\beta] \times \{\varepsilon^\beta\},$$

$$I_\varepsilon^2 = I_{\varepsilon,+}^2 \cup I_{\varepsilon,-}^2 = (\{\varepsilon^\beta\} \times [-2\varepsilon^\beta, 2\varepsilon^\beta]) \cup (\{-\varepsilon^\beta\} \times [-2\varepsilon^\beta, 2\varepsilon^\beta]).$$

Lemma 7.6. *Under the setting in Lemma 7.5, the following hold.*

(1) *There are constants $C, \varepsilon_0 > 0$ and a family of events $(B_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$ such that*

$$\sup_{y \in I_\varepsilon} \mathbf{P}^y(B_\varepsilon^c) = o_\varepsilon(1),$$

$$\sup_{y \in I_\varepsilon} \mathbf{P}(B_\varepsilon \cap \{|S_{\tau^1}| > z\}) \leq Ce^{-z^2/C}, \quad \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0, \quad z > 0,$$

$$\mathbf{P}^y(Y_{\tau^1} \in I_\varepsilon^1 | B_\varepsilon) = 1, \quad y \in I_\varepsilon.$$

Also, the stopping time τ^1 is tame under \mathbf{P}^y , uniformly in $y \in I_\varepsilon$.

(2) There are constants $C, \varepsilon_0 > 0$ and a family of events $(B_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$ such that

$$\sup_{y \in I_\varepsilon^1} \mathbf{P}(B_\varepsilon^c) = o_\varepsilon(1),$$

$$\sup_{y \in I_\varepsilon^1} \mathbf{P}^y (B_\varepsilon \cap \{e^{-\mu\tau_3} |S_{\tau_2}| > z\}) \leq C e^{-z^2/C}, \quad \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0, \quad z > 0,$$

$$\mathbf{P}^y(Y_{\tau_2} \in I_\varepsilon^2 | B_\varepsilon) = 1, \quad y \in I_\varepsilon^1.$$

Also, the stopping time τ^2 is tame under \mathbf{P}^y , uniformly in $y \in I_\varepsilon^1$.

(3) There are constants $C, \varepsilon_0 > 0$ and a family of events $(B_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$ such that

$$\sup_{y \in I_\varepsilon^2} \mathbf{P}^y(B_\varepsilon^c) = o_\varepsilon(1),$$

$$\sup_{y \in I_\varepsilon^2} \mathbf{P}^y (B_\varepsilon \cap \{|S_{\tau^3}| > z\}) \leq C e^{-z^2/C}, \quad \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0, \quad z > 0,$$

$$\mathbf{P}^y (Y_{\tau^3} \in \{r\varepsilon^\theta, -r\varepsilon^\theta\} \times [-3\varepsilon^\beta, 3\varepsilon^\beta] | B_\varepsilon) = 1, \quad y \in I_\varepsilon^2.$$

Also, the stopping time τ^3 is tame under \mathbf{P}^y , uniformly in $y \in I_\varepsilon^2$.

Let us derive Lemma 7.4 from Lemma 7.6 first and then prove the latter.

PROOF OF LEMMA 7.4: Decomposing the evolution into three stages corresponding to times $\tau^1, \tilde{\tau}^2, \tilde{\tau}^3$ and described in Lemma 7.6, and using the strong Markov property, we obtain the existence of a set B_ε with properties described in part 1, except (7.21), which we still need to check. Also, decomposing $\bar{\tau}$ into a sum of three exit times and combining three parts of Lemma 7.6, we immediately obtain part 2

To prove (7.21), it suffices (due to Lemma 7.2 (2)) to check

$$(7.22) \quad \sup_{y \in I_\varepsilon} \mathbf{P}(B_\varepsilon \cap \{|S_{\bar{\tau}}| > z\}) \leq C e^{-z^2/C}, \quad \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0), \quad z > 0,$$

for some $C, \varepsilon_0 > 0$.

Applying (7.9) twice, we obtain that, with probability 1,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\tilde{\tau}^3}(Y_0, W) &= e^{-\mu(\tilde{\tau}^3 - \tau^1)} S_{\tau^1}(Y_0, W) \\ &\quad + e^{-\mu(\tilde{\tau}^3 - \tilde{\tau}^2)} S_{\tilde{\tau}^2 - \tau^1}(Y_{\tau^1}, \Theta^{\tau^1} W) + S_{\tilde{\tau}^3 - \tilde{\tau}^2}(Y_{\tilde{\tau}^2}, \Theta^{\tilde{\tau}^2} W). \end{aligned}$$

The estimate (7.22) follows directly from this representation and Lemma 7.6. This completes the proof of part 1.

To prove Part 3, we recall that $\bar{\tau}, \tau, \zeta$ are defined as the times of exit from sets $D_\varepsilon, [-r\varepsilon^\theta, r\varepsilon^\theta] \times [-L', L']$, and $[-r\varepsilon^\theta, r\varepsilon^\theta] \times \mathbb{R}$, respectively. On B_ε , the exit from D_ε happens through the lateral sides of Π_3 . Since they belong to the boundaries of all these sets, we conclude that $\tau = \bar{\tau} = \zeta$ holds on B_ε . Combining this with part 2, we obtain the tameness claim of part 3. \square

Let us now prove Lemma 7.6. We first prove its part 1, then part 3, and then part 2.

PROOF OF PART 1: We will assume

$$(7.23) \quad y \in I_\varepsilon,$$

throughout the proof. In addition to Y , let us consider the deterministic process (\bar{Y}_t) given by

$$(7.24) \quad \begin{aligned} \bar{Y}_t^1 &= e^{\lambda t} Y_0^1, \\ \bar{Y}_t^2 &= e^{-\mu t} Y_0^2 = e^{-\mu t} L, \end{aligned}$$

We see that \bar{Y}_t^2 decreases in t . For

$$(7.25) \quad t_\varepsilon = -\frac{1}{\mu} \log \frac{\varepsilon^\beta}{2L},$$

we have

$$\bar{Y}_{t_\varepsilon}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^\beta.$$

Due to (7.19), $-\frac{\beta}{\rho} + \alpha > \beta$. We can use this and (7.23) to see that for some ε_0 (which does not depend on $Y_0 = y$), all $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, and all $t \in [0, t_\varepsilon]$,

$$|\bar{Y}_t^1| \leq e^{\lambda t_\varepsilon} \varepsilon^\alpha < \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^\beta.$$

So t_ε is the exit time from $\tilde{\Pi}_1 = [-\frac{\varepsilon^\beta}{2}, \frac{\varepsilon^\beta}{2}] \times [\frac{\varepsilon^\beta}{2}, L]$:

$$t_\varepsilon = \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 : \bar{Y}_t \notin \tilde{\Pi}_1 \right\}.$$

Let us use \bar{Y} to prove that Y exits Π_1 through the bottom side w.h.p.

Parts 3 and 5 of Lemma 7.2 and assumption (7.19) imply that there are constants $h_1, h_2, h_3 > 0$ such that for $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, and for all y satisfying (7.23), we have

$$\mathbf{P}^y \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, t_\varepsilon]} (e^{\lambda t} \varepsilon |U_t^1|) > \frac{\varepsilon^\beta}{2} \right\} < h_1 e^{-h_3 \varepsilon^{-h_2}}$$

and

$$\mathbf{P}^y \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, t_\varepsilon]} \varepsilon |N_t| > \frac{\varepsilon^\beta}{2} \right\} < h_1 e^{-h_3 \varepsilon^{-h_2}}.$$

This allows to define an event B_ε with $\mathbf{P}^y(B_\varepsilon) > 1 - 2h_1 e^{-h_3 \varepsilon^{-h_2}}$ such that on B_ε ,

$$\sup_{t \in [0, t_\varepsilon]} |Y_t - \bar{Y}_t|_\infty < \frac{\varepsilon^\beta}{2},$$

where we used (7.3) and (7.4). In particular, on B_ε , the exit from Π_1 happens through its bottom, before time t_ε .

Similarly to (7.25), we can define

$$t'_\varepsilon = -\frac{1}{\mu} \log \frac{3\varepsilon^\beta}{2L} = t_\varepsilon - \frac{1}{\mu} \log 3,$$

interpret it as the exit time from a smaller rectangle $[-\frac{\varepsilon^\beta}{2}, \frac{\varepsilon^\beta}{2}] \times [\frac{3\varepsilon^\beta}{2}, L]$, through its bottom $[-\frac{\varepsilon^\beta}{2}, \frac{\varepsilon^\beta}{2}] \times \{\frac{3\varepsilon^\beta}{2}\}$ and derive that $\tau^1 \geq t'_\varepsilon$ on B_ε . Therefore, on B_ε , we have

$$(7.26) \quad t'_\varepsilon \leq \tau^1 \leq t_\varepsilon.$$

so we can apply Lemma 7.2 (7) with $\Delta = \frac{1}{\mu} \log 3$ to derive the first claim of part 1. The tameness of τ^1 follows from the upper bound in (7.26). \square

PROOF OF PART 3: We only consider initial conditions given by

$$(7.27) \quad y \in I_{\varepsilon,+}^2.$$

The case of $y \in I_{\varepsilon,-}^2$ is similar. We recall the process \bar{Y}_t defined in (7.24). We see that \bar{Y}_t^1 increases in t and for the time

$$t_\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \frac{(r+1)\varepsilon^\theta}{\varepsilon^\beta},$$

we have

$$\bar{Y}_{t_\varepsilon}^1 = (r+1)\varepsilon^\theta,$$

and for some ε_0 , all $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, and all $t \in [0, t_\varepsilon]$,

$$|\bar{Y}_{t_\varepsilon}^2| \leq 2\varepsilon^\beta,$$

so t_ε is the exit time from $\tilde{\Pi}_3 = [-(r+1)\varepsilon^\theta, (r+1)\varepsilon^\theta] \times [-3\varepsilon^\beta, 3\varepsilon^\beta]$:

$$t_\varepsilon = \inf\{t \geq 0 : \bar{Y} \notin \tilde{\Pi}_3\}.$$

We can use $\beta < 1/2$ (guaranteed by (7.19)) and parts 3 and 5 of Lemma 7.2 to find constants $h_1, h_2, h_3 > 0$ such that for all y satisfying (7.27),

$$\mathbf{P}^y \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, t_\varepsilon]} e^{\lambda t} \varepsilon |U_t^1| > \varepsilon^\beta \right\} < h_1 e^{-h_3 \varepsilon^{-h_2}}$$

and

$$\mathbf{P}^y \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, t_\varepsilon]} \varepsilon |N_t| > \varepsilon^\beta \right\} < h_1 e^{-h_3 \varepsilon^{-h_2}}.$$

This allows to define an event B_ε with $\mathbf{P}^y(B_\varepsilon) > 1 - 2h_1 e^{-h_3 \varepsilon^{-h_2}}$ such that on B_ε ,

$$(7.28) \quad \sup_{t \in [0, t_\varepsilon]} |Y_t - \bar{Y}_t|_\infty < \varepsilon^\beta.$$

In particular, due to $\theta < \beta$ (see (7.19)), on B_ε , the exit from Π_3 happens through the right lateral side, before time t_ε . One can also define

$$t'_\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \frac{r\varepsilon^\theta/2}{\varepsilon^\beta}$$

and see that, due to (7.28), for sufficiently small ε , $t'_\varepsilon \leq \tau^3 \leq t_\varepsilon$ and $t_\varepsilon - t'_\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \frac{r+1}{r/2}$. Thus τ^3 is tame, and we can apply Lemma 7.2 (7) to derive the remaining claim of part 3. \square

To prove part 2, we need several auxiliary results (Lemmas 7.7, 7.8, 7.9 below). We define

$$\begin{aligned} \tau' &= \inf\{t \geq 0 : |Y_t^2| \geq 2\varepsilon^\beta\}, \\ \hat{\tau} &= \tau^2 \wedge \tau', \\ t_\varepsilon &= \frac{1-\beta}{\lambda} l_\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

so that $\hat{\tau}$ is the exit time from the rectangle $[-\varepsilon^\beta, \varepsilon^\beta] \times [-2\varepsilon^\beta, 2\varepsilon^\beta]$. We also define $\tilde{\Pi}_2 = \tilde{\Pi}_{2,\varepsilon} = [-\varepsilon^\beta, \varepsilon^\beta]^2$.

Lemma 7.7. *There is $c \in (0, 1)$ such that for sufficiently small ε ,*

$$(7.29) \quad \sup_{y \in \tilde{\Pi}_2} \mathbf{P}^y \{ \tau^2 > t_\varepsilon \} < c.$$

We also have

$$(7.30) \quad \sup_{y \in \tilde{\Pi}_2} \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ \tau^2 > t_\varepsilon, |Y_{t_\varepsilon}| \notin \tilde{\Pi}_2 \right\} = o_\varepsilon(1),$$

$$(7.31) \quad \sup_{y \in \tilde{\Pi}_2} \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ \tau^2 \leq t_\varepsilon, |Y_{\tau^2}^2| > 2\varepsilon^\beta \right\} = o_\varepsilon(1).$$

PROOF: Throughout this proof, \sup_y means $\sup_{y \in \tilde{\Pi}_2}$. Part 5 of Lemma 7.2 implies

$$\sup_y \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, t_\varepsilon]} |N_t| > l_\varepsilon \right\} = o_\varepsilon(1).$$

Therefore, due to (7.4),

$$(7.32) \quad \sup_y \mathbf{P}^y \{ \tau' \leq t_\varepsilon \} = \sup_y \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, t_\varepsilon]} |Y_t^2| \geq 2\varepsilon^\beta \right\} = o_\varepsilon(1)$$

and

$$\sup_y \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ |Y_{t_\varepsilon}^2| \geq \varepsilon^\beta \right\} = o_\varepsilon(1).$$

Estimates (7.30) and (7.31) follow from these bounds.

Let us define

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{M}_t^1 &= \int_0^t e^{-\lambda s} F_l^1(0) dW_s^l, \\ \widetilde{M}_t^1 &= \int_0^t e^{-\lambda s} (F_l^1(Y_s) - F_l^1(0)) dW_s^l. \end{aligned}$$

Due to (7.32),

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_y \mathbf{P}^y \{ t_\varepsilon \leq \tau^2 \} &= \sup_y \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ t_\varepsilon \leq \tau^2, e^{\lambda t_\varepsilon} |y^1 + \varepsilon U_{t_\varepsilon}^1| \leq \varepsilon^\beta \right\} \\ &= \sup_y \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ t_\varepsilon \leq \hat{\tau}, e^{\lambda t_\varepsilon} |y^1 + \varepsilon U_{t_\varepsilon}^1| \leq \varepsilon^\beta \right\} + o_\varepsilon(1) \\ &\leq \sup_y \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ t_\varepsilon \leq \hat{\tau}, |y^1 + \varepsilon \overline{M}_{t_\varepsilon}^1 + \varepsilon \widetilde{M}_{t_\varepsilon}^1 + \varepsilon^2 V_{t_\varepsilon}^1| \leq \varepsilon \right\} + o_\varepsilon(1) \\ &\leq \sup_y \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ |y^1 + \varepsilon \overline{M}_{t_\varepsilon}^1| \leq 2\varepsilon \right\} \\ &\quad + \sup_y \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ t_\varepsilon \leq \hat{\tau}, |\varepsilon \widetilde{M}_{t_\varepsilon}^1 + \varepsilon^2 V_{t_\varepsilon}^1| > \varepsilon \right\} + o_\varepsilon(1). \end{aligned}$$

The first term on the r.h.s. is bounded away from 1 because $\overline{M}_{t_\varepsilon}^1$ is a Gaussian r.v. with variance bounded away from 0. Due to the exponential martingale inequality, the second term is $o_\varepsilon(1)$ since V is bounded and the estimate $|F(Y_s) - F(0)| \leq C\varepsilon^\beta$ holds for some $C > 0$, all $\varepsilon > 0$ and $s \leq \hat{\tau}$. This completes the proof of (7.29) and the entire lemma. \square

Lemma 7.8. *For every $\varkappa > 2$,*

$$(7.33) \quad \sup_{y \in \tilde{\Pi}_2} \mathbf{P}^y \{ \tau^2 > (l_\varepsilon)^\varkappa \} = o_\varepsilon(1),$$

and

$$(7.34) \quad \sup_{y \in \tilde{\Pi}_2} \mathbf{P}^y \{ \tau^2 \leq (l_\varepsilon)^\varkappa, |Y_{\tau^2}^2| > 2\varepsilon^\beta \} = o_\varepsilon(1).$$

PROOF: Using (7.29), (7.30), and the Markov property iteratively, we obtain uniformly in $y \in \tilde{\Pi}_2$ and $k = 1, 2, \dots$:

$$\mathbf{P}^y \{ \tau^2 > kt_\varepsilon \} \leq (c + o_\varepsilon(1))^k.$$

Setting

$$k = n_\varepsilon = \left\lfloor \frac{(l_\varepsilon)^\varkappa}{t_\varepsilon} \right\rfloor + 1,$$

gives (7.33). To prove (7.34), we start by defining

$$\eta = \min \{ k \geq 1 : Y_{kt_\varepsilon} \notin \tilde{\Pi}_2 \}$$

and estimating

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}^y \{ \tau^2 \leq (l_\varepsilon)^\varkappa, |Y_{\tau^2}^2| > 2\varepsilon^\beta \} &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{n_\varepsilon} \mathbf{P}^y \{ \tau^2 \in (kt_\varepsilon, (k+1)t_\varepsilon], |Y_{\tau^2}^2| > 2\varepsilon^\beta \} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{n_\varepsilon} (\mathbf{P}^y \{ \tau^2 \in (kt_\varepsilon, (k+1)t_\varepsilon], |Y_{\tau^2}^2| > 2\varepsilon^\beta, \eta > k \} + \mathbf{P}^y \{ \tau^2 > kt_\varepsilon, \eta \leq k \}). \end{aligned}$$

To see that the first term in the k -th summand is uniformly $o_\varepsilon(1)$, we condition on Y_{kt_ε} and apply the Markov property and (7.31). For the second term, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}^y \{ \tau^2 > kt_\varepsilon, \eta \leq k \} &= \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{P}^y \{ \tau^2 > kt_\varepsilon, \eta = i \} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ \tau^2 > kt_\varepsilon, Y_{it_\varepsilon} \notin \tilde{\Pi}_2, Y_{(i-1)t_\varepsilon} \in \tilde{\Pi}_2 \right\} \leq k o_\varepsilon(1), \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in y , where the last inequality follows from (7.30) and conditioning on $Y_{(i-1)t_\varepsilon}$. Combining these estimates, we obtain

$$\sup_{y \in \tilde{\Pi}_2} \mathbf{P}^y \{ \tau^2 \leq (l_\varepsilon)^\varkappa, |Y_{\tau^2}^2| > 2\varepsilon^\beta \} \leq (n_\varepsilon + 1)^2 o_\varepsilon(1) = o_\varepsilon(1),$$

thus proving (7.34). \square

Lemma 7.9. *Uniformly in $y \in \{\varepsilon^\beta, -\varepsilon^\beta\} \times [-2\varepsilon^\beta, 2\varepsilon^\beta]$,*

$$\mathbf{P}^y \left\{ \tau^3 < \frac{\beta - \theta}{2\lambda} l_\varepsilon \right\} = o_\varepsilon(1).$$

PROOF: Let us denote $t_\varepsilon = \frac{\beta - \theta}{2\lambda} l_\varepsilon$, and write

$$\mathbf{P}^y \{ \tau^3 < t_\varepsilon \} \leq \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, \tau^3 \wedge t_\varepsilon]} |Y_t^1| \geq r\varepsilon^\theta \right\} + \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, \tau^3 \wedge t_\varepsilon]} |Y_t^2| \geq 3\varepsilon^\beta \right\} = I_1 + I_2.$$

Since $e^{\lambda t_\varepsilon} = \varepsilon^{(\theta-\beta)/2}$, parts 3 and 5 of Lemma 7.2 imply

$$I_1 \leq \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ e^{\lambda t_\varepsilon} \left(\varepsilon^\beta + \sup_{t \in [0, \tau^3 \wedge t_\varepsilon]} |\varepsilon U_t^1| \right) \geq r \varepsilon^\theta \right\} = o_\varepsilon(1)$$

and

$$I_2 \leq \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ 2\varepsilon^\beta + \sup_{t \in [0, \tau^3 \wedge t_\varepsilon]} |\varepsilon N_t| \geq 3\varepsilon^\beta \right\} = o_\varepsilon(1),$$

uniformly in y , and our lemma follows. \square

PROOF OF PART 2 OF LEMMA 7.6: The tameness of the exit time has already been proven in Lemma 7.8. To prove the remaining main claim of part 2, we take an arbitrary $\varkappa > 2$ and use Lemmas 7.8 and 7.9, and Lemma 7.2 (4) to find uniformly high probability events B_ε such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}^y (B_\varepsilon \cap \{e^{-\mu\tau^3} |S_{\tau^2}| > z\}) &\leq \mathbf{P}^y \left(B_\varepsilon \cap \left\{ \sup_{t \leq (l_\varepsilon)^\varkappa} |S_t| > z \varepsilon^{-\mu(\beta-\theta)/(2\lambda)} \right\} \right) \\ &\leq C((l_\varepsilon)^\varkappa + 1) \exp\{-z^2 \varepsilon^{-\mu(\beta-\theta)/\lambda} / C\} \\ &= C e^{-p(z, \varepsilon)}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$p(z, \varepsilon) = z^2 \varepsilon^{-\mu(\beta-\theta)/\lambda} / C - \log((l_\varepsilon)^\varkappa + 1).$$

There is $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for $z \geq 1$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$,

$$p(z, \varepsilon) \geq z^2 \varepsilon^{-\mu(\beta-\theta)/\lambda} / (2C) + \varepsilon^{-\mu(\beta-\theta)/\lambda} / (2C) - \log((l_\varepsilon)^\varkappa + 1) \geq z^2 / (2C).$$

For $z < 1$, we estimate the probability by 1. Combining these estimates and adjusting the value of the constant, we complete the proof of Lemma 7.6 (2) and hence, Lemma 7.4. \square

7.3. The setting in rectified coordinates. We recall that Condition **(H)** introduces a family of linearizing conjugacies and implies that for any $R, L' > 0$, we may assume that $f(U)$, the domain where the pushforward of b under f is linear, contains the rectangle Π defined in (7.17).

We are going to study the process $Y = f(X)$ until the time τ_Π , the exit time from Π . The Itô formula implies that until that time the evolution of Y is governed by SDE (7.1) with coefficients F and G given by

$$\begin{aligned} F_j^i(y) &= \partial_k f^i(f^{-1}(y)) \sigma_j^k(f^{-1}(y)), \quad y \in f(U), \\ G^i(y) &= \frac{1}{2} \partial_{jk}^2 f^i(f^{-1}(y)) (\sigma^j(f^{-1}(y)) \cdot \sigma^k(f^{-1}(y))), \quad y \in f(U), \end{aligned}$$

where the Einstein convention of summation over repeated indices is used. Since σ is assumed to be C_b^3 (see **(H)**) and f is assumed to be C_b^5 , we see that $F, G \in C_b^3$, and we can extend them to \mathbb{R}^2 preserving smoothness and boundedness (but not the linearizing property) and study solutions of (7.1) with thus extended coefficients. Estimates from sections 7.1, 7.2 hold for these solutions, hence, they apply to the process $f(X)$ stopped at τ_Π .

Let us describe the setting and show that it is compatible with **(A)**, **(B)**, **(C)**, and **(D)**, up to a small correction.

The role of vector field b in **(A)** is played by $\bar{b} : x \mapsto (\lambda x^1, -\mu x^2)$. The role of the diffusion X_t is played by Y_t , so **(A)** holds only up to a small correction given by $\varepsilon^2 G$ in the drift term.

The interior of Π plays the role of D in **(B)**, namely

$$(7.35) \quad D = (-R, R) \times (-L', L'),$$

and the origin $(0, 0)$ is the saddle point O associated with \bar{b} . We also assume that

$$(7.36) \quad R, L' \geq 1,$$

which we can always arrange by scaling f . We set

$$(7.37) \quad x_0 = (0, L), \quad v = (1, 0), \quad q_{\pm} = (\pm R, 0), \quad v_{\pm} = (0, 1)$$

where we choose $L > 0$ sufficiently small so that **(B)** is satisfied. One viable choice is $R, L' = 1$ and $L = 1/2$.

The process Y starting near x_0 exits Π , at time $\tau = \tau_{\Pi}$ given in (7.18), typically near q_{\pm} . See Figure 11 for this setting.




FIGURE 11. Dynamics in rectified coordinates

We are mostly interested in initial conditions described by Condition **(C)** which can be rewritten as follows: $\alpha \in (0, 1]$; the initial condition $Y_0 = Y_{\varepsilon, 0}$ is measurable with respect to \mathcal{F}_0 and satisfies

$$(7.38) \quad Y_0 = x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha \xi_\varepsilon v = (\varepsilon^\alpha \xi_\varepsilon, L),$$

for some real-valued r.v.'s ξ_ε such that $\varepsilon^\alpha \xi_\varepsilon \in [-1, 1]$, $\varepsilon > 0$.

We also assume that Condition **(D)** holds for some r.v. ξ .

In agreement with (4.5) and the definition of Q^x above that display, in this section, $Q^x = \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon x v} = \mathbf{P}^{(\varepsilon x, L)}$ denotes the distribution of the diffusion (7.1) with initial condition $Y_0 = x_0 + \varepsilon x v = (\varepsilon x, L)$.

As our main goal, in the next subsection, we prove lemmas stated in Sections 4 and 5 for the “rectified coordinates” setting described above. Let us summarize the setting for the convenience of reference:

Remark 7.1. A lemma is said to hold *in rectified coordinates* if it holds for Y given in (7.1) in place of X , D given in (7.35), and x_0, v, q_{\pm}, v_{\pm} given in (7.37), where R, L' satisfy (7.36) and $L > 0$ is sufficiently small so that **(B)** is satisfied.

7.4. Proofs of lemmas in rectified coordinates. Here, we collect proofs of some lemmas in Section 4 and 5 *in rectified coordinates* (see Remark 7.1). Some of our proofs use nontrivial local limit theorems that we postpone to Sections 9 and 10. These two sections assume the setting in Sections 7.1 and 7.2 and, additionally, that F and G in (7.1) are C_b^3 (see the beginning of Section 9). Hence, the results from those sections are applicable here.

We recall that we are considering the initial conditions described in (7.38), i.e., belonging to $I = [-R, R] \times \{L\}$. If $\xi_{\varepsilon} = x$ in (7.38) is deterministic, then the initial condition is

$$(7.39) \quad y = (0, L) + \varepsilon^{\alpha}(x, 0).$$

Throughout this subsection, τ stands for τ_{II} .

Lemma 7.10. *Under \mathbb{P}^y , events $A_{+, \varepsilon} \cup A_{-, \varepsilon}$ happen w.h.p., uniformly in $y \in I$. On that event,*

$$(7.40) \quad \tau = \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \frac{R}{|\varepsilon^{\alpha} x + \varepsilon U_{\tau}^1|},$$

$$(7.41) \quad Y_{\tau}^1 = e^{\lambda \tau} (\varepsilon^{\alpha} x + \varepsilon U_{\tau}^1),$$

$$(7.42) \quad Y_{\tau}^2 = e^{-\mu \tau} L + \varepsilon N_{\tau} = \frac{L}{R^{\rho}} |\varepsilon^{\alpha} x + \varepsilon U_{\tau}^1|^{\rho} + \varepsilon N_{\tau},$$

and (recalling (2.31))

$$(7.43) \quad \xi'_{\varepsilon} = \begin{cases} \frac{L}{R^{\rho}} |x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} U_{\tau}^1|^{\rho} + \varepsilon^{1-\rho \alpha} N_{\tau}, & \alpha \rho \leq 1, \\ \frac{L}{R^{\rho}} |\varepsilon^{\alpha - \frac{1}{\rho}} x + \varepsilon^{1 - \frac{1}{\rho}} U_{\tau}^1|^{\rho} + N_{\tau}, & \alpha \rho > 1. \end{cases}$$

PROOF: Lemma 7.4 directly implies that $A_{+, \varepsilon} \cup A_{-, \varepsilon}$ happens w.h.p., uniformly in $y \in I_{\varepsilon} = [-\varepsilon^{\alpha'}, \varepsilon^{\alpha'}] \times \{L\}$ for any $\alpha' \in (0, 1)$. It also happens w.h.p., uniformly in $y \in I \setminus I_{\varepsilon}$ due to a simple large deviation estimate. Identities (7.40), (7.41), (7.42) follow from (7.3), (7.4) and (7.39); (7.4) and (2.31) imply (7.43). \square

In the proof of Lemma 4.4 and multiple other instances throughout the paper, we will need the following obvious lemma.

Lemma 7.11. *Suppose that \mathcal{N} is a r.v. with density bounded by a constant C . Then, for any Borel sets $A_1, A_2 \subset \mathbb{R}$,*

$$|\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{N} \in A_1\} - \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{N} \in A_2\}| \leq C \text{Leb}(A_1 \Delta A_2).$$

7.4.1. Proof of Lemma 4.2 in rectified coordinates. The representation for ξ' in (7.43) holds w.h.p., uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$, due to Lemma 7.10. The lemma follows, since N_{τ} and U_{τ}^1 are uniformly tame due to Lemmas 7.2 (3) and 7.4 (3). \square

7.4.2. *Proof of Lemma 4.3 in rectified coordinates.* Let $I_\varepsilon = [\varepsilon l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'}, R] \times \{L\}$. Using (7.41) and Lemma 7.2 (3), we obtain

$$\sup_{y \in I_\varepsilon} \mathbf{P}^y(A_{-, \varepsilon}) \leq \sup_{y \in I_\varepsilon} \mathbf{P}^y \{Y_\tau^1 < 0\} \leq \sup_{y \in I_\varepsilon} \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ \sup_{t \geq 0} |U_t^1| > l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'} \right\} = o_\varepsilon(1),$$

for sufficiently large \varkappa . \square

7.4.3. *Proof of Lemma 4.4 in rectified coordinates.* Using (7.41), we obtain

$$\mathbf{Q}^x(A_{-, \varepsilon}) = \mathbf{Q}^x \{x + U_\tau^1 < 0\} + o_\varepsilon(1) = 1 - \mathbf{Q}^x \{x + U_\tau^1 \geq 0\} + o_\varepsilon(1),$$

uniformly over $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$. Choosing $\varkappa' > \varkappa$ and using Lemma 7.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Q}^x \{x + U_\tau^1 \geq 0\} &= \mathbf{Q}^x \left\{ x + U_\tau^1 \in [0, l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'}] \right\} + \mathbf{Q}^x \left\{ U_\tau^1 > l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'} - x \right\} \\ &= \mathbf{Q}^x \left\{ x + U_\tau^1 \in [0, l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'}] \right\} + o_\varepsilon(1), \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$. Applying Lemma 9.1 with 1, 0, 0, τ substituted for $\alpha, \xi, \theta, \zeta$, we have

$$\sup_{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)} \left| \mathbf{Q}^x \left\{ x + U_\tau^1 \in [0, l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'}] \right\} - \mathbf{P} \left\{ x + \mathcal{U} \in [\mp \varepsilon^\eta, l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'} \pm \varepsilon^\eta] \right\} \right| = o(\varepsilon^\delta),$$

for some $\delta, \eta > 0$ and a centered Gaussian r.v. \mathcal{U} with variance \mathbf{c}_1 defined in (9.2). Using the choice $\varkappa' > \varkappa$, the Gaussian tail of \mathcal{U} , and Lemma 7.11, we can verify that

$$\sup_{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)} \left| \mathbf{P} \left\{ x + \mathcal{U} \in [\mp \varepsilon^\eta, l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'} \pm \varepsilon^\eta] \right\} - \mathbf{P} \{x + \mathcal{U} \geq 0\} \right| = o(\varepsilon^{\delta'})$$

for some $\delta' > 0$. Setting $s = \mathbf{c}_1$, we have $\mathbf{P}\{y + \mathcal{U} \geq 0\} = 1 - \psi_s(-y)$. Combining these estimates, we complete the proof. \square

7.4.4. *Proof of Lemma 4.5 in rectified coordinates.* Using our assumption $\alpha < 1$, $\alpha\rho < 1$, the fact that $\xi_\varepsilon \in [l_\varepsilon^{-\varkappa}, l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa}]$ w.h.p., and Lemma 7.2 in (7.43), we obtain that $\xi'_\varepsilon \in [l_\varepsilon^{-\varkappa'}, l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'}]$ w.h.p. for sufficiently large \varkappa' .

7.4.5. *Proof of Lemma 4.6 in rectified coordinates.* The proof relies on results from Section 10. The first part of Lemma 4.6 is a combination of Propositions 10.2 and 10.3.

For part (3), it suffices to rewrite (7.42) (holding w.h.p. uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$):

$$(7.44) \quad Y_\tau^2 = \varepsilon^\rho |x + U_\tau^1|^\rho R^{-\rho} L + \varepsilon N_\tau^2,$$

and use Lemma 7.4 (1) to write

$$\sup_{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{Q}^x \left\{ \varepsilon^\rho |x + U_\tau^1|^\rho R^{-\rho} L + \varepsilon N_\tau^2 \leq -\varepsilon l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'} \right\} \leq \sup_{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{Q}^x \{N_\tau^2 \leq -l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'}\} = o_\varepsilon(1)$$

for $\varkappa' > 1/2$.

To prove part (2), we first note that, for any $C \in \mathbb{R}$, due to Proposition 10.1 (with 1, 0, $\frac{\beta(1+\delta)}{\rho}$, R , $-C$ substituted for $\alpha, \theta, \beta, r, c$, respectively),

$$(7.45) \quad \sup_{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{Q}^x \left\{ \tau + C \geq \frac{\beta(1+\delta)}{\mu} l_\varepsilon \right\} = O\left(\varepsilon^{\frac{\beta(1+\delta)}{\rho}-1}\right),$$

uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$. Note that the upper bound in part (2) is a specific case of this estimate, with $C = 0$. For the proof in original coordinates, we will need (7.45)

with nonzero C . To prove a matching lower bound for τ , we note that, due to (7.44), the symmetric difference between events $D_{1,\varepsilon} = \{Y_\tau \in \{R\} \times (-\infty, \varepsilon^\beta l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'}]\}$ and $D_{2,\varepsilon} = \left\{ \varepsilon^\rho (x + U_\tau^1)^\rho R^{-\rho} L + \varepsilon N_\tau^2 \leq \varepsilon^\beta l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'}, x + U_\tau^1 > 0 \right\}$ is a small probability event under \mathbb{Q}^x , uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$.

Due to (7.40), on $D_{2,\varepsilon}$ we have

$$\tau \geq \frac{\beta}{\mu} l_\varepsilon + \frac{1}{\mu} \log \frac{L}{l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'} - \varepsilon^{1-\beta} N_\tau^2},$$

$$l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'} - \varepsilon^{1-\beta} N_\tau^2 > 0.$$

Therefore, on $D_{2,\varepsilon}$, $\tau - \frac{\beta}{\mu} l_\varepsilon < -\frac{\beta\delta}{\mu} l_\varepsilon$ implies $|N_\tau^2| > L\varepsilon^{-\beta\delta} - l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'}$, but the latter occurs (uniformly) w.l.p. due to Lemma 7.4 (1). \square

7.4.6. *Proof of Lemma 4.7 in rectified coordinates.* Using (7.40), we obtain

$$\mathbb{Q}^x \left\{ \tau < \frac{1-\delta}{\lambda} l_\varepsilon \right\} = \mathbb{Q}^x \{ |x + U_\tau^1| > \varepsilon^{-\delta} R \} + o_e(1),$$

uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$. Due to Lemma 7.2 (3), the r.h.s. is $o_e(1)$, uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$. A matching lower bound is implied by Proposition 10.1 with $1, 0, 1 + \delta$ substituted for α, θ, β :

$$\mathbb{Q}^x \left\{ \tau > \frac{1+\delta}{\lambda} l_\varepsilon \right\} = O(\varepsilon^\delta),$$

uniformly in x . \square

7.4.7. *Proof of Lemma 5.2 in rectified coordinates.* Using (7.43) from Lemma 7.10 along with Lemmas 7.2 (3) and 7.4 (3), we obtain that if $\varkappa > \varkappa'/\rho$, then $\xi'_\varepsilon > l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'}$ w.h.p., uniformly in $x \in (l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'}, \varepsilon^{-\alpha}]$, and our claim follows. \square

7.4.8. *Proof of Lemma 5.5 in rectified coordinates.* Using (7.42) from Lemma 7.10, we can bound the probability of interest, up to a $o_e(1)$ term, by

$$\mathbb{P}^y \left\{ \varepsilon^{\alpha\rho} R^{-\rho} L |x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} U_\tau^1|^\rho + \varepsilon N_\tau < -\varepsilon^\beta l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'} \right\} \leq \mathbb{P}^y \left\{ |N_\tau| > \varepsilon^{\beta-1} l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'} \right\} = o_e(1),$$

uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$, where we used Lemma 7.4 (1). \square

7.4.9. *Proof of Lemma 5.12 in rectified coordinates.* Using (7.40), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^y \left\{ \tau < \frac{\alpha-\delta}{\lambda} l_\varepsilon \right\} &\leq \mathbb{P}^y \left\{ |x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} U_\tau^1| > \varepsilon^{-\delta} R \right\} + o_e(1) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}^y \left\{ \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} |U_\tau^1| > \varepsilon^{-\delta} R - |x| \right\} + o_e(1), \\ \mathbb{P}^y \left\{ \tau > \frac{\alpha+\delta}{\lambda} l_\varepsilon \right\} &\leq \mathbb{P}^y \left\{ |x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} U_\tau^1| < \varepsilon^\delta R \right\} + o_e(1) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}^y \left\{ |x| < \varepsilon^\delta R + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} |U_\tau^1| \right\} + o_e(1), \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$. Applying Lemma 7.2 (3) to U_τ^1 , we see that the first display is $o_e(1)$ uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$, and the second display is bounded from above by $\mathbf{1}_{|x| \leq \varepsilon^{\delta'}} + o_e(1)$ for some $\delta' > 0$. \square

8. PROOFS IN THE ORIGINAL COORDINATES

The goal of this section is to prove the results from Sections 4 and 5 in full generality. The plan is to use the results obtained in Section 7 *in rectified coordinates* to study the diffusion inside the domain of the linearizing conjugacy, and combine these results with the analysis of motion along heteroclinic orbits outside of that domain. We begin with the latter.

8.1. Diffusion along a heteroclinic orbit. The results in this section concern finite time horizon and are close to those in [FW12] and [AMB11b].

Given a vector field b , we call a C^1 curve $\chi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ b -transversal if, for every $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$b(\chi(t)) \cdot \frac{d}{dt}\chi(t) \neq 0.$$

For brevity, we often use χ to denote $\chi([0, 1]) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, the image of χ . In addition, we denote by $\overset{\circ}{\chi}$ the set $\chi((0, 1))$. We recall the definition of the flow $(\varphi^t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ from (2.28).

