

Infinite differentiability of the free energy for a Derrida-Retaux system

Xinxing Chen

School of Mathematical Sciences, Shanghai Jiaotong University, Shanghai 200240, China
chenxinx@sjtu.edu.cn

May 17, 2024

Abstract. We consider a recursive system which was introduced by Derrida and Retaux (J. Stat. Phys. **156** (2014) 268-290) as a toy model to study the depinning transition in presence of disorder. Derrida and Retaux predicted the free energy $F_\infty(p)$ of the system exhibit quite an unusual physical phenomenon which is an infinite order phase transition. Hu and Shi (J. Stat. Phys. **172** (2018) 718-741) studied a special situation and obtained other behavior of the free energy, while insisted on $p = p_c$ being an essential singularity. Recently, Chen, Dagard, Derrida, Hu, Lifshits and Shi (Ann. Probab. **49** (2021) 637-670) confirmed the Derrida-Retaux conjecture under suitable integrability condition. However, in the mathematical review, it is still unknown whether the free energy is infinitely differentiable at the critical point. So that, we continue to study the infinite differentiability of the free energy in this paper.

Keywords. Derrida-Retaux system, Infinite differentiability, Infinite order phase transition, Free energy, Recursive distribution equation

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 60G50, 82B20, 82B27.

1 Introduction

Fix an integer $m \geq 2$. Let X_0^* be a random variable which takes value of $\{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$. Let $p \in [0, 1]$, and let X_0 be a nonnegative integer-valued random variable which satisfies $P_{X_0} = (1 - p)\delta_0 + pP_{X_0^*}$, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{P}(X_0 = 0) = 1 - p, \quad \mathbf{P}(X_0 = k) = p\mathbf{P}(X_0^* = k) \quad \text{for each } k \geq 1. \quad (1.1)$$

For $n \geq 0$, we recursively define

$$X_{n+1} := (X_{n,1} + X_{n,2} + \dots + X_{n,m} - 1)^+, \quad (1.2)$$

where $X_{n,i}, i \geq 1$ are independent copies of X_n and $a^+ = \max\{a, 0\}$ for $a \in \mathbf{R}$. To avoid trivialities, we may assume further $c_1 := \mathbf{P}(X_0^* \geq 2) > 0$ for otherwise $X_n \leq 1, n \geq 0$ almost surely when $m = 2$.

System $\{X_n, n \geq 0\}$ satisfied (1.2) is generally called the Derrida-Retaux system. Derrida-Retaux [11] used it as a toy model to study the depinning transition, Collet, Eckmann, Glaser and Martin [8] as a spin-glass model, Li and Rogers [15] as a hierarchical model. The Derrida-Retaux system is also a max-type recursive distribution equation, see Aldous and Bandyopadhyay [1]. Moreover, it is closely related to the parking model on an infinite regular tree, see Aldous, Contat, Curien and Hénard [2]. There are difference continuous versions of Derrida-Retaux system, see Hu, Mallein and Pain [13], Chen, Dagard, Derrida and Shi [4]. For more references and conjectures about the Derrida-Retaux system, one can see [12], [6] and [7].

Collet, Eckmann, Glaser and Martin [8] showed that there exists a phase transition for system $\{X_n, n \geq 0\}$.

Theorem A (Collet et al. [8])

- (1) If $(m - 1)\mathbf{E}(X_0 m^{X_0}) \leq \mathbf{E}(m^{X_0}) < \infty$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}(X_n) = 0$;
- (2) If $(m - 1)\mathbf{E}(X_0 m^{X_0}) > \mathbf{E}(m^{X_0})$ or $\mathbf{E}(m^{X_0}) = \infty$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}(X_n) = \infty$.

Indeed, as known in [8] (also see [5]), $\mathbf{E}(m^{X_n}) - (m - 1)\mathbf{E}(X_n m^{X_n})$ keeps the same symbol as $\mathbf{E}(m^{X_0}) - (m - 1)\mathbf{E}(X_0 m^{X_0})$. Accordingly, system $\{X_n, n \geq 0\}$ is said to be subcritical if $(m - 1)\mathbf{E}(X_0 m^{X_0}) < \mathbf{E}(m^{X_0})$, critical if $(m - 1)\mathbf{E}(X_0 m^{X_0}) = \mathbf{E}(m^{X_0}) < \infty$ and supercritical

if $(m-1)\mathbf{E}(X_0 m^{X_0}) > \mathbf{E}(m^{X_0})$ or $\mathbf{E}(m^{X_0}) = \infty$. Let

$$p_c := \frac{1}{1 + \mathbf{E}(((m-1)X_0^* - 1)m^{X_0^*})} \in [0, 1).$$

The value $p = p_c$ is just the unique solution satisfying $\mathbf{E}(m^{X_0}) = (m-1)\mathbf{E}(X_0 m^{X_0})$, provided $\mathbf{E}(X_0^* m^{X_0^*}) < \infty$. So that, we can rewrite Theorem A as: Under $\mathbf{E}(X_0^* m^{X_0^*}) < \infty$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}(X_n) = 0 \quad \text{for } p \leq p_c \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}(X_n) = \infty \quad \text{for } p > p_c.$$