Lemma 8.1. *Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be compact and let $\chi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus E$ be C^2 , b -transversal. Suppose further that for every $z \in E$, there is a minimal time $t_z > 0$ such that $\varphi^{t_z} z \in \overset{\circ}{\chi}$. Let $\zeta = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t \in \chi\}$, where X_t is a solution of (1.1). Then there is a constant C such that*

$$(8.1) \quad \sup_{z \in E} \mathbf{P}^z \{\zeta > C\} = o_e(1),$$

and there are constants c_1, c_2 such that for all $\eta > 0$,

$$\sup_{z \in E} \mathbf{P}^z \{|X_\zeta - \varphi^{t_z} z| > \eta; \zeta < \infty\} \leq c_1 e^{-c_2 \eta^2 \varepsilon^{-2}}.$$

In particular, for any fixed $(\beta, \varkappa) \in ([0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}) \cup (\{1\} \times (1/2, +\infty))$,

$$\sup_{z \in E} \mathbf{P}^z \{|X_\zeta - \varphi^{t_z} z| > \varepsilon^\beta l_\varepsilon^\varkappa; \zeta < \infty\} = o_e(1).$$

PROOF: The lemma follows from the classical Freidlin–Wentzell Large Deviation Principle, which holds uniformly with respect to the initial condition z , see [FW12, Chapter 5, Theorem 3.2]. \square

Lemma 8.2. *Let $\chi_1, \chi_2 : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ be C^1 and b -transversal. Suppose for every $z \in \chi_1$, there is a minimal time $t_z > 0$ such that $\varphi^{t_z} z \in \chi_2$. Then the map ϕ defined by*

$$(8.2) \quad \phi(z) = \varphi^{t_z} z.$$

is a diffeomorphism on χ_1 .

PROOF: Due to the transversality assumption, this is a consequence of the implicit function theorem. \square

The following result is an extension of Theorem 2.2.

Lemma 8.3. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $\varkappa > 0$. Assume that χ is b -transversal. Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and let $T > 0$ be the minimal time such that $\varphi^T x_0 \in \overset{\circ}{\chi}$. Let (X_t) be a solution of (1.1) and $\zeta = \inf\{t > 0 : X_t \in \chi\}$. Then there is $\eta > 0$, a deterministic rank-one matrix A , a centered Gaussian vector M (once x_0 is fixed, M is a*

function of the noise realization W , so it does not depend on the initial condition $z \in \mathbb{R}_2$), it is concentrated on the tangent line to χ at $\varphi^T x_0$, and a family of random vectors $(r_{z,\varepsilon})_{|z-x_0| \leq \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^\alpha, \varepsilon > 0}$ such that under \mathbf{P}^z , w.h.p., uniformly in z , $\zeta < \infty$ and

$$X_\zeta = \varphi^T x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha (A\bar{z} + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} M + r_{z,\varepsilon}),$$

where

$$(8.3) \quad \bar{z} = \varepsilon^{-\alpha}(z - x_0)$$

and $|r_{z,\varepsilon}| \leq \varepsilon^\eta$ w.h.p. uniformly in z satisfying $|z - x_0| \leq \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^\alpha$. More precisely, there is $\eta > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{|z-x_0| \leq \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^\alpha} \mathbf{P}^z \left\{ |\varepsilon^{-\alpha}(X_\zeta - \varphi^T x_0) - A\bar{z} - \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} M| > \varepsilon^\eta, \quad \zeta < \infty \right\} = o_\varepsilon(1),$$

$$\sup_{|z-x_0| \leq \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^\alpha} \mathbf{P}^z \{ \zeta = \infty \} = o_\varepsilon(1).$$

PROOF: By Taylor's theorem, functions $Q_1(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $Q_2(\cdot, \cdot)$ defined by

$$(8.4) \quad b(z) = b(y) + Db(y)(z - y) + Q_1(y, z - y), \quad z, y \in \mathbb{R}^2,$$

$$(8.5) \quad \sigma(z) = \sigma(y) + Q_2(y, z - y), \quad z, y \in \mathbb{R}^2,$$

are continuous and satisfy, for some $K > 0$,

$$(8.6) \quad |Q_1(y, v)| \leq K|v|^2, \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^2, |v| \leq 1,$$

$$(8.7) \quad |Q_2(y, v)| \leq K(1 \wedge |v|), \quad y, v \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

On the left-hand side of the last inequality, we use $|\cdot|$ to denotes the operator norm of a matrix. We define the linearization (fundamental solution) near the orbit $(\varphi^t x_0)$ by

$$\frac{d}{dt} A(t) = Db(\varphi^t x_0)A(t), \quad A(0) = I,$$

where I is the 2×2 identity matrix. The standard theory of differential equations combined with the properties of $Db(\cdot)$ under our assumptions on b then imply that $(A(t))_{t \geq 0}$ has the semigroup property $A(t+s) = A(t)A(s)$ and there is a constant $c > 0$ such that $|A(t)| \leq e^{ct}$. We set

$$(8.8) \quad N_t = \int_0^t A(t-s)\sigma(\varphi^s x_0)dW_s, \quad t \geq 0,$$

then, recalling that \bar{z} and z are related by (8.3), we set

$$(8.9) \quad \Theta_\varepsilon(t, z) = A(t)\bar{z} + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} N_t, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^2, t \geq 0, \varepsilon > 0,$$

and define $r_\varepsilon(t, z)$ by

$$(8.10) \quad X_t = \varphi^t x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha (\Theta_\varepsilon(t, z) + r_\varepsilon(t, z)), \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^2, t \geq 0, \varepsilon > 0.$$

Lemma 8.4. For any $T' > 0$ and $\beta \in (0, \alpha)$,

$$\sup_{|z-x_0| \leq \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^\alpha} \mathbf{P}^z \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, T']} |r_\varepsilon(t, z)| > \varepsilon^\beta \right\} = o_\varepsilon(1).$$

PROOF: Let $\Delta_t = X_t - \varphi^t x_0$, so $\mathbf{P}^z\{\Delta_0 = \varepsilon^\alpha \bar{z}\} = 1$. Using (8.10), we obtain

$$(8.11) \quad \Delta_t = \varepsilon^\alpha (\Theta_\varepsilon(t, z) + r_\varepsilon(t, z)).$$

Then, since $X_0 = z$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d\Delta_t &= (b(X_t) - b(\varphi^t x_0))dt + \varepsilon\sigma(X_t)dW_t \\ &= Db(\varphi^t x_0)\Delta_t dt + \varepsilon\sigma(\varphi^t x_0)dW_t + Q_1(\varphi^t x_0, \Delta_t)dt + \varepsilon Q_2(\varphi^t x_0, \Delta_t)dW_t. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Duhamel's principle to this identity, using (8.11) and (8.9), we obtain

$$(8.12) \quad r_\varepsilon(t, z) = \Theta'_\varepsilon(t, z) + \Theta''_\varepsilon(t, z),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta'_\varepsilon(t, z) &= \varepsilon^{-\alpha} \int_0^t A(t-s)Q_1(\varphi^s x_0, \Delta_s)ds, \\ \Theta''_\varepsilon(t, z) &= \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} \int_0^t A(t-s)Q_2(\varphi^s x_0, \Delta_s)dW_s. \end{aligned}$$

Let us take an arbitrary $\beta' \in (0, \alpha)$ and define $\ell = \inf\{t \geq 0 : |\Delta_t| > \varepsilon^{\beta'}\} \wedge T'$. Then, using (8.6), (8.7), and the exponential martingale inequality, we obtain that for some constant $C > 0$ and for small ε ,

$$(8.13) \quad \sup_{|z-x_0| \leq \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^\alpha} \sup_{t \leq \ell} |\Theta'_\varepsilon(t, z)| \leq C\varepsilon^{2\beta'-\alpha}$$

and

$$(8.14) \quad \sup_{|z-x_0| \leq \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^\alpha} \mathbf{P}^z \left\{ \sup_{t \leq \ell} |\Theta''_\varepsilon(t, z)| \geq \varepsilon^{2\beta'-\alpha} \right\} = o_\varepsilon(1).$$

In addition, $\sup_{t \leq T'} |N_t|$ is tame, so $\sup_{t \leq \ell} |\Theta_\varepsilon(t, z)|$ is tame, uniformly in z satisfying $|z - x_0| \leq \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^\alpha$. Using this, (8.13), and (8.14) in (8.11), we obtain that for any $\beta'' < \alpha \wedge (2\beta')$, w.h.p, uniformly in z , $\sup_{t \leq \ell} |\Delta_t| \leq \varepsilon^{\beta''}$. Choosing $\beta'' \in (\beta', \alpha \wedge (2\beta'))$, we thus obtain that $\ell = T'$ w.h.p., uniformly in z . Combining this with (8.12), (8.13), (8.14), we complete the proof. \square

Going back to the proof of Lemma 8.3, we first note that its last claim follows from Lemma 8.1. To prove the main claim, we choose some $\alpha' \in (0, \alpha)$ (we will impose a tighter requirement later) and note that (8.10), (8.9), Lemma 8.4, and the b -transversality of χ imply that under \mathbf{P}^z ,

$$(8.15) \quad \zeta \in (T - \varepsilon^{\alpha'}, T + \varepsilon^{\alpha'})$$

w.h.p., uniformly in z satisfying $|z - x_0| \leq \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^\alpha$. Let us study the path X_t on this time interval.

First, let us introduce projection operators π_b and π_χ via a unique decomposition

$$(8.16) \quad v = \pi_b v + \pi_\chi v, \quad v \in \mathbb{R}^2,$$

where $\pi_b v$ is collinear with $b(\varphi^T x_0)$ and $\pi_\chi v$ is tangent to χ at $\varphi^T x_0$. We will prove that the lemma holds with

$$(8.17) \quad \begin{aligned} A\bar{z} &= \pi_\chi A(T)\bar{z}, \\ M &= \pi_\chi N_T. \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$A\bar{z} + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} M = \pi_\chi(\Theta_\varepsilon(T, z)).$$

Let us impose an additional requirement that $\alpha' > \alpha/2$ and prove that for any β satisfying

$$0 < \beta < \alpha' \wedge (1 - \alpha + \alpha'/3) \wedge (2\alpha' - \alpha),$$

we have that w.h.p. under \mathbf{P}^z , uniformly in z satisfying $|z - x_0| \leq \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^\alpha$,

$$(8.18) \quad \sup_{t \in (T - \varepsilon^{\alpha'}, T + \varepsilon^{\alpha'})} |\varepsilon^{-\alpha} \pi_\chi(X_t - \varphi^T x_0) - \pi_\chi \Theta_\varepsilon(T, z)| \leq \varepsilon^\beta.$$

To that end, let us use (8.10) to write

$$\begin{aligned} |\varepsilon^{-\alpha} \pi_\chi(X_t - \varphi^T x_0) - \pi_\chi \Theta_\varepsilon(T, z)| &\leq I_1 + I_2 + I_3 \\ &= \varepsilon^{-\alpha} |\pi_\chi(\varphi^t x_0 - \varphi^T x_0)| + |\pi_\chi(\Theta_\varepsilon(t, z) - \Theta_\varepsilon(T, z))| + |\pi_\chi(r_\varepsilon(t, z))|, \end{aligned}$$

and estimate each term on the right-hand side. Since $\varphi^t x_0$ is a C^2 function of t and $\frac{d}{dt} \varphi^t x_0|_{t=T} = b(\varphi^T x_0)$, we have

$$I_1 \leq \varepsilon^{-\alpha} C(t - T)^2 \leq \varepsilon^{2\alpha' - \alpha}, \quad t \in (T - \varepsilon^{\alpha'}, T + \varepsilon^{\alpha'}).$$

To estimate $N_t - N_T$, we assume $t \leq T$ the opposite case following by interchanging the role of t and T . Since $A(t)$ is smooth in t , we obtain

$$|A(t - s) - A(T - s)| \leq C\varepsilon^{\alpha'}, \quad t \in (T - \varepsilon^{\alpha'}, T + \varepsilon^{\alpha'}).$$

Using this, $|A(T - s)| < e^{cT}$, and the exponential martingale inequality, we obtain that w.h.p. under \mathbf{P}^z , uniformly in z ,

$$\begin{aligned} |N_t - N_T| &\leq \\ \left| \int_t^T A(T - s) \sigma(\varphi^s x_0) dW_s \right| + \left| \int_0^t (A(T - s) - A(t - s)) \sigma(\varphi^s x_0) dW_s \right| &< C\varepsilon^{\alpha'/3}, \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in (T - \varepsilon^{\alpha'}, T + \varepsilon^{\alpha'})$. So, w.h.p. uniformly in z ,

$$\sup_{t \in (T - \varepsilon^{\alpha'}, T + \varepsilon^{\alpha'})} I_2 \leq C(\varepsilon^{\alpha'} + \varepsilon^{1 - \alpha + \alpha'/3}).$$

Finally, due to Lemma 8.4, we know that w.h.p. under \mathbf{P}^z , uniformly in z ,

$$\sup_{t \in (T - \varepsilon^{\alpha'}, T + \varepsilon^{\alpha'})} I_3 \leq \varepsilon^{\alpha'}.$$

Combining these estimates for I_1, I_2, I_3 , we obtain that (8.18) holds w.h.p. under \mathbf{P}^z , uniformly in z satisfying $|z - x_0| \leq \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^\alpha$. Therefore, due to (8.15), w.h.p., uniformly in z ,

$$(8.19) \quad |\varepsilon^{-\alpha} \pi_\chi(X_\zeta - \varphi^T x_0) - \pi_\chi \Theta_\varepsilon(T, z)| \leq \varepsilon^\beta.$$

For small ε , this estimate implies $|\pi_\chi(X_\zeta - \varphi^T x_0)| \leq \varepsilon^{3\alpha/4}$ and, since $\chi \in C^2$, $|\pi_b(X_\zeta - \varphi^T x_0)| \leq C\varepsilon^{3\alpha/2}$. Combining the latter with (8.19) and choosing any $\eta \in (0, \beta \wedge (\alpha/2))$, we complete the proof of the lemma. \square

We will need another extension of Theorem 2.2. Let us adopt the setting of Lemma 8.3. Then for all z in a small neighborhood of x_0 , the minimal time t_z such that $\varphi^{t_z} z \in \chi$ is well-defined and finite. In that entire neighborhood, we can define the map ϕ by (8.2).

We recall the definition of N_t in (8.8) and define a random vector M by (8.16) and (8.17). Note that M is a function of the noise realization W . We can now state one more extension of Theorem 2.2 that we need.

Lemma 8.5. *In the setting of Lemma 8.3, there is $\eta > 0$ and a family of random vectors $(h_{z,\varepsilon})_{|z-x_0|<c, \varepsilon>0}$ such that for each $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $\varkappa > 0$, the following holds w.h.p. under \mathbf{P}^z , uniformly in z satisfying $|z - x_0| < \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^\varkappa$:*

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta &< \infty, \\ X_\zeta &= \phi(z) + \varepsilon M + \varepsilon h_{z,\varepsilon}, \\ |h_{z,\varepsilon}| &\leq \varepsilon^\eta. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 8.1. Let us restrict ϕ to a small segment χ such that $x_0 \in \chi \subset x_0 + \mathbb{R}v$ for some v transversal to $b(x_0)$. Then we can write $M = M'D\phi(x_0)v$ for some centered Gaussian r.v. M' , where $D\phi$ is the differential of the restriction of ϕ . Extending ϕ smoothly to the entire $x_0 + \mathbb{R}v$, we also have

$$|\phi(x_0 + (\varepsilon^\alpha x + \varepsilon M')v) - \phi(x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha xv) - \varepsilon M| \leq C(\varepsilon^2 |M'|^2 + \varepsilon^{1+\alpha} |M'| |x|).$$

The error can be absorbed into $h'_{x,\varepsilon} = h_{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha xv, \varepsilon}$, and hence, w.h.p. under $\mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha xv}$, uniformly in $x \in K_\varkappa(\varepsilon)$,

$$X_\zeta = \phi(x_0 + (\varepsilon^\alpha x + \varepsilon M')v) + \varepsilon h'_{x,\varepsilon}$$

and $|h'_{x,\varepsilon}| \leq \varepsilon^\eta$.

The proof of Lemma 8.5 is similar to that of Lemma 8.3. First, we prove the following auxiliary result:

Lemma 8.6. *Under the conditions stated above, for $h_\varepsilon(t, z)$ defined via*

$$X_t = \varphi^t z + \varepsilon N_t + \varepsilon h_\varepsilon(t, z), \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad t \geq 0, \quad \varepsilon > 0,$$

the following holds: if $T' > 0$ and $\beta \in (0, \alpha)$, then

$$\sup_{|z-x_0| \leq \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^\varkappa} \mathbf{P}^z \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, T']} |h_\varepsilon(t, z)| > \varepsilon^\beta \right\} = o_\varepsilon(1).$$

PROOF: Let

$$(8.20) \quad \Delta_t = X_t - \varphi^t z = \varepsilon N_t + \varepsilon h_\varepsilon(t, z).$$

In addition to the definitions of Q_1, Q_2 in (8.4), (8.5), we define

$$Q_3(z, y) = Db(z + y) - Db(z), \quad z, y \in \mathbb{R}^2,$$

and adjust the constant K in (8.6), (8.7), to ensure that

$$(8.21) \quad |Q_3(z, y)| \leq K(1 \wedge |y|), \quad z, y \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} d\Delta_t &= (b(X_t) - b(\varphi^t z))dt + \varepsilon \sigma(X_t) dW_t \\ &= Db(\varphi^t x_0) \Delta_t dt + Q_3(\varphi^t x_0, \varphi^t z - \varphi^t x_0) \Delta_t dt + Q_1(\varphi^t z, \Delta_t) dt \\ &\quad + \varepsilon \sigma(\varphi^t x_0) dW_t + \varepsilon Q_2(\varphi^t x_0, \varphi^t z - \varphi^t x_0) dW_t + \varepsilon Q_2(\varphi^t z, \Delta_t) dW_t. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the Duhamel principle to this identity, we obtain that

$$(8.22) \quad h_\varepsilon(t, z) = \varepsilon^{-1} \Delta_t - N_t = \Theta'_\varepsilon(t, z) + \Theta''_\varepsilon(t, z) + \Xi'_\varepsilon(t, z) + \Xi''_\varepsilon(t, z),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta'_\varepsilon(t, z) &= \varepsilon^{-1} \int_0^t A(t-s) Q_1(\varphi^s z, \Delta_s) ds, \\ \Theta''_\varepsilon(t, z) &= \int_0^t A(t-s) Q_2(\varphi^s z, \Delta_s) dW_s, \\ \Xi'_\varepsilon(t, z) &= \varepsilon^{-1} \int_0^t A(t-s) Q_3(\varphi^s x_0, \varphi^s z - \varphi^s x_0) \Delta_s ds, \\ \Xi''_\varepsilon(t, z) &= \int_0^t A(t-s) Q_2(\varphi^s x_0, \varphi^s z - \varphi^s x_0) dW_s.\end{aligned}$$

Let us take an arbitrary $\beta' \in (0, 1)$ and define $\ell = \inf\{t \geq 0 : |\Delta_t| \geq \varepsilon^{\beta'}\} \wedge T'$. Then, using (8.6), (8.7), (8.21) and the Lipschitzness of φ^t , we obtain that for all $\beta'' \in (0, \beta')$, $\alpha' \in (0, \alpha)$,

$$(8.23) \quad \sup_{|z-x_0| < \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^\alpha} \sup_{t \leq \ell} |\Theta'_\varepsilon(t, z)| = o(\varepsilon^{2\beta''-1}),$$

$$\sup_{|z-x_0| < \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^\alpha} \mathbf{P}^z \left\{ \sup_{t \leq \ell} |\Theta''_\varepsilon(t, z)| \geq \varepsilon^{\beta''} \right\} = o_e(1),$$

$$(8.24) \quad \sup_{|z-x_0| < \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^\alpha} \sup_{t \leq \ell} |\Xi'_\varepsilon(t, z)| = o(\varepsilon^{\alpha+\beta''-1}),$$

$$(8.25) \quad \sup_{|z-x_0| < \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^\alpha} \mathbf{P}^z \left\{ \sup_{t \leq \ell} |\Xi''_\varepsilon(t, z)| \geq \varepsilon^{\alpha'} \right\} = o_e(1).$$

Choosing β' and β'' sufficiently close to 1 and α' sufficiently close to α , using these relations along with (8.20) and the tameness of $\sup_{t \leq T'} |N_t|$, we obtain that

$$\sup_{|z-x_0| < \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^\alpha} \mathbf{P}^z \left\{ \sup_{t \leq \ell} |\Delta_t| \geq \varepsilon^{\beta'} \right\} = o_e(1),$$

which implies that w.h.p. under \mathbf{P}^z , uniformly in $|z - x_0| < \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^\alpha$, we have $\ell = T'$. Therefore, (8.23)–(8.25) hold with ℓ replaced by T' (w.h.p. for (8.23) and (8.24)). Once α', β', β'' are chosen to ensure relations $2\beta'' - 1 > \beta$, $\beta' > \beta$, $\alpha + \beta'' - 1 > \beta$, $\alpha' > \beta$, we can use these estimates in (8.22) to complete the proof. \square

PROOF OF LEMMA 8.5: Let $\beta_1 \in (0, 1)$ and note that Lemma 8.6 implies that

$$(8.26) \quad \zeta \in (t_z - \varepsilon^{\beta_1}, t_z + \varepsilon^{\beta_1})$$

w.h.p. under \mathbf{P}^z , uniformly in z . Let us study the path X_t on this time interval.

First, we define projection operators $\pi_{b,z}$ and $\pi_{\chi,z}$ via a unique decomposition

$$v = \pi_{b,z} v + \pi_{\chi,z} v, \quad v \in \mathbb{R}^2,$$

where $\pi_{b,z}$ is collinear with $b(\phi(z))$ and $\pi_{\chi,z} v$ is tangent to χ at $\phi(z)$. We define $M(z) = \pi_{\chi,z} N_{t_z}$. In particular, $M = M(x_0) = \pi_{\chi,x_0} N_{t_{x_0}}$.

We claim that there is $\beta_2 > 0$ such that w.h.p. under \mathbf{P}^z , uniformly in z ,

$$(8.27) \quad \sup_{t \in (t_z - \varepsilon^{\beta_1}, t_z + \varepsilon^{\beta_1})} |\varepsilon^{-1} \pi_{\chi,z}(X_t - \phi(z)) - M| \leq \varepsilon^{\beta_2}.$$

To prove this, let us use the representation for X_t from Lemma 8.6 and write

$$\begin{aligned} |\varepsilon^{-1}\pi_{\chi,z}(X_t - \phi(z)) - M| &\leq I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4 \\ &= \varepsilon^{-1}|\pi_{\chi,z}(\varphi^t z - \phi(z))| + |\pi_{\chi,z}N_t - M(z)| + |M(z) - M| + |\pi_{\chi,z}(h_\varepsilon(t, z))|, \end{aligned}$$

and estimate each term on the right-hand side. Since $|t - t_z| < \varepsilon^{\beta_1}$, and the tangent vector to the C^2 trajectory $(\varphi^t z)_{t \in (t_z - \varepsilon^{\beta_1}, t_z + \varepsilon^{\beta_1})}$ at $t = t_z$ is $b(\phi(z))$, we see that

$$\sup_{t \in (t_z - \varepsilon^{\beta_1}, t_z + \varepsilon^{\beta_1})} I_1 \leq \varepsilon^{2\beta_1 - 1}.$$

Using the exponential martingale inequality to control N , we obtain that, w.h.p., uniformly in z ,

$$\sup_{t \in (t_z - \varepsilon^{\beta_1}, t_z + \varepsilon^{\beta_1})} I_2 \leq \varepsilon^{\beta_1/3}.$$

Let us estimate I_3 . The definitions of $M(z)$ and M imply that

$$I_3 \leq |\pi_{\chi,z}(N_{t_z} - N_{t_{x_0}})| + |(\pi_{\chi,z} - \pi_{\chi,x_0})N_{t_{x_0}}| = I_{3,1} + I_{3,2}.$$

The operator norm of $\pi_{\chi,z}$ is bounded, so for a constant $C > 0$ and an arbitrary $\beta_3 \in (0, \alpha/2)$, we have w.h.p. under \mathbf{P}^z , uniformly in $|z - x_0| \leq \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^\alpha$,

$$I_{3,1} \leq C|N_{t_z} - N_{t_{x_0}}| \leq \varepsilon^{\beta_3},$$

where in the second inequality we used the Lipschitzness of t_z in z and the fact that N_t is a diffusion process. Since the projection operator $\pi_{\chi,z}$ is Lipschitz in z , we also conclude that for $\beta'_3 \in (\beta_3, \alpha)$, w.h.p. under \mathbf{P}^z , uniformly in $|z - x_0| \leq \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^\alpha$,

$$I_{3,2} \leq \varepsilon^{\beta'_3}|N_{t_{x_0}}| \leq \varepsilon^{\beta_3},$$

where the last estimate follows from the fast decay of the Gaussian tail. We also use Lemma 8.6 to find $\beta_4 > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{t \in (t_z - \varepsilon^{\beta_1}, t_z + \varepsilon^{\beta_1})} I_4 \leq e^{\beta_4}.$$

Combining these estimates and choosing β_1 sufficiently close to 1, we obtain our claim (8.27). Using (8.26), we obtain that w.h.p., uniformly in z ,

$$|\pi_{\chi,z}(X_\zeta - \phi(z)) - \varepsilon M| \leq \varepsilon^{1+\beta_2}.$$

Since $\chi \in C^2$, this estimate implies that for some $K > 0$ and any $\beta_5 \in (0, 1)$, w.h.p. under \mathbf{P}^z , uniformly in z ,

$$|\pi_{b,z}(X_\zeta - \phi(z))| \leq K(\varepsilon|M| + \varepsilon^{1+\beta_2})^2 \leq \varepsilon^{1+\beta_5}.$$

Combining the last two estimates, we complete the proof of the lemma. \square

8.2. Proofs of lemmas from Sections 4 and 5 in the original coordinates.

We recall that the initial conditions for all the results we need to prove are described in assumption **(C)** where $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, $x_0 \in \mathcal{W}^s$, v is transversal to \mathcal{W}^s at x_0 , and in addition ξ_ε is assumed to be tame. In other words, w.h.p., initial conditions belong to $x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha K_\varkappa(\varepsilon)v$ and we will restrict ourselves to these initial values only.

We are going to split the evolution into three stages (and rely on the strong Markov property for solutions of Itô SDE's), see Figure 12: (i) along the stable manifold \mathcal{W}^s , (ii) in a small neighborhood of the saddle point O , (iii) along the unstable manifold \mathcal{W}^u .

To that end, we recall that our choice of parameters $R, L, L' > 0$ and the drift-linearizing conjugacy f defined on a neighborhood U of the saddle point ensures that the rectangle Π defined by (7.17) satisfies $\Pi \subset f(U)$, i.e., $f^{-1}(\Pi) \subset U$ (see Section 7.3).

In the first stage, the process X evolves mostly outside Π . This stage ends at time $\zeta = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t \in \chi\}$, when the process X hits $\chi = f^{-1}([-R, R] \times \{L\})$. The outcome of this first stage can be studied using results of Section 8.1. In particular, $\zeta < \infty$ and X_ζ belongs to a small neighborhood of $f^{-1}(0, L)$ w.h.p.

This means that, w.h.p., the evolution of X after ζ is well-defined and, while X stays within U , can be described in terms of the process Y given by $Y_t = f(X_{\zeta+t})$. This process solves the rectified SDE (7.1) with initial condition $Y_0 = f(X_\zeta)$ (belonging to χ and close to $f^{-1}(0, L)$ w.h.p.), and W replaced by $W(\cdot + \zeta) - W(\zeta)$. The second stage lasts while the process Y stays within Π (i.e., the process $X_{\zeta+t}$ stays within $f^{-1}(\Pi)$), i.e., until time $\tau_\Pi = \inf\{t \geq 0 : Y_t \in \partial\Pi\}$ (in terms of Y), or until time $\zeta + \tau_\Pi$ (in terms of X). The exit time τ_Π and exit location Y_{τ_Π} are studied in detail in Section 7. In particular, w.h.p., $\tau_\Pi < \infty$, events

$$(8.28) \quad A_{\Pi, \pm, \varepsilon} = \{Y_{\tau_\Pi} \in \{\pm R\} \times [-L', L']\}.$$

get realized (i.e., the exit happens through one of the lateral sides of Π), and Y_{τ_Π} is close to $(-R, 0)$ or $(R, 0)$, i.e., $X_{\zeta+\tau_\Pi}$ is close to $f(-R, 0)$ or $f(R, 0)$.

This, in turn, means that, w.h.p., the evolution of X after $\zeta + \tau_\Pi$ is well-defined. The process \tilde{X} given by $\tilde{X}_t = X_{\zeta+\tau+t}$ solves SDE (1.1) with W replaced by $W(\cdot + \zeta + \tau_\Pi) - W(\zeta + \tau_\Pi)$ and satisfies $\tilde{X}_0 = X_{\zeta+\tau_\Pi}$. The third stage lasts for time $\tilde{\tau} = \inf\{t \geq 0 : \tilde{X}_t \in \partial D\}$. For this stage, we can study the exit time $\tilde{\tau}$ and exit location $\tilde{X}_{\tilde{\tau}}$ using the results of Section 8.1. In particular, we can conclude that w.h.p. $\tilde{\tau} < \infty$ and $\tilde{X}_{\tilde{\tau}}$ belongs to a small neighborhood of q_\pm .

There are nonrigorous elements in this description of the three-stage evolution. Let us convert them into rigorous statements. To that end, let us define the following curves:

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_0 &= x_0 + [-c_0, c_0]v, & \chi_1 &= f^{-1}([-R, R] \times \{L\}), \\ \chi_{2, \pm} &= f^{-1}(\{\pm R\} \times [-L', L']), & \chi_2 &= \chi_{2,+} \cup \chi_{2,-}, \\ \chi_{3, \pm} &= q_\pm + [-1, 1]v_+, & \chi_3 &= \chi_{3,+} \cup \chi_{3,-}, \end{aligned}$$

where the constant $c_0 \in (0, 1)$ is chosen to ensure that the deterministic flow $(\varphi^t)_{t \geq 0}$ transports χ_0 into $\hat{\chi}_1$. Note that χ_2 is transported by $(\varphi^t)_{t \geq 0}$ into $\hat{\chi}_3$ due to the part of condition **(H)** on transport from U . We also define $t_x = \min\{t : \varphi^t x \in \chi_1\}$, $\phi(x) = \varphi^{t_x} x$ for $x \in \chi_0$, and $\tilde{t}_x = \min\{t : \varphi^t x \in \chi_3\}$, $\tilde{\phi}(x) = \varphi^{\tilde{t}_x} x$ for $x \in \chi_2$. It is easy to see that

$$(8.29) \quad \phi(x_0) = f^{-1}(0, L),$$

$$(8.30) \quad \tilde{\phi}(q_{\Pi, \pm}) = q_\pm,$$

where

$$(8.31) \quad q_{\Pi, \pm} = f^{-1}(\pm R, 0).$$

We will prove the following lemma in Section 8.2.1:

Lemma 8.7. *The following holds w.h.p. under \mathbf{P}^z , uniformly in $z \in \chi_0$:*

$$(8.32) \quad X_\zeta \in \chi_1, \quad Y_0 \in [-R, R] \times \{L\},$$

$$(8.33) \quad Y_{\tau_\Pi} \in \{\pm R\} \times [-L', L'], \quad X_{\zeta+\tau_\Pi} = \tilde{X}_0 \in \chi_2,$$

$$(8.34) \quad X_\tau = \tilde{X}_{\tilde{\tau}} \in \chi_3,$$

$$(8.35) \quad \tau = \zeta + \tau_\Pi + \tilde{\tau},$$

and for every $\varkappa > \frac{1}{2}$

$$(8.36) \quad |X_\zeta - \phi(X_0)| \leq \varepsilon l_\varepsilon^\varkappa,$$

$$(8.37) \quad |\tilde{X}_{\tilde{\tau}} - \tilde{\phi}(\tilde{X}_0)| \leq \varepsilon l_\varepsilon^\varkappa.$$

In addition,

$$(8.38) \quad \sup_{z \in \chi_0} \mathbf{P}^z(A_{\pm, \varepsilon} \Delta A_{\Pi, \pm, \varepsilon}) = o_\varepsilon(1).$$

In the proofs below we will combine the finite time horizon results obtained in Section 8.1 with the *rectified coordinates* versions of the lemmas proved in Section 7. In our three-stage analysis, we will obviously rely on the strong Markov property for diffusions without mentioning it explicitly.

8.2.1. *Proof of Lemma 8.7.* In this proof we shorten “w.h.p. under \mathbf{P}^z uniformly in $z \in \chi_0$ ” to “w.h.p.”

Lemma 8.1 applied to the process X traveling from χ_0 to χ_1 implies that (8.32) and (8.36) hold w.h.p. Therefore, we can apply Lemma 7.10 and conclude that $A_{\Pi, +, \varepsilon} \cup A_{\Pi, -, \varepsilon}$ happens w.h.p. Therefore, (8.33) holds w.h.p.

Applying Lemma 8.1 on each of the disjoint events $A_{\Pi, +, \varepsilon}$, and $A_{\Pi, -, \varepsilon}$ to the process \tilde{X} traveling between χ_2 and χ_3 , we obtain that (8.34), (8.37) and (8.38) hold w.h.p. Identity (8.35) simply computes the total time spent by the process X in all three stages. \square

8.2.2. *Proof of Lemma 4.2.* For initial conditions in $x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)v$ (which is a subset of χ_0 for small ε), a strengthening of (8.32) follows from Lemmas 8.1, 8.2 and the smoothness of f :

Lemma 8.8. *For every $\varkappa > 0$ and every $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, there is $\varkappa' > 0$ such that under $\mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha x v}$ w.h.p., uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$, the following holds:*

$$(8.39) \quad \begin{aligned} |X_\zeta - f^{-1}(0, L)| &\leq \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'}, \\ Y_0 &\in (\varepsilon^\alpha K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)) \times \{L\}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 8.8 allows us to apply Lemma 4.2 *in rectified coordinates* (proved in Section 7.4.1), so recalling (8.28) and using the smoothness of f^{-1} and the identity $\tilde{X}_0 = f^{-1}(Y_{\tau_\Pi})$, we obtain the following:

Lemma 8.9. *Let $\varkappa > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1]$. Then under $\mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha x v}$, w.h.p. uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$ the event $A_{\Pi, -, \varepsilon} \cup A_{\Pi, +, \varepsilon}$ happens and, moreover (for all sufficiently large $\varkappa' > 0$),*

$$(8.40) \quad \begin{aligned} Y_{\tau_\Pi} &\in \{-R, R\} \times (\varepsilon^{\alpha'} K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)), \\ |\tilde{X}_0 - f^{-1}(R, 0)| \wedge |\tilde{X}_0 - f^{-1}(-R, 0)| &\leq \varepsilon^{\alpha'} l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'}. \end{aligned}$$




FIGURE 12. Dynamics in three stages.

Relation (8.40) allows to apply Lemmas 8.1, 8.2 to \tilde{X} strengthening relation (8.34) of Lemma 8.7 and obtaining relations (4.3), (4.4) of Lemma 4.2. \square

8.2.3. *Proof of Lemma 4.3.* For initial conditions in $x_0 + [c_0, 1]v$, we can use the last part of assumption **(B)** and Lemma 8.1 to show that $A_{-, \varepsilon}$ happens w.l.p. under Q^x uniformly over those initial conditions. So it suffices to consider only initial conditions in $x_0 + \varepsilon[l_\varepsilon^x, c_0\varepsilon^{-1}]v = x_0 + [\varepsilon l_\varepsilon^x, c_0]v \subset \chi_0$.

Using (8.36) of Lemma 8.7, the smoothness of f , for an arbitrary x'' , we can find x large enough to guarantee that $Y_0^1 > \varepsilon l_\varepsilon^{x''}$ w.h.p. under Q^x , uniformly in $x \in [l_\varepsilon^x, c_0\varepsilon^{-1}]$. Lemma 4.3 *in rectified coordinates* (proved in Section 7.4.2) implies that $A_{\Pi, -, \varepsilon}$ happens w.l.p. Now, applying (8.38) of Lemma 8.7, we conclude that $A_{-, \varepsilon}$ happens w.l.p. (uniformly in $x \in [l_\varepsilon^x, \varepsilon^{-1}]$). \square

8.2.4. *Proof of Lemma 4.4.* Uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$, we have, for some $\varkappa', \varkappa'' > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{Q}^x(A_{-, \varepsilon}) &= \mathbb{Q}^x \left(A_{-, \varepsilon} \cap A_{\Pi, -, \varepsilon} \cap \{Y_{\tau_{\Pi}}^2 \in \varepsilon^{\alpha'} K_{\varkappa''}(\varepsilon)\} \right) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{Q}^x \left(A_{-, \varepsilon} \cap A_{\Pi, +, \varepsilon} \cap \{Y_{\tau_{\Pi}}^2 \in \varepsilon^{\alpha'} K_{\varkappa''}(\varepsilon)\} \right) + o_e(1) \\
&= \mathbb{Q}^x \left(A_{\Pi, -, \varepsilon} \cap \{Y_{\tau_{\Pi}}^2 \in \varepsilon^{\alpha'} K_{\varkappa''}(\varepsilon)\} \right) + o_e(1) \\
&= \mathbb{Q}^x(A_{\Pi, -, \varepsilon}) + o_e(1) \\
&= \mathbb{Q}^x(A_{\Pi, -, \varepsilon} \cap \{Y_0 \in (\varepsilon K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)) \times \{L\}\}) + o_e(1) \\
(8.41) \quad &= \mathbb{E}^{x_0 + \varepsilon x v} [\mathbb{P}(A_{\Pi, -, \varepsilon} | Y_0) \mathbf{1}_{Y_0 \in (\varepsilon K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)) \times \{L\}}] + o_e(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Here the first identity follows from Lemma 8.9, the second one from (8.38) of Lemma 8.7, the third one from Lemma 8.9, the fourth one from Lemma 8.8, and the last one is simply a disintegration with respect to Y_0 .