It is important to study the quantity

$$F_\infty(p) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \downarrow \frac{\mathbf{E}(X_n)}{m^n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \uparrow \frac{\mathbf{E}(X_n) - \frac{1}{m-1}}{m^n},$$

which is called the free energy of system $\{X_n, n \geq 0\}$, see Derrida and Retaux [11]. By Theorem A, under $\mathbf{E}(X_0^* m^{X_0^*}) < \infty$ the free energy also has a phase transition:

$$F_\infty(p) = 0 \quad \text{for } p \leq p_c \quad \text{and} \quad F_\infty(p) > 0 \quad \text{for } p > p_c.$$

Derrida and Retaux [11] predicted system $\{X_n, n \geq 0\}$ exhibit an infinite order phase transition which is a Berezinskii-Kosterlitz-Thouless type, and gave a famous conjecture which says that under suitable integrability condition on X_0^* , in the nearly supercritical regime

$$F_\infty(p) = \exp\left\{-\frac{C + o(1)}{(p - p_c)^{1/2}}\right\}, \quad p \downarrow p_c.$$

Infinite order phase transition is quite an unusual physical phenomenon. Similar phenomenon were also shown in vertex-reinforced jump process on a regular tree [17], classical spin system on a lattice with a long range inhomogeneous coupling [9] and explosive percolation with a particular initial power-law distribution [10].

Later, Hu and Shi [14] considered a special X_0^* , which satisfies $\mathbf{P}(X_0^* = k) \sim cm^{-k}k^{-\alpha}$, $k \rightarrow \infty$, for some constants $c < \infty$ and $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}$. They proved that if $\alpha < 2$ then

$$F_\infty(p) = \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{(p - p_c)^{\nu(\alpha) + o(1)}}\right\}, \quad p \downarrow p_c, \tag{1.3}$$

where $\nu(\alpha) = \frac{1}{2-\alpha}$ for $\alpha < 2$ (note that $\mathbf{E}(X_0^* m^{X_0^*}) = \infty$ in such situation). Recently in [3], we gave a partial answer to the Derrida-Retaux conjecture by showing that if $\mathbf{E}((X_0^*)^3 m^{X_0^*}) < \infty$ then

$$F_\infty(p) = \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{(p - p_c)^{1/2 + o(1)}}\right\}, \quad p \downarrow p_c. \tag{1.4}$$

We also considered the same situation $\mathbf{P}(X_0^* = k) \sim cm^{-k}k^{-\alpha}$, $k \rightarrow \infty$, and proved that (1.3) still holds true for $\alpha > 2$, with $\nu(\alpha) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\alpha-2}, & 2 < \alpha \leq 4, \\ \frac{1}{2}, & \alpha > 4. \end{cases}$ While when $\mathbf{P}(X_0^* = k) \sim cm^{-k}k^{-2}$, $k \rightarrow \infty$, the free energy was shown in a different behavior:

$$F_\infty(p) = \exp(-e^{(c'+o(1))/p}), \quad p \downarrow p_c = 0, \quad (1.5)$$

where $c' = \frac{1}{(m-1)c}$.

However, in the mathematical review, it is still a problem whether the free energy $F_\infty(p)$ is infinitely differentiable at $p = p_c$. Even in the situation $\mathbf{P}(X_0^* = k) \sim cm^{-k}k^{-\alpha}$, $k \rightarrow \infty$, infinite differentiability can not be derived directly from (1.3), (1.4) or (1.5) owing to the small term $o(1)$. We need some carefulness. As it is known, see Russo [16], the percolation probability on \mathbf{Z}^2 is infinitely differentiable except at $p = p_c$ at most.

Based on the above factors, we study the infinite differentiability of $F_\infty(p)$ in this paper. Write $F_\infty^{(k)}(p) = \frac{d^k}{dp^k}F_\infty(p)$, $p \in [0, 1]$ for the k -th derivative of $F_\infty(p)$, where $F_\infty^{(k)}(0)$ stands for the right derivative at $p = 0$, while $F_\infty^{(k)}(1)$ for the left derivative at $p = 1$.

By (1.2), we have $\mathbf{E}(X_{n+1}) = m\mathbf{E}(X_n) - 1 + \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0)^m$ which implies $\mathbf{E}(X_n) = m^n\mathbf{E}(X_0) - \frac{m^n-1}{m-1} + m^n \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{\mathbf{P}(X_i=0)^m}{m^{i+1}}$. So,

$$F_\infty(p) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{E}(X_n)}{m^n} = \mathbf{E}(X_0) - \frac{1}{m-1} + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbf{P}(X_n = 0)^m}{m^{n+1}}.$$

Our main result is the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume $\mathbf{E}(s^{X_0^*}) < \infty$ for $|s| < m$. Then $F_\infty \in C^\infty[0, 1]$ and for $k \geq 0$,*

$$F_\infty^{(k)}(p) = \frac{d^k}{dp^k} \left(\mathbf{E}(X_0) - \frac{1}{m-1} \right) + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m^{n+1}} \frac{d^k}{dp^k} \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0)^m,$$

where the summation converges uniformly in $p \in [0, 1]$.