To compute the expectation in (8.41), we use Lemma 4.4 *in rectified coordinates* (proved in Section 7.4.3) and obtain for some $s > 0$:

$$(8.42) \quad \sup_{y \in K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)} |\mathbb{P}(A_{\Pi, -, \varepsilon} | Y_0 = (\varepsilon y, L)) - \psi_s(-y)| = o(\varepsilon^\delta).$$

To study the asymptotics of $\varepsilon^{-1} Y_0^1 = \varepsilon^{-1} f^1(X_\zeta)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, where f^1 is the first coordinate of f , we will apply Lemma 8.3 with $\chi = \chi_1$, $T = t_{x_0}$. Using A, M introduced in that lemma to define $\bar{c} = \nabla f^1(\phi(x_0)) \cdot (Av)$, $\bar{M} = \nabla f^1(\phi(x_0)) \cdot M$, and using (8.29) to see that $f^1(\phi(x_0)) = 0$, we obtain, due to the smoothness of f^1 , that there is $\eta > 0$ such that w.h.p.

$$(8.43) \quad |\varepsilon^{-1} Y_0^1 - (\bar{c}x + \bar{M})| \leq \varepsilon^\eta.$$

Combining (8.41), (8.42), and (8.43), choosing sufficiently large $\varkappa' > 0$, using the Gaussianity of \bar{M} , and the fact that ψ_s is bounded and Lipschitz, we obtain that, for some $\delta' > 0$,

$$\sup_{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)} |\mathbb{Q}^x(A_{-, \varepsilon}) - \mathbb{E}\psi_s(-\bar{c}x - \bar{M})| = o(\varepsilon^{\delta'}).$$

Since \bar{M} is centered and Gaussian, the function $x \mapsto \mathbb{E}\psi_s(-\bar{c}x - \bar{M})$ is given by $x \mapsto \psi_{s'}(-x)$ for some $s' > 0$ and thus the proof is complete. \square

8.2.5. *Proof of Lemma 4.5.* In this proof, we shorten “w.h.p. under $\mathbb{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha x v}$, uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$ ” into “w.h.p.” Let us study three stages sequentially. First, using (8.36) of Lemma 8.7 and the tameness of ξ_ε , we have that (8.36) holds w.h.p. for $X_0 = x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha \xi_\varepsilon v$ and some $\varkappa > 0$. Due to Lemma 8.2, the function ϕ is Lipschitz on its natural domain. Thus, (8.29) and the assumption that $\alpha < 1$ imply

$$f(\phi(X_0)) \in [\varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^{-\varkappa_1}, \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa_1}] \times \{L\},$$

for some $\varkappa_1 > 0$. Since f is Lipschitz and $Y_0 = f(X_\zeta)$, the above two displays imply that, for some $\varkappa_2 > 0$, w.h.p. the outcome of the first stage satisfies

$$Y_0^1 \in [\varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^{-\varkappa_2}, \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa_2}].$$

Combining this with Lemma 4.5 *in rectified coordinates* (proved in Section 7.4.4), we obtain that for some $\varkappa_3 > 0$, w.h.p. the outcome of the second stage satisfies

$$Y_{\tau_{\Pi}} \in \{R\} \times \varepsilon^{\alpha\rho} [l_\varepsilon^{-\varkappa_3}, l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa_3}].$$

Using this, (8.37), the fact that $\tilde{X}_0 = f^{-1}(Y_{\tau\Pi})$, that f is smooth and orientation-preserving (see **(H)**), property (8.30), the Lipschitzness of the function $z \mapsto \tilde{\phi}(f^{-1}(z))$ (due to Lemma 8.2), and the assumption $\alpha\rho < 1$, we obtain that for some $\varkappa_4 > 0$, $\tilde{X}_{\tilde{\tau}} \in q_+ + \varepsilon^{\alpha\rho}[l_\varepsilon^{-\varkappa_4}, l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa_4}]v_+$ w.h.p., which completes the proof. \square

8.2.6. *Proof of Lemma 4.6.* The lemma was proved *in rectified coordinates* in Section 7.4.5. We prove the lemma in the following order: part (3), part (2), part (1). In this proof, “w.h.p.” is understood as w.h.p. under \mathbf{Q}^x uniformly in $x \in K_\varkappa(\varepsilon)$ for a fixed $\varkappa > 0$, and all $o_\varepsilon(1)$ are understood to be uniform in $x \in K_\varkappa(\varepsilon)$.

Part (3). Let

$$H = A_{+,\varepsilon} \cap \left\{ \tilde{X}_{\tilde{\tau}} \notin q_+ + [-\varepsilon l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'}, +\infty)v_+ \right\},$$

$$E = \left\{ Y_{\tau\Pi} \notin \{R\} \times [-\varepsilon l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa''}, +\infty) \right\},$$

where \varkappa'' is to be chosen later. In view of (8.34), it suffices to show that $\mathbf{Q}^x(H) = o_\varepsilon(1)$. Identity (8.38) of Lemma 8.7 implies $\mathbf{Q}^x(A_{+,\varepsilon} \cap A_{\Pi,-,\varepsilon}) = o_\varepsilon(1)$. Also, $f^{-1}(Y_{\tau\Pi}) = \tilde{X}_0 \in \chi_{2,+}$ on $A_{\Pi,+,\varepsilon}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Q}^x(H) &\leq \mathbf{Q}^x(H \cap A_{\Pi,+,\varepsilon}) + o_\varepsilon(1) \\ &\leq \mathbf{Q}^x(H \cap E^c \cap \{\tilde{X}_0 \in \chi_{2,+}\}) + \mathbf{Q}^x(A_{\Pi,+,\varepsilon} \cap E) + o_\varepsilon(1) \\ (8.44) \quad &\leq \mathbf{Q}^x(H \cap E^c \cap \{\tilde{X}_0 \in \chi_{2,+}\}) + o_\varepsilon(1), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 4.6 (3) *in rectified coordinates* for sufficiently large \varkappa'' . On $E^c \cap \{\tilde{X}_0 \in \chi_{2,+}\}$, we have w.h.p.

$$f(\tilde{X}_0) \in f(q_{\Pi,+}) + \{0\} \times (-\infty, -\varepsilon l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa''}).$$

Using (8.37), the above display, (8.30), the fact that f and $\tilde{\phi}$ are orientation-preserving diffeomorphisms (see Lemma 8.2), we obtain that w.h.p.

$$\tilde{X}_{\tilde{\tau}} \in q_+ + (-\infty, -C_1 \varepsilon l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa''} + C_2 \varepsilon l_\varepsilon^{\tilde{\varkappa}})v_+$$

on $E^c \cap \{\tilde{X}_0 \in \chi_{2,+}\}$ for some constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$. Choosing \varkappa'' sufficiently large, we can use this to ensure w.h.p.

$$(8.45) \quad \tilde{X}_{\tilde{\tau}} \in q_+ + (-\infty, -\varepsilon l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'})v_+$$

on $E^c \cap \{\tilde{X}_0 \in \chi_{2,+}\}$. Then, the definition of H implies that

$$\mathbf{Q}^x(H \cap E^c \cap \{\tilde{X}_0 \in \chi_{2,+}\}) = o_\varepsilon(1).$$

Using this in (8.44), we obtain $\mathbf{Q}^x(H) = o_\varepsilon(1)$ thus completing the proof of part (3).

Part (2). Due to (8.34), up to an $o_\varepsilon(1)$ error uniformly in $x \in K_\varkappa(\varepsilon)$, the left-hand side of (4.11) can be rewritten as

$$(8.46) \quad \mathbf{Q}^x \left\{ \left| \frac{\tau}{\frac{\beta}{\mu} l_\varepsilon} - 1 \right| > \delta, A_{+,\varepsilon}, H^c \right\},$$

where

$$H = \left\{ \tilde{X}_{\tilde{\tau}} \in q_+ + \left(\varepsilon^\beta l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'}, \infty \right) v_+ \right\}.$$

Let us estimate this expression. Using arguments similar to those for (8.45), we can choose $\varkappa'' > 0$ sufficiently large to ensure

$$(8.47) \quad \mathbb{Q}^x(E \cap H^c) = o_e(1),$$

where

$$E = \left\{ Y_{\tau_{\Pi}} \in \{R\} \times \left(\varepsilon^{\beta} l_{\varepsilon}^{\varkappa''}, \infty \right) \right\}.$$

Now, using (8.38) of Lemma 8.7 and (8.47), representing τ via (8.35), and applying estimate (8.1) of Lemma 8.1 to times ζ and $\tilde{\tau}$, we can bound the expression in (8.46) by

$$\mathbb{Q}^x \left\{ \frac{\tau_{\Pi} + C}{\frac{\beta}{\mu} l_{\varepsilon}} - 1 > \delta, A_{\Pi,+,\varepsilon}, E^c \right\} + \mathbb{Q}^x \left\{ \frac{\tau_{\Pi}}{\frac{\beta}{\mu} l_{\varepsilon}} - 1 < -\delta, A_{\Pi,+,\varepsilon}, E^c \right\} + o_e(1),$$

for some constant $C > 0$. Using (7.45) and Lemma 4.6 (2) *in rectified coordinates*, we conclude that the quantity above is $O(\varepsilon^{\frac{\beta(1+\delta)}{\rho}-1})$, completing the proof of part 2.

Part (1). In this part, we abbreviate “w.h.p. in \mathbb{Q}^x uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$ and $[a, b] \in K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)$ ” to “w.h.p.”; also all estimates involving $o(\cdot)$ are understood to hold uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$ and $[a, b] \in K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)$. We start by analyzing the third stage. Setting

$$E = \{ Y_{\tau_{\Pi}} \in \{R\} \times \varepsilon^{\beta} K_{\varkappa''}(\varepsilon) \},$$

and using arguments similar to those for (8.45), for sufficiently large $\varkappa'' > 0$, we have that

$$(8.48) \quad \mathbb{Q}^x \left(\left\{ \tilde{X}_{\tilde{\tau}} \in q_+ + \varepsilon^{\beta} [a, b] v_+ \right\} \cap E^c \right) = o_e(1).$$

On the event E , we rewrite $\tilde{X}_0 = f^{-1}(Y_{\tau_{\Pi}})$ as

$$\tilde{X}_0 = q_{\Pi,+} + \varepsilon^{\beta} \frac{f^{-1}(Y_{\tau_{\Pi}}) - q_{\Pi,+}}{\varepsilon^{\beta}}$$

where $q_{\Pi,+}$ is given in (8.31).

We apply Lemma 8.3 to the transition from χ_2 to χ_3 with $\chi_3, q_{\Pi,+}, t_{q_{\Pi,+}}^3, \beta$ substituted for χ, x_0, T, α therein. Let A, M, r be given by that lemma. We set $\tilde{M} = \frac{v_+}{|v_+|^2} \cdot M$, $\tilde{r}_{\varepsilon} = \frac{v_+}{|v_+|^2} \cdot r_{\tilde{X}_0, \varepsilon}$, and define \tilde{f} on a suitable subset of real numbers via its inverse

$$\tilde{f}^{-1}(y) = \frac{v_+}{|v_+|^2} \cdot A(f^{-1}(R, y) - q_{\Pi,+}).$$

Assumption **(H)** implies that \tilde{f} is an increasing C_b^5 -diffeomorphism,

Using (8.30) and Lemma 8.3, we have on E ,

$$\frac{v_+}{|v_+|^2} \cdot (\tilde{X}_{\tilde{\tau}} - q_+) = \tilde{f}^{-1}(Y_{\tau_{\Pi}}^2) + \varepsilon \tilde{M} + \varepsilon^{\beta} \tilde{r}_{\varepsilon},$$

where \tilde{M} is a centered Gaussian variable independent of $Y_{\tau_{\Pi}}$, and the r.v. \tilde{r}_{ε} satisfies $|\tilde{r}_{\varepsilon}| \leq \varepsilon^{\eta}$ w.h.p. for some $\eta > 0$. Then, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{Q}^x \left\{ \tilde{X}_{\tilde{\tau}} \in q_+ + \varepsilon^{\beta} [a, b] v_+ \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{Q}^x \left(\left\{ \tilde{f}^{-1}(Y_{\tau_{\Pi}}^2) + \varepsilon \tilde{M} + \varepsilon^{\beta} \tilde{r}_{\varepsilon} \in \varepsilon^{\beta} [a, b], Y_{\tau_{\Pi}}^1 = R \right\} \cap E \right) + o_e(1) \\ &= \mathbb{Q}^x \left(\left\{ Y_{\tau_{\Pi}} \in \{R\} \times [\tilde{f}(\varepsilon^{\beta} a - \varepsilon \tilde{M} - \varepsilon^{\beta} \tilde{r}_{\varepsilon}), \tilde{f}(\varepsilon^{\beta} b - \varepsilon \tilde{M} - \varepsilon^{\beta} \tilde{r}_{\varepsilon})] \right\} \cap E \right) + o_e(1), \end{aligned}$$

where we used (8.48) in the first equality, and the monotonicity of \tilde{f} in the second identity. Let $\tilde{c} = \tilde{f}'(0)$. Since $\tilde{f}(0) = 0$, there are deterministic constants $C, \eta_1 > 0$ such that w.h.p.

$$\left| \frac{\tilde{f}(\varepsilon^\beta a - \varepsilon \widetilde{M} - \varepsilon^\beta \tilde{r}_\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^\beta} - \tilde{c} \left(a - \varepsilon^{1-\beta} \widetilde{M} \right) \right| \leq \tilde{c} |\tilde{r}_\varepsilon| + C \varepsilon^\beta \left(a - \varepsilon^{1-\beta} \widetilde{M} - \tilde{r}_\varepsilon \right)^2 \leq \varepsilon^{\eta_1}.$$

Here, in the last inequality, we used the Gaussian tail of \widetilde{M} and the bound on $|\tilde{r}_\varepsilon|$. A similar estimate also holds for a replaced by b . Set $\widehat{M} = \widetilde{M} \mathbf{1}_{\beta=1}$. For brevity, let us use the notation \asymp_\pm introduced in (2.1). The above two displays yield that

$$(8.49) \quad \mathbf{Q}^x \left\{ \widetilde{X}_{\tilde{\tau}} \in q_+ + \varepsilon^\beta [a, b] v_+ \right\} \\ \asymp_\pm \mathbf{Q}^x \left\{ Y_{\tau_{\text{II}}} \in \{R\} \times \varepsilon^\beta \tilde{c} \left[a - \widehat{M} \mp \varepsilon^{\eta_1}, b - \widehat{M} \pm \varepsilon^{\eta_1} \right] \right\} + o_\varepsilon(1),$$

for some $\eta_2 > 0$, where we chose \varkappa'' sufficiently large and used the Gaussian tail of \widehat{M} to drop the conditioning on E .

Next, we study the second stage of the dynamics and apply Lemma 4.6 (1) *in rectified coordinates* to see that for some $\varkappa'', \delta, c > 0$, and $\nu \in \mathcal{M}$, uniformly in $y \in K_{\varkappa''}(\varepsilon)$,

$$(8.50) \quad \varepsilon^{-\left(\frac{\beta}{p}-1\right)} \mathbf{P} \left\{ Y_{\tau_{\text{II}}} \in \{R\} \times \varepsilon^\beta \tilde{c} \left[a - \widehat{M} \mp \varepsilon^{\eta_1}, b - \widehat{M} \pm \varepsilon^{\eta_1} \right] \mid Y_0 = (\varepsilon y, L) \right\} \\ = g_c(y) \mathbf{E} \nu \left(B_\pm - \widehat{M} \right) + o(\varepsilon^\delta),$$

where $B_\pm = [a \mp \varepsilon^{\eta_1}, b \mp \varepsilon^{\eta_1}]$.

We want to evaluate the above with y replaced by $\varepsilon^{-1} Y_0^1$. To do so, we need to consider the dynamics in the first stage. Recall that (8.43) holds w.h.p. for some $\eta > 0$. Using that g_c is bounded and Lipschitz, properties (4.9) and (4.10) of ν , Gaussian tails of \overline{M} and \widehat{M} , and the decay of \tilde{r}_ε , we can verify that

$$\left| \mathbf{E}^{x_0 + \varepsilon x v} g_c \left(\varepsilon^{-1} Y_0^1 \right) \mathbf{E} \nu \left(B_\pm - \widehat{M} \right) - \mathbf{E} g_c \left(\tilde{c} x + \overline{M} \right) \mathbf{E} \nu \left([a, b] - \widehat{M} \right) \right| = o \left(\varepsilon^{\delta'} \right)$$

for some $\delta' > 0$. This together with (8.34), (8.49), (8.50), and Lemma 8.8 completes the proof. \square

8.2.7. Proof of Lemma 4.7. The lemma follows from its version *in rectified coordinates* (proved in Section 7.4.6) and exactly the same argument based on (8.35) as in the proof of Lemma 4.6 (2). \square

8.2.8. Proof of Lemma 5.2. For $x \in (c_0 \varepsilon^{-\alpha}, \varepsilon^{-\alpha}]$, we have $X_0 \in x_0 + (c_0, 1]v$. In view of **(B)**, applying Lemma 8.1 to the transition from $x_0 + (c_0, 1]v$ to $q_+ + [-1, 1]v_+$, we have $X_\tau \in q_+ + (c', 1]v_+$ and thus $\xi' \geq \varepsilon^{-\alpha \rho} c' > l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'}$ for some $c' > 0$ w.h.p. uniformly in $x \in (c_0 \varepsilon^{-\alpha}, \varepsilon^{-\alpha}]$.

For $x \in (l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa}, c_0 \varepsilon^{-\alpha}]$, we use (8.36) and (8.37) in Lemma 8.7 to obtain that

$$\varepsilon^{-\alpha} Y_0^1 \in \left(l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa} \left(c_1 - c_3 \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'' - \varkappa} \right), \varepsilon^{-\alpha} \left(\left(c_2 + c_3 \varepsilon l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa''} \right) \wedge R \right) \right]$$

for some $\varkappa'' > \frac{1}{2}$ to be chosen and constants $c_1, c_2, c_3 > 0$, w.h.p. uniformly in $x \in (l_\varepsilon^\varkappa, c_0\varepsilon^{-\alpha}]$, and that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha x v} \left\{ \xi'_\varepsilon \leq l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'}, A_{+, \varepsilon} \right\} \\ & \leq \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha x v} \left\{ Y_{\text{II}} \in \{R\} \times c_4 \varepsilon^{\alpha'} (-\infty, l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'} (1 + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha'} l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'' - \varkappa'})) \right\} + o_e(1) \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $x \in (l_\varepsilon^\varkappa, c_0\varepsilon^{-\alpha}]$ for some $c_4 > 0$. Choosing \varkappa'' sufficiently large, and then \varkappa sufficiently large, we can now deduce the desired result from these displays and Lemma 5.2 *in rectified coordinates* proved in Section 7.4.7. \square

8.2.9. *Proof of Lemma 5.5.* Using Lemma 8.7 and applying Lemma 8.1 to the third stage, we obtain that for some $\varkappa'' > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha x v} \left\{ X_\tau \in q_+ + \varepsilon^\beta (-\infty, -l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'}) v_+, A_{+, \varepsilon} \right\} \\ & \leq \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha x v} \left\{ Y_{\text{III}} \in R \times (-\infty, -\varepsilon^\beta l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa''}) \right\} + o_e(1) \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $x \in K_\varkappa(\varepsilon)$. The desired result follows from this display, (8.39) of Lemma 8.8, and Lemma 5.5 *in rectified coordinates* (proved in Section 7.4.8).

8.2.10. *Proof of Lemma 5.12.* Using (8.35), for any $\delta > 0$, we have

$$(8.51) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha x v_0} \left\{ \left| \frac{\tau}{\frac{\alpha}{\lambda} l_\varepsilon} - 1 \right| > 3\delta \right\} \\ & \leq \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha x v_0} \left\{ \zeta \geq \frac{\alpha\delta}{\lambda} l_\varepsilon \right\} + \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha x v_0} \left\{ \left| \frac{\tau_{\text{II}}}{\frac{\alpha}{\lambda} l_\varepsilon} - 1 \right| > \delta \right\} \\ & \quad + \mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha x v_0} \left\{ \tilde{\tau} \geq \frac{\alpha\delta}{\lambda} l_\varepsilon \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 8.1 implies that ζ and $\tilde{\tau}$ are bounded by a positive constant w.h.p. uniformly in $x \in K_\varkappa(\varepsilon)$. Hence, the first and third terms in (8.51) are $o_e(1)$. Rewriting the second term in (8.51) as

$$\mathbf{E}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha x v_0} \left[\mathbf{P} \left\{ \left| \frac{\tau_{\text{II}}}{\frac{\alpha}{\lambda} l_\varepsilon} - 1 \right| > \delta \mid Y_0 \right\} \right],$$

and using Lemma 8.8 and Lemma 5.12 *in rectified coordinates* (proved in Section 7.4.9), we obtain that the second term in (8.51) is bounded from above by

$$\mathbf{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha x v_0} \left\{ |\varepsilon^{-\alpha} f^1(X_\zeta)| \leq \varepsilon^{\delta'} \right\} + o_e(1)$$

for some $\delta' > 0$ uniformly in $x \in K_\varkappa(\varepsilon)$. Using (8.36) of Lemma 8.7, (8.29), the smoothness of $f \circ \phi$, and the fact that $\frac{d}{dr} f^1 \circ \phi(x_0 + rv)|_{r=0} > 0$, we can bound the main term in the above display by $\mathbf{1}_{|x| \leq \varepsilon^{\delta''}} + o_e(1)$ for some $\delta'' > 0$ uniformly in $x \in K_\varkappa(\varepsilon)$, completing the proof. \square

8.3. Proof of Lemma 5.9. We consider the dynamics in three stages as described in Section 8.2. We will use the notation ϕ, r , etc. in the analysis of the first stage and we will use $\tilde{\phi}, \tilde{r}$, etc. in the third stage. We shorten “w.h.p. under $\mathbb{P}^{x_0 + \varepsilon^\alpha x v}$ uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$ and $[a, b] \in K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)$ ” to “w.h.p.”

Applying Lemma 8.5 and Remark 8.1 to the first stage, we have that, w.h.p.,

$$(8.52) \quad X_\zeta = \phi(x_0 + (\varepsilon^\alpha x + \varepsilon M)v) + \varepsilon r_\varepsilon,$$

where $M = M'$ and $r_\varepsilon = h'_{x, \varepsilon}$ for M', h' given in Remark 8.1 (we suppress the dependence on x in the notation). Moreover,

$$(8.53) \quad |r_\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon^{\eta'}, \quad \text{w.h.p.},$$

for some $\eta' \in (0, 1)$. Since $Y_0 = f(X_\zeta)$, using (8.52), we can write

$$(8.54) \quad Y_0 = (\varepsilon^\alpha y_\varepsilon, L),$$

where

$$(8.55) \quad y_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-\alpha} f^1(\phi(x_0 + (\varepsilon^\alpha x + \varepsilon M)v) + \varepsilon r_\varepsilon).$$

Since f is orientation-preserving (see **(H)**), we can see from (8.29) that $s \mapsto f^1(\phi(x_0 + sv))$ is nondecreasing in a neighborhood of 0. For later use, we extend f and ϕ as diffeomorphisms so that the function $s \mapsto f^1(\phi(x_0 + sv))$ is nondecreasing on \mathbb{R} and, moreover, its derivative is bounded above and below by positive constants.

Applying Lemma 8.5 to the third stage, we get

$$(8.56) \quad \tilde{X}_{\tilde{\tau}} = \tilde{\phi}(\tilde{X}_0) + \varepsilon(\tilde{M} + \tilde{r}_\varepsilon)$$

w.h.p., where $\tilde{M} = M$ and $\tilde{r}_\varepsilon = h_{\tilde{x}_0, \varepsilon}$ for M, h given in that lemma. Moreover,

$$(8.57) \quad |\tilde{r}_\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon^{\hat{\eta}}, \quad \text{w.h.p.},$$

for some $\hat{\eta} > 0$.

Recall $q_{\Pi, +}$ in (8.31), and we set

$$(8.58) \quad g(s) = \frac{v_+}{|v_+|^2} \cdot (\tilde{\phi}(f^{-1}(R, s)) - \tilde{\phi}(q_{\Pi, +})).$$

Since both $\tilde{\phi}$ and f are diffeomorphisms we have that g is invertible on $[-L', L']$, which contains the range of $Y_{\tau_{\Pi}}^2$. Due to (8.30) and the assumption that f is orientation-preserving (see **(H)**), we can see that g is nondecreasing and, moreover, its derivative is bounded below by a positive constant. For later use, we extend g smoothly to \mathbb{R} preserving these properties.

Let $\tilde{M} = \frac{v_+}{|v_+|^2} \cdot \widehat{M}$ and $\tilde{r}_\varepsilon = \frac{v_+}{|v_+|^2} \cdot \hat{r}_\varepsilon$. Note that \tilde{M} is a Gaussian r.v. and \tilde{r}_ε satisfies

$$(8.59) \quad |\tilde{r}_\varepsilon| \leq \varepsilon^{\eta''}, \quad \text{w.h.p.},$$

for some $\eta'' > 0$ (due to (8.57)). Using (8.56), (8.30), and (8.58), we obtain that, uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$,

$$(8.60) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left\{ X_\tau \in q_+ + \varepsilon^{\alpha'} [a, b] v_+ \right\} = \mathbb{P} \left\{ \tilde{X}_{\tilde{\tau}} \in q_+ + \varepsilon^{\alpha'} [a, b] v_+ \right\} + o_\varepsilon(1) \\ & = \mathbb{P} \left\{ g(Y_{\tau_{\Pi}}^2) \in \left[\varepsilon^{\alpha'} a - \varepsilon(\tilde{M} + \tilde{r}_\varepsilon), \varepsilon^{\alpha'} b - \varepsilon(\tilde{M} + \tilde{r}_\varepsilon) \right], Y_{\tau_{\Pi}}^1 = L \right\} + o_\varepsilon(1) \\ & = \mathbb{P} \left\{ Y_{\tau_{\Pi}} \in \{L\} \times \varepsilon^{\alpha'} [a_\varepsilon, b_\varepsilon] \right\} + o_\varepsilon(1), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(8.61) \quad a_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-\alpha'} g^{-1} \left(\varepsilon^{\alpha'} a - \varepsilon \left(\widetilde{M} + \tilde{r}_\varepsilon \right) \right),$$

$$(8.62) \quad b_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-\alpha'} g^{-1} \left(\varepsilon^{\alpha'} b - \varepsilon \left(\widetilde{M} + \tilde{r}_\varepsilon \right) \right).$$

Due to (8.60) and (8.55), we can apply Proposition 10.4 to the dynamics in the second stage where $Y \in \Pi$ evolves between times 0 and τ_Π , with y_ε and $[a_\varepsilon, b_\varepsilon]$ substituted for y and $[a, b]$ in that proposition. Since there are four cases in Proposition 10.4, we treat them separately here. We recall that \mathcal{U} , \mathcal{N} , and c are introduced just before the statement of Proposition 10.4.

Case 1. Let us consider the first case $\rho < 1$. In this case, $\alpha' = \alpha\rho$. Proposition 10.4 (1) along with (8.54), (8.39) and (8.60) yields

$$(8.63) \quad \mathbb{P} \left\{ X_\tau \in q_+ + \varepsilon^{\alpha'} [a, b] v_+ \right\} = P_\varepsilon + o(\varepsilon^\delta)$$

for some $\delta > 0$, uniformly in $x \in K_{\mathcal{X}}(\varepsilon)$ and $[a, b] \in K_{\mathcal{X}'}(\varepsilon)$, where

$$P_\varepsilon = \mathbb{P} \left\{ c |y_\varepsilon + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{U}|^\rho \in [a_\varepsilon, b_\varepsilon], y_\varepsilon + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{U} \geq 0 \right\},$$

with $c = R^{-\rho} L$.

The next step is to get rid of r_ε and \tilde{r}_ε in our approximations, so that the only remaining randomness in the resulting approximations is Gaussian. The key properties to use are (8.53) and (8.59). We want to compare the right-hand side of (8.63) to

$$\tilde{P}_\varepsilon = \mathbb{P} \left\{ c |\tilde{y}_\varepsilon + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{U}|^\rho \in [\tilde{a}_\varepsilon, \tilde{b}_\varepsilon], \tilde{y}_\varepsilon + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{U} \geq 0 \right\},$$

where

$$(8.64) \quad \tilde{y}_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-\alpha} f^1(\phi(x_0 + (\varepsilon^\alpha x + \varepsilon M)v)),$$

$$(8.65) \quad \tilde{a}_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-\alpha'} g^{-1} \left(\varepsilon^{\alpha'} a - \varepsilon \widetilde{M} \right),$$

$$(8.66) \quad \tilde{b}_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-\alpha'} g^{-1} \left(\varepsilon^{\alpha'} b - \varepsilon \widetilde{M} \right).$$

We can write

$$P_\varepsilon = \mathbb{P} \left\{ \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{U} \in A_\varepsilon \right\}, \quad \tilde{P}_\varepsilon = \mathbb{P} \left\{ \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{U} \in \tilde{A}_\varepsilon \right\},$$

where

$$A_\varepsilon = \left[\left((c^{-1} a_\varepsilon) \vee 0 \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho}} - y_\varepsilon, \left((c^{-1} b_\varepsilon) \vee 0 \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho}} - y_\varepsilon \right],$$

$$\tilde{A}_\varepsilon = \left[\left((c^{-1} \tilde{a}_\varepsilon) \vee 0 \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho}} - \tilde{y}_\varepsilon, \left((c^{-1} \tilde{b}_\varepsilon) \vee 0 \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho}} - \tilde{y}_\varepsilon \right].$$

Comparing (8.55), (8.61), (8.62) with (8.64), (8.65), (8.66), using the Lipschitzness of various functions involved, along with (8.53) and (8.59), we can verify that

$$(8.67) \quad |y_\varepsilon - \tilde{y}_\varepsilon| \leq C \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} |r_\varepsilon| \leq C \varepsilon^{1-\alpha+\eta'}, \quad \text{w.h.p.},$$

$$(8.68) \quad |a_\varepsilon - \tilde{a}_\varepsilon|, |b_\varepsilon - \tilde{b}_\varepsilon| \leq C \varepsilon^{1-\alpha'} |\tilde{r}_\varepsilon| \leq C \varepsilon^{1-\alpha'+\eta''}, \quad \text{w.h.p.}$$

Using the Gaussianity of \widetilde{M} , M , the Lipschitzness of g^{-1} and the assumption that $[a, b] \subset K_{\mathcal{X}'}(\varepsilon)$, we can see that $a_\varepsilon, b_\varepsilon, \tilde{a}_\varepsilon, \tilde{b}_\varepsilon \in K_{\mathcal{X}}(\varepsilon)$ w.h.p. for some $\tilde{\varkappa} > 0$. Using

these together with $\rho < 1$, we can see that the Lebesgue measure of the symmetric difference between A_ε and \tilde{A}_ε is bounded w.h.p. by

$$C \left(\left(l_\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\rho}-1} \varepsilon^{1-\alpha'+\eta''} \right) \vee \varepsilon^{1-\alpha+\eta'''} \right) < \varepsilon^{1-\alpha+\eta'''},$$

for ε sufficiently small and some small $\eta''' > 0$, where the last equality is due to $\rho < 1$ and thus $\alpha' = \alpha\rho < \alpha$. Then, Lemma 7.11 implies that, for some $\delta' > 0$,

$$P_\varepsilon = \tilde{P}_\varepsilon + o\left(\varepsilon^{\delta'}\right),$$

uniformly in $x \in K_{\mathcal{X}}(\varepsilon)$ and $[a, b] \in K_{\mathcal{X}'}(\varepsilon)$. Using (8.64), (8.65), (8.66), and the obvious monotonicity of the function g , we can write

$$\tilde{P}_\varepsilon = \mathbb{P} \left\{ \Phi_{1,\varepsilon} \left(x, M, \mathcal{U}, \tilde{M} \right) \in [a, b], \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}(x, M, \mathcal{U}) \geq 0 \right\},$$

where

$$(8.69) \quad \begin{aligned} \Phi_{1,\varepsilon}(x, y^1, y^2, y^3) &= \varepsilon^{-\alpha'} \left(g \left(c\varepsilon^{\alpha'} |\Phi_{2,\varepsilon}(x, y^1, y^2)|^\rho \right) + \varepsilon y^3 \right), \\ \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}(x, y^1, y^2) &= \varepsilon^{-\alpha} f^1(\phi(x_0 + (\varepsilon^\alpha x + \varepsilon y^1)v)) + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} y^2. \end{aligned}$$

We can also write $\Phi_{2,\varepsilon}(x, y^1, y^2) = \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}(x, y^1, y^2, y^3)$ although it does not depend on y^3 at all. This completes the main part of the proof of (1), with $m = 3$.

Then, we verify the properties of $\Phi_{i,\varepsilon}$, $i = 1, 2$, claimed in (2). Using the smoothness of functions involved and the identities

$$(8.70) \quad f^1(\phi(x_0)) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad g(0) = 0$$

(which are due to (8.29) and (8.58)), we can see that $\Phi_{i,\varepsilon}$, $i = 1, 2$, converges in LU as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, and the limits are of the form described in (2). The remaining properties follow from these expressions.

Let us verify (3). We recall the extensions described below (8.55). Since $z \mapsto f^1(\phi(x_0 + zv))$ is nondecreasing, we know that for fixed realizations of M and \mathcal{U} , the function $x \mapsto \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}(x, M, \mathcal{U})$ is nondecreasing. Since the function g is also nondecreasing, we can see that on $\{x : \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}(\cdot, M, \mathcal{U}) \geq 0\}$, the function $x \mapsto \Phi_{1,\varepsilon}(x, M, \mathcal{U}, \tilde{M})$ is nondecreasing for every fixed realization of randomness. Hence (3) holds. To prove (4), it suffices now to define monotone functions

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{+,\varepsilon}(x) &= \mathbb{P} \left\{ \Phi_{1,\varepsilon} \left(x, M, \mathcal{U}, \tilde{M} \right) \geq a, \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}(x, M, \mathcal{U}) \geq 0 \right\}, \\ \phi_{-,\varepsilon}(x) &= -\mathbb{P} \left\{ \Phi_{1,\varepsilon} \left(x, M, \mathcal{U}, \tilde{M} \right) > b, \Phi_{2,\varepsilon}(x, M, \mathcal{U}) \geq 0 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we turn to (5). Using the fact that $\alpha' = \alpha\rho$, that f^1 , ϕ , and g are Lipschitz and (8.70), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \Phi_{1,\varepsilon} \left(x, M, \mathcal{U}, \tilde{M} \right) \right| \geq K_{\mathcal{X}'}(\varepsilon) \right\} \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ c_1 \varepsilon^\rho |\mathcal{U}|^\rho + c_2 \varepsilon^\rho |M|^\rho + \varepsilon |\tilde{M}| \geq \varepsilon^{\alpha'} l_\varepsilon^{\mathcal{X}'} - c_3 \varepsilon^{\alpha\rho} |x|^\rho \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constants c_1, c_2, c_3 . Since $\alpha' = \alpha\rho \leq \rho < 1$, the Gaussianity of $\mathcal{U}, M, \tilde{M}$, implies (5).

Lastly, we verify (6). Using (8.70), and that g and $s \mapsto f^1(\phi(x_0 + sv))$ have derivatives bounded below by positive constants, we have that, for some constants

$C, C' > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi_{2,\varepsilon}(x, y^1, y^2)| &\geq C|x| - C|y^1| - |y^2|, \\ |\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}(x, y^1, y^2, y^3)| &\geq C'|\Phi_{2,\varepsilon}(x, y^1, y^2)|^\rho - |y^3|. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $q > 0$ sufficiently small, and $R > 0$ sufficiently large, we can see that for $|x| > R$ and $|y|_\infty < |x|^q$,

$$|\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}(x, y^1, y^2, y^3)| \geq C''|x|^\rho - |y^3| \geq C'''|x|^\rho.$$

Case 2. Let us treat the second case: $\rho = 1$. Here, $\alpha' = \alpha\rho = \alpha$. Proposition 10.4 (2) along with (8.54), (8.39) and (8.60) gives that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\{X_\tau \in q_+ + \varepsilon^{\alpha'}[a, b]v_+\} \\ &= \mathbb{P}\{c|y_\varepsilon + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{U}| + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{N} \in [a_\varepsilon, b_\varepsilon], y_\varepsilon + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{U} \geq 0\} + o(\varepsilon^\delta) \\ (8.71) \quad &= \mathbb{P}\{\varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{U} \in A_\varepsilon\} + o(\varepsilon^\delta), \end{aligned}$$

where we redefine, for $y_\varepsilon, a_\varepsilon, b_\varepsilon$ given previously in (8.55) and (8.61),

$$A_\varepsilon = -y_\varepsilon + [c^{-1}(a_\varepsilon - \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{N}) \vee 0, c^{-1}(b_\varepsilon - \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{N}) \vee 0].$$

We want to compare (8.71) with

$$(8.72) \quad \mathbb{P}\{c|\tilde{y}_\varepsilon + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{U}| + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{N} \in [\tilde{a}_\varepsilon, \tilde{b}_\varepsilon], \tilde{y}_\varepsilon + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{U} \geq 0\} = \mathbb{P}\{\varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{U} \in \tilde{A}_\varepsilon\},$$

where we define, for $\tilde{y}_\varepsilon, \tilde{a}_\varepsilon, \tilde{b}_\varepsilon$ given previously in (8.64) and (8.65),

$$\tilde{A}_\varepsilon = -\tilde{y}_\varepsilon + [c^{-1}(\tilde{a}_\varepsilon - \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{N}) \vee 0, c^{-1}(\tilde{b}_\varepsilon - \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{N}) \vee 0].$$

Using (8.67) and (8.68), we can see that the symmetric difference between A_ε and \tilde{A}_ε has Lebesgue measure bounded w.h.p. by

$$C\left(\varepsilon^{1-\alpha+\eta'} \vee \varepsilon^{1-\alpha'+\eta''}\right) < \varepsilon^{1-\alpha'+\eta'''},$$

for some $\eta''' > 0$. Therefore, Lemma 7.11 implies that the difference between the Gaussian probabilities in (8.71) and (8.72) is $o(\varepsilon^{\delta'})$ for some $\delta' > 0$. Inserting the expressions for $\tilde{a}_\varepsilon, \tilde{b}_\varepsilon, \tilde{y}_\varepsilon$ into (8.72), we obtain (1), with $m = 4$, if $\Phi_{2,\varepsilon}$ is defined by (8.69) and

$$\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}(x, y^1, y^2, y^3, y^4) = \varepsilon^{-\alpha} (g(c\varepsilon^\alpha |\Phi_{2,\varepsilon}(x, y^1, y^2)| + \varepsilon y^3) + \varepsilon y^4).$$

The properties of $\Phi_{i,\varepsilon}$ in (2)–(6) can be verified similarly to Case 1.

Case 3. We turn to the third case: $\rho > 1$ and $\alpha\rho \leq 1$. In this case, we have

$$(8.73) \quad \alpha' = \alpha\rho > \alpha.$$

Applying Proposition 10.4 (3) and its modification in Remark 10.2 to (8.60), we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\{X_\tau \in q_+ + \varepsilon^{\alpha'}[a, b]v_+\} \\ &= \mathbb{P}\{c|y_\varepsilon + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{U}|^\rho + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha'}\mathcal{N} \in [a_\varepsilon, b_\varepsilon], y_\varepsilon + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{U} \geq 0\} + o(\varepsilon^\delta) \\ (8.74) \quad &= \mathbb{P}\{\varepsilon^{1-\alpha'}\mathcal{N} \in A_\varepsilon, \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{U} \in B_\varepsilon\} + o(\varepsilon^\delta), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$A_\varepsilon = -c|y_\varepsilon + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{U}|^\rho + [a_\varepsilon, b_\varepsilon], \quad B_\varepsilon = [-y_\varepsilon, \infty).$$

We want to compare (8.74) with

$$(8.75) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left\{ c|\tilde{y}_\varepsilon + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{U}|^\rho + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha'}\mathcal{N} \in [\tilde{a}_\varepsilon, \tilde{b}_\varepsilon], \quad \tilde{y}_\varepsilon + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{U} \geq 0 \right\} \\ = \mathbb{P} \left\{ \varepsilon^{1-\alpha'}\mathcal{N} \in \tilde{A}_\varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{U} \in \tilde{B}_\varepsilon \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{A}_\varepsilon = -c|\tilde{y}_\varepsilon + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{U}|^\rho + [\tilde{a}_\varepsilon, \tilde{b}_\varepsilon], \quad \tilde{B}_\varepsilon = [-\tilde{y}_\varepsilon, \infty).$$

Using $\rho > 1$, (8.73), (8.67) and (8.68), we can see that the symmetric difference between A_ε and \tilde{A}_ε has Lebesgue measure bounded w.h.p. by

$$C \left(\left((l_\varepsilon^{\tilde{z}})^{\rho-1} \varepsilon^{1-\alpha+\eta'} \right) \vee \varepsilon^{1-\alpha'+\eta''} \right) < \varepsilon^{1-\alpha'+\eta'''},$$

for some $\eta''' > 0$. The symmetric difference between B_ε and \tilde{B}_ε is bounded by $C\varepsilon^{1-\alpha+\eta'}$ w.h.p. Thus, due to Lemma 7.11, the Gaussian probabilities in (8.74) and (8.75) differ by an error $o(\varepsilon^{\delta'})$ for some $\delta' > 0$. Inserting the expressions for $\tilde{a}_\varepsilon, \tilde{b}_\varepsilon, \tilde{y}_\varepsilon$ in (8.65) and (8.64) into (8.75), we obtain (1), with $m = 4$, if we define $\Phi_{2,\varepsilon}$ as in (8.69) and

$$\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}(x, y^1, y^2, y^3, y^4) = \varepsilon^{-\alpha'} \left(g \left(c\varepsilon^{\alpha'} |\Phi_{2,\varepsilon}(x, y^1, y^2)|^\rho + \varepsilon y^3 \right) + \varepsilon y^4 \right).$$

The properties of $\Phi_{i,\varepsilon}$ in (2)–(6) can be verified similarly to Case 1.

Case 4. Lastly, we consider the case: $\rho > 1$ and $\alpha\rho > 1$, implying $\alpha' = 1$. Proposition 10.4 (4) applied to (8.60) yields

$$(8.76) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left\{ X_\tau \in q_+ + \varepsilon^{\alpha'} [a, b] v_+ \right\} &= \mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathcal{N} \in [a_\varepsilon, b_\varepsilon], \quad y_\varepsilon + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{U} \geq 0 \right\} + o(\varepsilon^\delta) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left\{ \varepsilon^{1-\alpha'}\mathcal{N} \in A_\varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{U} \in B_\varepsilon \right\} + o(\varepsilon^\delta), \end{aligned}$$

where $A_\varepsilon = [a_\varepsilon, b_\varepsilon]$, $B_\varepsilon = [-y_\varepsilon, \infty)$. We want to compare (8.76) with

$$(8.77) \quad \mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathcal{N} \in [\tilde{a}_\varepsilon, \tilde{b}_\varepsilon], \quad \tilde{y}_\varepsilon + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{U} \geq 0 \right\} = \mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathcal{N} \in \tilde{A}_\varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{U} \in \tilde{B}_\varepsilon \right\},$$

where $\tilde{A}_\varepsilon = [\tilde{a}_\varepsilon, \tilde{b}_\varepsilon]$, $\tilde{B}_\varepsilon = [-\tilde{y}_\varepsilon, \infty)$. Using (8.67) and (8.68), we can see that the Lebesgue measure of the symmetric difference between A_ε and \tilde{A}_ε is bounded by $C\varepsilon^{1-\alpha'+\eta''}$, and the Lebesgue measure of the symmetric difference between B_ε and \tilde{B}_ε is bounded by $C\varepsilon^{1-\alpha+\eta'}$. Hence, due to Lemma 7.11, the difference between the Gaussian probabilities in (8.76) and (8.77) is $o(\varepsilon^{\delta'})$ for some $\delta' > 0$. Inserting the expressions for $\tilde{a}_\varepsilon, \tilde{b}_\varepsilon, \tilde{y}_\varepsilon$ in (8.65) and (8.64) into (8.77), we obtain (1), with $m = 4$, if $\Phi_{2,\varepsilon}$ is defined by (8.69) and

$$\Phi_{1,\varepsilon}(y^1, y^2, y^3, y^4) = \varepsilon^{-1} (g(\varepsilon y^3) + \varepsilon y^4).$$

Since $\alpha\rho > 1$ in this case, we do not need to verify (6). All the other properties of $\Phi_{i,\varepsilon}$ can be verified similarly as in Case 1. \square

9. GAUSSIAN APPROXIMATION FOR THE STOPPED PROCESS U^1

In this section we assume the setting *in rectified coordinates* and the notation described in Sections 7.1 and 7.2 with the additional assumption that F and G in (7.1) are C_b^3 . Throughout this section, we fix $L > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, and study solutions of (7.1) with initial conditions of the form $(\varepsilon^\alpha x, L)$. For brevity, we write

$$(9.1) \quad \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} = \mathbf{P}^{(\varepsilon^\alpha x, L)}.$$

Our main goal here is to prove, for a family of stopping times, a local Gaussian approximation (Lemma 9.1 and its corollary) for the process U^1 (defined in (7.2)) stopped at those times. It will be used then in Section 10 to prove local limit theorems for the exit location and a precise estimate on the exit time *in rectified coordinates*, crucial for the proof of Lemma 4.6 in Section 7.4.5. Our results here are based on the density estimates of Section 11 which are collected in Lemma 11.1. The smoothness assumptions on F and G allow us to apply these results.

The exit times we consider are $\tau = \tau_{r, \theta, \varepsilon}$ and $\zeta = \zeta_{r, \theta, \varepsilon}$ defined in (7.15) and (7.16). The main results of this section are stated for ζ . Lemma 7.5 implies though that if $\theta > 0$ is small enough to satisfy (7.14), then we can ignore the distinction between these exit times: for every $\varkappa > 0$, we have $\tau = \zeta$ w.h.p. under $\mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x}$ uniformly over $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$ (for any $\alpha \in (0, 1]$). Thus, under (7.14), the results of this section with τ replaced by ζ also hold.

Let us generalize the model case definition of (2.16) and set

$$(9.2) \quad \mathbf{c}_1 = \int_0^\infty e^{-2\lambda s} |F^1(0, e^{-\mu s} L)|^2 ds.$$

Lemma 9.1. *Let $\varkappa, \varkappa', r > 0$, $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, $\xi > -\alpha$, $\theta \in [0, \alpha]$ and $\zeta = \zeta_{r, \theta, \varepsilon}$ be given in (7.16). Then, for each $c > 0$ and $\eta \in (0, 1 - \theta)$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{\substack{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon), \\ [a, b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)}} \left| \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \{x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} U_\zeta^1 \in \varepsilon^\xi [a, b]\} - \mathbf{P} \{x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{U} \in \varepsilon^\xi [a \mp c\varepsilon^\eta, b \pm c\varepsilon^\eta]\} \right| = o\left(\varepsilon^{((\xi + \alpha - 1) \vee 0) + \delta}\right),$$

where \mathcal{U} is a centered Gaussian r.v. with variance \mathbf{c}_1 .

Using Lemma 7.11 and adjusting δ , we have the following consequence.

Corollary 9.1. *In the setting of Lemma 9.1, if $\alpha = 1$ and $\xi \geq 0$, then there is $\delta > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{\substack{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon), \\ [a, b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)}} \left| \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \{x + U_\zeta^1 \in \varepsilon^\xi [a, b]\} - \mathbf{P} \{x + \mathcal{U} \in \varepsilon^\xi [a, b]\} \right| = o(\varepsilon^{\xi + \delta}).$$

The rest of the section is devoted to the proof of Lemma 9.1 which is divided into two steps: an approximation by the process stopped at a deterministic time and a Gaussian approximation of the latter based on an iteration scheme. They are implemented separately in Section 9.1 and Section 9.2.

Since notation is simpler at the scale ε^1 , we will primarily work under $\mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x}$ for x in a set larger than $K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$, which allows us to recover the desired result under $\mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x}$ by substituting $\varepsilon^{\alpha-1}x$ for x .

9.1. Approximation by the process stopped at a deterministic time.

Lemma 9.2. *Let $\varkappa', r, c > 0$, $\xi > -1$, $\theta \in [0, 1)$, $\eta \in (0, 1 - \theta)$, and $\zeta = \zeta_{r, \theta, \varepsilon}$ be given in (7.16). Then, for every $\delta > 0$,*

$$\sup_{\substack{x \in r\varepsilon^{\theta-1}(-1, 1) \\ [a, b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)}} |\mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \{x + U_\zeta^1 \in \varepsilon^\xi[a, b]\} - \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \{x + U_T^1 \in \varepsilon^\xi[a \mp c\varepsilon^\eta, b \pm c\varepsilon^\eta]\}| = o_\varepsilon(1),$$

where

$$(9.3) \quad T = T(\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \frac{r\varepsilon^{\theta-\xi-1}}{l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'+\delta}}.$$

PROOF: All estimates in this proof are understood to hold uniformly in $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $[a, b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)$. For convenience, we set

$$(9.4) \quad A_{\pm, \varepsilon} = \varepsilon^\xi[a \mp c\varepsilon^\eta, b \pm c\varepsilon^\eta].$$

First, we establish an upper bound. The definition of ζ in (7.16) along with (7.3) implies that

$$(9.5) \quad r\varepsilon^\theta = \varepsilon e^{\lambda\zeta} |x + U_\zeta^1|, \quad \zeta = \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \frac{r\varepsilon^{\theta-1}}{|x + U_\zeta^1|}.$$

Let us start by showing $\zeta \geq T$ on the relevant event. Indeed, using (9.3), (9.5) and the definition of $K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)$ in (3.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \{x + U_\zeta^1 \in \varepsilon^\xi[a, b], \zeta < T\} \\ & \leq \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \left\{ |x + U_\zeta^1| \leq \varepsilon^\xi l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'}, |x + U_\zeta^1| > \varepsilon^\xi l_\varepsilon^{\varkappa'+\delta} \right\} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$(9.6) \quad \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \{x + U_\zeta^1 \in \varepsilon^\xi[a, b]\} \leq \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \{x + U_{\zeta \vee T}^1 \in \varepsilon^\xi[a, b]\}.$$

Then, we compare $U_{\zeta \vee T}^1$ with U_T^1 . We recall $U_t^1 = M_t^1 + \varepsilon V_t^1$ (see (7.2)). Let us take any $\delta' \in (0, 1 - \theta - \eta)$. The boundedness of F^1 implies that

$$\langle M^1 \rangle_{\zeta \vee T} - \langle M^1 \rangle_T \leq C e^{-2\lambda T} \leq C \varepsilon^{2(1+\xi-\theta-\delta')}.$$

Applying the exponential martingale inequality (Lemma 7.1), we see that

$$\mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \left\{ |M_{\zeta \vee T}^1 - M_T^1| > \frac{1}{2} c \varepsilon^{\xi+\eta} \right\} \leq 2 \exp \left(-C \varepsilon^{2(\eta+\theta-1+\delta')} \right) = o_\varepsilon(1).$$

Using Lemma 7.2 (2), we also have

$$\mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \left\{ |\varepsilon V_{\zeta \vee T}^1 - \varepsilon V_T^1| > \frac{1}{2} c \varepsilon^{\xi+\eta} \right\} = 0$$

for small ε . From the above two displays, we obtain

$$(9.7) \quad \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \left\{ |U_{\zeta \vee T}^1 - U_T^1| > c \varepsilon^{\xi+\eta} \right\} = o_\varepsilon(1),$$

which together with (9.6) gives an upper bound.

To find a lower bound, we start with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \{x + U_\zeta^1 \in \varepsilon^\xi[a, b]\} & \geq \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \{x + U_\zeta^1 \in \varepsilon^\xi[a, b]; |U_\zeta^1 - U_T^1| \leq c \varepsilon^{\xi+\eta}\} \\ & \geq \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \{x + U_T^1 \in A_{-, \varepsilon}; |U_\zeta^1 - U_T^1| \leq c \varepsilon^{\xi+\eta}\} \\ & \geq \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \{x + U_T^1 \in A_{-, \varepsilon}\} - \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \{x + U_T^1 \in A_{-, \varepsilon}; |U_\zeta^1 - U_T^1| > c \varepsilon^{\xi+\eta}\}. \end{aligned}$$

To show that the second term on the right-hand side is $o_\varepsilon(1)$, we bound it by

$$(9.8) \quad \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \left\{ \zeta \geq T; |U_\zeta^1 - U_T^1| > c\varepsilon^{\xi+\eta} \right\} + \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \left\{ \zeta < T; x + U_T^1 \in A_{-, \varepsilon} \right\}.$$

The first term is $o_\varepsilon(1)$ due to (9.7). For the second term, we apply (7.3), the definition of T in (9.3), the definition of $A_{-, \varepsilon}$ in (9.4) and the strong Markov property to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \left\{ \zeta < T; x + U_T^1 \in A_{-, \varepsilon} \right\} &= \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \left\{ \zeta < T; Y_T^1 \in \varepsilon e^{\lambda T} A_{-, \varepsilon} \right\} \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \left\{ \zeta < T; |Y_T^1| \leq r\varepsilon^\theta l_\varepsilon^{-\delta} \right\} \\ &\leq \mathbf{E}^{\varepsilon x} \left[\mathbf{P}^{Y_\zeta} \left\{ \inf_{t \in [0, T]} |Y_t^1| \leq r\varepsilon^\theta l_\varepsilon^{-\delta} \right\} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We have $\mathbf{P}^{Y_\zeta} \{|Y_0^1| = r\varepsilon^\theta\} = 1$. Hence (7.3) implies $|Y_t^1| = |e^{\lambda t}(Y_0^1 + \varepsilon U_t^1)| \geq r\varepsilon^\theta - \varepsilon|U_t^1|$. From this, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}^{Y_\zeta} \left\{ \inf_{t \in [0, T]} |Y_t^1| \leq r\varepsilon^\theta l_\varepsilon^{-\delta} \right\} &\leq \mathbf{P}^{Y_\zeta} \left\{ \inf_{t \in [0, T]} (r\varepsilon^\theta - \varepsilon|U_t^1|) \leq r\varepsilon^\theta l_\varepsilon^{-\delta} \right\} \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}^{Y_\zeta} \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |U_t^1| \geq r\varepsilon^{\theta-1} (1 - l_\varepsilon^{-\delta}) \right\} = o_\varepsilon(1), \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\theta < 1$ and Lemma 7.2 (3) in the third equality. This shows that (9.8) is $o_\varepsilon(1)$ and completes the proof. \square

9.2. Gaussian approximation for the deterministically stopped process.

Lemma 9.3. *In the setting of Lemma 9.2, let $\varrho > \varrho' > 0$. Let $T(\varepsilon)$ be a deterministic function of ε satisfying*

$$(9.9) \quad T(\varepsilon) \in [\varrho' \lambda^{-1} l_\varepsilon, \varrho \lambda^{-1} l_\varepsilon], \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1/2).$$

For

$$(9.10) \quad \xi \geq -1 + \varrho,$$

$\kappa' > 0$, and $v \in (0, 1)$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{|x| \leq \varepsilon^{v-1}, A \subset \varepsilon^\xi K_{\kappa'}(\varepsilon)} \left| \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \left\{ x + U_{T(\varepsilon)}^1 \in A \right\} - \mathbf{P} \left\{ x + \mathcal{U} \in A \right\} \right| = o\left(\varepsilon^{(\xi v_0) + \delta}\right),$$

where \mathcal{U} is a centered Gaussian r.v. with variance \mathbf{c}_1 defined in (9.2).

To prove Lemma 9.3, we need the following iterative scheme.

Lemma 9.4. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 9.3, there is $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for each $v \in (0, 1)$, there are positive constants $\varepsilon_k, C_k, \delta_k$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, N$ and v' such that*

$$(9.11) \quad \sup_{\substack{|x| \leq \varepsilon^{v-1}, |w| \leq \varepsilon^{v'-1} \\ A \subset \varepsilon^\xi K_{\kappa'}(\varepsilon)}} \left| \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \left\{ x + U_{t_k}^1 + e^{-\lambda t_k} w \in A \right\} - \mathbf{P} \left\{ x + \mathcal{U}_k + e^{-\lambda t_k} w \in A \right\} \right| \leq C_k \varepsilon^{(\xi v_0) + \delta_k},$$

holds for all $k = 1, 2, \dots, N$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_k]$. Here, for each $k = 1, 2, \dots, N$,

$$(9.12) \quad t_k = t_k(\varepsilon) = \frac{k}{N} T(\varepsilon)$$

and \mathcal{U}_k is a centered Gaussian random variable with variance

$$(9.13) \quad \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{U}_k|^2 = \int_0^{t_1} e^{-2\lambda s} |F^1(0, e^{-\mu s} L)|^2 ds + \frac{1}{2\lambda} |F^1(0, 0)|^2 (e^{-2\lambda t_1} - e^{-2\lambda t_k}).$$

Let us first use this lemma to prove Lemma 9.3.

PROOF OF LEMMA 9.3: Setting $k = N$ and $w = 0$, we obtain, for some $\delta > 0$,

$$\sup_{|x| \leq \varepsilon^{v-1}, AC\varepsilon^\xi K_{\mu'}(\varepsilon)} \left| \mathbb{P}^{ex} \left\{ x + U_{T(\varepsilon)}^1 \in A \right\} - \mathbb{P} \left\{ x + \mathcal{U}_N \in A \right\} \right| = o\left(\varepsilon^{(\xi v_0) + \delta}\right).$$

It remains to compare \mathcal{U}_N with \mathcal{U} . Using the definition of \mathbf{c}_1 , identities $t_1 = \frac{1}{N}T(\varepsilon)$, $t_N = T(\varepsilon)$, (9.9), (9.13), and the boundedness of F^1 , we obtain that there is $a > 0$ such that

$$|\mathbb{E}|\mathcal{U}_N|^2 - \mathbb{E}|\mathcal{U}|^2| \leq C \int_{\frac{T(\varepsilon)}{N}}^{\infty} e^{-2\lambda s} ds + C e^{-2\lambda \frac{T(\varepsilon)}{N}} + C e^{-2\lambda T(\varepsilon)} \leq C \varepsilon^a.$$

Since \mathcal{U}_N with \mathcal{U} are Gaussian and centered, it can be checked that there is $a' > 0$ such that the difference of densities $|\varphi_{\mathcal{U}_N}(x) - \varphi_{\mathcal{U}}(x)| \leq C \varepsilon^{a'} e^{-c|x|^2}$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, for some $\delta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{|x| \leq \varepsilon^{v-1}, AC\varepsilon^\xi K_{\mu'}(\varepsilon)} |\mathbb{P} \{x + \mathcal{U}_N \in A\} - \mathbb{P} \{x + \mathcal{U} \in A\}| &\leq C \varepsilon^{a'} \left(\left(\varepsilon^\xi l_\varepsilon^{\mu'} \right) \vee 1 \right), \\ &= o\left(\varepsilon^{(\xi v_0) + \delta}\right) \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

PROOF OF LEMMA 9.4: Recalling the range of $T(\varepsilon)$ in (9.9), we fix $N \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large to satisfy

$$\frac{T(\varepsilon)}{N} \leq \bar{\theta} l_\varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$$

for $\bar{\theta}$ given in Lemma 11.1. Then we use (9.10) to fix v' satisfying

$$(9.14) \quad 0 < v' < \left(\frac{1}{N} \varrho + \xi - \varrho + 1 \right) \wedge 1.$$

For $k = 1$, the choice of N allows us to apply Lemma 11.1 (1) to the deterministic time t_1 (given in (9.12)) to obtain that, for some $\delta, \delta_1 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{\substack{|x| \leq \varepsilon^{v-1}, |w| \leq \varepsilon^{v'-1} \\ AC\varepsilon^\xi K_{\mu'}(\varepsilon)}} \left| \mathbb{P}^{ex} \left\{ x + U_{t_1}^1 + e^{-\lambda t_1} w \in A \right\} - \mathbb{P} \left\{ x + \mathcal{U}_1 + e^{-\lambda t_1} w \in A \right\} \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{\substack{|x| \leq \varepsilon^{v-1}, |w| \leq \varepsilon^{v'-1} \\ AC\varepsilon^\xi K_{\mu'}(\varepsilon)}} \int_{\{s \in \mathbb{R}: x+s+e^{-\lambda t_1} w \in A\}} C \varepsilon^\delta (1 + \varepsilon^{1-v}|x|) e^{-c|s|^2} ds \\ &\leq C \varepsilon^\delta \left(\left(\varepsilon^\xi l_\varepsilon^{\mu'} \right) \wedge 1 \right) \leq C \varepsilon^{(\xi v_0) + \delta_1}, \end{aligned}$$

as desired.

Then, we proceed by induction. Let $k \leq N$ and let us assume that (9.11) holds for $k-1$. For $u \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we set

$$(9.15) \quad z(u) = (z^1(u), z^2(u)) = (e^{\lambda t_{k-1}}(x + u^1), e^{-\mu t_{k-1}}(\varepsilon^{-1}L + u^2)),$$

where we suppressed the dependence on ε in the notation. Using (7.3) and (7.4), we have $\mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \{\varepsilon z(U_{t_{k-1}}) = Y_{t_{k-1}}\} = 1$. The Markov property of Y together with (7.3) implies

$$(9.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \{x + U_{t_k}^1 + e^{-\lambda t_k} w \in A\} &= \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \{Y_{t_k}^1 + \varepsilon w \in \varepsilon e^{\lambda t_k} A\} \\ &= \mathbf{E}^{\varepsilon x} \left[\mathbf{P}^{Y_{t_{k-1}}} \{Y_{t_1}^1 + \varepsilon w \in \varepsilon e^{\lambda t_k} A\} \right] = \mathbf{E}^{\varepsilon x} A_\varepsilon(U_{t_{k-1}}, w), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$A_\varepsilon(u, w) = \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon z(u)} \{z^1(u) + U_{t_1}^1 + e^{-\lambda t_1} w \in e^{\lambda t_{k-1}} A\}.$$

Let \mathcal{Z} be a centered Gaussian r.v. with variance

$$(9.17) \quad \mathbf{E}|\mathcal{Z}|^2 = \frac{1}{2\lambda} |F^1(0, 0)|^2 (1 - e^{-2\lambda t_1})$$

and independent of all the other randomness. To check (9.11) for k and complete the induction step, we must show that the error caused by replacing $U_{t_1}^1$ and $U_{t_{k-1}}^1$ by \mathcal{Z} and \mathcal{U}_{k-1} , respectively, in (9.16) is small. More precisely, (9.11) for k will follow immediately once we prove that there are $\varepsilon_k, \delta', \delta'' > 0$ such that the following relations hold uniformly in $|x| \leq \varepsilon^{v-1}$, $|w| \leq \varepsilon^{v'-1}$, $A \subset \varepsilon^\xi K_{\mathcal{K}'}(\varepsilon)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_k)$:

$$(9.18) \quad |\mathbf{E}^{\varepsilon x} A_\varepsilon(U_{t_{k-1}}, w) - \mathbf{E}^{\varepsilon x} B_\varepsilon(U_{t_{k-1}}, w)| = o\left(\varepsilon^{(\xi \vee 0) + \delta'}\right),$$

$$(9.19) \quad |\mathbf{E}^{\varepsilon x} B_\varepsilon(U_{t_{k-1}}, w) - C_\varepsilon(x, w)| = o\left(\varepsilon^{(\xi \vee 0) + \delta''}\right),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} B_\varepsilon(u, w) &= \mathbf{P} \{z^1(u) + \mathcal{Z} + e^{-\lambda t_1} w \in e^{\lambda t_{k-1}} A\}, \\ C_\varepsilon(x, w) &= \mathbf{P} \{x + \mathcal{U}_k + e^{-\lambda t_k} w \in A\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us derive (9.18). The choice of N and definition of t_1 allow us to apply Lemma 11.1 (2), by which there are $\hat{\delta}, \hat{c} > 0$ such that

$$(9.20) \quad \begin{aligned} &|A_\varepsilon(u, w) - B_\varepsilon(u, w)| \\ &\leq \int_{\{s \in \mathbb{R}: z^1(u) + s + e^{-\lambda t_1} w \in e^{\lambda t_{k-1}} A\}} C \left(\varepsilon |z^2(u)| + \varepsilon^{\hat{\delta}} \left(1 + \varepsilon^{1-v'} |z^1(u)| \right) \right) e^{-\hat{c}|s|^2} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Let us estimate the right-hand side. Using (9.10), (9.9), (9.12) and (9.14), we have, for ε sufficiently small,

$$e^{\lambda t_{k-1}} \varepsilon^\xi l_\varepsilon^{\mathcal{K}'} \leq e^{\frac{N-1}{N} \rho l_\varepsilon} \varepsilon^\xi l_\varepsilon^{\mathcal{K}'} \leq \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{N} \rho + \xi - \rho} l_\varepsilon^{\mathcal{K}'} < \varepsilon^{v'-1},$$

which along with $A \subset \varepsilon^\xi K_{\mathcal{K}'}(\varepsilon)$ implies that if $z^1(u) + s + e^{-\lambda t_1} w \in e^{\lambda t_{k-1}} A$ and $|w| \leq \varepsilon^{v'-1}$, then

$$(9.21) \quad \varepsilon^{1-v'} |z^1(u)| \leq C + \varepsilon^{1-v'} |s| \leq C + |s|.$$

On the other hand, from (9.15), (9.9) and (9.12), one can see that, for some $a > 0$,

$$(9.22) \quad \varepsilon |z^2(u)| \leq e^{-\mu t_{k-1}} (L + \varepsilon |u^2|) \leq \varepsilon^a L + \varepsilon e^{-\mu t_{k-1}} |u^2|.$$

Using $e^{-\tilde{c}|s|^2}$ to absorb polynomials of $|s|$, from (9.20), (9.21) and (9.22) we obtain that, for some $\tilde{\delta}, \tilde{c} > 0$,

$$|A_\varepsilon(u, w) - B_\varepsilon(u, w)| \leq \varepsilon^{\tilde{\delta}} \int_{\{s \in \mathbb{R}: z^1(u) + s + e^{-\lambda t_1} w \in e^{\lambda t_{k-1}} A\}} C(1 + e^{-\mu t_{k-1}} |u^2|) e^{-\tilde{c}|s|^2} ds, \quad |w| \leq \varepsilon^{v'-1}.$$

Let \mathcal{N} be a centered Gaussian r.v. with density proportional to $e^{-\tilde{c}|x|^2}$ and independent of other randomness. The last display implies that, if $|w| \leq \varepsilon^{v'-1}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbf{E}^{\varepsilon x} A_\varepsilon(U_{t_{k-1}}, w) - \mathbf{E}^{\varepsilon x} B_\varepsilon(U_{t_{k-1}}, w)| \\ & \leq C \varepsilon^{\tilde{\delta}} \mathbf{E}^{\varepsilon x} \left[(1 + e^{-\mu t_{k-1}} |U_{t_{k-1}}^2|) \mathbf{1}_{\{x + U_{t_{k-1}}^1 + e^{-\lambda t_k} w + e^{-\lambda t_{k-1}} \mathcal{N} \in A\}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $p, p' > 1$ satisfy $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$. We will choose p very close to 1 later. Using (7.2) and Lemma 7.2 (5), we have that $\mathbf{E}^{\varepsilon x} (e^{-\mu t_{k-1}} |U_{t_{k-1}}^2|)^{p'} < C$. Hence, applying Hölder's inequality to the above display, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbf{E}^{\varepsilon x} A_\varepsilon(U_{t_{k-1}}, w) - \mathbf{E}^{\varepsilon x} B_\varepsilon(U_{t_{k-1}}, w)| \\ & \leq C \varepsilon^{\tilde{\delta}} \left(\mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \left\{ x + U_{t_{k-1}}^1 + e^{-\lambda t_k} w + e^{-\lambda t_{k-1}} \mathcal{N} \in A \right\} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $e^{-\lambda t_1}$ decays like a small positive power of ε , we have that, for small ε ,

$$(9.23) \quad |w| \leq \varepsilon^{v'-1} \quad \text{implies} \quad |e^{-\lambda t_1} w| + l_\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon^{v'-1}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbf{E}^{\varepsilon x} A_\varepsilon(U_{t_{k-1}}, w) - \mathbf{E}^{\varepsilon x} B_\varepsilon(U_{t_{k-1}}, w)| \\ & \leq C \varepsilon^{\tilde{\delta}} \left(\mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \left\{ x + U_{t_{k-1}}^1 + e^{-\lambda t_{k-1}} (e^{-\lambda t_1} w + \mathcal{N}) \in A; |\mathcal{N}| \leq l_\varepsilon \right\} + o_\varepsilon(1) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ & \leq C \varepsilon^{\tilde{\delta}} \left(\mathbf{P} \left\{ x + \mathcal{U}_{k-1} + e^{-\lambda t_{k-1}} (e^{-\lambda t_1} w + \mathcal{N}) \in A \right\} + o \left(\varepsilon^{(\xi \vee 0) + \delta_{k-1}} \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ & \leq C \varepsilon^{\tilde{\delta}} \left((\varepsilon^\xi l_\varepsilon^{\mathcal{K}'}) \wedge 1 + o \left(\varepsilon^{(\xi \vee 0) + \delta_{k-1}} \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} = \mathcal{O} \left(\varepsilon^{\frac{\xi \vee 0}{p} + \tilde{\delta} \frac{\mathcal{K}'}{p}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $|x| \leq \varepsilon^{v-1}$, $|w| \leq \varepsilon^{v'-1}$ and $A \subset \varepsilon^\xi K_{\mathcal{K}'}(\varepsilon)$. Here, in the second inequality we used the induction assumption (9.11) for $k-1$ allowed by (9.23), the Gaussian tail of \mathcal{N} , and Fubini's theorem along with the independence of \mathcal{N} . In the last line we used $A \subset \varepsilon^\xi K_{\mathcal{K}'}(\varepsilon)$, the uniform boundedness of the density of \mathcal{U}_{k-1} (see (9.13)), independence of \mathcal{N} and Fubini's theorem. Choosing p sufficiently close to 1 completes the proof of (9.18).

Let us now prove (9.19). The following holds uniformly in $|x| \leq \varepsilon^{v-1}$, $|w| \leq \varepsilon^{v'-1}$ and $A \subset \varepsilon^\xi K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}^{\varepsilon x} B_\varepsilon(U_{t_{k-1}}, w) \\
&= \mathbb{P}^{\varepsilon x} \left\{ x + U_{t_{k-1}}^1 + e^{-\lambda t_{k-1}} (e^{-\lambda t_1} w + \mathcal{Z}) \in A \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{P}^{\varepsilon x} \left\{ x + U_{t_{k-1}}^1 + e^{-\lambda t_{k-1}} (e^{-\lambda t_1} w + \mathcal{Z}) \in A; |\mathcal{Z}| \leq l_\varepsilon \right\} + o_\varepsilon(1) \\
&= \mathbb{P} \left\{ x + \mathcal{U}_{k-1} + e^{-\lambda t_{k-1}} (e^{-\lambda t_1} w + \mathcal{Z}) \in A; |\mathcal{Z}| \leq l_\varepsilon \right\} + o\left(\varepsilon^{(\xi \vee 0) + \delta_{k-1}}\right) \\
&= \mathbb{P} \left\{ x + \mathcal{U}_{k-1} + e^{-\lambda t_{k-1}} \mathcal{Z} + e^{-\lambda t_k} w \in A \right\} + o\left(\varepsilon^{(\xi \vee 0) + \delta_{k-1}}\right), \\
&= C_\varepsilon(y, w) + o\left(\varepsilon^{(\xi \vee 0) + \delta_{k-1}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

In the third identity, we used the induction assumption allowed by (9.23), independence of \mathcal{Z} , and Fubini's theorem. In the last line, we used the identity in distribution between $\mathcal{U}_{k-1} + e^{-\lambda t_{k-1}} \mathcal{Z}$ and \mathcal{U}_k (see (9.13) and (9.17)). This proves (9.19) with $\delta'' = \delta_{k-1}$ completing the induction step and the entire proof. \square

Now, we are ready to prove Lemma 9.1.

PROOF OF LEMMA 9.1: We substitute $1, \varepsilon^{\alpha-1}x, \xi + \alpha - 1$ for c, x, ξ in both Lemmas 9.2 and 9.3. We choose an arbitrary $v \in (0, \alpha)$ in Lemma 9.3. We set $\varrho = \xi + \alpha - \theta$ and choose an arbitrary $\varrho' \in (0, \varrho)$ for Lemma 9.3. Then, with ξ replaced by $\xi + \alpha - 1$, (9.10) holds and (9.9) is satisfied for $T(\varepsilon)$ given in (9.3), for sufficiently small ε . Combining Lemma 9.2 and Lemma 9.3 (with \varkappa' therein replaced by any $\varkappa'' > \varkappa'$), we obtain the desired result. \square

10. LOCAL LIMIT THEOREMS

In this section, we adopt the setting of Section 9. The goal is to compute the tail asymptotics for exit times and obtain local limit theorems for exit locations, *in rectified coordinates*.

We recall the notation $\mathbb{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x}$ in (9.1) and the notation for Gaussian densities in (2.2).

10.1. Exit times.

Proposition 10.1. *Let $\varkappa, r > 0$, $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, $\theta \in [0, \alpha)$, $\beta \geq 1 - \theta$, $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $\zeta = \zeta_{r, \theta, \varepsilon}$ be given in (7.16) and \mathbf{c}_1 be given in (9.2). There is $\delta > 0$ such that the following hold: If $\theta + \beta - \alpha > 0$, then*

$$\sup_{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)} \left| \varepsilon^{-(\theta + \beta - \alpha)} \mathbb{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \{ \zeta \geq \beta \lambda^{-1} l_\varepsilon + c \} - 2r e^{-\lambda c} g_{\mathbf{c}_1}(\varepsilon^{\alpha-1} x) \right| = o(\varepsilon^\delta);$$

If $\theta + \beta - \alpha = 0$, then

$$\sup_{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)} \left| \mathbb{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \{ \zeta \geq \beta \lambda^{-1} l_\varepsilon + c \} - \int_{[-r e^{-\lambda c}, r e^{-\lambda c}]} g_{\mathbf{c}_1}(\varepsilon^{\alpha-1} x - s) ds \right| = o(\varepsilon^\delta).$$

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 10.1: Due to $\theta < \alpha$, for sufficiently small ε , the initial condition we are interested in satisfies

$$|Y_0^1| = \varepsilon^\alpha |x| \leq \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^\varkappa \leq r \varepsilon^\theta$$

for all $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$. The definition of ζ thus ensures that $|Y_\zeta^1| = r\varepsilon^\theta$, which along with the formula (7.3) implies that $\mathbb{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x}$ -a.s.

$$e^{\lambda\zeta}|\varepsilon^\alpha x + \varepsilon U_\zeta^1| = r\varepsilon^\theta, \quad \text{or equivalently,} \quad \zeta = \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \frac{r\varepsilon^\theta}{|\varepsilon^\alpha x + \varepsilon U_\zeta^1|}.$$

From this, we have

$$\{\zeta \geq \beta\lambda^{-1}l_\varepsilon + c\} \stackrel{\mathbb{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x}}{=} \{|x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}U_\zeta^1| \leq re^{-\lambda c}\varepsilon^{\theta+\beta-\alpha}\}.$$

Applying Lemma 9.1 with $\xi = \theta + \beta - \alpha$ and arbitrary $\eta \in (0, 1 - \theta)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)} \left| \mathbb{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \{\zeta \geq \beta\lambda^{-1}l_\varepsilon + c\} - \mathbb{P} \{|x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{U}| \leq re^{-\lambda c}\varepsilon^{\theta+\beta-\alpha} \pm \varepsilon^\eta\} \right| \\ = o\left(\varepsilon^{(\theta+\beta-1)\vee 0 + \delta'}\right) \end{aligned}$$

for some $\delta' > 0$. Rewriting the probability involving \mathcal{U} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^{-((\theta+\beta-\alpha)\vee 0)} \mathbb{P} \{|x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{U}| \leq re^{-\lambda c}\varepsilon^{\theta+\beta-\alpha} \pm \varepsilon^\eta\} \\ = \varepsilon^{-((\theta+\beta-\alpha)\vee 0)} \int_{[-re^{-\lambda c}\varepsilon^{\theta+\beta-\alpha} \mp \varepsilon^\eta, re^{-\lambda c}\varepsilon^{\theta+\beta-\alpha} \pm \varepsilon^\eta]} g_{\mathbf{c}_1}(\varepsilon^{\alpha-1}x - s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Estimating the right-hand side with the help of Lemma 7.11, we obtain the desired result. \square

10.2. Atypical exit locations. Recalling stopping times given in (7.15), for $R > 0$, we set

$$(10.1) \quad \tau = \tau_{R,0,\varepsilon} = \tau_\Pi.$$

We also recall the definition of stability index ρ in (2.24).