Remark 1.2. Let $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}$ and $c > 0$. Consider the example X_0^* which satisfies $\mathbf{P}(X_0^* = k) \sim cm^{-k}k^{-\alpha}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. We have $\mathbf{E}(s^{X_0^*}) < \infty$ for $|s| < m$ always, and so $F_\infty \in C^\infty[0, 1]$.

Remark 1.3. Assume $\mathbf{E}(s^{X_0^*}) < \infty$ for $|s| < m$. As the summation in Theorem 1.1 converges uniformly, we have

$$F_\infty^{(k)}(p) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d^k}{dp^k} \frac{\mathbf{E}(X_n)}{m^n}, \quad k \geq 0, \quad p \in [0, 1].$$

Remark 1.4. Assume $\mathbf{E}(X_0^* m^{X_0^*}) < \infty$. Then $p_c \in (0, 1)$. By Theorem 1.1, F_∞ is infinitely differentiable at $p = p_c$. By Theorem A, $F_\infty(p) = 0$ for $p \in [0, p_c)$. Hence

$$F_\infty^{(k)}(p_c) = \lim_{p \uparrow p_c} F_\infty^{(k)}(p) = 0, \quad k \geq 0.$$

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, by using the Hoeffding's inequality and admitting Propositions 2.3 and 2.4, we give the proof of Theorem 1.1. Where, Proposition 2.3 gives upper bounds for $|\frac{d^k}{dp^k} \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0)|$ in terms of $\mathbf{P}(X_n = 0)$, $\mathbf{P}(\sum_{i=1}^{m^n-k} X_{0,i} \leq m^n)$ and $\prod_{i=0}^{M-1} \mathbf{E}(m^{(1-\delta)(X_i \wedge (M-i))})^{(m-1)k}$; Proposition 2.4 shows some inequalities related to $\mathbf{P}(X_n = 0)$ and $\prod_{i=0}^{M-1} \mathbf{E}(m^{(1-\delta)(X_i \wedge (M-i))})^{m-1}$. In Sections 3 and 4, we prove Propositions 2.3 and 2.4 respectively. Some further remark and question is presented in Section 5.

Notation. We will use $c_i > 0, 1 \leq i \leq 7$ and $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbf{Z}^+$ to stand for some constants which are independent of p and n .

2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Let us begin with the famous Hoeffding's inequality.

Lemma 2.1. (*Hoeffding's inequality*) Let $a > 0$. Let $W_n, n \geq 1$ be a sequence of independent random variables with $0 \leq W_n \leq a$. Then

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n W_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E}(W_i) - t\right) \leq e^{-\frac{2t^2}{na^2}}, \quad n \geq 1, \quad t > 0.$$

By (1.2), $\sum_{i=1}^m X_{n,i} - 1 \leq X_{n+1} \leq \sum_{i=1}^m X_{n,i}$ for all $n \geq 0$. Hence in the meaning of stochastic dominance, we have $\sum_{i=1}^{m^n} X_{0,i} - m^n \leq X_n \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m^n} X_{0,i}$, where $X_{0,i}, i \geq 1$ are independent copies of X_0 . So that we need estimate the summation of these $X_{0,i}$. With the help of Hoeffding's inequality, we have the following result.

Lemma 2.2. Assume that $c_1 := \mathbf{P}(X_0^* \geq 2) > 0$. Then for any $p \in [1 - \frac{c_1}{4}, 1]$, $k \geq 1$ and $n \geq \lfloor \frac{\log(k) + \log(\frac{4+c_1}{c_1})}{\log m} \rfloor + 1$, we have

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m^n-k} X_{0,i} \leq m^n\right) \leq e^{-\frac{c_1^2}{32}(m^n-k)}.$$

Proof. Fix $p \in [1 - \frac{c_1}{4}, 1]$, $k \geq 1$ and $n \geq \lfloor \frac{\log(k) + \log(\frac{4+c_1}{c_1})}{\log m} \rfloor + 1$. Then $(1 + \frac{c_1}{4})(m^n - k) \geq m^n$. Since $c_1 \in (0, 1]$, $p \in [1 - \frac{c_1}{4}, 1]$, $P_{X_0} = (1 - p)\delta_0 + pP_{X_0^*}$ and $X_0^* \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$,

$$\mathbf{E}(X_0 \wedge 2) = p\mathbf{E}(X_0^* \wedge 2) = p(1 + \mathbf{P}(X_0^* \geq 2)) \geq (1 - \frac{c_1}{4})(1 + c_1) \geq 1 + \frac{c_1}{2}.$$

Hence

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m^n-k} \mathbf{E}(X_{0,i} \wedge 2) - \frac{c_1}{4}(m^n - k) = [\mathbf{E}(X_0 \wedge 2) - \frac{c_1}{4}](m^n - k) \geq m^n.$$

Using Lemma 2.1 we obtain immediately

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m^n-k} X_{0,i} \leq m^n\right) &\leq \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m^n-k} (X_{0,i} \wedge 2) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m^n-k} \mathbf{E}(X_{0,i} \wedge 2) - \frac{c_1}{4}(m^n - k)\right) \\ &\leq e^{-\frac{c_1^2}{32}(m^n - k)}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Next, we give two propositions which will be useful in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proposition 2.3. Fix $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. Assume $c_2 := \mathbf{E}(m^{(1-\delta)X_0^*}) < \infty$. Let $p \in (0, 1)$, $k \geq 1$, $n \geq 1$ and $M = \lfloor n - \delta^{-1} \ln n \rfloor$. Then the following three statements hold true:

- (1) $\left| \frac{d^k}{dp^k} \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0) \right| \leq 2^k k! m^{kn} \frac{\mathbf{P}(X_n = 0)}{(1-p)^k}$;
- (2) $\left| \frac{d^k}{dp^k} \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0) \right| \leq 2^k k! m^{kn} \mathbf{P}(\sum_{i=1}^{m^n-k} X_{0,i} \leq m^n)$;
- (3) There exists constant $n_1 = n_1(m, \delta, c_2, k) \in \mathbf{Z}^+$ such that for $n \geq n_1$,

$$\left| \frac{d^k}{dp^k} \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0) \right| \leq m^{3\delta kn} \prod_{i=0}^{M-1} \mathbf{E}(m^{(1-\delta)(X_i \wedge (M-i))})^{(m-1)k}.$$

Proposition 2.4. Fix $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{16m})$. Assume that $c_1 := \mathbf{P}(X_0^* \geq 2) > 0$ and $c_2 := \mathbf{E}(m^{(1-\delta)X_0^*}) < \infty$. Then there exist constants $c_i = c_i(m, \delta, c_1, c_2) > 0$, $3 \leq i \leq 5$, such that for $p \in (0, 1)$ and $n > M \geq 1$,

$$\prod_{i=0}^{M-1} \mathbf{E}(m^{(1-\delta)(X_i \wedge (M-i))})^{m-1} \leq c_3 m^{2\delta M} \quad \text{or} \quad \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0) \leq c_5 e^{-c_4 m^{n-M}}. \quad (2.1)$$

Let us admit Propositions 2.3 and 2.4 hold true for the time being whose proof will be postponed to Sections 3 and 4 respectively, and we will use them to prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By $X_{n+1} = (X_{n,1} + \cdots + X_{n,m} - 1)^+$ for $n \geq 0$, we have $\mathbf{E}(X_{n+1}) = m\mathbf{E}(X_n) - 1 + \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0)^m$ and so,

$$\mathbf{E}(X_n) = m^n \mathbf{E}(X_0) - \frac{m^n - 1}{m - 1} + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} m^{n-i-1} \mathbf{P}(X_i = 0)^m.$$

Hence

$$F_\infty(p) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{E}(X_n)}{m^n} = \mathbf{E}(X_0) - \frac{1}{m - 1} + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbf{P}(X_n = 0)^m}{m^{n+1}}.$$

Since $P_{X_0} = (1 - p)\delta_0 + pP_{X_0^*}$, $\mathbf{P}(X_0 = \ell)$ is a polynomial function of $p \in [0, 1]$ for each $\ell \geq 0$. Since $X_{n+1} = (X_{n,1} + \cdots + X_{n,m} - 1)^+$ for all $n \geq 0$, we can iteratively get that $\mathbf{P}(X_n = \ell)$ is a polynomial function of p for each $n \geq 0$ and $\ell \geq 0$, too. It deduces that all $\mathbf{P}(X_n = \ell)$ are infinitely differentiable in p ; Especially they have right derivatives at $p = 0$ and left derivatives at $p = 1$. So, we will have our main result if for each $k \geq 0$ there has

$$\lim_{n_0 \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{p \in (0,1)} \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m^{n+1}} \left| \frac{d^k}{dp^k} \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0)^m \right| = 0. \quad (2.2)$$

Since $\frac{d^k}{dp^k} \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0)^m = \sum_{(k_1, k_2, \dots, k_m): k_1 + k_2 + \dots + k_m = k} \binom{k}{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_m} \prod_{i=1}^m \frac{d^{k_i}}{dp^{k_i}} \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0)$, we have

$$\left| \frac{d^k}{dp^k} \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0)^m \right| \leq m^k \max \left\{ |\mathbf{P}(X_n = 0)|, \left| \frac{d}{dp} \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0) \right|, \dots, \left| \frac{d^k}{dp^k} \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0) \right| \right\}^m.$$

So, to prove (2.2), it is suffice to prove that for each $k \geq 0$ uniformly in $p \in (0, 1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\frac{d^k}{dp^k} \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0) = O(m^{\frac{n}{2m}}). \quad (2.3)$$

When $k = 0$, it is trivial for (2.3) since $0 \leq \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0) \leq 1$.