Proposition 10.2. *Suppose $\rho < 1$. Let $\varkappa, \varkappa' > 0$. Let τ be defined by (10.1), and \mathbf{c}_1 by (9.2). Then for each $\beta \in (\rho, 1)$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\substack{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon) \\ [a,b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)}} \left| \varepsilon^{-\left(\frac{\beta}{\rho}-1\right)} \mathbb{P}^{\varepsilon x} \{Y_\tau \in \{R\} \times \varepsilon^\beta[a, b]\} - RL^{-\frac{1}{\rho}} g_{\mathbf{c}_1}(x) \left(|b \vee 0|^{\frac{1}{\rho}} - |a \vee 0|^{\frac{1}{\rho}} \right) \right| \\ = o(\varepsilon^\delta). \end{aligned}$$

PROOF: In this proof and further on, we often use the notation \asymp_\pm introduced in (2.1). Using Lemma 7.10, we have that, under $\mathbb{P}^{\varepsilon x}$ uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$ and $[a, b] \in K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)$,

$$\{Y_\tau \in \{R\} \times \varepsilon^\beta[a, b]\} \stackrel{\text{w.h.p.}}{=} \left\{ x + U_\tau^1 \geq 0; R^{-\rho} L \varepsilon^\rho (x + U_\tau^1)^\rho + \varepsilon N_\tau^2 \in \varepsilon^\beta[a, b] \right\}.$$

Then, Lemma 7.5 implies that, for any $\eta \in (0, 1 - \beta)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^{\varepsilon x} \{Y_\tau \in \{R\} \times \varepsilon^\beta[a, b]\} \\ \asymp_\pm \mathbb{P}^{\varepsilon x} \{x + U_\tau^1 \geq 0; R^{-\rho} L \varepsilon^\rho (x + U_\tau^1)^\rho \in \varepsilon^\beta[a \mp \varepsilon^\eta, b \pm \varepsilon^\eta]\} \pm o_\varepsilon(1) \\ = \mathbb{P}^{\varepsilon x} \{x + U_\tau^1 \in A_\pm^\varepsilon\} \pm o_\varepsilon(1), \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$ and $[a, b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)$, where

$$A_\pm^\varepsilon = RL^{-\frac{1}{\rho}} \varepsilon^{\frac{\beta}{\rho}-1} \left[((a \mp \varepsilon^\eta) \vee 0)^{\frac{1}{\rho}}, ((b \mp \varepsilon^\eta) \vee 0)^{\frac{1}{\rho}} \right].$$

Lemma 7.5 ensures that

$$(10.2) \quad \sup_{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \{\tau \neq \zeta_{R,0,\varepsilon}\} = o_e(1), \quad \alpha \in (0, 1].$$

Using (10.2) with $\alpha = 1$, and Corollary 9.1 with $R, \frac{\beta}{\rho} - 1, 0$ substituted for r, ξ, θ , we obtain

$$\mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \{Y_\tau \in \{R\} \times \varepsilon^\beta [a, b]\} \asymp_{\pm} \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \{x + \mathcal{U} \in A_{\pm}^\varepsilon\} \pm o\left(\varepsilon^{\frac{\beta}{\rho} - 1 + \delta}\right)$$

for some $\delta > 0$, uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$ and $[a, b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)$. Since the variance of \mathcal{U} is \mathbf{c}_1 , an elementary Gaussian integral estimate (see the proof of (10.7) below for a similar argument) yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\substack{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon) \\ [a, b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)}} \left| \varepsilon^{-(\frac{\beta}{\rho} - 1)} \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \{x + \mathcal{U} \in A_{\pm}^\varepsilon\} - RL^{-\frac{1}{\rho}} g_{\mathbf{c}_1}(x) \left(|b \vee 0|^{\frac{1}{\rho}} - |a \vee 0|^{\frac{1}{\rho}} \right) \right| \\ = o\left(\varepsilon^{\delta'}\right), \end{aligned}$$

for some $\delta' > 0$. Combining the last two displays we complete the proof. \square

Let us now consider the case $\beta = 1$. In addition to \mathbf{c}_1 , we define

$$(10.3) \quad \mathbf{c}_2 = \int_{-\infty}^0 e^{2\mu s} |F^2(Re^{-\lambda s}, 0)|^2 ds.$$

Proposition 10.3. *Suppose $\rho < 1$. Let $\varkappa, \varkappa' > 0$. Let τ be given in (10.1), \mathbf{c}_1 in (9.2), \mathbf{c}_2 in (10.3). Then there is $\delta > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{\substack{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon) \\ [a, b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)}} \left| \varepsilon^{-(\frac{1}{\rho} - 1)} \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \{Y_\tau \in \{R\} \times \varepsilon [a, b]\} - RL^{-\frac{1}{\rho}} g_{\mathbf{c}_1}(x) \mathbf{E}h(a, b; \mathcal{N}) \right| = o(\varepsilon^\delta)$$

where

$$(10.4) \quad h(a, b; z) = |(b - z) \vee 0|^{\frac{1}{\rho}} - |(a - z) \vee 0|^{\frac{1}{\rho}}$$

and \mathcal{N} is a centered Gaussian r.v. with variance \mathbf{c}_2 .

Recall the family of stopping times given in (7.16). We need the next lemma, which is slightly more general than the setting of Proposition 10.3. In particular, we are not requiring $\rho < 1$ here.

Lemma 10.1. *Suppose $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, $\rho > 0$. Let $\beta, \varkappa, \varkappa' > 0$. For $\theta \in (0, 1)$, we set*

$$(10.5) \quad \zeta = \zeta_{1,\theta,\varepsilon}.$$

Then for any sufficiently small $\theta > 0$ and sufficiently small $\eta > 0$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that the following holds uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$ and $[a, b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \{Y_\tau \in \{R\} \times \varepsilon^\beta [a, b]\} \asymp_{\pm} \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \{x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} U_\zeta^1 \in B_{\pm}^\varepsilon(\mathcal{N})\} \\ \pm \varepsilon^\delta \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \{x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} U_\zeta^1 \in B_{\pm}^\varepsilon(\mathcal{Z})\} \pm o_e(1), \end{aligned}$$

where τ is given in (10.1), and, for $s \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$(10.6) \quad B_{\pm}^\varepsilon(s) = \varepsilon^{-\alpha} RL^{-\frac{1}{\rho}} \left[\left((\varepsilon^\beta a - \varepsilon s \mp \varepsilon^{1+\eta}) \vee 0 \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho}}, \left((\varepsilon^\beta b - \varepsilon s \pm \varepsilon^{1+\eta}) \vee 0 \right)^{\frac{1}{\rho}} \right] \subset \mathbb{R},$$

and \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{Z} are centered Gaussian r.v.'s (defined on an extended probability space) such that the random vector $(U_\zeta^1, \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{Z})$ has independent components. The variance of \mathcal{N} equals \mathbf{c}_2 given in (10.3), and the variance of \mathcal{Z} does not depend on x .

Remark 10.1. In principle, the nonlinear dynamical system we are considering entangles the noisy perturbations in various directions in a sophisticated way. However, this key lemma describes the asymptotic disentanglement of noisy contributions in two coordinate directions and gives the asymptotics of the exit distribution in terms of independent r.v.'s U_ζ^1 and \mathcal{N} . These two r.v.'s can be viewed as contributions from the white noise accumulated along two coordinate axes, \mathcal{N} being the distributional limit of N_τ^2 . The asymptotic independence emerges since the determining noisy contributions along the first axis and the second axis are mostly accumulated during two non-overlapping time intervals: (i) during the motion along the stable manifold (until ζ), and (ii) during the motion along the unstable manifold (after ζ).

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 10.3: Let \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{Z} be given in Lemma 10.1 for $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 1$.

The treatment for terms involving \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{Z} is exactly the same since they are both independent centered Gaussian r.v.'s. Hence, we only present the argument for \mathcal{N} and estimate

$$\mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \{x + U_\zeta^1 \in B_\pm^\varepsilon(\mathcal{N})\}.$$

We apply Corollary 9.1 with $r = 1$, $\xi = \frac{1}{\rho} - 1$ to see that for some $\delta' > 0$

$$\sup_{\substack{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon) \\ [a, b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon) \\ |z| \leq l_\varepsilon}} |\mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \{x + U_\zeta^1 \in B_\pm^\varepsilon(z)\} - \mathbf{P} \{x + \mathcal{U} \in B_\pm^\varepsilon(z)\}| = o\left(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\rho}-1+\delta'}\right).$$

Using the above display and the Gaussian tail of \mathcal{N} , and integrating in z with respect to the law of \mathcal{N} , we obtain that

$$\mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \{x + U_\zeta^1 \in B_\pm^\varepsilon(\mathcal{N})\} = \mathbf{P} \{x + \mathcal{U} \in B_\pm^\varepsilon(\mathcal{N})\} + o\left(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\rho}-1+\delta'}\right)$$

uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$ and $[a, b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)$.

Let us write

$$\mathbf{P} \{x + \mathcal{U} \in B_\pm^\varepsilon(\mathcal{N})\} = \mathbf{E} \int_{B_\pm^\varepsilon(\mathcal{N})} g_{\mathbf{c}_1}(s - x) ds.$$

We need the following estimate, the proof of which is postponed:

$$(10.7) \quad \sup_{\substack{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon) \\ [a, b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon) \\ z \in \mathbb{R}}} \left| \varepsilon^{-(\frac{1}{\rho}-1)} \int_{B_\pm^\varepsilon(z)} g_{\mathbf{c}_1}(s - x) ds - RL^{-\frac{1}{\rho}} g_{\mathbf{c}_1}(x) h(a, b; z) \right| \leq C\varepsilon^{\delta''} (|z|^p + 1),$$

for some $\delta'', p > 0$, where h is defined in (10.4).

Hence, the three displays above yield

$$\sup_{\substack{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon) \\ [a,b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)}} \left| \varepsilon^{-(\frac{1}{p}-1)} \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \{x + U_{\zeta}^1 \in B_{\pm}^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{N})\} - RL^{-\frac{1}{p}} g_{\mathbf{c}_1}(x) \mathbf{E}h(a, b; \mathcal{N}) \right| = o\left(\varepsilon^{\delta' \wedge \delta''}\right).$$

A similar result holds with \mathcal{N} replaced by \mathcal{Z} , which gives, due to $|h(a, b; z)| \leq C(|a|^{\frac{1}{p}} + |b|^{\frac{1}{p}} + |z|^{\frac{1}{p}})$ (see the definition of h in (10.4)), that

$$\sup_{\substack{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon) \\ [a,b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)}} \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon x} \{x + U_{\zeta}^1 \in B_{\pm}^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{Z})\} = \mathcal{O}\left(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p}-1} l_{\varepsilon}^{\frac{\varkappa'}{p}}\right).$$

The above two displays together with Lemma 10.1 imply the desired result. \square

PROOF OF (10.7): All statements below are understood to hold uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$ and $[a, b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)$. Let us set

$$B^{\varepsilon}(z) = \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{p}-1} RL^{-\frac{1}{p}} \left[|(a-z) \vee 0|^{\frac{1}{p}}, |(b-z) \vee 0|^{\frac{1}{p}} \right] \subset \mathbb{R}.$$

We shall compare the terms in (10.7) with

$$\mathbf{I} = \varepsilon^{-(\frac{1}{p}-1)} \int_{B^{\varepsilon}(z)} g_{\mathbf{c}_1}(s-x) ds.$$

Using the definitions of $B_{\pm}^{\varepsilon}(z)$ in (10.6) (with $\alpha = \beta = 1$), $B^{\varepsilon}(z)$ above, $K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$ and $K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)$ in (3.1), we have

$$\left| \varepsilon^{-(\frac{1}{p}-1)} \int_{B_{\pm}^{\varepsilon}(z)} g_{\mathbf{c}_1}(s-x) ds - \mathbf{I} \right| \leq C \varepsilon^{-(\frac{1}{p}-1)} |B_{\pm}^{\varepsilon}(z) \Delta B^{\varepsilon}(z)| \leq C \varepsilon^{\delta} (|z|^p + 1),$$

for some $\delta, p > 0$. The definition of $h(a, b; z)$ in (10.4) implies that

$$RL^{-\frac{1}{p}} g_{\mathbf{c}_1}(x) h(a, b; z) = \varepsilon^{-(\frac{1}{p}-1)} \int_{B^{\varepsilon}(z)} g_{\mathbf{c}_1}(x) ds.$$

Due to the definitions of $B^{\varepsilon}(z)$, $K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$ and $K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)$ and the fact that $|g_{\mathbf{c}_1}(x) - g_{\mathbf{c}_1}(s-x)| \leq C|s|$, we obtain, for some $\delta', p' > 0$,

$$\left| \mathbf{I} - \varepsilon^{-(\frac{1}{p}-1)} \int_{B^{\varepsilon}(z)} g_{\mathbf{c}_1}(x) ds \right| \leq C \int_{B^{\varepsilon}(z)} \varepsilon^{-(\frac{1}{p}-1)} |s| ds \leq C \varepsilon^{\delta'} (|z|^{p'} + 1).$$

Combining the above three displays, we arrive at (10.7). \square

10.2.1. *Proof of Lemma 10.1.* Let us outline the plan. We will stop the process Y at ζ (given in (10.5)) using the strong Markov property and show that from ζ onward, the exit event can be approximated by a simpler event involving only $Y_{T_1}^2$ (equivalently, $N_{T_1}^2$ due to (7.4)) at a deterministic time T_1 (Lemma 10.3); then we apply a density estimate result to show that this simpler event can be approximated by replacing $N_{T_1}^2$ by \mathcal{N} (Lemma 10.4); finally, we undo the stopping at ζ and complete the proof of Lemma 10.1.

In this proof, if not otherwise specified, all statements are understood to hold uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$ and $[a, b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)$.

Before proceeding, let us make a further notational simplification. It is easier to work with stopping times for exiting a vertical strip as in (7.16). So, let us redefine

$$(10.8) \quad \tau = \zeta_{R,0,\varepsilon}.$$

Due to (10.2), working with this definition of τ instead of the original one, we introduce a uniform probability error of order $o_e(1)$. Therefore, although we prove all the results in this section using the definition in (10.8), they also automatically hold true for the original definition in (10.1).

In view of (10.5) and (10.8), we have

$$\zeta \leq \tau.$$

Using (7.3), we have that, whenever $|Y_0^1| < \varepsilon^\theta$,

$$(10.9) \quad \varepsilon^\theta = e^{\lambda\zeta} |\varepsilon^\alpha x + \varepsilon U_\zeta^1|, \quad \text{or equivalently,} \quad \zeta = \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \frac{\varepsilon^\theta}{|\varepsilon^\alpha x + \varepsilon U_\zeta^1|},$$

and, whenever $|Y_0^1| < R$,

$$(10.10) \quad R = e^{\lambda\tau} |Y_0^1 + \varepsilon U_\tau^1|, \quad \text{or equivalently,} \quad \tau = \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \frac{R}{|Y_0^1 + \varepsilon U_\tau^1|}.$$

Let us disintegrate the distribution of Y_τ with respect to Y_ζ using only the typical values of the latter:

Lemma 10.2. *If*

$$(10.11) \quad 0 < \vartheta_0 < \beta \wedge 1,$$

then, for sufficiently small $\theta > 0$, the following holds uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$ and in $[a, b] \in K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)$,

$$(10.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \{Y_\tau \in \{R\} \times \varepsilon^\beta [a, b]\} \\ = \mathbf{E}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \left[\mathbf{P}^{Y_\zeta} \{Y_\tau \in \{R\} \times \varepsilon^\beta [a, b]\} \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_\zeta^1 = \varepsilon^\theta, |Y_\zeta^2| < \varepsilon^{\vartheta_0}\}} \right] + o_e(1). \end{aligned}$$

PROOF: Let us first exclude unlikely values of Y_ζ and prove the following:

$$(10.13) \quad \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \{Y_\tau \in \{R\} \times \varepsilon^\beta K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon), |Y_\zeta^2| \geq \varepsilon^{\vartheta_0}\} = o_e(1),$$

$$(10.14) \quad \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \{Y_\tau \in \{R\} \times \varepsilon^\beta K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon), Y_\zeta^1 = -\varepsilon^\theta\} = o_e(1).$$

Since $|Y_0^1| \leq \varepsilon^\alpha l_\varepsilon^\varkappa \leq \varepsilon^\theta$ for sufficiently small ε , we know that

$$(10.15) \quad |Y_\zeta^1| = \varepsilon^\theta.$$

To estimate Y_ζ^2 , we use the strong Markov property and (7.4) to see

$$(10.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \{Y_\tau^2 \in \varepsilon^\beta K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon), |Y_\zeta^2| \geq \varepsilon^{\vartheta_0}\} &= \mathbf{E}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \left[\mathbf{P}^{Y_\zeta} \{Y_\tau^2 \in \varepsilon^\beta K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)\} \mathbf{1}_{|Y_\zeta^2| \geq \varepsilon^{\vartheta_0}} \right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \left[\mathbf{P}^{Y_\zeta} \{e^{-\mu\tau} Y_0^2 + \varepsilon N_\tau^2 \in \varepsilon^\beta K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)\} \mathbf{1}_{|Y_\zeta^2| \geq \varepsilon^{\vartheta_0}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Due to (10.15), we can use (10.10) to see that

$$(10.17) \quad \mathbf{P}^{Y_\zeta} \{e^{-\mu\tau} Y_0^2 + \varepsilon N_\tau^2 \in \varepsilon^\beta K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)\} = \mathbf{P}^{Y_\zeta} \{R^{-\rho} |Y_0^1 + \varepsilon U_\tau^1|^\rho Y_0^2 + \varepsilon N_\tau^2 \in \varepsilon^\beta K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)\}.$$

We want to control N_τ^2 in the above display using Lemma 7.2 (6). Using (10.10) with $Y_0 = z$ satisfying $|z^1| = \varepsilon^\theta$, we have for $q > \theta\lambda^{-1}$ and ε sufficiently small,

$$\mathbf{P}^z \{ \tau \geq ql_\varepsilon \} \leq \mathbf{P}^z \{ |U_\tau^1| > \varepsilon^{\theta-1} - R\varepsilon^{q\lambda-1} \} = o_\varepsilon(1),$$

where we used Lemma 7.2 (3). This along with Lemma 7.2 (6) implies that

$$\mathbf{P}^{Y_\zeta} \{ |N_\tau^2| > \varepsilon^{-p} \} = o_\varepsilon(1)$$

for every $p > 0$. Using this, $[a, b] \subset K_{\mathcal{K}'}(\varepsilon)$ and the fact that $|Y_0^2| \geq \varepsilon^{\vartheta_0}$ holds a.s. under \mathbf{P}^{Y_ζ} with $|Y_\zeta^2| \geq \varepsilon^{\vartheta_0}$, we bound the left-hand side of (10.17) from above by

$$\mathbf{P}^{Y_\zeta} \left\{ C|Y_0^1 + \varepsilon U_\tau^1|^\rho \varepsilon^{\vartheta_0} \leq \varepsilon^{(\beta \wedge 1) - \delta} \right\} + o_\varepsilon(1), \quad \text{if } |Y_\zeta^2| \geq \varepsilon^{\vartheta_0},$$

for arbitrary $\delta > 0$. Since $|Y_0^1| = \varepsilon^\theta$ holds a.s. under \mathbf{P}^{Y_ζ} due to (10.15), we use Lemma 7.2 (3) and (10.11) to see that, for sufficiently small θ , we can choose δ so that the main term in this display can be bounded by

$$\mathbf{P}^{Y_\zeta} \left\{ \varepsilon^{-1}(\varepsilon^\theta - C\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{\rho}((\beta \wedge 1) - \delta - \vartheta_0)}) \leq |U_\tau^1| \right\} = o_\varepsilon(1), \quad \text{if } |Y_\zeta^2| \geq \varepsilon^{\vartheta_0}.$$

Hence, the left-hand side of (10.17) is $o_\varepsilon(1)$ when $|Y_\zeta^2| \geq \varepsilon^{\vartheta_0}$. Inserting this into (10.16), we obtain

$$\mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^{\alpha x}} \{ Y_\tau^2 \in \varepsilon^\beta K_{\mathcal{K}'}(\varepsilon), |Y_\zeta^2| \geq \varepsilon^{\vartheta_0} \} = o_\varepsilon(1).$$

and (10.13) follows. To prove (10.14), we apply the strong Markov property:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^{\alpha x}} \{ Y_\tau^1 = R, Y_\zeta = -\varepsilon^\theta \} &\leq \mathbf{E}^{\varepsilon^{\alpha x}} \left[\mathbf{P}^{Y_\zeta} \{ Y_\tau^1 > 0 \} \mathbf{1}_{Y_\zeta^1 = -\varepsilon^\theta} \right] \\ &\leq \mathbf{E}^{\varepsilon^{\alpha x}} \mathbf{P}^{Y_\zeta} \{ -\varepsilon^\theta + \varepsilon U_\tau^1 > 0 \} \leq \mathbf{E}^{\varepsilon^{\alpha x}} \mathbf{P}^{Y_\zeta} \{ U_\tau^1 > \varepsilon^{\theta-1} \} = o_\varepsilon(1), \end{aligned}$$

where we used (7.3) in the second estimate and Lemma 7.2 (3) in the last one. Finally, applying the strong Markov property and relations (10.13), (10.14), we see that uniformly in $x \in K_{\mathcal{K}}(\varepsilon)$ and $[a, b] \in K_{\mathcal{K}'}(\varepsilon)$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^{\alpha x}} \{ Y_\tau \in \{R\} \times \varepsilon^\beta [a, b] \} \\ &= \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^{\alpha x}} \{ Y_\tau \in \{R\} \times \varepsilon^\beta [a, b], Y_\zeta^1 = \varepsilon^\theta, |Y_\zeta^2| < \varepsilon^{\vartheta_0} \} + o_\varepsilon(1) \\ &= \mathbf{E}^{\varepsilon^{\alpha x}} \left[\mathbf{P}^{Y_\zeta} \{ Y_\tau \in \{R\} \times \varepsilon^\beta [a, b] \} \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_\zeta^1 = \varepsilon^\theta, |Y_\zeta^2| < \varepsilon^{\vartheta_0}\}} \right] + o_\varepsilon(1), \end{aligned}$$

so (10.12) holds, and the proof is completed. \square

Now, we investigate the dynamics after ζ . Taking into account the indicator function in the above display, we study $\mathbf{P}^y \{ Y_\tau^2 \in \varepsilon^\beta [a, b] \}$ for $[a, b] \subset K_{\mathcal{K}'}(\varepsilon)$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$ satisfying

$$(10.18) \quad y^1 = \varepsilon^\theta, \quad |y^2| < \varepsilon^{\vartheta_0}.$$

For these values of y , due to (10.10), we have \mathbf{P}^y -a.s.

$$(10.19) \quad \tau = \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \frac{R}{|y^1 + \varepsilon U_\tau^1|},$$

which is to be compared with the following deterministic time

$$(10.20) \quad T_1 = T_1(\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \frac{R}{|y^1|} = \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \frac{R}{\varepsilon^\theta}.$$

We emphasize that T_1 is in fact independent of y under assumption (10.18). The next result shows that T_1 is a good approximation of τ under \mathbf{P}^y .

Lemma 10.3. *If $\vartheta_0, \vartheta_1 > 0$ satisfy*

$$(10.21) \quad \vartheta_1 < 1, \quad \vartheta_1 + \vartheta_0 > 1,$$

then, for sufficiently small $\theta, \eta > 0$, the following holds uniformly in y satisfying (10.18) and $[a, b] \subset K_{\mathcal{X}'}(\varepsilon)$,

$$\mathbf{P}^y \{Y_\tau \in \{R\} \times \varepsilon^\beta [a, b]\} \asymp_\pm \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ Y_{T_1}^2 \in \left[\varepsilon^\beta a \mp \frac{\varepsilon^{1+\eta}}{2}, \varepsilon^\beta b \pm \frac{\varepsilon^{1+\eta}}{2} \right] \right\} \pm o_\varepsilon(1).$$

PROOF: In this proof, if not otherwise specified, all statements are understood to hold uniformly in y satisfying (10.18) and $[a, b] \subset K_{\mathcal{X}'}(\varepsilon)$. Since $Y_0^1 = y^1 = \varepsilon^\theta$ holds a.s. under \mathbf{P}^y , using (7.3) and Lemma 7.2 (3), we obtain

$$\mathbf{P}^y \{Y_\tau^1 \neq R\} \leq \mathbf{P}^y \{\varepsilon^\theta + \varepsilon U_\tau^1 < 0\} \leq \mathbf{P}^y \{|U_\tau^1| > \varepsilon^{\theta-1}\} = o_\varepsilon(1).$$

The desired result will follow once we show that, for all sufficiently small $\eta > 0$,

$$(10.22) \quad \mathbf{P}^y \{|Y_\tau^2 - Y_{T_1}^2| > \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{1+\eta}\} = o_\varepsilon(1).$$

To show (10.22), we start by controlling $\tau - T_1$. Using (10.19), (10.20), (10.18), Lemma 7.2 (3), the fact the $e^s - 1 \geq s$, and (10.21), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}^y \{\tau - T_1 \geq \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1}\} &\leq \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ \log \frac{|y^1|}{|y^1 + \varepsilon U_\tau^1|} \geq \lambda \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1} \right\} \leq \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ e^{\lambda \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1}} \varepsilon |U_\tau^1| \geq (e^{\lambda \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1}} - 1) |y^1| \right\} \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ e^{\lambda \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1}} |U_\tau^1| \geq \lambda \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1 - 1 + \theta} \right\} = o_\varepsilon(1), \end{aligned}$$

if θ is small enough to ensure $\vartheta_1 - 1 + \theta < 0$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}^y \{T_1 - \tau \geq \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1}\} &\leq \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ \log \frac{|y^1 + \varepsilon U_\tau^1|}{|y^1|} \geq \lambda \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1} \right\} \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}^y \{|U_\tau^1| \geq \lambda \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1 - 1 + \theta}\} = o_\varepsilon(1). \end{aligned}$$

In conclusion, we have

$$(10.23) \quad \mathbf{P}^y \{|T_1 - \tau| \geq \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1}\} = o_\varepsilon(1).$$

With this estimate at hand, let us compare Y_τ^2 and $Y_{T_1}^2$. Using (7.4), we have

$$(10.24) \quad \mathbf{P}^y \{|Y_\tau^2 - Y_{T_1}^2| \geq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{1+\eta}\} \leq \mathbf{P}^y \{|y^2| |e^{-\mu\tau} - e^{-\mu T_1}| \geq \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^{1+\eta}\} + \mathbf{P}^y \{|N_\tau^2 - N_{T_1}^2| \geq \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^\eta\}.$$

Let us estimate the first term on the right of (10.24). On $\{|T_1 - \tau| < \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1}\}$, we have

$$|e^{-\mu\tau} - e^{-\mu T_1}| \leq \mu |\tau - T_1| \leq \mu \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1}.$$

Hence, using (10.23), (10.18) and (10.21), we obtain

$$(10.25) \quad \mathbf{P}^y \{|y^2| |e^{-\mu\tau} - e^{-\mu T_1}| \geq \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^{1+\eta}\} \leq \mathbf{P}^y \{\mu \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1 + \vartheta_0} \geq \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^{1+\eta}\} + o_\varepsilon(1) = o_\varepsilon(1),$$

for sufficiently small $\eta > 0$.

Then, we turn to the second term on the right of (10.24). Due to (10.23),

$$(10.26) \quad \mathbf{P}^y \{|N_\tau^2 - N_{T_1}^2| \geq \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^\eta\} \leq \mathbf{P}^y \{|N_\tau^2 - N_{T_1}^2| \geq \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^\eta\} + o_\varepsilon(1),$$

where we have set

$$\bar{\tau} = (\tau \vee (T_1 - \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1})) \wedge (T_1 + \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1}).$$

Then, we write

$$(10.27) \quad \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ |N_{\bar{\tau}}^2 - N_{T_1}^2| \geq \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^\eta \right\} \leq \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ e^{-\mu T_1} |U_{\bar{\tau}}^2 - U_{T_1}^2| \geq \frac{1}{8}\varepsilon^\eta \right\} \\ + \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ |e^{-\mu \bar{\tau}} - e^{-\mu T_1}| |U_{\bar{\tau}}^2| \geq \frac{1}{8}\varepsilon^\eta \right\}.$$

Due to (7.2), the first term on the right of (10.27) can be estimated as

$$\mathbf{P}^y \left\{ e^{-\mu T_1} |U_{\bar{\tau}}^2 - U_{T_1}^2| \geq \frac{1}{8}\varepsilon^\eta \right\} \leq \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ e^{-\mu T_1} |M_{\bar{\tau}}^2 - M_{T_1 - \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1}}^2| \geq \frac{1}{32}\varepsilon^\eta \right\} \\ + \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ e^{-\mu T_1} |M_{T_1}^2 - M_{T_1 - \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1}}^2| \geq \frac{1}{32}\varepsilon^\eta \right\} + \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ e^{-\mu T_1} |V_{\bar{\tau}}^2 - V_{T_1}^2| \geq \frac{1}{16}\varepsilon^{\eta-1} \right\} \\ \leq 2\mathbf{P}^y \left\{ \sup_{t \in [T_1 - \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1}, T_1 + \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1}]} |M_t^2 - M_{T_1 - \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1}}^2| \geq \frac{1}{32}e^{\mu T_1} \varepsilon^\eta \right\} \\ + \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ |V_{\bar{\tau}}^2 - V_{T_1}^2| \geq \frac{1}{16}e^{\mu T_1} \varepsilon^{\eta-1} \right\}.$$

For $t \in [T_1 - \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1}, T_1 + \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1}]$, we have $\langle M^2 \rangle_t - \langle M^2 \rangle_{T_1 - \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1}} \leq Ce^{2\mu T_1} \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1}$ (see (7.2)). Also, $|V_{\bar{\tau}}^2 - V_{T_1}^2|$ is bounded by $Ce^{\mu T_1} \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1}$. Using these and the exponential martingale inequality (Lemma 7.1), the above is $o_e(1)$ provided η is small enough to guarantee $2\eta - \vartheta_1 < 0$ and $\eta - 1 - \vartheta_1 < 0$.

The second term on the right of (10.27) can similarly be bounded from above by

$$\mathbf{P}^y \left\{ \left(e^{-\mu(T_1 - \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1})} - e^{-\mu T_1} \right) \sup_{t \in [T_1 - \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1}, T_1 + \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1}]} |M_t^2| \geq \frac{1}{8}\varepsilon^\eta \right\} \\ + \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ \left(e^{-\mu(T_1 - \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1})} - e^{-\mu T_1} \right) |V_{\bar{\tau}}^2| \geq \frac{1}{8}\varepsilon^{\eta-1} \right\}.$$

For $t \in [T_1 - \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1}, T_1 + \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1}]$, $\langle M^2 \rangle_t < Ce^{2\mu T_1}$. In addition, $|V_{\bar{\tau}}^2|$ is bounded by $Ce^{\mu T_1}$. Thus the the exponential martingale inequality (Lemma 7.1) and

$$e^{-\mu(T_1 - \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1})} - e^{-\mu T_1} \leq Ce^{-\mu T_1} \varepsilon^{\vartheta_1}$$

imply that both terms in the previous display are $o_e(1)$ provided $\eta > 0$ is small enough to ensure $\eta - \vartheta_1 < 0$ and $\eta - 1 - \vartheta_1 < 0$.

In conclusion, for η sufficiently small, we obtain that the left-hand sides in (10.27) and thus (10.26) are $o_e(1)$, the latter of which combined with (10.25) and (10.24) verifies (10.22). This completes the proof. \square

Let us now choose concrete values $\vartheta_0 = \frac{3(\beta \wedge 1)}{4}$ and $\vartheta_1 = 1 - \frac{\beta \wedge 1}{4}$ satisfying (10.11) and (10.21) thus making Lemmas 10.2 and 10.3 applicable.

Due to (7.4) and (10.20), we have

$$Y_{T_1}^2 = e^{-\mu T_1} y^2 + \varepsilon N_{T_1}^2 = R^{-\rho} \varepsilon^{\theta \rho} y^2 + \varepsilon N_{T_1}^2, \quad \mathbf{P}^y\text{-a.s.}$$

We define a family of sets $E_{\pm}^{\varepsilon}(s)$ for $s \in \mathbb{R}$ by

$$(10.28) \quad E_{\pm}^{\varepsilon}(s) = \left\{ r \in \mathbb{R} : R^{-\rho} \varepsilon^{\theta \rho} r + \varepsilon s \in \left[\varepsilon^{\beta} a \mp \frac{\varepsilon^{1+\eta}}{2}, \varepsilon^{\beta} b \pm \frac{\varepsilon^{1+\eta}}{2} \right] \right\},$$

which allows us to rewrite

$$(10.29) \quad \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ Y_{T_1}^2 \in \left[\varepsilon^{\beta} a \mp \frac{\varepsilon^{1+\eta}}{2}, \varepsilon^{\beta} b \pm \frac{\varepsilon^{1+\eta}}{2} \right] \right\} = \mathbf{P}^y \left\{ y^2 \in E_{\pm}^{\varepsilon}(N_{T_1}^2) \right\}.$$

We are suppressing the dependence of E_{\pm}^{ε} on $[a, b]$ in our notation.

Let us estimate the the error caused by replacing $N_{T_1}^2$ by a Gaussian r.v. in (10.29).

Lemma 10.4. *There are independent centered Gaussian r.v.'s \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{Z} with constant variances such that*

$$\sup_{\substack{y^1 = \varepsilon^\theta, |y^2| < \varepsilon^{\vartheta_0} \\ [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}}} \left| \mathbb{P}^y \{y^2 \in E_{\pm}^\varepsilon(N_{T_1}^2)\} - \mathbb{P} \{y^2 \in E_{\pm}^\varepsilon(\mathcal{N})\} \right| \leq \varepsilon^\delta \mathbb{P} \{y^2 \in E_{\pm}^\varepsilon(\mathcal{Z})\},$$

for some $\delta > 0$. In addition, \mathcal{N} has variance \mathbf{c}_2 given in (10.3).

PROOF: Recalling the definition of $T_1 = T_1(\varepsilon)$ in (10.20), we choose $\theta > 0$ sufficiently small so that $T_1 \leq \theta l_\varepsilon$ for all small ε , where θ is given in Lemma 11.1. This allows us to apply Lemma 11.1 (4) with $v < \theta$ to see that there are constants $\delta, \delta', c > 0$ such that, for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$(10.30) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sup_{\substack{y^1 = \varepsilon^\theta \\ |y^2| < \varepsilon^{\vartheta_0}}} \left| \varphi_{(U_{T_1}^1, N_{T_1}^2)}(z) - \varphi_{\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{T_1}}(z) \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{\substack{y^1 = \varepsilon^\theta \\ |y^2| < \varepsilon^{\vartheta_0}}} C (|y^2| + \varepsilon^\delta (1 + \varepsilon^{-v}|y^1|)) e^{-c|z|^2} \leq \varepsilon^{\delta'} e^{-c|z|^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_t$ is defined in (11.1). Note that $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_t$ does not depend on y once we impose the constraint $y^1 = \varepsilon^\theta$, so we will write $\varphi_{\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{T_1}}$ instead of $\varphi_{\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{T_1}}^y$.

Using $e^{\lambda T_1} \varepsilon^\theta = R$ (due to (10.20)) and a change of variables, we can get

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{T_1}^2 \right|^2 = \int_{-T_1(\varepsilon)}^0 e^{2\mu s} |F^2(Re^{\lambda s}, 0)|^2 ds.$$

Let \mathcal{N} be a centered Gaussian r.v. with variance \mathbf{c}_2 given in (10.3). It can be easily checked that, for some $\delta'', c'' > 0$,

$$\left| \varphi_{\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{T_1}^2}(s) - \varphi_{\mathcal{N}}(s) \right| \leq \varepsilon^{\delta''} e^{-c''|s|^2}, \quad s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Therefore, we conclude from this and (10.30) that, for some $\bar{\delta}, \bar{c} > 0$,

$$\sup_{\substack{y^1 = \varepsilon^\theta \\ |y^2| < \varepsilon^{\vartheta_0}}} \left| \varphi_{N_{T_1}^2}^y(s) - \varphi_{\mathcal{N}}(s) \right| \leq \varepsilon^{\bar{\delta}} e^{-\bar{c}|s|^2}, \quad s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

We emphasize that \mathcal{N} is independent of ε, y . Extending the probability space if necessary, we can assume that \mathcal{N} is independent of Y , and we can also take \mathcal{Z} to be an independent centered Gaussian r.v. with density proportional to $e^{-\bar{c}|z|^2}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, using the above display and integrating over the region $\{s \in \mathbb{R} : y^2 \in E_{\pm}^\varepsilon(s)\}$, we obtain the desired result. \square

Now let us combine the evolution before and after ζ . Recalling (10.12), we set

$$C^\varepsilon = \{Y_\zeta^1 = \varepsilon^\theta, |Y_\zeta^2| < \varepsilon^{\vartheta_0}\} = \{Y_\zeta^1 \geq 0, |Y_\zeta^2| < \varepsilon^{\vartheta_0}\}.$$

Hence, (10.12), Lemma 10.3, (10.29), and Lemma 10.4 imply

$$(10.31) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \{Y_\tau^2 \in \varepsilon^\beta [a, b]\} \\ & \asymp_{\pm} \mathbb{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \{Y_\zeta^2 \in E_{\pm}^\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}), C^\varepsilon\} \pm \varepsilon^\delta \mathbb{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \{Y_\zeta^2 \in E_{\pm}^\varepsilon(\mathcal{Z}), C^\varepsilon\} \pm o_\varepsilon(1). \end{aligned}$$

The next result removes the constraint $\{|Y_\zeta^2| < \varepsilon^{\vartheta_0}\}$.

Lemma 10.5. *The following holds uniformly in $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$ and $[a, b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)$:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \{Y_\tau \in \{R\} \times \varepsilon^\beta [a, b]\} &\asymp_{\pm} \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \{Y_\zeta^2 \in E_{\pm}^\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}), Y_\zeta^1 \geq 0\} \\ &\pm \varepsilon^\delta \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \{Y_\zeta^2 \in E_{\pm}^\varepsilon(\mathcal{Z}), Y_\zeta^1 \geq 0\} \pm o_e(1). \end{aligned}$$

PROOF: Using the definition of E_{\pm}^ε in (10.28) and Gaussian tail of \mathcal{N} , we have that, for sufficiently small $\delta' > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \{Y_\zeta^2 \in E_{\pm}^\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}), Y_\zeta^1 \geq 0, |Y_\zeta^2| \geq \varepsilon^{\vartheta_0}\} \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \left\{ R^{-\rho} \varepsilon^{\theta\rho} Y_\zeta^2 + \varepsilon \mathcal{N} \in \left[\varepsilon^\beta a \mp \frac{\varepsilon^{1+\eta}}{2}, \varepsilon^\beta b \pm \frac{\varepsilon^{1+\eta}}{2} \right], |Y_\zeta^2| \geq \varepsilon^{\vartheta_0} \right\} \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \left\{ \varepsilon^{\theta\rho + \vartheta_0} \leq C \varepsilon^{(\beta \wedge 1) - \delta'} \right\} + o_e(1) = o_e(1). \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is guaranteed by (10.11). Replacing \mathcal{N} in the above argument by \mathcal{Z} , we also have

$$\mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \{Y_\zeta^2 \in E_{\pm}^\varepsilon(\mathcal{Z}), Y_\zeta^1 \geq 0, |Y_\zeta^2| \geq \varepsilon^{\vartheta_0}\} = o_e(1).$$

These two displays above together with (10.31) yield the desired result. \square

Then, we proceed to approximating $\mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \{Y_\zeta^2 \in E_{\pm}^\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}), Y_\zeta^1 \geq 0\}$ and $\mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \{Y_\zeta^2 \in E_{\pm}^\varepsilon(\mathcal{Z}), Y_\zeta^1 \geq 0\}$. The treatment is similar for both of them because they are both independent centered Gaussian r.v.'s.

The displays (7.4) and (10.9) imply that

$$Y_\zeta^2 = e^{-\mu\zeta} L + \varepsilon N_\zeta^2 = L \varepsilon^{(\alpha-\theta)\rho} |x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} U_\zeta^1|^\rho + \varepsilon N_\zeta^2, \quad \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x}\text{-a.s.}$$

Using this and the definition of E_{\pm}^ε in (10.28), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} (10.32) \quad &\mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \{Y_\zeta^2 \in E_{\pm}^\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}), Y_\zeta^1 \geq 0\} \\ &= \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \left\{ R^{-\rho} \varepsilon^{\theta\rho} Y_\zeta^2 + \varepsilon \mathcal{N} \in \left[\varepsilon^\beta a \mp \frac{\varepsilon^{1+\eta}}{2}, \varepsilon^\beta b \pm \frac{\varepsilon^{1+\eta}}{2} \right], Y_\zeta^1 \geq 0 \right\} \\ &= \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \left\{ L R^{-\rho} \varepsilon^{\alpha\rho} |x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} U_\zeta^1|^\rho + R^{-\rho} \varepsilon^{1+\theta\rho} N_\zeta^2 + \varepsilon \mathcal{N} \in \left[\varepsilon^\beta a \mp \frac{\varepsilon^{1+\eta}}{2}, \varepsilon^\beta b \pm \frac{\varepsilon^{1+\eta}}{2} \right], Y_\zeta^1 \geq 0 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We can apply Lemma 7.5 to get that

$$\sup_{x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)} \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \left\{ |R^{-\rho} \varepsilon^{\theta\rho} N_\zeta^2| > \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^\eta \right\} = o_e(1),$$

for all $\eta > 0$ satisfying $\eta < \theta\rho$. This along with (10.32) yields that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \{Y_\zeta^2 \in E_{\pm}^\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}), Y_\zeta^1 \geq 0\} \\ &= \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \left\{ L R^{-\rho} \varepsilon^{\alpha\rho} |x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} U_\zeta^1|^\rho + \varepsilon \mathcal{N} \in \left[\varepsilon^\beta a \mp \varepsilon^{1+\eta}, \varepsilon^\beta b \pm \varepsilon^{1+\eta} \right], Y_\zeta^1 \geq 0 \right\} + o_e(1). \end{aligned}$$

Lastly, due to (7.3),

$$\{Y_\zeta^1 \geq 0\} \stackrel{\mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x}}{=} \{x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} U_\zeta^1 \geq 0\}.$$

Using these estimates and Lemma 10.5, we complete the proof of Lemma 10.1. \square

10.3. Typical exit locations.

Proposition 10.4. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, $\rho > 0$, $\alpha' = (\alpha\rho) \wedge 1$, $c = R^{-\rho}L$. Let τ be defined by (10.1). Let \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{N} be centered independent Gaussian r.v.'s with variance \mathbf{c}_1 and \mathbf{c}_2 given in (9.2) and (10.3), respectively. For $a, b, x \in \mathbb{R}$, set*

$$P_\varepsilon^{\alpha, \rho}(x, [a, b]) = \mathbb{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \left\{ Y_\tau \in \{R\} \times \varepsilon^{\alpha'} [a, b] \right\}.$$

For every $\varkappa, \varkappa' > 0$, the following hold for some $\delta > 0$:

(1) If $\rho < 1$, then

$$\sup_{\substack{x \in K_\varkappa(\varepsilon) \\ [a, b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)}} \left| P_\varepsilon^{\alpha, \rho}(x, [a, b]) - \mathbb{P} \left\{ c |x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{U}|^\rho \in [a, b], x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{U} \geq 0 \right\} \right| = o(\varepsilon^\delta).$$

(2) If $\rho = 1$, then

$$\sup_{\substack{x \in K_\varkappa(\varepsilon) \\ [a, b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)}} \left| P_\varepsilon^{\alpha, \rho}(x, [a, b]) - \mathbb{P} \left\{ c |x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{U}| + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{N} \in [a, b], x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{U} \geq 0 \right\} \right| = o(\varepsilon^\delta).$$

(3) If $\rho > 1$ and $\alpha\rho \leq 1$, then

$$\sup_{\substack{x \in K_\varkappa(\varepsilon) \\ [a, b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)}} \left| P_\varepsilon^{\alpha, \rho}(x, [a, b]) - \mathbb{P} \left\{ c |x|^\rho + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha\rho} \mathcal{N} \in [a, b] \right\} \mathbb{P} \left\{ x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{U} \geq 0 \right\} \right| = o(\varepsilon^\delta).$$

(4) If $\rho > 1$ and $\alpha\rho > 1$, then

$$\sup_{\substack{x \in K_\varkappa(\varepsilon) \\ [a, b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)}} \left| P_\varepsilon^{\alpha, \rho}(x, [a, b]) - \mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathcal{N} \in [a, b] \right\} \mathbb{P} \left\{ x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{U} \geq 0 \right\} \right| = o(\varepsilon^\delta).$$

Remark 10.2. Sometimes, it is useful to replace $|x|^\rho$ in part (3) by $|x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{U}|^\rho$. We claim that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{P} \left\{ c |x|^\rho + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha\rho} \mathcal{N} \in [a, b], x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{U} \geq 0 \right\} \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \mathbb{P} \left\{ c |x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{U}|^\rho + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha\rho} \mathcal{N} \in [a, b], x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{U} \geq 0 \right\} \right| = o(\varepsilon^{\delta'}) \end{aligned}$$

for some $\delta' > 0$, uniformly in $x \in K_\varkappa(\varepsilon)$ and $[a, b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)$. To see this, we first restrict \mathcal{U} to $[-l_\varepsilon, l_\varepsilon]$, introducing a probability error of at most $o_\varepsilon(1)$. Then, we rewrite thus modified probabilities above as Gaussian integrals, first integrating over \mathcal{N} and then over \mathcal{U} . For a given \mathcal{U} , the Lebesgue measure of the symmetric difference of the domains of integration for \mathcal{N} is bounded by $l_\varepsilon^{p'} \varepsilon^{(1-\alpha)-(1-\alpha\rho)} = l_\varepsilon^{p'} \varepsilon^{\alpha(\rho-1)} = o(\varepsilon^{\delta'})$ for some $p', \delta' > 0$, uniformly in $x \in K_\varkappa(\varepsilon)$ and $[a, b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)$. The domains of integration for \mathcal{U} are always the same. Hence, the above display holds, implying the following version of the estimate in (3):

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\substack{x \in K_\varkappa(\varepsilon) \\ [a, b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)}} \left| P_\varepsilon^{\alpha, \rho}(x, [a, b]) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \mathbb{P} \left\{ c |x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{U}|^\rho + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha\rho} \mathcal{N} \in [a, b], x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{U} \geq 0 \right\} \right| = o(\varepsilon^\delta). \end{aligned}$$

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 10.4: In this proof, all statements are understood to hold uniformly in $x \in K_\varkappa(\varepsilon)$ and $[a, b] \subset K_{\varkappa'}(\varepsilon)$. We also shorten ‘‘w.h.p.

under $\mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x}$ uniformly in $x \in K_{\neq}(\varepsilon)$ into “w.h.p.” For brevity, we often write $P = P_\varepsilon^{\alpha, \rho}(x, [a, b])$. For $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we define

$$B_{a,b} = c^{-\frac{1}{\rho}} \left[(a \vee 0)^{\frac{1}{\rho}}, (b \vee 0)^{\frac{1}{\rho}} \right].$$

Note that $x \in B_{a,b}$ is equivalent to $x \geq 0$ and $cx^\rho \in [a, b]$. For $a, b, h \in \mathbb{R}$, we introduce an h -perturbation of $B_{a,b}$ by:

$$A_{a,b}^{\pm h} = c^{-\frac{1}{\rho}} \left[(a \vee 0)^{\frac{1}{\rho}} \mp h, (b \vee 0)^{\frac{1}{\rho}} \pm h \right],$$

Recall ζ given in (10.5) is controlled by the parameter $\theta \in (0, \alpha)$. Later, we will choose θ to be sufficiently small.

Part (1). Note that in this case, we automatically have $\alpha' = \alpha\rho < 1$. Lemma 7.10 implies that

$$(10.33) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \{Y_\tau \in \{R\} \times \varepsilon^{\alpha\rho}[a, b]\} \\ &= \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \left\{ c|x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}U_\tau^1|^\rho + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha\rho}N_\tau^2 \in [a, b], x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}U_\tau^1 \geq 0 \right\} + o_e(1). \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 7.5 (with $\theta = 0$ therein), we can choose $\delta' > 0$ as small as needed so that $|N_\tau^2| < \varepsilon^{-\delta'}$ w.h.p. Hence, due to (10.33),

$$P \asymp_\pm \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \left\{ x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}U_\tau^1 \in B_{a \mp \varepsilon^v, b \pm \varepsilon^v} \right\} + o_e(1),$$

where $v = 1 - \alpha\rho - \delta'$. Here, let us use (10.8) to redefine τ thus introducing a probability error of order $o_e(1)$. This allows us to apply Lemma 9.1 to τ . Using the above display and Lemma 9.1 with $R, 0, 0$ substituted for r, θ, ξ therein, we have that, for all $\eta \in (0, 1)$,

$$P \asymp_\pm \mathbf{P} \left\{ x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}U \in A_{a \mp \varepsilon^v, b \pm \varepsilon^v}^{\pm \varepsilon^\eta} \right\} + o(\varepsilon^\delta).$$

Note that $\text{Leb}(A_{a \mp \varepsilon^v, b \pm \varepsilon^v}^{\pm \varepsilon^\eta} \Delta B_{a,b}) \leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{v}{\rho} \wedge \eta}$. Due to $\rho < 1$, by choosing δ' sufficiently small and η sufficiently close to 1, we can ensure $\frac{v}{\rho} \wedge \eta > 1 - \alpha$. Using Lemma 7.11, we obtain

$$\mathbf{P} \left\{ x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}U \in A_{a \mp \varepsilon^v, b \pm \varepsilon^v}^{\pm \varepsilon^\eta} \right\} = \mathbf{P} \left\{ x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}U \in B_{a,b} \right\} + o(\varepsilon^{\delta''})$$

for some $\delta'' > 0$ completing the proof.

Part (2). Applying Lemma 10.1 with $\beta = \alpha\rho$, we obtain

$$P \asymp_\pm \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \left\{ x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}U_\zeta^1 \in B_{a - \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}(\mathcal{N}_{\pm \varepsilon^\eta}), b - \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}(\mathcal{N}_{\mp \varepsilon^\eta})} \right\} + o(\varepsilon^\delta)$$

for some $\eta, \delta > 0$. Then, applying Lemma 9.1 with $1, 0$ substituted for r, ξ therein, we obtain

$$P \asymp_\pm \mathbf{P}^{\varepsilon^\alpha x} \left\{ x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}U \in A_\varepsilon^\pm \right\} + o(\varepsilon^{\delta'}),$$

where

$$A_\varepsilon^\pm = A_{a - \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}(\mathcal{N}_{\pm \varepsilon^\eta}), b - \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}(\mathcal{N}_{\mp \varepsilon^\eta})}^{\pm \varepsilon^v}$$

for $v \in (0, 1 - \theta)$ to be chosen and some $\delta' > 0$. Due to $\rho = 1$, we have $\text{Leb}(A_\varepsilon^\pm \Delta B_{a - \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{N}, b - \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{N}}) \leq C\varepsilon^{v \wedge (1-\alpha+\eta)}$. Choosing θ close to zero, we can ensure that v is close to 1 to ensure that the exponent satisfies $v \wedge (1 - \alpha + \eta) > 1 - \alpha$. Using Lemma 7.11 to estimate the difference between two Gaussian integrals, we obtain the the desired result.

Part (3). Note that $\alpha < 1$ is necessary for this case. Using Lemma 10.1 with $\beta = \alpha\rho$, we get that

$$P \asymp_{\pm} \mathbb{P}^{\varepsilon^{\alpha}x} \left\{ x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} U_{\zeta}^1 \in B_{a-\varepsilon^{1-\alpha\rho}(\mathcal{N} \pm \varepsilon^{\eta}), b-\varepsilon^{1-\alpha\rho}(\mathcal{N} \mp \varepsilon^{\eta})} \right\} + o(\varepsilon^{\delta})$$

for some $\eta, \delta > 0$. Due to Lemma 7.2 (3), we have $|U_{\zeta}^1| < \varepsilon^{-\delta'}$ w.h.p. for $\delta' > 0$ as small as needed. Using this and the independence of \mathcal{N} , we have

$$(10.34) \quad P \asymp_{\pm} \mathbb{P} \left\{ c|x|^{\rho} + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha\rho} \mathcal{N} \in [a_{\pm, \varepsilon}, b_{\pm, \varepsilon}] \right\} \mathbb{P}^{\varepsilon^{\alpha}x} \left\{ x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} U_{\zeta}^1 \geq 0 \right\} + o(\varepsilon^{\delta}),$$

where

$$a_{\pm, \varepsilon} = a \mp \varepsilon^{1-\alpha\rho+\eta} - c((x \pm \varepsilon^{1-\alpha-\delta'}) \vee 0)^{\rho} + c|x|^{\rho},$$

$$b_{\pm, \varepsilon} = b \pm \varepsilon^{1-\alpha\rho+\eta} - c((x \mp \varepsilon^{1-\alpha-\delta'}) \vee 0)^{\rho} + c|x|^{\rho}.$$

If $x \geq -\varepsilon^{1-\alpha-\delta'}$, then, due to $x \in K_{\varkappa}(\varepsilon)$ and $\rho > 1$, the Lebesgue measure of $[a, b] \Delta [a_{\pm, \varepsilon}, b_{\pm, \varepsilon}]$ is bounded by $C\varepsilon^{(1-\alpha\rho+\eta) \wedge (1-\alpha-\delta')}$, where $\delta'' > \delta'$ still can be made as small as needed. Due to $\rho > 1$, the exponent is strictly larger than $1 - \alpha\rho$ for sufficiently small δ'' . Applying Lemma 7.11, we obtain that the first factor on the right of (10.34) is

$$\left(\mathbb{P} \{ c|x|^{\rho} + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha\rho} \mathcal{N} \in [a, b] \} \pm o(\varepsilon^{\delta''}) \right) \mathbf{1}_{[-\varepsilon^{1-\alpha-\delta'}, \infty)}(x) + \mathcal{O}(1) \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, -\varepsilon^{1-\alpha-\delta'})}(x)$$

for some $\delta''' > 0$.

For the second factor on the right of (10.34), choosing \varkappa'' sufficiently large and using Lemma 7.2 (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^{\varepsilon^{\alpha}x} \left\{ x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} U_{\zeta}^1 \geq 0 \right\} &= \mathbb{P}^{\varepsilon^{\alpha}x} \left\{ x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} U_{\zeta}^1 \in [0, l_{\varepsilon}^{\varkappa''}] \right\} + \mathbb{P}^{\varepsilon^{\alpha}x} \left\{ \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} U_{\zeta}^1 > l_{\varepsilon}^{\varkappa''} - x \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{P}^{\varepsilon^{\alpha}x} \left\{ x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} U_{\zeta}^1 \in [0, l_{\varepsilon}^{\varkappa''}] \right\} + o_e(1). \end{aligned}$$

Invoking Lemma 9.1 with 1, 0 substituted for r, ξ therein, we get that, for arbitrary $v \in (0, 1 - \theta)$ to be chosen and some $\bar{\delta}, \hat{\delta} > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^{\varepsilon^{\alpha}x} \left\{ x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} U_{\zeta}^1 \geq 0 \right\} &= \mathbb{P} \left\{ x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{U} \in [0 \mp \varepsilon^v, l_{\varepsilon}^{\varkappa''} \pm \varepsilon^v] \right\} + o(\varepsilon^{\bar{\delta}}) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left\{ x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{U} \geq 0 \right\} + o(\varepsilon^{\hat{\delta}}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows, once we choose v close enough to $1 - \theta$ to ensure $v > 1 - \alpha$, from Lemma 7.11, and the Gaussian tail of \mathcal{U} . We also have

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{U} \geq 0 \right\} \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, -\varepsilon^{1-\alpha-\delta'})}(x) = o_e(1),$$

taking into account the Gaussian tail of \mathcal{U} . Combining the results on both factors in (10.34) completes the proof of part (3).

Part (4). Applying Lemma 10.1 with $\beta = 1$, we obtain that, for some $\delta > 0$,

$$P \asymp_{\pm} \mathbb{P}^{\varepsilon^{\alpha}x} \left\{ c\varepsilon^{\alpha\rho-1} (x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} U_{\zeta}^1)^{\rho} + \mathcal{N} \in [a \mp \varepsilon^{\eta}, b \pm \varepsilon^{\eta}], x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} U_{\zeta}^1 \geq 0 \right\} + o(\varepsilon^{\delta}).$$

Due to Lemma 7.2 (3), we have $|x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} U_{\zeta}^1| \leq l_{\varepsilon}^{\varkappa''}$ w.h.p. for some sufficiently large $\varkappa'' > 0$. This along with $\alpha\rho > 1$ and the independence of \mathcal{N} implies that, for some $\eta' > 0$,

$$P \asymp_{\pm} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathcal{N} \in [a \mp \varepsilon^{\eta'}, b \pm \varepsilon^{\eta'}] \right\} \mathbb{P}^{\varepsilon^{\alpha}x} \left\{ x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha} U_{\zeta}^1 \geq 0 \right\} + o(\varepsilon^{\delta}).$$

Due to Lemma 7.11, the first factor on the right differs from $\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{N} \in [a, b]\}$ by an error term $o(\varepsilon^{\delta'})$ for some δ' . The second one can be shown, with an argument

similar to the proof of part (3), to be $\mathbf{P}\{x + \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\mathcal{U} \geq 0\}$ up to an $o(\varepsilon^{\delta''})$ error for some $\delta'' > 0$. Combining these estimates, we obtain the desired result. \square

11. DENSITY ESTIMATES

In this section, we prove Lemma 11.1, which has been used in Sections 9 and 10. We first introduce the setting for this lemma.

Consider the process Y_t in \mathbb{R}^2 given in (7.1). Recall the associated processes U_t and N_t defined in (7.2). For $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $t \geq 0$, we define \mathbb{R}^2 -valued Gaussian vectors Z and \bar{Z} by

$$(11.1) \quad \begin{aligned} Z_t^1 &= \int_0^t e^{-\lambda s} F_l^1(0, e^{-\mu s} y^2) dW_s^l, \\ Z_t^2 &= e^{-\mu t} \int_0^t e^{\mu s} F_l^2(e^{\lambda s} y^1, e^{-\mu s} y^2) dW_s^l, \\ \bar{Z}_t^1 &= \int_0^t e^{-\lambda s} F_l^1(0, 0) dW_s^l, \\ \bar{Z}_t^2 &= e^{-\mu t} \int_0^t e^{\mu s} F_l^2(e^{\lambda s} y^1, 0) dW_s^l, \end{aligned}$$

where we suppressed the dependence on y in the notation.

Recall that, for $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$, the probability measure under which $Y_0 = y$ a.s. is denoted by \mathbf{P}^y . For a random vector \mathcal{X} , we denote its probability density function (with respect to the Lebesgue measure) under \mathbf{P}^y by $\varphi_{\mathcal{X}}^y$. Since \bar{Z}_t^1 is independent of y , we write its density simply as $\varphi_{\bar{Z}_t^1}$.

Lemma 11.1. *There is $\bar{\theta} > 0$ such that for each $v \in (0, 1)$, there are constants $C, c, \delta > 0$ such that, for ε sufficiently small and all $y \in \mathbb{R}^2$,*

$$(1) \quad \left| \varphi_{U_{T(\varepsilon)}^y}^y(s) - \varphi_{Z_{T(\varepsilon)}^1}^y(s) \right| \leq C\varepsilon^\delta (1 + \varepsilon^{-v}|y^1|) e^{-c|s|^2} \text{ for all } s \in \mathbb{R};$$

$$(2) \quad \left| \varphi_{U_{T(\varepsilon)}^y}^y(s) - \varphi_{\bar{Z}_{T(\varepsilon)}^1}^y(s) \right| \leq C(|y^2| + \varepsilon^\delta (1 + \varepsilon^{-v}|y^1|)) e^{-c|s|^2} \text{ for all } s \in \mathbb{R};$$

$$(3) \quad \left| \varphi_{(U^1, N^2)_{T(\varepsilon)}}^y(z) - \varphi_{Z_{T(\varepsilon)}}^y(z) \right| \leq C\varepsilon^\delta (1 + \varepsilon^{-v}|y^1|) e^{-c|z|^2} \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{R}^2;$$

$$(4) \quad \left| \varphi_{(U^1, N^2)_{T(\varepsilon)}}^y(z) - \varphi_{\bar{Z}_{T(\varepsilon)}}^y(z) \right| \leq C(|y^2| + \varepsilon^\delta (1 + \varepsilon^{-v}|y^1|)) e^{-c|z|^2} \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{R}^2$$

hold for all deterministic functions $T(\cdot)$ satisfying $1 \leq T(\varepsilon) \leq \bar{\theta}l_\varepsilon$.

This lemma is a special case of a more general result, Lemma 11.2, in higher dimensions. Our goal is to prove Lemma 11.2. We start by describing the general setting. We will deduce Lemma 11.1 from Lemma 11.2 in the next subsection.

11.1. General setting and main result. Let ν, d be positive integers satisfying $\nu < d$, and let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfy

$$(11.2) \quad \lambda^1 > \lambda^2 > \dots > \lambda^\nu > 0 > \lambda^{\nu+1} > \dots > \lambda^d,$$

so the origin is a saddle point of the vector field $x \mapsto (\lambda^i x^i)_{1 \leq i \leq d}$. The coordinates $1, \dots, \nu$ correspond to the unstable directions near the origin, and the remaining coordinates $\nu + 1, \dots, d$ correspond to the stable directions.

We consider the following SDE

$$(11.3) \quad dY_t^i = \lambda^i Y_t^i dt + \varepsilon F_j^i(Y_t) dW_t^j + \varepsilon^2 G^i(Y_t) dt, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, d,$$

assuming that

$$(11.4) \quad c_0 := \min_{|u|=1, u \in \mathbb{R}^d} |u^\top F(x)|^2 > 0, \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d;$$

F, G and their derivatives up to the third order are bounded.

We consider the initial conditions, for $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$(11.5) \quad Y_0 = y.$$

By Duhamel's principle, we can solve (11.3) with (11.5) by

$$(11.6) \quad Y_t^j = e^{\lambda^j t} (y^j + \varepsilon U_t^j) = e^{\lambda^j t} y^j + \varepsilon N_t^j,$$

where

$$(11.7) \quad U_t^j = M_t^j + \varepsilon V_t^j, \quad N_t^j = e^{\lambda^j t} U_t^j,$$

and

$$(11.8) \quad M_t^j = \int_0^t e^{-\lambda^j s} F_l^j(Y_s) dW_s^l,$$

$$(11.9) \quad V_t^j = \int_0^t e^{-\lambda^j s} G^j(Y_s) ds.$$

We emphasize that $U_t, N_t, M_t,$ and V_t depend on y and ε .

For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d, t \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote

$$\begin{aligned} x^{\leq \nu} &= (x^1, x^2, \dots, x^\nu) \in \mathbb{R}^\nu, \\ x^{> \nu} &= (x^{\nu+1}, x^{\nu+2}, \dots, x^d) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-\nu}, \\ e^{\lambda t} x &= (e^{\lambda^j t} x^j)_{j=1}^d. \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$(11.10) \quad Z_t^i = \begin{cases} \int_0^t e^{-\lambda^i s} F_l^i(0^{\leq \nu}, (e^{\lambda s} y)^{> \nu}) dW_s^l, & \text{for } i \leq \nu, \\ e^{\lambda^i t} \int_0^t e^{-\lambda^i s} F_l^i(e^{\lambda s} y) dW_s^l, & \text{for } i > \nu, \end{cases}$$

$$\bar{Z}_t^i = \begin{cases} \int_0^t e^{-\lambda^i s} F_l^i(0) dW_s^l, & \text{for } i \leq \nu, \\ e^{\lambda^i t} \int_0^t e^{-\lambda^i s} F_l^i((e^{\lambda s} y)^{\leq \nu}, 0^{> \nu}) dW_s^l, & \text{for } i > \nu. \end{cases}$$

For a r.v. \mathcal{X} with values in a Euclidean space, its Lebesgue density, if exists, is denoted by $\varphi_{\mathcal{X}}$. Since U_t, N_t, Z_t and \bar{Z}_t depend on y , we add a superscript y to the density notation to emphasize this dependence. For example, we write the density of U_t as $\varphi_{U_t^y}$. Since $\bar{Z}_t^{\leq \nu}$ is independent of y , we denote the density of $\bar{Z}_t^{\leq \nu}$ by $\varphi_{\bar{Z}_t^{\leq \nu}}$.

Lemma 11.2. *Consider (11.6) with initial condition (11.5). Let*

$$(11.11) \quad \mathbf{p}(x) = \sum_{j,k=1}^{\nu} x \frac{\lambda^j}{\lambda^k}, \quad \text{for } x \geq 0.$$

Then there is $\bar{\theta} > 0$ such that for each $v \in (0, 1)$, there are constants $C, c, \delta > 0$ such that, for ε sufficiently small and for all deterministic functions $T(\cdot)$ satisfying

$$(11.12) \quad 1 \leq T(\varepsilon) \leq \bar{\theta} l_\varepsilon,$$

the following hold:

- (1) $\left| \varphi_{U_{T(\varepsilon)}^{\leq \nu}}^y(x) - \varphi_{Z_{T(\varepsilon)}^{\leq \nu}}^y(x) \right| \leq C\varepsilon^\delta (1 + \mathbf{p}(\varepsilon^{-v}|y^{\leq \nu}|)) e^{-c|x|^2}$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$;
- (2) $\left| \varphi_{U_{T(\varepsilon)}^{\leq \nu}}^y(x) - \varphi_{Z_{T(\varepsilon)}^{\leq \nu}}^y(x) \right| \leq C(|y^{> \nu}| + \varepsilon^\delta (1 + \mathbf{p}(\varepsilon^{-v}|y^{\leq \nu}|))) e^{-c|x|^2}$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$;
- (3) $\left| \varphi_{(U^{\leq \nu}, N^{> \nu})_{T(\varepsilon)}}^y(x) - \varphi_{Z_{T(\varepsilon)}}^y(x) \right| \leq C\varepsilon^\delta (1 + \mathbf{p}(\varepsilon^{-v}|y^{\leq \nu}|)) e^{-c|x|^2}$, for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$;
- (4) $\left| \varphi_{(U^{\leq \nu}, N^{> \nu})_{T(\varepsilon)}}^y(x) - \varphi_{Z_{T(\varepsilon)}}^y(x) \right| \leq C(|y^{> \nu}| + \varepsilon^\delta (1 + \mathbf{p}(\varepsilon^{-v}|y^{\leq \nu}|))) e^{-c|x|^2}$, for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

11.2. Preliminaries. Let us introduce the necessary notation from the Malliavin calculus.

For any $\mathcal{T} \in (0, \infty)$, we let $\Omega_{\mathcal{T}}$ be the standard Wiener space for \mathbb{R}^d -valued Wiener processes on $[0, \mathcal{T}]$. We also set

$$(11.13) \quad \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{T}} = L^2([0, \mathcal{T}]; \mathbb{R}^d)$$

with the inner product denoted by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{T}}}$. Note that $\{W(h)\}_{h \in \mathcal{H}}$ given by

$$W(h) = \int_0^{\mathcal{T}} \sum_{i=1}^d h^i(s) dW_s^i, \quad h \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{T}},$$

is an isonormal Gaussian process (real-valued) indexed by $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{T}}$ (meaning that W is a centered Gaussian process satisfying $\mathbf{E}W(h)W(h') = \langle h, h' \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{T}}}$ for all $h, h' \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{T}}$). For $p \in [1, \infty)$, let $L^p(\Omega_{\mathcal{T}}; \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{T}})$ be the set of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{T}}$ -valued random variables with finite norm $(\mathbf{E}\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{T}}}^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}$. Then, the Malliavin derivative operator is an unbounded operator $\mathcal{D} : L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L^p([0, \mathcal{T}]; \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{T}})$ defined initially for “smooth” random variables of the form

$$\mathcal{X} = f(W(h_1), \dots, W(h_m))$$

by

$$\mathcal{D}\mathcal{X} = \sum_{i=1}^m \partial_i f(W(h_1), \dots, W(h_m)) h_i,$$

where $f : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth and compactly supported for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. It is extended to a closed operator under the graph norm

$$\|\mathcal{X}\|_{1,p,\mathcal{T}} = (\mathbf{E}|\mathcal{X}|^p + \mathbf{E}\|\mathcal{D}\mathcal{X}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{T}}}^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

We denote the domain of \mathcal{D} by $\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{T}}^{1,p}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, this construction can be extended to $\mathcal{D} : L^p(\Omega; \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\otimes n}) \rightarrow L^p(\Omega; \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\otimes n+1})$ with norm

$$\|\mathcal{X}\|_{1,p,\mathcal{T}} = \left(\mathbf{E}\|\mathcal{X}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\otimes n}}^p + \mathbf{E}\|\mathcal{D}\mathcal{X}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\otimes n+1}}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Here, we omitted n , the degree of the tensor product, in the notation for simplicity. In the same fashion, we denote the associated domain still by $\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{T}}^{1,p}$. The degree of the tensor product will be clear from the context. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the k -th order derivative operator $\mathcal{D}^{(k)}$ can be defined inductively. Its domain is denoted by $\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{T}}^{k,p}$ and the associated graph norm by $\|\cdot\|_{k,p,\mathcal{T}}$. In particular, it sends an $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\otimes n}$ -valued random variable \mathcal{X} in $\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{T}}^{k,p}$ to an $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\otimes n+k}$ -valued random variable $\mathcal{D}^{(k)}\mathcal{X}$, for $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ with the understanding that $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\otimes 0} = \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, we have

$$\|\mathcal{X}\|_{k,p,\mathcal{T}} = \left(\mathbb{E} \|\mathcal{X}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\otimes n}}^p + \sum_{i=1}^k \|\mathcal{D}^i \mathcal{X}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\otimes n+i}}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

It is clear that $\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{T}}^{k,p} \subset \mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{T}}^{k',p'}$ for $p' \geq p$ and $k' \geq k$. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we set $\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{T}}^{k,\infty} = \bigcap_{p \in [0,\infty)} \mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{T}}^{k,p}$.

We refer to [Nua95, Chapter 1] for more details on the basics of Malliavin calculus. Later, we will also need results from [Nua95, Chapter 2] on the application of the Malliavin calculus to solutions of SDE.

For an \mathbb{R}^m -valued random vector \mathcal{X} satisfying $\mathcal{X}^i \in \mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{T}}^{1,1}$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$, the associated *Malliavin matrix* of \mathcal{X} is an $m \times m$ random matrix given by

$$(11.14) \quad \sigma_{\mathcal{X}} = \left(\langle \mathcal{D}\mathcal{X}^i, \mathcal{D}\mathcal{X}^j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{T}}} \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq m}.$$

If the components of \mathcal{X} are in $\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{T}}^{k,p}$, we write $\|\mathcal{X}\|_{k,p,\mathcal{T}} = \sum_{i=1}^m \|\mathcal{X}^i\|_{k,p,\mathcal{T}}$.

Let us recall [BC14, Theorem 2.14.B] (see also [BCC16, Theorem 2.4.6]) which estimates the difference between derivatives of two densities in terms of Sobolev norms and the Malliavin matrix. For our purposes, in our statement of this result, Theorem 11.1 below, we simplify the conditions of the original theorem by setting the localization random variable Θ to be 1, the derivative order $q = 0$ (i.e., we compare densities themselves, without derivatives) and using Meyer's inequality (c.f. [Nua95, Theorem 1.5.1]) to bound the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck operator. We stress that, although the conditions of Theorem 2.14.B as it is stated in [BC14] do not formally allow for $q = 0$, that theorem is still valid for this value of q . In fact, in [BC14], Theorem 2.14 is derived from Theorem 2.1 via an approximation argument. In turn, part B of Theorem 2.1 is restated and proved in the form of Theorem 3.10, where q is allowed to be 0.

Theorem 11.1 ([BC14]). *For $i = 1, 2$, let \mathcal{X}_i be an \mathbb{R}^d -valued random vector with components in $\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{T}}^{3,\infty}$ satisfying $\mathbb{E}(\det \sigma_{\mathcal{X}_i})^{-p} < \infty$ for every $p > 1$. Then, there exist positive constants C, a, b, γ only depending on d such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$*

$$|\varphi_{\mathcal{X}_1}(x) - \varphi_{\mathcal{X}_2}(x)| \leq C \|\mathcal{X}_1 - \mathcal{X}_2\|_{2,\gamma,\mathcal{T}} \left(\prod_{i=1,2} (1 \vee \mathbb{E}(\det \sigma_{\mathcal{X}_i})^{-\gamma}) (1 + \|\mathcal{X}_i\|_{3,\gamma,\mathcal{T}}) \right)^a \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1,2} \mathbb{P}\{|\mathcal{X}_i - x| < 2\} \right)^b.$$

We will use this theorem to derive Lemma 11.2. Thus our goal is to estimate all the factors on the right-hand side of this bound for the choices of \mathcal{X}_1 and \mathcal{X}_2 relevant

for Lemma 11.2. In particular, we will need to estimate moments of Malliavin derivatives and negative moments the Malliavin covariance matrix.

The fact that C, a, p do not depend on \mathcal{T} is important because we will apply this estimate to times \mathcal{T} given by a function of ε growing to ∞ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Let us fix

$$(11.15) \quad \bar{\theta} = \frac{1}{8 \max\{\lambda^1, |\lambda^d|, 1\}}.$$

Hence, if $T = T(\varepsilon)$ satisfies (11.12) for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, then

$$(11.16) \quad e^{|\lambda^j|T} \leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{8}} \text{ and } T \leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{8}}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, d, \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1).$$

Let us arbitrarily fix $T = T(\varepsilon)$ satisfying (11.12) and thus (11.16).

For a random variable ξ , we define

$$[\xi]_p = (\mathbf{E}|\xi|^p)^{\frac{2}{p}}.$$

Let us derive a few basic inequalities.

Lemma 11.3. *Let $p \geq 2$.*

- *There is a positive constant C depending only on p, d such that, for any $t_2 > t_1 \geq 0$ and any adapted \mathbb{R}^d -valued process $(\mathcal{X}_s)_{s \geq 0} = ((\mathcal{X}_{l,s})_{1 \leq l \leq d})_{s \geq 0}$,*

$$(11.17) \quad \left[\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \mathcal{X}_{l,s} dW_s^l \right]_p \leq C \int_{t_1}^{t_2} [\mathcal{X}_s]_p ds.$$

- *For any $t_2 > t_1 \geq 0$, any measurable process $(\mathcal{X}_s)_{s \geq 0}$,*

$$(11.18) \quad \left[\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \mathcal{X}_s ds \right]_p \leq |t_2 - t_1| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} [\mathcal{X}_s]_p ds.$$

- *For any $\mathcal{T} > 0$, any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and any measurable process $(\mathcal{X}_s)_{s \in [0, \mathcal{T}]^n}$,*

$$(11.19) \quad \left[\|\mathcal{X}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\otimes n}} \right]_p \leq \int_{[0, \mathcal{T}]^n} [\mathcal{X}_{s^1, s^2, \dots, s^n}]_p ds^1 ds^2 \dots ds^n,$$

where $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{T}}$ is given in (11.13).

PROOF: For the reader's convenience we recall the Minkowski integral inequality: for any $q \in [1, \infty)$, $n \geq 1$, and $[t_1, t_2] \subset \mathbb{R}$,

$$\left(\mathbf{E} \left| \int_{[t_1, t_2]^n} \mathcal{X}_{s^1, s^2, \dots, s^n} ds^1 ds^2 \dots ds^n \right|^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq \int_{[t_1, t_2]^n} (\mathbf{E} |\mathcal{X}_{s^1, s^2, \dots, s^n}|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}} ds^1 ds^2 \dots ds^n.$$

Using the BDG inequality, and the Minkowski integral inequality (with $q = p/2$) together with $p \geq 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \mathcal{X}_{l,s} dW_s^l \right]_p &= \left(\mathbf{E} \left| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \mathcal{X}_{l,s} dW_s^l \right|^p \right)^{\frac{2}{p}} \leq C \left(\mathbf{E} \left| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} |\mathcal{X}_s|^2 ds \right|^{\frac{p}{2}} \right)^{\frac{2}{p}} \\ &\leq C \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (\mathbf{E} |\mathcal{X}_s|^p)^{\frac{2}{p}} ds = C \int_{t_1}^{t_2} [\mathcal{X}_s]_p ds, \end{aligned}$$

where C only depends on p and d due to the BDG inequality. This is (11.17). Using the Minkowski integral inequality and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\left[\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \mathcal{X}_s ds \right]_p = \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \mathcal{X}_s ds \right|^p \right)^{\frac{2}{p}} \leq \left(\int_{t_1}^{t_2} (\mathbb{E} |\mathcal{X}_s|^p)^{\frac{1}{p}} ds \right)^2 \leq |t_2 - t_1| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} [\mathcal{X}_s]_p ds$$

yielding (11.18). Lastly, (11.19) follows from

$$\|\mathcal{X}\|_{\mathcal{H}_T^{\otimes n}}^2 = \int_{[0, T]^n} |\mathcal{X}_{s^1, s^2, \dots, s^n}|^2 ds^1 ds^2 \dots ds^n$$

and the Minkowski integral inequality. \square

We set, for small ε and T given in (11.12),

$$(11.20) \quad \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(\varepsilon) = \mathcal{H}_{T(\varepsilon)},$$

and will apply (11.19) to processes indexed by $[0, T(\varepsilon)]^n$. We emphasize that \mathcal{H} depends on ε .

Henceforth, we fix an arbitrary $\nu \in (0, 1)$ (as in the statement of Lemma 11.2). Most of the estimates below are obtained for all $p \geq 2$. We need this restriction in order to apply Lemma 11.3 in intermediate steps. However, it is easy to extend our results to $p \in [1, 2)$ using Jensen’s inequality.

For $A, B \in \mathbb{R}$, we write $A \lesssim B$ if and only if there is a constant $C > 0$, only depending on $p, \lambda, F, G, \bar{\theta}, \nu$, such that the inequality $A \leq CB$ holds. Here, d is the dimension of the Euclidean space fixed at the beginning of this subsection; λ, F, G determined the SDE given in (11.3); and $\bar{\theta}$ has been fixed in (11.15). Note that, in particular, the constant C is independent of ε, y . Occasionally, we stress the dependence of the constant on p by writing \lesssim_p .