Fix $k \geq 1$ and $\delta \in (0, \frac{\ln m}{10km^2})$. Let $n_1 \in \mathbf{Z}^+$ and $c_i > 0$, $3 \leq i \leq 5$ be the constants in Propositions 2.3 and 2.4. Let $n \geq \max\{\lfloor \frac{\log(k) + \log(\frac{4+c_1}{c_1})}{\log m} \rfloor + 1, n_1\}$. If $p \in [1 - \frac{c_1}{4}, 1)$, then using (2) of Proposition 2.3 and Lemma 2.2, we get

$$\left| \frac{d^k}{dp^k} \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0) \right| \leq 2^k k! m^{kn} \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m^n-k} X_{0,i} \leq m^n\right) \leq 2^k k! m^{kn} e^{-\frac{c_1^2}{32}(m^n-k)} = O(m^{\frac{n}{2m}}).$$

Otherwise, let $p \in (0, 1 - \frac{c_1}{4})$. By (1) and (3) of Proposition 2.3, we have

$$\left| \frac{d^k}{dp^k} \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0) \right| \leq \min \left\{ 2^k k! m^{kn} \frac{\mathbf{P}(X_n = 0)}{(\frac{c_1}{4})^k}, m^{3\delta kn} \prod_{i=0}^{M-1} \mathbf{E}(m^{(1-\delta)X_i^{(M)}})^{(m-1)k} \right\},$$

where $M = \lfloor n - \delta^{-1} \ln n \rfloor$ and $X_i^{(M)} = X_i \wedge (M - i)$. By Proposition 2.4, there has

$$\prod_{i=0}^{M-1} \mathbf{E}(m^{(1-\delta)X_i^{(M)}})^{m-1} \leq c_3 m^{2\delta M} \quad \text{or} \quad \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0) \leq c_5 e^{-c_4 m^{n-M}}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{d^k}{dp^k} \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0) \right| &\leq \max \left\{ 2^k k! m^{kn} \frac{c_5 e^{-c_4 m^{n-M}}}{(\frac{c_1}{4})^k}, m^{3\delta kn} (c_3 m^{2\delta M})^k \right\} \\ &\leq \max \left\{ 8^k k! c_5 c_1^{-k} m^{kn} e^{-c_4 m^{\delta^{-1} \ln n}}, c_3^k m^{5\delta kn} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\delta \in (0, \frac{\ln m}{10km^2})$, $k \geq 1$ and $m \geq 2$, we have $\delta^{-1} \geq \frac{40}{\ln m}$ and $5\delta k \leq \frac{1}{2m}$. Therefore, uniformly in $p \in (0, 1 - \frac{c_1}{4})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\left| \frac{d^k}{dp^k} \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0) \right| \leq \max \left\{ 8^k k! c_5 c_1^{-k} m^{kn} e^{-c_4 n^{40}}, c_3^k m^{\frac{n}{2m}} \right\} = O(m^{\frac{n}{2m}}).$$

Such we prove (2.3) and finish the proof of the theorem. \square

3 Proof of Proposition 2.3

To obtain the bounds of $\frac{d^k}{dp^k} \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0)$ in Proposition 2.3, it is convenient to use a hierarchical representation of system $\{X_n, n \geq 0\}$, as in [8, 11, 3].

Let \mathbb{T} be a (reversed) m -regular tree. For any vertex $v \in \mathbb{T}$, denote by $|v|$ the generation of v . Let $\mathbb{T}_n := \{v \in \mathbb{T} : |v| = n\}$ for $n \geq 0$. So that, the initial generation \mathbb{T}_0 is just the set of the leaves of \mathbb{T} . For $v \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \mathbb{T}_0$, let $v^{(1)}, v^{(2)}, \dots, v^{(m)}$ be the m parents of v .

For $v \in \mathbb{T}_0$, let $X_0^*(v)$ be a random variable having the law as X_0^* , $U(v)$ a binomial random variable with $\mathbf{P}(U(v) = 1) = p$. Assume further all these $X_0^*(v), U(v), v \in \mathbb{T}_0$ are independent. Define

$$X(v) := X_0^*(v)U(v), \quad v \in \mathbb{T}_0; \quad (3.1)$$

and iteratively set

$$X(v) := (X(v^{(1)}) + \cdots + X(v^{(m)}) - 1)^+, \quad v \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \mathbb{T}_0. \quad (3.2)$$

By definition, $X(v), v \in \mathbb{T}_n$ are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d) having the same law as X_n . We will use X to stand for $(X(v), v \in \mathbb{T})$.

For $n \geq 0$, write e_n for the first lexicographic vertex in the n -th generation of \mathbb{T} . Since $X(e_n)$ has the same law as X_n , we will use the notation $X_n = X(e_n)$ if without making any confusion. For $u \in \mathbb{T}$ and $0 \leq n \leq |u|$, set $\mathbb{T}^u := \{v \in \mathbb{T} : v \text{ is an ancestor of } u\} \cup \{u\}$ and $\mathbb{T}_n^u := \mathbb{T}^u \cap \mathbb{T}_n$. Then the value of X_n is determined by $X(v), v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}$. Therefore, our question is changed into calculating the derivatives of $\mathbf{E}(f(X))$, where $f : \mathbf{R}^{\mathbb{T}} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is some indicator function satisfying that the value of $f(X)$ is determined by $X(v), v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}$.