11.3. Derivative estimates. In this subsection, we assume $p \geq 2$ if not otherwise specified.

We need bounds on all the factors on the right-hand side of the estimate provided by Theorem 11.1. The Malliavin matrix will be estimated in the next subsection. The main goal of this subsection is to estimate $\|\mathcal{X}_1 - \mathcal{X}_2\|_{2, \gamma, \mathcal{T}}$ and $\|\mathcal{X}_i\|_{3, \gamma, \mathcal{T}}$. Thus we need to estimate Malliavin derivatives of \mathcal{X}_i and $\mathcal{X}_1 - \mathcal{X}_2$, where \mathcal{X}_1 is $(U_{T(\varepsilon)}^{\leq \nu}, N_{T(\varepsilon)}^{\geq \nu})$ and \mathcal{X}_2 is one of the Gaussian approximations defined via (11.10).

To compute the Malliavin derivatives of those processes viewed as solutions of SDEs, we will use [Nua95, Theorems 2.2.1 and 2.2.2], so let us recall the notation from [Nua95, Section 2.2]. For a real-valued measurable process $(\mathcal{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$, its \mathcal{H} -valued derivative $\mathcal{D}\mathcal{X}_t$ at any fixed $t \in [0, T]$, if it exists, can be written in (real-valued) coordinates as

$$\mathcal{D}\mathcal{X}_t = (\mathcal{D}_r^j \mathcal{X}_t)_{j \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}, r \in [0, T]}.$$

Similar notation applies to higher order Malliavin derivatives. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes k}$ -valued derivative $\mathcal{D}^{(k)}\mathcal{X}_t$, if it exists, can be written in coordinates as (see, e.g., the proof of [Nua95, Theorem 2.2.2])

$$\mathcal{D}^{(k)}\mathcal{X}_t = (\mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_k}^{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k} \mathcal{X}_t)_{\substack{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\} \\ r_1, r_2, \dots, r_k \in [0, T]}}.$$

We need estimates of all these components of the Malliavin derivatives up to order 3.

We will need to make approximations to $F(Y_s)$, and it is convenient to introduce notation for the resulting errors. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we set

$$H^i(t, x) = \begin{cases} F^i(x) - F^i(0^{\leq \nu}, (e^{\lambda t} y)^{> \nu}), & i \leq \nu, \\ F^i(x) - F^i(e^{\lambda t} y), & i > \nu, \end{cases}$$

$$\overline{H}^i(t, x) = \begin{cases} F^i(x) - F^i(0), & i \leq \nu, \\ F^i(x) - F^i((e^{\lambda t} y)^{\leq \nu}, 0^{> \nu}), & i > \nu. \end{cases}$$

Note that we use different deterministic approximations for the unstable and stable components, which will allow for more compact formulas later on. Using (11.4) and (11.6), we have that, uniformly in t ,

$$(11.21) \quad |H^i(t, Y_t)| \lesssim \begin{cases} (|Y_t^{\leq \nu}| + \varepsilon |N_t^{> \nu}|) \wedge 1, & i \leq \nu, \\ (\varepsilon |e^{\lambda t} U_t^{\leq \nu}| + \varepsilon |N_t^{> \nu}|) \wedge 1, & i > \nu, \end{cases}$$

$$(11.22) \quad |\overline{H}^i(t, Y_t)| \lesssim \left(|H^i(t, Y_t)| + \sum_{j > \nu} e^{\lambda^j t} |y^j| \right) \wedge 1, \quad i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}.$$

Using the definitions (11.8), (11.9), (11.7), and (11.4), we have that for each $q \geq 1$ there is a constant $C_q > 0$ such that, for all t ,

$$(11.23) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} |M_t^j|^q, \mathbb{E} |V_t^j|^q, \mathbb{E} |U_t^j|^q &\leq C_q, \quad j \leq \nu; \\ \mathbb{E} |e^{\lambda^j t} M_t^j|^q, \mathbb{E} |e^{\lambda^j t} V_t^j|^q, \mathbb{E} |N_t^j|^q &\leq C_q, \quad j > \nu. \end{aligned}$$

11.3.1. *0th order derivatives.* Our first goal is to obtain L^p estimates on

$$(11.24) \quad \begin{aligned} U_T^i - Z_T^i, U_T^i - \overline{Z}_T^i, \quad i \leq \nu, \\ N_T^i - Z_T^i, N_T^i - \overline{Z}_T^i, \quad i > \nu. \end{aligned}$$

Taking arbitrary $\beta \in (0, 1)$ to be determined later, we define

$$\eta^j = \inf \left\{ t > 0 : |Y_t^j| \geq \varepsilon^\beta \right\}, \quad j \leq \nu; \quad \eta = \min_{1 \leq j \leq \nu} \eta^j.$$

We first derive a few estimates involving η^j . The above definition implies $\varepsilon^\beta \leq |Y_{\eta^j}^j| = e^{\lambda^j \eta^j} |y^j + \varepsilon U_{\eta^j}^j|$. Hence, $\eta^j \geq \frac{1}{\lambda^j} \log(\varepsilon^\beta |y^j + \varepsilon U_{\eta^j}^j|^{-1})$, which implies that

$$(11.25) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} e^{-q\eta} &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\nu} \mathbb{E} e^{-q\eta^j} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\nu} \varepsilon^{-\beta \frac{q}{\lambda^j}} \mathbb{E} |y^j + \varepsilon U_{\eta^j}^j|^{\frac{q}{\lambda^j}} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{j=1}^{\nu} (\varepsilon^{-\beta} |y^{\leq \nu}|)^{\frac{q}{\lambda^j}} + \sum_{j=1}^{\nu} \varepsilon^{(1-\beta) \frac{q}{\lambda^j}} \mathbb{E} |U_{\eta^j}^j|^{\frac{q}{\lambda^j}} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{j=1}^{\nu} (\varepsilon^{-\beta} |y^{\leq \nu}|)^{\frac{q}{\lambda^j}} + \sum_{j=1}^{\nu} \varepsilon^{(1-\beta) \frac{q}{\lambda^j}}, \quad q > 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{E} |U_{\eta^j}^j|^{\frac{q}{\lambda^j}} \lesssim 1$ follows from the definition of U_t in (11.7) and BDG inequality.

Let us consider $i \leq \nu$. Recall the definition of \mathbf{p} from (11.11). Using BDG, (11.21), (11.23) and (11.25) with $\beta = \frac{1}{2}\nu$ and $q = p\lambda^i$, we obtain, for some $\delta' > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(11.26) \quad & \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^T \left| e^{-\lambda^i s} H^i(s, Y_s) \right|^2 ds \right|^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
& \lesssim \sum_{j \leq \nu} \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^{T \wedge \eta} \left| e^{-\lambda^i s} Y_s^j \right|^2 ds \right|^{\frac{p}{2}} + \sum_{j > \nu} \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^{T \wedge \eta} \left| e^{-\lambda^i s} \varepsilon N_s^j \right|^2 ds \right|^{\frac{p}{2}} + \mathbb{E} \left| \int_{T \wedge \eta}^T \left| e^{-\lambda^i s} \right|^2 ds \right|^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
& \lesssim \varepsilon^{\beta p} + \varepsilon^p + \mathbb{E} e^{-p\lambda^i \eta} \lesssim \varepsilon^{\beta p} + \varepsilon^p + \mathbf{p} \left(\left(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}\nu} |y^{\leq \nu}| \right)^p \right) + \mathbf{p} \left(\varepsilon^{(1-\frac{\nu}{2})p} \right) \\
& \lesssim \varepsilon^{\delta'} \left(1 + \mathbf{p} \left(\varepsilon^{-\nu} |y^{\leq \nu}| \right) \right)^p, \quad i \leq \nu,
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we also used that for $r \geq 0$, $\mathbf{p}(r^p) \lesssim_p (\mathbf{p}(r))^p$. Due to (11.22) and the fact that $\lambda^j < 0$ for $j > \nu$, (11.26) also implies

$$\begin{aligned}
(11.27) \quad & \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^T \left| e^{-\lambda^i s} \overline{H}^i(s, Y_s) \right|^2 ds \right|^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
& \lesssim \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^T \left| e^{-\lambda^i s} H^i(s, Y_s) \right|^2 ds \right|^{\frac{p}{2}} + \sum_{j > \nu} \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^T \left| e^{-\lambda^i s} e^{\lambda^j s} y^j \right|^2 ds \right|^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
& \lesssim \varepsilon^{\delta'} \left(1 + \mathbf{p} \left(\varepsilon^{-\nu} |y^{\leq \nu}| \right) \right)^p + |y^{> \nu}|^p, \quad i \leq \nu.
\end{aligned}$$

Due to (11.26) and (11.23), for some $\delta_0 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(11.28) \quad & \mathbb{E} |U_T^i - Z_T^i|^p \lesssim \mathbb{E} |M_T^i - Z_T^i|^p + \varepsilon^p \mathbb{E} |V_T^i|^p \lesssim \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^T \left| e^{-\lambda^i s} H^i(s, Y_s) \right|^2 ds \right|^{\frac{p}{2}} + \varepsilon^p \\
& \lesssim \varepsilon^{\delta_0} \left(1 + \mathbf{p} \left(\varepsilon^{-\nu} |y^{\leq \nu}| \right) \right)^p, \quad i \leq \nu.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, using (11.27) and (11.23), we have, for some $\delta'_0 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(11.29) \quad & \mathbb{E} |U_T^i - \overline{Z}_T^i|^p \lesssim \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^T \left| e^{-\lambda^i s} \overline{H}^i(s, Y_s) \right|^2 ds \right|^{\frac{p}{2}} + \varepsilon^p \\
& \lesssim \varepsilon^{\delta'_0} \left(1 + \mathbf{p} \left(\varepsilon^{-\nu} |y^{\leq \nu}| \right) \right)^p + |y^{> \nu}|^p, \quad i \leq \nu.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we consider $i > \nu$. Let us estimate, using Minkowski's integral inequality, (11.21) and (11.23),

$$\begin{aligned}
(11.30) \quad & \mathbb{E} \left| e^{2\lambda^i T} \int_0^T \left| e^{-\lambda^i s} H^i(s, Y_s) \right|^2 ds \right|^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
& \lesssim \sum_{j \leq \nu} \mathbb{E} \left| e^{2\lambda^i T} \int_0^T \left| e^{-\lambda^i s} \varepsilon e^{\lambda^j s} U_s^j \right|^2 ds \right|^{\frac{p}{2}} + \sum_{j > \nu} \mathbb{E} \left| e^{2\lambda^i T} \int_0^T \left| e^{-\lambda^i s} \varepsilon N_s^j \right|^2 ds \right|^{\frac{p}{2}} \\
& \lesssim \sum_{j \leq \nu} \varepsilon^p e^{p\lambda^i T} + \varepsilon^p \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{p}{2}}, \quad i > \nu.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\lambda^j < 0$ for $j > \nu$, due to (11.22) and (11.30), similar to the derivation of (11.27), one can see

$$(11.31) \quad \mathbb{E} \left| e^{2\lambda^i T} \int_0^T \left| e^{-\lambda^i s} \overline{H}^i(s, Y_s) \right|^2 ds \right|^{\frac{p}{2}} \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{p}{2}} + |y^{>\nu}|^p, \quad i > \nu.$$

Using (11.30) and (11.23), we obtain

$$(11.32) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} |N_T^i - Z_T^i|^p &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \left| e^{\lambda^i T} M_T^i - Z_T^i \right| + \varepsilon^p \mathbb{E} \left| e^{\lambda^i T} V_T^i \right| \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E} \left| e^{2\lambda^i T} \int_0^T \left| e^{-\lambda^i s} H^i(s, Y_s) \right|^2 ds \right|^{\frac{p}{2}} + \varepsilon^p \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{p}{2}}, \quad i > \nu. \end{aligned}$$

From (11.31) and (11.22) it can be derived that

$$(11.33) \quad \mathbb{E} \left| N_T^i - \overline{Z}_T^i \right|^p \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{p}{2}} + |y^{>\nu}|^p, \quad i > \nu.$$

11.3.2. *1st order derivatives.* In order to estimate the Malliavin derivatives of the r.v.'s in (11.24), we need to estimate the derivatives of U_t^i and N_t^i . These derivatives are, in turn, related to those of Y_t^i due to (11.6) and (11.7):

$$(11.34) \quad \mathcal{D}^{(k)} Y_t^i = \varepsilon e^{\lambda^i t} \mathcal{D}^{(k)} U_t^i = \varepsilon \mathcal{D}^{(k)} N_t^i,$$

where the superscript in parentheses indicates the order of differentiation. For $j = 1, 2, \dots, d$, [Nua95, Theorem 2.2.1] implies

$$(11.35) \quad \mathcal{D}_r^j U_t^i = e^{-\lambda^i r} F_j^i(Y_r) + \int_r^t e^{-\lambda^i s} \partial_k F_l^i(Y_s) \mathcal{D}_r^j Y_s^k dW_s^l + \varepsilon \int_r^t e^{-\lambda^i s} \partial_k G^i(Y_s) \mathcal{D}_r^j Y_s^k ds.$$

Let $0 \leq r \leq t \leq T$. We use (11.35), (11.17), and (11.18) to obtain the first inequality below; we plug in (11.34) to obtain the second inequality; and use estimates (11.4) and (11.16) to obtain that, uniformly in r, t ,

$$(11.36) \quad \begin{aligned} \left[\mathcal{D}_r^j U_t^i \right]_p &\lesssim \left[e^{-\lambda^i r} F_j^i(Y_r) \right]_p + \sum_{k=1}^d \left(\int_r^t e^{-2\lambda^i s} \left[\mathcal{D}_r^j Y_s^k \right]_p ds + \varepsilon^2 T \int_r^t e^{-2\lambda^i s} \left[\mathcal{D}_r^j Y_s^k \right]_p ds \right) \\ &\lesssim e^{-2\lambda^i r} + (\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^4 T) \sum_{k \leq \nu} \int_r^t e^{2(\lambda^k - \lambda^i)s} \left[\mathcal{D}_r^j U_s^k \right]_p ds + (\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^4 T) \sum_{k > \nu} \int_r^t e^{-2\lambda^i s} \left[\mathcal{D}_r^j N_s^k \right]_p ds \\ &\lesssim e^{-2\lambda^i r} + \varepsilon \int_r^t \sum_{k \leq \nu} \left[\mathcal{D}_r^j U_s^k \right]_p ds + \sum_{k > \nu} \left[\mathcal{D}_r^j N_s^k \right]_p ds, \quad i \leq \nu, \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have that, uniformly in r, t ,

(11.37)

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{D}_r^j N_t^i]_p &\lesssim \left[e^{\lambda^i(t-r)} F_j^i(Y_r) \right]_p + \sum_{k=1}^d e^{2\lambda^i t} \left(\int_r^t e^{-2\lambda^i s} [\mathcal{D}_r^j Y_s^k]_p ds + \varepsilon^2 T \int_r^t e^{-2\lambda^i s} [\mathcal{D}_r^j Y_s^k]_p ds \right) \\ &\lesssim e^{2\lambda^i(t-r)} + (\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^4 T) \sum_{k \leq \nu} \int_r^t e^{2\lambda^k s} [\mathcal{D}_r^j U_s^k]_p ds + (\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^4 T) \sum_{k > \nu} \int_r^t [\mathcal{D}_r^j N_s^k]_p ds \\ &\lesssim e^{2\lambda^i(t-r)} + \varepsilon \int_r^t \sum_{k \leq \nu} [\mathcal{D}_r^j U_s^k]_p ds + \sum_{k > \nu} [\mathcal{D}_r^j N_s^k]_p ds, \quad i > \nu. \end{aligned}$$

We need the following lemma.

Lemma 11.4. *Let $d, l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m \geq 0$. Write $\mathbf{r} = (r_i)_{i=1}^l$ with all r_i nonnegative, and $\hat{\mathbf{r}} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq d} r_i$. Suppose $c(\mathbf{r}, t) \geq 0$ for all \mathbf{r}, t and that $t \mapsto c(\mathbf{r}, t)$ is nondecreasing for each fixed \mathbf{r} . Then, the system of inequalities*

(11.38)

$$0 \leq a^i(\mathbf{r}, t) \leq C \left(\varepsilon^m c^i(\mathbf{r}, t) + \varepsilon \sum_{k=1}^d \int_{\hat{\mathbf{r}}}^t a^k(\mathbf{r}, s) ds \right), \quad \hat{\mathbf{r}} \leq t \leq T, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, d,$$

with T satisfying (11.16), implies that there is a constant C independent of ε, T such that $a^i(\mathbf{r}, t) \leq C \varepsilon^m \sum_{k=1}^d c^k(\mathbf{r}, t)$ for all $t \in [0, T]$, \mathbf{r} satisfying $\hat{\mathbf{r}} \leq t$, and $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$.

PROOF OF LEMMA 11.4: Let $b(\mathbf{r}, t) = \sum_{i=1}^d a^i(\mathbf{r}, t)$. We sum up the inequalities (11.38) in i to obtain

$$0 \leq b(\mathbf{r}, t) \leq C \left(\varepsilon^m \sum_{k=1}^d c^k(\mathbf{r}, t) + \varepsilon \int_0^t b(\mathbf{r}, s) ds \right).$$

Gronwall's inequality implies that for some constant C independent of ε

$$0 \leq b(\mathbf{r}, t) \leq C \varepsilon^m \sum_{k=1}^d c^k(\mathbf{r}, t) e^{C\varepsilon T}.$$

Due to (11.16), $e^{C\varepsilon T}$ is bounded. Using $a^i(\mathbf{r}, t) \leq b(\mathbf{r}, t)$, we complete the proof. \square

Applying this result with $l = 1, m = 0$, $c^i(r, t) = e^{-2\lambda^i r}$ and $a^i(r, t) = [\mathcal{D}_r^j U_t^i]_p$ for $i \leq \nu$, $c^i(r, t) = e^{2\lambda^i(t-r)}$ and $a^i(r, t) = [\mathcal{D}_r^j N_t^i]_p$ for $i > \nu$ to (11.36) and (11.37), we obtain, for $i \leq \nu, m > \nu, 1 \leq j \leq d$

$$(11.39) \quad [\mathcal{D}_r^j U_t^i]_p, [\mathcal{D}_r^j N_t^m]_p \lesssim \sum_{k \leq \nu} e^{-2\lambda^k r} + \sum_{k > \nu} e^{2\lambda^k(t-r)} \lesssim 1, \quad r \leq t \leq T,$$

which implies due to (11.34) and (11.16) that

$$(11.40) \quad [\mathcal{D}_r^j Y_t^i]_p \lesssim \varepsilon, \quad r \leq t \leq T, \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq d.$$

The estimates (11.39) together with (11.19) give

$$(11.41) \quad \left[\left\| \mathcal{D}(U_T^{\leq \nu}, N_T^{> \nu}) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \right]_p \lesssim 1.$$

For $i \leq \nu$, we have that, due to (11.10),

$$\mathcal{D}_r^j Z_t^i = e^{-\lambda^i r} F_j^i(0^{\leq \nu}, (e^{\lambda^i s} y)^{> \nu}),$$

which along with (11.35) yields that

(11.42)

$$\mathcal{D}_r^j (U_t^i - Z_t^i) = e^{-\lambda^i r} H_j^i(r, Y_r) + \int_r^t e^{-\lambda^i s} \partial_k F_l^i(Y_s) \mathcal{D}_r^j Y_s^k dW_s^l + \varepsilon \int_r^t e^{-\lambda^i s} \partial_k G^i(Y_s) \mathcal{D}_r^j Y_s^k ds.$$

Hence, we obtain

$$(11.43) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left[\|\mathcal{D}(U_T^i - Z_T^i)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \right]_p \lesssim \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T \left| e^{-\lambda^i r} H^i(r, Y_r) \right|^2 dr \right]^{\frac{p}{2}} \right)^{\frac{2}{p}} \\ & + \sum_{j,k=1}^d \left[\left\| \int_{\cdot}^T e^{-\lambda^i s} \partial_k F_l^i(Y_s) \mathcal{D}^j Y_s^k dW_s^l \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \right]_p \\ & + \sum_{j,k=1}^d \varepsilon^2 \left[\left\| \int_{\cdot}^T e^{-\lambda^i s} \partial_k G^i(Y_s) \mathcal{D}^j Y_s^k ds \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \right]_p. \end{aligned}$$

Due to (11.26), the first term on the right is $\lesssim \varepsilon^{2\delta'/p} (1 + \mathbf{p}(\varepsilon^{-\nu} |y^{\leq \nu}|))^2$. For the next two terms, we first invoke properties (11.17), (11.18) and (11.19), and then apply the boundedness of derivatives of F , (11.40), (11.16) to get

(11.44)

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\left\| \int_{\cdot}^T e^{-\lambda^i s} \partial_k F_l^i(Y_s) \mathcal{D}^j Y_s^k dW_s^l \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \right]_p \leq \int_0^T \left[\int_r^T e^{-\lambda^i s} \partial_k F_l^i(Y_s) \mathcal{D}_r^j Y_s^k dW_s^l \right]_p dr \\ & \lesssim \int_0^T \int_r^T \sum_l \left[e^{-\lambda^i s} \partial_k F_l^i(Y_s) \mathcal{D}_r^j Y_s^k \right]_p ds dr \lesssim \int_0^T \int_r^T [\mathcal{D}_r^j Y_s^k]_p ds dr \lesssim \varepsilon T^2 \leq \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

and, similarly,

$$(11.45) \quad \varepsilon^2 \left[\left\| \int_{\cdot}^T e^{-\lambda^i s} \partial_k G^i(Y_s) \mathcal{D}^j Y_s^k ds \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \right]_p \lesssim \varepsilon^2 T \int_0^T \int_r^T [\mathcal{D}_r^j Y_s^k]_p ds dr \leq \varepsilon^2.$$

Therefore, these yield, for some $\delta_1 > 0$,

$$(11.46) \quad \left[\|\mathcal{D}(U_T^{\leq \nu} - Z_T^{\leq \nu})\|_{\mathcal{H}} \right]_p \lesssim \varepsilon^{\delta_1} (1 + \mathbf{p}(\varepsilon^{-\nu} |y^{\leq \nu}|))^2.$$

For $i > \nu$, we can compute

$$(11.47) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_r^j (N_t^i - Z_t^i) &= e^{\lambda^i(t-r)} H_j^i(r, Y_r) + e^{\lambda^i t} \int_r^t e^{-\lambda^i s} \partial_k F_l^i(Y_s) \mathcal{D}_r^j Y_s^k dW_s^l \\ &+ \varepsilon e^{\lambda^i t} \int_r^t e^{-\lambda^i s} \partial_k G^i(Y_s) \mathcal{D}_r^j Y_s^k ds. \end{aligned}$$

Note that now $\lambda^i < 0$. To bound $\left[\|\mathcal{D}(N_T^i - Z_T^i)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \right]_p$, we first estimate it similarly to (11.43), and then apply (11.30) and estimates analogous to (11.44) and (11.45) to obtain, for some $\delta'_1 > 0$,

$$(11.48) \quad \left[\|\mathcal{D}(N_T^{> \nu} - Z_T^{> \nu})\|_{\mathcal{H}} \right]_p \lesssim \varepsilon^{\delta'_1}.$$

To compare with \bar{Z}_T , we note that $\mathcal{D}_r^j(U_t^i - \bar{Z}_t^i)$ and $\mathcal{D}_r^j(N_t^i - \bar{Z}_t^i)$ have representations similar to (11.42) and (11.47), respectively, only with H replaced by \bar{H} . Repeating estimations (11.42)–(11.48) and using (11.27) and (11.31) in place of (11.26) and (11.30), we obtain

$$(11.49) \quad \left[\left\| \mathcal{D}(U_T^{\leq \nu} - \bar{Z}_T^{\leq \nu}) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \right]_p \lesssim \varepsilon^{\delta_1} (1 + \mathbf{p}(\varepsilon^{-\nu} |y^{\leq \nu}|))^2 + |y^{\leq \nu}|^2,$$

$$(11.50) \quad \left[\left\| \mathcal{D}(N_T^{> \nu} - \bar{Z}_T^{> \nu}) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \right]_p \lesssim \varepsilon^{\delta_1} + |y^{> \nu}|^2.$$

11.3.3. *2nd order derivatives.* Note that (11.10) implies that Z_t and \bar{Z}_t are integrals of deterministic functions and thus

$$(11.51) \quad \mathcal{D}^{(k)} Z_t = \mathcal{D}^{(k)} \bar{Z}_t = 0, \quad k \geq 2, \quad t \geq 0.$$

To compute higher order derivatives of U_t^i , $i = 1, \dots, d$, let us rewrite (11.6) as

$$\begin{aligned} U_t^i &= \int_0^t e^{-\lambda^i s} F_l^i(Y_s) dW_s^l + \varepsilon \int_0^t e^{-\lambda^i s} G^i(Y_s) ds \\ &= \int_0^t e^{-\lambda^i s} F_l^i(e^{\lambda^i s} (y + \varepsilon U_s)) dW_s^l + \varepsilon \int_0^t e^{-\lambda^i s} G^i(e^{\lambda^i s} (y + \varepsilon U_s)) ds \end{aligned}$$

and apply formula (2.54) in [Nua95, Section 2.2] to this equation which plays the role of of equation (2.37) therein. For $r_1, r_2 \leq t \leq T$, we obtain

$$(11.52) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2}^{j_1, j_2} U_t^i &= e^{-\lambda^i r_1} \partial_k F_{j_1}^i(Y_{r_1}) \mathcal{D}_{r_2}^{j_2} Y_{r_1}^k + e^{-\lambda^i r_2} \partial_k F_{j_2}^i(Y_{r_2}) \mathcal{D}_{r_1}^{j_1} Y_{r_2}^k \\ &+ \int_{r_1 \vee r_2}^t e^{-\lambda^i s} (\partial_{k_1, k_2}^2 F_l^i(Y_s)) (\mathcal{D}_{r_1}^{j_1} Y_s^{k_1}) (\mathcal{D}_{r_2}^{j_2} Y_s^{k_2}) dW_s^l + \int_{r_1 \vee r_2}^t e^{-\lambda^i s} \partial_k F_l^i(Y_s) \mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2}^{j_1, j_2} Y_s^k dW_s^l \\ &+ \varepsilon \int_{r_1 \vee r_2}^t e^{-\lambda^i s} (\partial_{k_1, k_2}^2 G^i(Y_s)) (\mathcal{D}_{r_1}^{j_1} Y_s^{k_1}) (\mathcal{D}_{r_2}^{j_2} Y_s^{k_2}) ds + \varepsilon \int_{r_1 \vee r_2}^t e^{-\lambda^i s} \partial_k G^i(Y_s) \mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2}^{j_1, j_2} Y_s^k ds. \end{aligned}$$

We can also derive this formula directly from (11.35).

Let us use this identity to estimate $[\mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2}^{j_1, j_2} U_t^i]_p$ for $i \leq \nu$. In this case, we have $e^{-\lambda^i s} \leq 1$ for all $s \geq 0$. We use properties (11.17) and (11.18), the boundedness of the derivatives of F and G assumed in (11.4), the estimate $[(\mathcal{D}_{r_1}^{j_1} Y_s^{k_1})(\mathcal{D}_{r_2}^{j_2} Y_s^{k_2})]_p \leq [\mathcal{D}_{r_1}^{j_1} Y_s^{k_1}]_{2p} [\mathcal{D}_{r_2}^{j_2} Y_s^{k_2}]_{2p}$ implied by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, and (11.34) to obtain that, uniformly in $r_1, r_2 \leq t \leq T$,

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2}^{j_1, j_2} U_t^i]_p &\lesssim [\mathcal{D}_{r_2}^{j_2} Y_{r_1}^k]_p + [\mathcal{D}_{r_1}^{j_1} Y_{r_2}^k]_p \\ &+ (1 + \varepsilon^2 T) \sum_{k_1, k_2=1}^d \int_{r_1 \vee r_2}^t [\mathcal{D}_{r_1}^{j_1} Y_s^{k_1}]_{2p} [\mathcal{D}_{r_2}^{j_2} Y_s^{k_2}]_{2p} ds \\ &+ (1 + \varepsilon^2 T) \sum_{k=1}^d \int_{r_1 \vee r_2}^t [\mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2}^{j_1, j_2} Y_s^k]_p ds, \quad i \leq \nu. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, using (11.52), the relation in (11.34), and that $e^{\lambda^i(t-s)} \leq 1$ for all $s \leq t$ when $i > \nu$, we have exactly the same bound for $[\mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2}^{j_1, j_2} N_t^i]_p$, $i > \nu$, uniformly in

$r_1, r_2 \leq t \leq T$:

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2}^{j_1, j_2} N_t^i]_p &\lesssim [\mathcal{D}_{r_2}^{j_2} Y_{r_1}^k]_p + [\mathcal{D}_{r_1}^{j_1} Y_{r_2}^k]_p \\ &+ (1 + \varepsilon^2 T) \sum_{k_1, k_2=1}^d \int_{r_1 \vee r_2}^t [\mathcal{D}_{r_1}^{j_1} Y_s^{k_1}]_{2p} [\mathcal{D}_{r_2}^{j_2} Y_s^{k_2}]_{2p} ds \\ &+ (1 + \varepsilon^2 T) \sum_{k=1}^d \int_{r_1 \vee r_2}^t [\mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2}^{j_1, j_2} Y_s^k]_p ds, \quad i > \nu. \end{aligned}$$

Applying (11.40) to bound the first order derivatives of Y , using (11.34) to rewrite the second order derivatives of Y in terms of U for $k \leq \nu$ and in terms of N for $k > \nu$, and then applying (11.16) to bound T and $e^{2\lambda^k s}$ for $k \leq \nu$, one can see that, uniformly in $r_1, r_2 \leq t \leq T$, $i \leq \nu$ and $m > \nu$,

(11.53)

$$[\mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2}^{j_1, j_2} U_t^i]_p, [\mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2}^{j_1, j_2} N_t^m]_p \lesssim \varepsilon + \varepsilon \int_{r_1 \vee r_2}^t \left(\sum_{k \leq \nu} [\mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2}^{j_1, j_2} U_s^k]_p + \sum_{k > \nu} [\mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2}^{j_1, j_2} N_s^k]_p \right) ds.$$

Let us momentarily fix j_1, j_2 , and set

$$a^i(r_1, r_2, t) = \begin{cases} [\mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2}^{j_1, j_2} U_t^i]_p, & i \leq \nu, \\ [\mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2}^{j_1, j_2} N_t^i]_p = e^{2\lambda^j t} [\mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2}^{j_1, j_2} U_t^i]_p, & i > \nu. \end{cases}$$

Plug this into (11.53) to obtain that, uniformly in $r_1, r_2 \leq t \leq T$,

$$a^i(r_1, r_2, t) \lesssim \varepsilon + \varepsilon \sum_{k=1}^d \int_{r_1 \vee r_2}^t a^k(r_1, r_2, s) ds, \quad i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}.$$

Lemma 11.4 implies

(11.54)

$$[\mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2}^{j_1, j_2} U_t^i]_p, [\mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2}^{j_1, j_2} N_t^m]_p \lesssim \varepsilon, \quad \text{for } i \leq \nu, m > \nu; r_1, r_2, t \leq T, 1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq d,$$

This result, due to (11.34) and (11.16), yields

$$(11.55) \quad [\mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2}^{j_1, j_2} Y_t^i]_p \lesssim \varepsilon^2, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq d; r_1, r_2, t \leq T, 1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq d,$$

which is for later use.

From (11.19) and (11.54), we obtain

$$\left[\left\| \mathcal{D}^{(2)} U_T^i \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes 2}} \right]_p \lesssim \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^d \int_{[0, T]^2} [\mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2}^{j_1, j_2} U_T^i]_p dr_1 dr_2 \lesssim \varepsilon T^2, \quad i \leq \nu,$$

and a similar bound for $\left[\left\| \mathcal{D}^{(2)} N_T^i \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes 2}} \right]_p$, $i \geq \nu$. This along with (11.16), (11.54) and (11.51) implies

$$(11.56) \quad \begin{aligned} \left[\left\| \mathcal{D}^{(2)} \left(U_T^{\leq \nu}, N_T^{\geq \nu} \right) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes 2}} \right]_p &\lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ \left[\left\| \mathcal{D}^{(2)} \left(\left(U_T^{\leq \nu}, N_T^{\geq \nu} \right) - Z_T \right) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes 2}} \right]_p &\lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ \left[\left\| \mathcal{D}^{(2)} \left(\left(U_T^{\leq \nu}, N_T^{\geq \nu} \right) - \bar{Z}_T \right) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes 2}} \right]_p &\lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

11.3.4. *3rd order derivatives.* Similarly to the above argument for second order derivatives, we apply (2.54) from [Nua95, Section 2.2] to obtain that for $r_1, r_2, r_3 \leq t \leq T$,

$$\mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2, r_3}^{j_1, j_2, j_3} U_t^i = A_{r_1, r_2, r_3}^{j_1, j_2, j_3} + \int_{r_1 \vee r_2 \vee r_3}^t e^{-\lambda^i s} B_{r_1, r_2, r_3, l}^{j_1, j_2, j_3}(s) dW_s^l + \varepsilon \int_{r_1 \vee r_2 \vee r_3}^t e^{-\lambda^i s} C_{r_1, r_2, r_3}^{j_1, j_2, j_3}(s) ds,$$

where: $A_{r_1, r_2, r_3}^{j_1, j_2, j_3}$ is a linear combination of terms

$$e^{-\lambda^i r_{n_0}} \partial_{k_1, k_2}^2 F_{j_{n_0}}^i(Y_{r_{n_0}}) \prod_{m=1}^2 \mathcal{D}_{r_{n_m}}^{j_{n_m}} Y_{r_{n_0}}^{k_m}, \quad e^{-\lambda^i r_{n_0}} \partial_k F_{j_{n_0}}^i(Y_{r_{n_0}}) \mathcal{D}_{r_{n_1}, r_{n_2}}^{j_{n_1}, j_{n_2}} Y_{r_{n_0}}^k,$$

$B_{r_1, r_2, r_3, l}^{j_1, j_2, j_3}(s)$ is a linear combination of terms

$$\partial_{k_1, k_2, k_3}^3 F_l^i(Y_s) \prod_{m=1}^3 \mathcal{D}_{r_m}^{j_m} Y_s^{k_m}, \quad \partial_{k_1, k_2}^2 F_l^i(Y_s) \left(\mathcal{D}_{r_{n_1}, r_{n_2}}^{j_{n_1}, j_{n_2}} Y_s^{k_1} \right) \left(\mathcal{D}_{r_{n_3}}^{j_{n_3}} Y_s^{k_2} \right), \quad \partial_k F_l^i(Y_s) \mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2, r_3}^{j_1, j_2, j_3} Y_s^k,$$

$C_{r_1, r_2, r_3}^{j_1, j_2, j_3}(s)$ is a linear combination of terms

$$\partial_{k_1, k_2, k_3}^3 G^i(Y_s) \prod_{m=1}^3 \mathcal{D}_{r_m}^{j_m} Y_s^{k_m}, \quad \partial_{k_1, k_2}^2 G^i(Y_s) \left(\mathcal{D}_{r_{n_1}, r_{n_2}}^{j_{n_1}, j_{n_2}} Y_s^{k_1} \right) \left(\mathcal{D}_{r_{n_3}}^{j_{n_3}} Y_s^{k_2} \right), \quad \partial_k G^i(Y_s) \mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2, r_3}^{j_1, j_2, j_3} Y_s^k.$$

In all these terms, $\{n_0, n_1, n_2\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$.

Following the same steps as in the analysis of (11.52), applying the estimates of first and second derivatives that we already have established in (11.40) and (11.55) we obtain, for $i \leq \nu$, $m > \nu$, uniformly in $r_1, r_2, r_3 \leq t \leq T$,

$$\left[\mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2, r_3}^{j_1, j_2, j_3} U_t^i \right]_p, \left[\mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2, r_3}^{j_1, j_2, j_3} N_t^m \right]_p \lesssim \varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon \left(\int_r^t \sum_{k \leq \nu} \left[\mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2, r_3}^{j_1, j_2, j_3} U_s^k \right]_p + \sum_{k > \nu} \left[\mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2, r_3}^{j_1, j_2, j_3} N_s^k \right]_p ds \right),$$

where $r = r_1 \vee r_2 \vee r_3$. Lemma 11.4 then implies that for $i \leq \nu$, $m > \nu$, and $1 \leq j_1, j_2, j_3 \leq d$,

$$\left[\mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2, r_3}^{j_1, j_2, j_3} U_t^i \right]_p, \left[\mathcal{D}_{r_1, r_2, r_3}^{j_1, j_2, j_3} N_t^m \right]_p \lesssim \varepsilon^2, \quad r_1, r_2, r_3, t \leq T.$$

This along with (11.16) and (11.19) implies

$$(11.57) \quad \left[\left\| \mathcal{D}^{(3)} \left(U_T^{\leq \nu}, N_T^{> \nu} \right) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes 3}} \right]_p \lesssim \varepsilon.$$

11.3.5. *Sobolev norms.* Note that estimates above are obtained for an arbitrarily fixed $p \geq 2$. Then, 0th order derivative estimates (11.23), (11.28), (11.32), (11.29), (11.33), 1st order derivative estimates (11.41), (11.46), (11.48), (11.49), (11.50), 2nd order derivative estimates (11.56) and 3rd order derivative estimates (11.57) along with Jensen's inequality yield the following bounds on Sobolev norms: for every $p \geq 1$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that

$$(11.58) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left\| \left(U_T^{\leq \nu}, N_T^{> \nu} \right) \right\|_{3, p} \lesssim_p 1, \\ & \left\| \left(U_T^{\leq \nu}, N_T^{> \nu} \right) - Z_T \right\|_{2, p} \lesssim_p \varepsilon^\delta \left(1 + \mathbf{p} \left(\varepsilon^{-\nu} |y^{\leq \nu}| \right) \right), \\ & \left\| \left(U_T^{\leq \nu}, N_T^{> \nu} \right) - \bar{Z}_T \right\|_{2, p} \lesssim_p \varepsilon^\delta \left(1 + \mathbf{p} \left(\varepsilon^{-\nu} |y^{\leq \nu}| \right) \right) + |y^{> \nu}|. \end{aligned}$$

Since Z_T and \overline{Z}_T are linear in W , it is easy to compute

$$(11.59) \quad \|Z_T\|_{3,p}, \quad \|\overline{Z}_T\|_{3,p} \lesssim_p 1, \quad p \geq 1.$$

11.4. Malliavin matrix estimates. We recall the definition of Malliavin matrices given in (11.14). We replace \mathcal{T} therein by T given in (9.12), or equivalently, replace \mathcal{H}_T therein by \mathcal{H} given in (11.20). We want to show that for each $p \geq 1$ there is a constant C_p such that

$$(11.60) \quad \mathbf{E} \left| \det \sigma_{(U_T^{\leq \nu}, N_T^{\geq \nu})} \right|^{-p}, \quad \mathbf{E} |\det \sigma_{Z_T}|^{-p}, \quad \mathbf{E} |\det \sigma_{\overline{Z}_T}|^{-p} \leq C_p, \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1).$$

Since the Malliavin matrices of $Z_T, Z^{\leq \nu}, \overline{Z}_T^{\leq \nu}, \overline{Z}_T$ are deterministic, the corresponding bounds are, in fact, trivial, and we need to consider only the negative moments of and $\det \sigma_{(U_T^{\leq \nu}, N_T^{\geq \nu})}$.