To obtain a simple form of our result, we still need some notation. Let A be a finite subset of \mathbb{T}_0 . We define $\Theta^A X := (\Theta^A X(v), v \in \mathbb{T})$ which such that

$$\Theta^A X(v) := X(v)1_{\{v \notin A\}} + X_0^*(v)1_{\{v \in A\}}, \quad v \in \mathbb{T}_0; \quad (3.3)$$

$$\Theta^A X(v) := (\Theta^A X(v^{(1)}) + \cdots + \Theta^A X(v^{(m)}) - 1)^+, \quad v \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \mathbb{T}_0. \quad (3.4)$$

Then the value of $\Theta^A X(e_n)$ is determined by $\Theta^A X(v), v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}$ for each n . Since $X(u) \leq X_0^*(u)$ for $u \in \mathbb{T}_0$, we have $\sup_{B: B \subseteq A} \Theta^B X(v) = \Theta^A X(v)$ for any $v \in \mathbb{T}_0$. Iteratively using (3.4), we have $\sup_{B: B \subseteq A} \Theta^B X(v) = \Theta^A X(v)$ for $v \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \mathbb{T}_0$, too. For any function f on $\mathbf{R}^{\mathbb{T}}$, we define

$$\nabla^A f(X) := \sum_{B: B \subseteq A} (-1)^{|A|-|B|} f(\Theta^B X),$$

where $|A|$ is the cardinality of A . By definition, for any constants $a, b \in \mathbf{R}$ and functions f and g on $\mathbf{R}^{\mathbb{T}}$,

$$\nabla^A (af + bg)(X) = a\nabla^A f(X) + b\nabla^A g(X). \quad (3.5)$$

Lemma 3.1. *Let $k \geq 1$, $n \geq 0$ and $x_v \in \mathbf{Z}^+$ for $v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}$. Then*

$$\frac{d^k}{dp^k} \mathbf{P}(X(v) = x_v, v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}) = \frac{k!}{(1-p)^k} \sum_{A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}: |A|=k} \mathbf{E}(1_{\{X|_A=0\}} \nabla^A 1_{\{X(v)=x_v, v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}\}}), \quad (3.6)$$

where the meaning of $X|_A = 0$ is $X(v) = 0$ for all $v \in A$.

Proof. Fix $x_v \in \mathbf{Z}^+$, $v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}$ and set $\mathcal{D} := \{v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n} : x_v > 0\}$, $\alpha_{x,\mathcal{D}} := \prod_{v \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbf{P}(X_0^*(v) = x_v)$.

The left-hand side of (3.6) is easy to calculate. By (3.1), for $v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}$,

$$\mathbf{P}(X(v) = x_v) = \mathbf{P}(X_0^*(v)U(v) = x_v) = [\mathbf{P}(X_0^*(v) = x_v)p]^{1_{\{x_v > 0\}}}(1-p)^{1_{\{x_v = 0\}}}.$$

So,

$$\mathbf{P}(X(v) = x_v, v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}) = \prod_{v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}} \mathbf{P}(X(v) = x_v) = \alpha_{x,\mathcal{D}} p^{|\mathcal{D}|} (1-p)^{m^n - |\mathcal{D}|}.$$

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LHS}_{(3.6)} &= \alpha_{x,\mathcal{D}} \frac{d^k}{dp^k} p^{|\mathcal{D}|} (1-p)^{m^n - |\mathcal{D}|} \\ &= \alpha_{x,\mathcal{D}} \sum_{h=0}^k \binom{k}{h} \left(\frac{d^h}{dp^h} p^{|\mathcal{D}|} \right) \left(\frac{d^{k-h}}{dp^{k-h}} (1-p)^{m^n - |\mathcal{D}|} \right) \\ &= k! \alpha_{x,\mathcal{D}} \sum_{h=0}^k (-1)^{k-h} \binom{|\mathcal{D}|}{h} \binom{m^n - |\mathcal{D}|}{k-h} p^{|\mathcal{D}|-h} (1-p)^{m^n - |\mathcal{D}| - k + h}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we calculate the right-hand side of (3.6). Fix $A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}$ with $|A| = k$. Let $B \subset A$. By (3.3), conditioned on event $\{X|_A = 0, 1_{\{\Theta^B X(v) = x_v, v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}\}} = 1\}$, for $u \in A \cap \mathcal{D}$,

$$1_{\{u \in B\}} \geq 1_{\{X(u)=0, \Theta^B X(u) > 0\}} \geq 1_{\{X|_A=0, \Theta^B X(u)=x_u\}} = 1;$$

while $x_u = \Theta^B X(u) = X_0^*(u) \geq 1$ for $u \in B$. Hence there must has $B = A \cap \mathcal{D}$ conditioned on $\{1_{\{X|_A=0\}} 1_{\{\Theta^B X(v) = x_v, v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}\}} = 1\}$. So, writing $h = |A \cap \mathcal{D}|$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1_{\{X|_A=0\}} \nabla^A 1_{\{X(v) = x_v, v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}\}} &= 1_{\{X|_A=0\}} \sum_{B: B \subset A} (-1)^{|A|-|B|} 1_{\{\Theta^B X(v) = x_v, v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}\}} \\ &= 1_{\{X|_A=0\}} (-1)^{k-h} 1_{\{\Theta^{A \cap \mathcal{D}} X(v) = x_v, v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}\}} \\ &= (-1)^{k-h} \prod_{v \in \mathcal{D}} 1_{\{X_0^*(v) = x_v\}} \prod_{v \in \mathcal{D} \setminus A} 1_{\{U(v)=1\}} \prod_{v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n} \setminus (\mathcal{D} \setminus A)} 1_{\{U(v)=0\}}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows immediately,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{E}(1_{\{X|_A=0\}} \nabla^A 1_{\{X(v) = x_v, v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}\}}) \\ &= (-1)^{k-h} \prod_{v \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbf{P}(X_0^*(v) = x_v) \prod_{v \in \mathcal{D} \setminus A} \mathbf{P}(U(v) = 1) \prod_{v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n} \setminus (\mathcal{D} \setminus A)} \mathbf{P}(U(v) = 0) \\ &= (-1)^{k-h} \alpha_{x,\mathcal{D}} p^{|\mathcal{D}|-h} (1-p)^{m^n - |\mathcal{D}| + h}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{RHS}_{(3.6)} &= \frac{k!}{(1-p)^k} \sum_{h=0}^k \sum_{A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}: |A|=k, |A \cap \mathcal{D}|=h} \mathbf{E}(1_{\{X|_A=0\}} \nabla^A 1_{\{X(v)=x_v, v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}\}}) \\
&= \frac{k!}{(1-p)^k} \alpha_{x, \mathcal{D}} \sum_{h=0}^k \sum_{A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}: |A|=k, |A \cap \mathcal{D}|=h} (-1)^{k-h} p^{|\mathcal{D}|-h} (1-p)^{m^n-|\mathcal{D}|+h} \\
&= k! \alpha_{x, \mathcal{D}} \sum_{h=0}^k \binom{|\mathcal{D}|}{h} \binom{m^n - |\mathcal{D}|}{k-h} (-1)^{k-h} p^{|\mathcal{D}|-h} (1-p)^{m^n-|\mathcal{D}|-k+h}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $\text{LHS}_{(3.6)} = \text{RHS}_{(3.6)}$ holds true, we complete the proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma 3.2. *For each $k \geq 1$ and $n \geq 0$, we have*

$$\left| \frac{d^k}{dp^k} \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0) \right| \leq \frac{2^k k!}{(1-p)^k} \sum_{A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}: |A|=k} \mathbf{P}(\nabla^A 1_{\{X_n=0\}} \neq 0, X|_A = 0).$$

Proof. Fix $k \geq 1$ and $n \geq 0$. By (3.2), $X(v) \geq X(v^{(j)}) - 1$ for $\mathbb{T} \setminus \mathbb{T}_0$ and $1 \leq j \leq m$. Hence

$$X(e_n) \geq X(v) - n + |v|, \quad v \in \mathbb{T}^{e_n}.$$

It implies that conditioned on $\{X_n = 0\}$ we have $X(v) \leq n$ for all $v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}$. Hence

$$1_{\{X_n=0\}} = \sum_{x_v \in \{0,1,\dots,n\} \text{ for } v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}} 1_{\{X_n=0, X(v)=x_v, v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}\}}.$$

Since the value of X_n is determined by $X(v), v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}$, the above equation can be rewrote as

$$1_{\{X_n=0\}} = \sum_{x_v \in \{0,1,\dots,n\} \text{ for } v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}} a_x 1_{\{X(v)=x_v, v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}\}}, \quad (3.7)$$

where $a_x \in \{0, 1\}$ is non-random and satisfies $1_{\{X_n=0, X(v)=x_v, v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}\}} = a_x 1_{\{X(v)=x_v, v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}\}}$. So,

$$\mathbf{P}(X_n = 0) = \sum_{x_v \in \{0,1,\dots,n\} \text{ for } v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}} a_x \mathbf{P}(X(v) = x_v, v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}). \quad (3.8)$$

Since the sums on the right-hand side of (3.8) have only finite terms, we have

$$\frac{d^k}{dp^k} \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0) = \sum_{x_v \in \{0,1,\dots,n\} \text{ for } v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}} a_x \frac{d^k}{dp^k} \mathbf{P}(X(v) = x_v, v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}).$$

Using Lemma 3.1 and the Fubini Theorem, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^k}{dp^k} \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0) &= \sum_{x_v \in \{0,1,\dots,n\} \text{ for } v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{\text{en}}} a_x \frac{k!}{(1-p)^k} \sum_{A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{\text{en}}: |A|=k} \mathbf{E}(1_{\{X|_A=0\}} \nabla^A 1_{\{X(v)=x_v, v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{\text{en}}\}}) \\ &= \frac{k!}{(1-p)^k} \sum_{A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{\text{en}}: |A|=k} \mathbf{E}(1_{\{X|_A=0\}} \sum_{x_v \in \{0,1,\dots,n\} \text{ for } v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{\text{en}}} a_x \nabla^A 1_{\{X(v)=x_v, v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{\text{en}}\}}). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by (3.7) and (3.5),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x_v \in \{0,1,\dots,n\} \text{ for } v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{\text{en}}} a_x \nabla^A 1_{\{X(v)=x_v, v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{\text{en}}\}} &= \nabla^A \sum_{x_v \in \{0,1,\dots,n\} \text{ for } v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{\text{en}}} a_x 1_{\{X(v)=x_v, v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{\text{en}}\}} \\ &= \nabla^A 1_{\{X_n=0\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{d^k}{dp^k} \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0) = \frac{k!}{(1-p)^k} \sum_{A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{\text{en}}: |A|=k} \mathbf{E}(1_{\{X|_A=0\}} \nabla^A 1_{\{X_n=0\}}).$$