11.4.1. *Boundedness of $\mathbf{E} |\det \sigma_{(U_T^{\leq \nu}, N_T^{\geq \nu})}|^{-p}$.* We express Y_s in terms of U_s using (11.6), and rewrite (11.35) as

$$\mathcal{D}_r^j U_t^i = A_j^i(r) + \int_r^t \overline{A}_{k,l}^i(s) \mathcal{D}_r^j U_s^k dW_s^l + \int_r^t \overline{B}_k^i(s) \mathcal{D}_r^j U_s^k ds,$$

where

$$(11.61) \quad A_j^i(r) = e^{-\lambda^i r} F_j^i(Y_r), \quad \overline{A}_{k,l}^i(s) = \varepsilon e^{(\lambda^k - \lambda^i)s} \partial_k F_l^i(Y_s), \quad \overline{B}_k^i(s) = \varepsilon^2 e^{(\lambda^k - \lambda^i)s} \partial_k G^i(Y_s).$$

Due to (11.4) and (11.16), for all i, j, k, l , we have

$$(11.62) \quad |A_j^i(r)| \lesssim e^{-\lambda^i r}, \quad r \leq T; \quad \sup_{s \leq T} |\overline{A}_{k,l}^i(s)| \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{4}}, \quad \sup_{s \leq T} |\overline{B}_k^i(s)| \lesssim \varepsilon^{\frac{7}{4}}.$$

Two useful $d \times d$ -matrix-valued processes are given by

$$(11.63) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{Y}_j^i(t) &= \delta_j^i + \int_0^t \overline{A}_{k,l}^i(s) \mathbf{Y}_j^k(s) dW_s^l + \int_0^t \overline{B}_k^i(s) \mathbf{Y}_j^k(s) ds, \\ \mathbf{Z}_j^i(t) &= \delta_j^i - \int_0^t \overline{A}_{j,l}^k(s) \mathbf{Z}_k^i(s) dW_s^l - \int_0^t \left(\overline{B}_j^k(s) - \sum_{l=1}^d \overline{A}_{m,l}^k(s) \overline{A}_{j,l}^m(s) \right) \mathbf{Z}_k^i(s) ds, \end{aligned}$$

where δ_j^i is the Kronecker symbol. They correspond to (2.57) and (2.58) in [Nua95, Section 2.3.1]. Using the Itô's formula, one can check that (see the computations below (2.58) in [Nua95, Section 2.3.1])

$$(11.64) \quad \mathbf{Z}(t) \mathbf{Y}(t) = \mathbf{Y}(t) \mathbf{Z}(t) = I,$$

where I the identity matrix. Furthermore, (2.60) and (2.61) from [Nua95, Section 2.3.1] show that

$$(11.65) \quad \sigma_{U_t} = \mathbf{Y}(t) \mathbf{C}_t \mathbf{Y}(t)^\top$$

where \top denotes the matrix transpose operation and

$$(11.66) \quad \mathbf{C}_t^{ij} = \sum_{l=1}^d \int_0^t \mathbf{Z}_k^i(s) A_l^k(s) \mathbf{Z}_m^j(s) A_l^m(s) ds.$$

Let $\Lambda = \Lambda(T(\varepsilon))$ be a $d \times d$ diagonal matrix with diagonal entries

$$(11.67) \quad \Lambda_i^i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } i \leq \nu, \\ e^{\lambda^i T} \leq 1 & \text{for } i > \nu. \end{cases}$$

Due to (11.7), we have $\mathcal{D}_r^j N_T^i = e^{\lambda^i T} \mathcal{D}_r^j U_T^i = \Lambda_i^i \mathcal{D}_r^j U^i$ for $i > \nu$, which together with (11.65) implies that

$$\sigma_{(U_T^{\leq \nu}, N_T^{\geq \nu})} = \Lambda \sigma_{U_T} \Lambda^\top = \Lambda \mathbf{Y}(T) \mathbf{C}_T \mathbf{Y}(T)^\top \Lambda^\top.$$

Let us define a $d \times d$ -matrix valued process $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(t)$ by (no summation over repeated indices is involved)

$$\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_j^i(t) = \frac{\Lambda_j^i}{\Lambda_j^j} \mathbf{Y}_j^i(t), \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq d,$$

which satisfies

$$\Lambda \mathbf{Y}(T) = \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(T) \Lambda,$$

which, due to (11.64), implies that

$$(11.68) \quad \det \mathbf{Z}(T) = (\det \mathbf{Y}(T))^{-1} = (\det \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(T))^{-1},$$

$$(11.69) \quad \sigma_{(U_T^{\leq \nu}, N_T^{\geq \nu})} = \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(T) \Lambda \mathbf{C}_T \Lambda^\top \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}(T)^\top.$$

Then, (11.68), (11.69) and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality yield

$$(11.70) \quad \mathbb{E} \left| \det \sigma_{(U_T^{\leq \nu}, N_T^{\geq \nu})} \right|^{-p} \leq \left(\mathbb{E} |\det \Lambda \mathbf{C}_T \Lambda^\top|^{-2p} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\mathbb{E} |\det \mathbf{Z}(T)|^{4p} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

To estimate $\mathbb{E} |\det \mathbf{Z}(T)|^p$ for $p \geq 1$, we study objects related to $\mathbf{Z}(t)$, which will be needed later. Let us define

$$(11.71) \quad \bar{\mathbf{Z}}_j^i(t) = \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |\mathbf{Z}_j^i(s)|, \quad \hat{\mathbf{Z}}_j^i(t) = \mathbf{Z}_j^i(t) - \delta_j^i.$$

Displays (11.63) and (11.62) imply that

$$\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_j^i(T) \lesssim \delta_j^i + \sup_{0 \leq r \leq T} \left| \int_0^r \bar{A}_{j,i}^k \mathbf{Z}_k^i(s) dW_s^l \right| + \int_0^T \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} \sum_{k=1}^d \bar{\mathbf{Z}}_k^i(s) ds.$$

We take $[\cdot]_p$ of both sides and use (11.62) and (11.16) to obtain, for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$\left[\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_j^i(T) \right]_p \lesssim_p \delta_j^i + \sum_{k=1}^d \int_0^T \left(\varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} + \varepsilon^3 T \right) \left[\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_k^i(s) \right]_p ds \lesssim_p \delta_j^i + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} \sum_{k=1}^d \int_0^T \left[\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_k^i(s) \right]_p ds.$$

Lemma 11.4 implies now that for each $p \geq 2$,

$$(11.72) \quad \left[\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_j^i(T) \right]_p \lesssim_p 1, \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1).$$

A similar calculation reveals that

$$\left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \hat{\mathbf{Z}}_j^i(t) \right| \right]_p \lesssim_p \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} \sum_{k=1}^d \int_0^T \left[\bar{\mathbf{Z}}_k^i(s) \right]_p ds.$$

Plugging (11.72) into the above display we obtain, for each $p \geq 2$,

$$(11.73) \quad \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \hat{\mathbf{Z}}_j^i(t) \right| \right]_p \lesssim_p \varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1).$$

Expressing $\det \mathbf{Z}(T)$ as a polynomial of the matrix entries, applying (11.72) and Hölder's inequality, we see that for each $p \geq 1$, there is $C_p > 0$ such that

$$\mathbf{E} |\det \mathbf{Z}(T)|^p \leq C_p, \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1).$$

In view of the above display and (11.70), to bound $\mathbf{E} |\det \sigma_{(U_T^{\leq \nu}, N_T^{> \nu})}|^{-p}$, it remains to show that $\mathbf{E} |\det \Lambda \mathbf{C}_T \Lambda^\top|^{-2p}$ is bounded.

Let $\mu_{\Lambda \mathbf{C}_T \Lambda^\top}$ be the smallest eigenvalue of $\Lambda \mathbf{C}_T \Lambda^\top$, which is nonnegative since $\Lambda \mathbf{C}_T \Lambda^\top$ is positive semi-definite. Then, it suffices to show, for each $p \geq 1$, there is $C_p > 0$ such that

$$(11.74) \quad \mathbf{P} \{ \mu_{\Lambda \mathbf{C}_T \Lambda^\top} \leq \zeta \} \leq C_p \zeta^p, \quad \zeta \geq 0.$$

To this end, we will use the following lemma ([BC21b, Lemma 5.4]):

Lemma 11.5. *Let \mathcal{A} be a symmetric positive semi-definite random $d \times d$ matrix. Let μ be its smallest eigenvalue. Then for each $p \geq 1$, there is $C_{p,d} > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbf{P} \{ \mu \leq \zeta \} \leq C_{p,d} \left(\sup_{|v|=1} \mathbf{E} |v \cdot \mathcal{A} v|^{-(p+2d)} + \mathbf{E} \left| \sum_{i,j=1}^d |\mathcal{A}^{ij}|^2 \right|^{\frac{p}{2}} \right) \zeta^p, \quad \zeta \geq 0.$$

We will apply this lemma to $\mathcal{A} = \Lambda \mathbf{C}_T \Lambda^\top$.

For the second term in the parentheses, it suffices to fix arbitrary $p \geq 1$ and estimate $\mathbf{E} |(\Lambda \mathbf{C}_T \Lambda^\top)^{ij}|^p$. Note that, due to (11.66) and (11.67),

$$(\Lambda \mathbf{C}_T \Lambda^\top)^{ij} = \sum_{1 \leq k, l, m \leq d} \int_0^T \Lambda_i^i \mathbf{Z}_k^i(s) A_l^k(s) \Lambda_j^j \mathbf{Z}_m^j(s) A_l^m(s) ds.$$

We split terms on the right of the above display into three cases.

The first case is where $k \neq i$ and $m \neq j$, in which $\mathbf{Z}_k^i(s) = \widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_k^i(s)$ and $\mathbf{Z}_m^j(s) = \widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_m^j(s)$ (recall the definition of $\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}$ in (11.71)). Using (11.18), (11.62), (11.67), (11.73), and (11.16), we obtain (with no summation over repeated indices) by the Cauchy–Schwartz inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\sum_{l=1}^d \int_0^T \Lambda_i^i \mathbf{Z}_k^i(s) A_l^k(s) \Lambda_j^j \mathbf{Z}_m^j(s) A_l^m(s) ds \right]_p \\ & \lesssim_p T \int_0^T e^{2|\lambda^k|T} e^{2|\lambda^m|T} \left[\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_k^i(s) \right]_{2p} \left[\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_m^j(s) \right]_{2p} ds \\ & \lesssim_p T \int_0^T \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{4}} \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{4}} \varepsilon^2 ds \leq T^2 \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

The second case is where $k = i$ and $m = j$. Applying the same estimates but with (11.72) in place of (11.73), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{l=1}^d \int_0^T \Lambda_l^i \mathbf{Z}_l^i(s) A_l^i(s) \Lambda_l^j \mathbf{Z}_l^j(s) A_l^j(s) ds \right|^p \\ & \lesssim_p \sum_{l=1}^d \left(\int_0^T \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \Lambda_l^i \mathbf{Z}_l^i(s) A_l^i(s) \Lambda_l^j \mathbf{Z}_l^j(s) A_l^j(s) \right|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} ds \right)^p \\ & \lesssim_p \left(\int_0^T \Lambda_l^i e^{-\lambda^i s} \Lambda_l^j e^{-\lambda^j s} ds \right)^p \lesssim_p 1, \end{aligned}$$

where the last \lesssim follows from (11.2) and (11.67).

The third case is where either $k = i$ and $m \neq j$, or $k \neq i$ and $m = j$. It can be treated using a combination of above arguments.

Therefore, we conclude that $\mathbb{E} |(\Lambda C_T \Lambda^\top)^{ij}|^p \lesssim_p 1$, for each $p \geq 1$. Thus to derive (11.74) from Lemma 11.5, we only need to verify that for each $p \geq 1$ there is C_p such that

$$(11.75) \quad \mathbb{P} \{v \cdot (\Lambda C_T \Lambda^\top v) \leq \zeta\} \leq C_p \zeta^p, \quad \zeta > 0, \quad v \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}, \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1),$$

where $\mathbb{S}^{d-1} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x| = 1\}$ is the unit sphere.

PROOF OF (11.75): Due to (11.66), one can see

$$v \cdot (\Lambda C_T \Lambda^\top v) = \int_0^T |A(s)^\top \mathbf{Z}(s)^\top \Lambda v|^2 ds.$$

Using (11.61) and (11.4), we have

$$(11.76) \quad v \cdot (\Lambda C_T \Lambda^\top v) \geq \int_0^T |R_s|^2 ds,$$

where $R_t = (R_t^1, \dots, R_t^d)$ is defined by

$$(11.77) \quad R_t^j = \sqrt{c_0} \sum_{i=1}^d e^{-\lambda^j t} \mathbf{Z}_j^i(t) \Lambda_i^j v^i, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, d, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

with c_0 introduced in (11.4) and the dependence on $v \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ suppressed. In this notation, (11.76) and (11.79) imply that

$$\mathbb{P} \{v \cdot (\Lambda C_T \Lambda^\top v) \leq \zeta\} \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \int_0^T |R_s|^2 ds \leq \zeta \right\}.$$

The desired result (11.75) follows from the next lemma. \square

Lemma 11.6. *Let R_s be given in (11.77) which depends on the choice of $v \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. For each $p \geq 1$, there is $C_p > 0$ independent of v such that*

$$(11.78) \quad \mathbb{P} \left\{ \int_0^T |R_s|^2 ds \leq \zeta \right\} \leq C_p \zeta^{\frac{1}{16p}}, \quad \zeta > 0, \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1).$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 11.6: We can rewrite

$$(11.79) \quad \begin{aligned} R_t^j &= R_0^j + M_t^j + A_t^j + B_t^j \\ &= R_0^j + \int_0^t u_t^j(s) dW_s^l + \int_0^t a^j(s) ds + \int_0^t b^j(s) ds, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, d, \end{aligned}$$

where R_0 , $u(s)$, $a(s)$, $b(s)$ are obtained as follows: we first apply Itô's formula using the definition of $\mathbf{Z}(s)$ given in (11.63), which determines R_0 , $u(s)$ and $a(s) + b(s)$; then we write $\mathbf{Z}_j^i(s) = \delta_j^i + \widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_j^i(s)$ (see (11.71)) in one of the summations in $a(s) + b(s)$; finally, we collect the terms with δ_j^i to be $b(s)$ and all the rest to be $a(s)$. Thus

$$(11.80) \quad \begin{aligned} R_0^j &= \sqrt{c_0} \Lambda_j^j v_j = \begin{cases} \sqrt{c_0} v_j, & j \leq \nu, \\ \sqrt{c_0} e^{\lambda^j T} v_j, & j > \nu, \end{cases} \\ u_t^j(s) &= -\sqrt{c_0} \sum_{i,k=1}^d \Lambda_i^i v_i e^{-\lambda^j s} \overline{A}_{j,l}^k(s) \mathbf{Z}_k^i(s), \\ a^j(s) &= - \left(\sqrt{c_0} \sum_{i=1}^d \Lambda_i^i v_i \lambda^j e^{-\lambda^j s} \widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_j^i(s) \right) \\ &\quad - \left(\sqrt{c_0} \sum_{i,k,m} \Lambda_i^i v_i e^{-\lambda^j s} \left(\overline{B}_j^k(s) - \sum_l \overline{A}_{m,l}^k(s) \overline{A}_{j,l}^m(s) \right) \mathbf{Z}_k^i(s) \right) \\ b^j(s) &= -\sqrt{c_0} \Lambda_j^j v_j \lambda^j e^{-\lambda^j s} = \begin{cases} -\sqrt{c_0} v_j \lambda^j e^{-\lambda^j s}, & j \leq \nu, \\ -\sqrt{c_0} v_j \lambda^j e^{\lambda^j (T-s)}, & j > \nu. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

We estimate

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} |u(s)|^p \lesssim_p \sum_{i,j,k,l} e^{p|\lambda^j|T} \mathbb{E} \left| \sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} \overline{A}_{j,l}^k(s) \overline{\mathbf{Z}}_k^i(T) \right|^p \lesssim_p \varepsilon^{-\frac{p}{8}} \varepsilon^{\frac{3p}{4}} \leq \varepsilon^{\frac{p}{2}}, \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1),$$

where the first inequality follows from the expression of $u(s)$ in (11.80), and the second inequality is due to (11.16), (11.62), and (11.72). Similarly, first use the definition of $a(s)$ in (11.80) and then estimate terms according to (11.62), (11.73), and (11.16) to see

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^T |a(s)|^2 ds \right)^p &\lesssim_p \sum_{i,j} \mathbb{E} \left(\left| \sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} |\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}_j^i(s)| \right|^2 \int_0^T e^{2|\lambda^j|s} ds \right)^p \\ &\quad + \sum_{i,j,k,l} \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\varepsilon^{\frac{7}{4}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} \right)^{2p} |\overline{\mathbf{Z}}_j^i(T)|^{2p} \left(\int_0^T e^{2|\lambda^j|s} ds \right)^p \right) \\ &\lesssim_p \varepsilon^{3p} \varepsilon^{-\frac{2p}{8}} \leq \varepsilon^{\frac{p}{2}}, \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1). \end{aligned}$$

The above two estimates and Markov's inequality imply that for some $C_p > 0$ independent of $v \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$,

$$(11.81) \quad \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} \left(|u(s)| + \int_0^s |a(r)|^2 dr \right) > \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \zeta^{-\frac{1}{16}} \right\} \leq C_p \zeta^{\frac{1}{16}p}, \quad \zeta > 0, \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1).$$

Let j be the index that satisfies $|v_j| = \max_{1 \leq j \leq d} |v_i|$. Since $v \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, we have

$$(11.82) \quad |v_j| \geq d^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

In addition, let

$$(11.83) \quad \bar{\lambda} = \max_{0 \leq i \leq d} |\lambda^i|, \quad \underline{\lambda} = \min_{0 \leq i \leq d} |\lambda^i|.$$

Recalling the definition of M_t in (11.79), introducing one more auxiliary process

$$N_t^j = \int_0^t R^j(s) u_t^j(s) dW_s^l, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, d,$$

we define, for each $\zeta > 0$ and each $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$(11.84) \quad \begin{aligned} B_0^{\zeta, \varepsilon} &= \left\{ \int_0^T |R_s|^2 ds \leq \zeta, \sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} \left(|u(s)| + \int_0^s |a(r)|^2 dr \right) \leq \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \zeta^{-\frac{1}{16}} \right\}, \\ B_1^{\zeta, \varepsilon} &= \left\{ \langle M^j \rangle_T \leq (c_1 + 1) \zeta^{\frac{1}{8}}, \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |M_t^j| \geq \zeta^{\frac{1}{32}} \right\}, \\ B_2^{\zeta, \varepsilon} &= \left\{ \langle N^j \rangle_T \leq \varepsilon \zeta^{\frac{7}{8}}, \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |N_t^j| \geq \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \zeta^{\frac{3}{8}} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(11.85) \quad c_1 = \sqrt{2c_0 \underline{\lambda}^{-1}} + 5.$$

These sets depend on ε since $T = T(\varepsilon)$, R_s , $u(s)$, $a(s)$, M_s , and N_s do. The exponential martingale inequality implies that, for some $C_p > 0$ independent of $v \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ B_1^{\zeta, \varepsilon} \cup B_2^{\zeta, \varepsilon} \right\} \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{\zeta^{-\frac{1}{16}}}{2(c_1+1)} \right) + 2 \exp \left(-\frac{\zeta^{-\frac{1}{8}}}{2} \right) \leq C_p \zeta^{\frac{1}{16}p}, \quad \zeta > 0, \varepsilon \in (0, 1).$$

This and (11.81) imply that to derive the desired result (11.78) it remains to show that there is $\zeta_0 > 0$ such that

$$(11.86) \quad B_0^{\zeta, \varepsilon} \subset B_1^{\zeta, \varepsilon} \cup B_2^{\zeta, \varepsilon}, \quad \zeta \in (0, \zeta_0), \varepsilon \in (0, 1).$$

Let us fix the following two constants

$$(11.87) \quad c_2 = 2 + \sqrt{2} + \sqrt{c_0 \bar{\lambda}}, \quad c_3 = \left(\frac{c_2}{\sqrt{c_0 d^{-1}}} \right)^3,$$

and derive (11.86) for ζ_0 chosen small enough to ensure

$$(11.88) \quad \sqrt{2c_0 \bar{\lambda}} \zeta_0^{\frac{1}{2}} < c_0 d^{-1}, \quad \zeta_0^{\frac{1}{3}} < \frac{1}{2}, \quad c_2 \zeta_0^{\frac{1}{32}} < \sqrt{c_0 d^{-1}}, \quad (c_2 + \sqrt{c_3}) \zeta_0^{\frac{1}{64}} < \sqrt{c_0 d^{-1}}.$$

Suppose (11.86) is false. Then we can choose $\zeta \in (0, \zeta_0)$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and ω such that

$$(11.89) \quad \omega \in B_0^{\zeta, \varepsilon} \setminus (B_1^{\zeta, \varepsilon} \cup B_2^{\zeta, \varepsilon}).$$

Since $\omega \in B_0^{\zeta, \varepsilon}$ due to (11.89), we have

$$\langle N^j \rangle_T \leq \int_0^T |R_s^j u^j(s)|^2 ds \leq \left(\sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} |u(s)|^2 \right) \int_0^T |R_s|^2 ds \leq \left(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \zeta^{-\frac{1}{16}} \right)^2 \zeta = \varepsilon \zeta^{\frac{7}{8}}.$$

Since $\omega \notin B_2^{\zeta, \varepsilon}$, this implies

$$(11.90) \quad \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \int_0^t R_s^j u_t^j(s) dW_s^l \right| = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |N_t^j| < \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \zeta^{\frac{3}{8}}.$$

Since $\omega \in B_0^{\zeta, \varepsilon}$, the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality implies

$$(11.91) \quad \begin{aligned} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \int_0^t R_s^j a^j(s) ds \right| &\leq \left(\int_0^T |R_s^j|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^T |a^j(s)|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \zeta^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \zeta^{-\frac{1}{16}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{4}} \zeta^{\frac{15}{32}}. \end{aligned}$$

We recall $b(s)$ defined in (11.80).

The Itô formula applied to (11.79) gives

$$\begin{aligned} |R_t^j|^2 &= |R_0^j|^2 + 2 \int_0^t R_s^j dR_s^j + \langle M^j \rangle_t \\ &= |R_0^j|^2 + 2 \left(\int_0^t R_s^j u_t^j dW_s^l + \int_0^t R_s^j a^j(s) ds + \int_0^t R_s^j b^j(s) ds \right) + \langle M^j \rangle_t. \end{aligned}$$

This together with (11.90), (11.91) and $\omega \in B_0^{\zeta, \varepsilon}$ due to (11.89) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \langle M^j \rangle_t dt &= \int_0^T |R_s^j|^2 dt - T |R_0^j|^2 - 2 \int_0^T \int_0^t R_s^j dR_s^j dt \\ &\leq \zeta - T |R_0^j|^2 + 2 \int_0^T \left| \int_0^t R_s^j b^j(s) ds \right| dt + 2T \left(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \zeta^{\frac{3}{8}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{4}} \zeta^{\frac{15}{32}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We treat cases $j \leq \nu$ and $j > \nu$ separately.

If $j \leq \nu$, i.e., $\lambda^j > 0$, we use the definition of R_0^j in (11.80) and (11.82) to bound $|R_0^j|$ from below, use $\omega \in B_0^{\zeta, \varepsilon}$ to estimate the iterated integral term by

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_0^t R_s^j b^j(s) ds \right| &\leq \left(\int_0^T |R_s^j|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^t |b^j(s)|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \zeta^{\frac{1}{2}} v_j \sqrt{c_0} \lambda^j \left(\int_0^t e^{-2\lambda^j s} ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \zeta^{\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{c_0} \lambda^j \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\lambda^j}} = \sqrt{\frac{c_0 |\lambda^j|}{2}} \zeta^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad t \leq T, \end{aligned}$$

and use the first condition in (11.88) to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} -T |R_0^j|^2 + 2 \int_0^T \left| \int_0^t R_s^j b^j(s) ds \right| dt &\leq -T \frac{c_0}{d} + 2T \sqrt{\frac{c_0 \lambda^j}{2}} \zeta^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq T \left(\sqrt{2c_0 \bar{\lambda}} \zeta^{\frac{1}{2}} - c_0 d^{-1} \right) \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\lambda}$ was defined in (11.83). If $j > \nu$, i.e., $\lambda^j < 0$, we use

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_0^t R_s^j b^j(s) ds \right| &\leq \zeta^{\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{c_0} |\lambda^j| e^{\lambda^j T} \left(\int_0^t e^{-2\lambda^j s} ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \zeta^{\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{c_0} |\lambda^j| e^{\lambda^j T} \frac{e^{-\lambda^j t}}{\sqrt{2|\lambda^j|}} = \sqrt{\frac{c_0 |\lambda^j|}{2}} \zeta^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{\lambda^j(T-t)}, \quad t \leq T, \end{aligned}$$

to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} -T \left| R_0^j \right|^2 + 2 \int_0^T \left| \int_0^t R_s^j b^j(s) ds \right| dt &\leq 0 + 2 \int_0^T \sqrt{\frac{c_0 |\lambda^j|}{2}} \zeta^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{\lambda^j(T-t)} dt \\ &\leq \sqrt{2c_0 |\lambda^j|} e^{\lambda^j T} \frac{e^{-\lambda^j T} - 1}{|\lambda^j|} \zeta^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \sqrt{2c_0 \underline{\Delta}^{-1}} \zeta^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\underline{\Delta}$ was defined in (11.83). Recall c_1 given in (11.85). These estimates along with (11.16) show that, in both cases,

$$\int_0^T \langle M^j \rangle_t dt \leq \zeta + \sqrt{2c_0 \underline{\Delta}^{-1}} \zeta^{\frac{1}{2}} + 2 \left(\zeta^{\frac{3}{8}} + \zeta^{\frac{3}{8}} \right) \leq c_1 \zeta^{\frac{3}{8}}.$$

Since $t \mapsto \langle M^j \rangle_t$ is nondecreasing, we conclude that

$$\gamma \langle M^j \rangle_{T-\gamma} \leq c_1 \zeta^{\frac{3}{8}}, \quad 0 < \gamma \leq T.$$

Since $\omega \in B_0^{\zeta, \varepsilon}$ implies $\sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} |u(s)| \leq \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \zeta^{-\frac{1}{16}} \leq \zeta^{-\frac{1}{16}}$, using the definition of M_t in (11.79), we get

$$\langle M^j \rangle_T - \langle M^j \rangle_{T-\gamma} \leq \gamma \zeta^{-\frac{1}{8}}.$$

The above two displays yield $\langle M^j \rangle_T \leq c_1 \gamma^{-1} \zeta^{\frac{3}{8}} + \gamma \zeta^{-\frac{1}{8}}$. Recall that in the statement of Lemma 11.2, it is required that $T \geq 1$. The second condition in (11.88) thus guarantees that $\zeta^{\frac{1}{4}} < \zeta_0^{\frac{1}{4}} < (\frac{1}{2})^{\frac{3}{4}} < 1 \leq T$. Therefore, we can set $\gamma = \zeta^{\frac{1}{4}}$ and obtain

$$\langle M^j \rangle_T \leq c_1 \zeta^{-\frac{1}{4} + \frac{3}{8}} + \zeta^{\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{8}} \leq (c_1 + 1) \zeta^{\frac{1}{8}}.$$

Since $\omega \notin B_1^{\zeta, \varepsilon}$ due to (11.89), the definition of $B_1^{\zeta, \varepsilon}$ in (11.84) indicates that

$$(11.92) \quad \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| M_t^j \right| < \zeta^{\frac{1}{32}}.$$

On the other hand, Markov's inequality and $\omega \in B_0^{\zeta, \varepsilon}$ imply that

$$\text{Leb} \left\{ t \in [0, T] : \left| R_t^j \right| \geq \zeta^{\frac{1}{3}} \right\} \leq \frac{1}{\zeta^{\frac{2}{3}}} \int_0^T \left| R_t^j \right|^2 dt \leq \zeta^{\frac{1}{3}}.$$

Using (11.92) and (11.79), we thus have

$$\text{Leb} \left\{ t \in [0, T] : \left| R_0^j + A_t^j + B_t^j \right| \geq \zeta^{\frac{1}{3}} + \zeta^{\frac{1}{32}} \right\} \leq \zeta^{\frac{1}{3}}.$$

Note that $\zeta^{\frac{1}{3}} < \zeta_0^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{1}{2}T$ due to the second condition in (11.88) and $T \geq 1$. Hence, for each $t \in [0, T]$, there is $t' \in [0, T]$ satisfying $|t - t'| \leq 2\zeta^{\frac{1}{3}}$ and $|R_0^j + A_{t'}^j + B_{t'}^j| < \zeta^{\frac{1}{3}} + \zeta^{\frac{1}{32}}$. Recall the definitions A_t^j and B_t^j in (11.79) and $b(s)$ in (11.80). Then, for each $t \in [0, T]$, we obtain, regardless of whether $j \leq \nu$ or

$j > \nu$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(11.93) \quad & \left| R_0^j + A_t^j + B_t^j \right| \leq \left| R_0^j + A_{t'}^j + B_{t'}^j \right| + \left| \int_{t'}^t a^j(s) ds \right| + \left| \int_{t'}^t b^j(s) ds \right| \\
& < \zeta^{\frac{1}{3}} + \zeta^{\frac{1}{32}} + \left| \int_{t'}^t |a(s)|^2 ds \right|^{\frac{1}{2}} |t - t'|^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left| \int_{t'}^t |b^j(s)|^2 ds \right|^{\frac{1}{2}} |t - t'|^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \leq \zeta^{\frac{1}{3}} + \zeta^{\frac{1}{32}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{4}} \zeta^{-\frac{1}{32}} \sqrt{2} \zeta^{\frac{1}{6}} + \sqrt{c_0} |\lambda^j| (2\lambda^j)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{2} \zeta^{\frac{1}{6}} \\
& \leq \left(2 + \sqrt{2} + \sqrt{c_0 \bar{\lambda}} \right) \zeta^{\frac{1}{32}} = c_2 \zeta^{\frac{1}{32}}, \quad t \leq T.
\end{aligned}$$

where c_2 was given in (11.87). We used the assumption $\omega \in B_0^{\zeta, \varepsilon}$ to bound the integral of $|a(s)|^2$ and the definition of b^j to bound the integral of $|b^j(s)|^2$.

Setting $t = 0$ in the above display we obtain

$$(11.94) \quad \left| R_0^j \right| < c_2 \zeta^{\frac{1}{32}}.$$

If $j \leq \nu$, then, using the expression for R_0^j in (11.80) and (11.82), we obtain $|R_0^j| \geq \sqrt{c_0 d^{-1}}$, which along with (11.94) and the third condition in (11.88) implies

$$\sqrt{c_0 d^{-1}} < c_2 \zeta^{\frac{1}{32}} < c_2 \zeta_0^{\frac{1}{32}} \leq \sqrt{c_0 d^{-1}},$$

a contradiction.

If $j > \nu$, then, due to (11.16), we have $e^{\lambda^j T} = e^{-|\lambda^j| T} \geq \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{8}}$. Due to the formula for R_0^j in (11.80), (11.82) and (11.94), we have

$$(11.95) \quad \sqrt{c_0 d^{-1}} \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{8}} \leq \left| R_0^j \right| < c_2 \zeta^{\frac{1}{32}}.$$

Since (11.16) gives $T \leq \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{8}}$ and $\omega \in B_0^{\zeta, \varepsilon}$, (11.95) implies

$$T \int_0^T |a^j(s)|^2 ds \leq T \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \zeta^{-\frac{1}{16}} \leq \varepsilon^{\frac{3}{8}} \zeta^{-\frac{1}{16}} \leq \left(\frac{c_2 \zeta^{\frac{1}{32}}}{\sqrt{c_0 d^{-1}}} \right)^3 \zeta^{-\frac{1}{16}} = c_3 \zeta^{\frac{1}{32}},$$

where c_3 was given in (11.87). Setting $t = T$ in (11.93) and recalling that A_t^j is defined in (11.79), we see that the above display implies:

$$(11.96) \quad \left| R_0^j + B_T^j \right| \leq c_2 \zeta^{\frac{1}{32}} + \left| A_T^j \right| \leq c_2 \zeta^{\frac{1}{32}} + T^{\frac{1}{2}} \left| \int_0^T |a^j(s)|^2 ds \right|^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq (c_2 + \sqrt{c_3}) \zeta^{\frac{1}{64}}.$$

On the other hand, expressions for R_0^j, B_t^j in (11.79), (11.80) show that

$$(11.97) \quad R_0^j + B_T^j = \sqrt{c_0} e^{\lambda^j T} v_j - \int_0^T \sqrt{c_0} v_j \lambda^j e^{\lambda^j(T-s)} ds = \sqrt{c_0} v_j.$$

Lastly, we have

$$\sqrt{c_0 d^{-1}} \leq \sqrt{c_0} |v_j| \leq (c_2 + \sqrt{c_3}) \zeta^{\frac{1}{64}} < (c_2 + \sqrt{c_3}) \zeta_0^{\frac{1}{64}} < \sqrt{c_0 d^{-1}},$$

where the first inequality follows from (11.82), the second one from (11.96) and (11.97), the last one from the fourth condition in (11.88). But, the above display is absurd.

By contradiction, (11.86) holds for ζ_0 satisfying (11.88). This completes the proof of (11.86) and thus Lemma 11.6. \square

In conclusion, we have shown that for each $p \geq 1$ there is $C_p > 0$ such that

$$\mathbf{E} \left| \det \sigma_{(U_T^{\leq \nu}, N_T^{\geq \nu})} \right|^{-p} \leq C_p, \quad \varepsilon \in (0, 1).$$

11.5. Proof of Lemma 11.2. Using the exponential martingale inequality, the boundedness of V_t^i for $i \leq \nu$ and that of $e^{\lambda^i t} V_t^i$ for $i > \nu$, one can see that there are constants $C, c > 0$ independent of y, ε, θ , and any particular choice of $T = T(\varepsilon)$ such that, uniformly in $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\mathbf{P} \left\{ \left| (U_T^{\leq \nu}, N_T^{\geq \nu}) - x \right| < 2 \right\}, \mathbf{P} \left\{ |Z_T - x| < 2 \right\}, \mathbf{P} \left\{ |\bar{Z}_T - x| < 2 \right\} \leq C e^{-c|x|^2}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

This display, along with (11.58), (11.59), (11.60) and Theorem 11.1 implies parts (3) and (4) of Lemma 11.2. Parts (1) and (2) follow then straightforwardly. \square

REFERENCES

- [AMB11a] Sergio Angel Almada Monter and Yuri Bakhtin. Normal forms approach to diffusion near hyperbolic equilibria. *Nonlinearity*, 24(6):1883–1907, 2011.
- [AMB11b] Sergio Angel Almada Monter and Yuri Bakhtin. Scaling limit for the diffusion exit problem in the Levinson case. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 121(1):24–37, 2011.
- [AP16] Peter Ashwin and Claire Postlethwaite. Quantifying noisy attractors: from heteroclinic to excitable networks. *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, 15(4):1989–2016, 2016.
- [ASK03] Dieter Armbruster, Emily Stone, and Vivien Kirk. Noisy heteroclinic networks. *Chaos*, 13(1):71–86, 2003.
- [Bak10] Yuri Bakhtin. Small noise limit for diffusions near heteroclinic networks. *Dyn. Syst.*, 25(3):413–431, 2010.
- [Bak11] Yuri Bakhtin. Noisy heteroclinic networks. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 150(1):1–42, Jun 2011.
- [Bas11] Richard F. Bass. *Stochastic Processes*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [BC14] Vlad Bally and Lucia Caramellino. On the distances between probability density functions. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 19:33 pp., 2014.
- [BC21a] Yuri Bakhtin and Hong-Bin Chen. Atypical exit events near a repelling equilibrium. *The Annals of Probability*, 49(3):1257 – 1285, 2021.
- [BC21b] Yuri Bakhtin and Hong-Bin Chen. Long exit times near a repelling equilibrium. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 31(2):594 – 624, 2021.
- [BCC16] Vlad Bally, Lucia Caramellino, and Rama Cont. *Stochastic integration by parts and functional Itô calculus*. Springer, 2016.
- [BPG19a] Yuri Bakhtin and Zsolt Pajor-Gyulai. Malliavin calculus approach to long exit times from an unstable equilibrium. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 29(2):827–850, 04 2019.
- [BPG19b] Yuri Bakhtin and Zsolt Pajor-Gyulai. Scaling limit for escapes from unstable equilibria in the vanishing noise limit: Nontrivial Jordan block case. *Stochastics and Dynamics*, 19(03):1950022, 2019.
- [BPG20] Yuri Bakhtin and Zsolt Pajor-Gyulai. Tails of exit times from unstable equilibria on the line. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 57(2):477–496, 2020.
- [FK17] M. Freidlin and L. Koralov. Metastable distributions of Markov chains with rare transitions. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 167(6):1355–1375, 2017.
- [FW12] M.I. Freidlin and A.D. Wentzell. *Random Perturbations of Dynamical Systems*. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften. Springer, 2012.
- [HIK⁺18] Martin Hairer, Gautam Iyer, Leonid Koralov, Alexei Novikov, and Zsolt Pajor-Gyulai. A fractional kinetic process describing the intermediate time behaviour of cellular flows. *Ann. Probab.*, 46(2):897–955, 2018.
- [HKPG16] Martin Hairer, Leonid Koralov, and Zsolt Pajor-Gyulai. From averaging to homogenization in cellular flows—an exact description of the transition. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 52(4):1592–1613, 2016.
- [Kif81] Yuri Kifer. The exit problem for small random perturbations of dynamical systems with a hyperbolic fixed point. *Israel J. Math.*, 40(1):74–96, 1981.

- [Kra40] H.A. Kramers. Brownian motion in a field of force and the diffusion model of chemical reactions. Physica, 7(4):284–304, 1940.
- [Nua95] D. Nualart. The Malliavin Calculus and Related Topics. Probability and its applications : a series of the applied probability trust. Springer-Verlag, 1995.
- [Per01] Lawrence Perko. Differential equations and dynamical systems, volume 7 of Texts in Applied Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, New York, third edition, 2001.
- [SA99] Emily Stone and Dieter Armbruster. Noise and $O(1)$ amplitude effects on heteroclinic cycles. Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science, 9(2):499–506, 1999.
- [SH90] Emily Stone and Philip Holmes. Random perturbations of heteroclinic attractors. SIAM J. Appl. Math., 50(3):726–743, 1990.

COURANT INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

Email address: bakhtin@cims.nyu.edu

Email address: hbchen@cims.nyu.edu

Email address: zsolt@gcims.nyu.edu