Since $|\nabla^A 1_{\{X_n=0\}}| = \left| \sum_{B: B \subset A} (-1)^{|A|-|B|} 1_{\{\Theta^B X(e_n)=0\}} \right| \leq 2^k$ for $A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{\text{en}}$ with $|A| = k$, we draw out the conclusion of the lemma immediately. \square

We have to estimate $\mathbf{P}(\nabla^A 1_{\{X_n=0\}} \neq 0, X|_A = 0)$, so that, we should understand what will happen when event $\{\nabla^A 1_{\{X_n=0\}} \neq 0\}$ occurs.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $n \geq 0, i \geq 0$ and $A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{\text{en}}$ with $A \neq \emptyset$. Then conditioned on event $\{\nabla^A 1_{\{X(e_n)=i\}} \neq 0\}$, the following three statements hold true:*

- (1) $X(v) \leq n + i - |v|$ for any $v \in \mathbb{T}^{\text{en}}$;
- (2) $\Theta^A X(e_n) \geq (i \vee 1)$;
- (3) There exist some integers $x_1 \geq 0, \dots, x_m \geq 0$ with $(x_1 + \dots + x_m - 1)^+ = i$ such that

$$\nabla^{A \cap \mathbb{T}_0^{\text{en}(j)}} 1_{\{X(e_n^{(j)})=x_j\}} \neq 0 \quad \text{for each } 1 \leq j \leq m.$$

Proof. Fix $n \geq 0, i \geq 0$ and $A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{\text{en}}$ with $A \neq \emptyset$. Suppose event $\{\nabla^A 1_{\{X(e_n)=i\}} \neq 0\}$ occur.

Since $\nabla^A 1_{\{X(e_n)=i\}} = \sum_{B: B \subset A} (-1)^{|A|-|B|} 1_{\{\Theta^B X(e_n)=i\}}$ and $\sum_{B: B \subset A} (-1)^{|A|-|B|} = (1-1)^{|A|} = 0$,

$$0 = \inf_{B: B \subset A} 1_{\{\Theta^B X(e_n)=i\}} < \sup_{B: B \subset A} 1_{\{\Theta^B X(e_n)=i\}} = 1.$$

Since $\Theta^B X(e_n) \geq X(e_n)$ for any B ,

$$1_{\{X(e_n) \leq i\}} = \sup_{B: B \subset A} 1_{\{\Theta^B X(e_n) \leq i\}} \geq \sup_{B: B \subset A} 1_{\{\Theta^B X(e_n) = i\}}.$$

Hence $X(e_n) \leq i$. Furthermore, by $X(e_n) \geq X(v) - n + |v|$ for $v \in \mathbb{T}^{e_n}$, we obtain (1).

Since $\sup_{B: B \subset A} \Theta^B X(e_n) = \Theta^A X(e_n)$, we have

$$1_{\{i=0\}} 1_{\{\Theta^A X(e_n)=0\}} \leq \inf_{B: B \subset A} 1_{\{\Theta^B X(e_n)=i\}} = 0.$$

and

$$1_{\{\Theta^A X(e_n) \geq i\}} = \sup_{B: B \subset A} 1_{\{\Theta^B X(e_n) \geq i\}} \geq \sup_{B: B \subset A} 1_{\{\Theta^B X(e_n) = i\}} = 1.$$

So that we draw out the conclusion of (2).

We are left to prove (3). For short, we write $[m] = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$, $A_j = A \cap \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n^{(j)}}$ for $j \in [m]$ and $\Xi_i = \{(x_1, \dots, x_m) : (x_1 + \dots + x_m - 1)^+ = i, x_j \geq 0 \text{ for } j \in [m]\}$. By (3.5) and $1_{\{X(e_n)=i\}} = \sum_{(x_1, \dots, x_m) \in \Xi_i} 1_{\{X(e_n^{(j)})=x_j \text{ for } j \in [m]\}}$, we have

$$\nabla^A 1_{\{X(e_n)=i\}} = \sum_{(x_1, \dots, x_m) \in \Xi_i} \nabla^A 1_{\{X(e_n^{(j)})=x_j \text{ for } j \in [m]\}}.$$

On the other hand, since $\Theta^{B_1 \cup \dots \cup B_m} X(e_n^{(j)}) = \Theta^{B_j} X(e_n^{(j)})$ for any $B_1 \subset A_1, \dots, B_m \subset A_m$ and $j \in [m]$, we get that for each $(x_1, \dots, x_m) \in \Xi_i$,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^A 1_{\{X(e_n^{(j)})=x_j \text{ for } j \in [m]\}} &= \sum_{B_1 \subset A_1, \dots, B_m \subset A_m} (-1)^{|A| - |B_1 \cup \dots \cup B_m|} 1_{\{\Theta^{B_1 \cup \dots \cup B_m} X(e_n^{(j)})=x_j \text{ for } j \in [m]\}} \\ &= \sum_{B_1 \subset A_1, \dots, B_m \subset A_m} (-1)^{(|A_1| + \dots + |A_m|) - (|B_1| + \dots + |B_m|)} 1_{\{\Theta^{B_j} X(e_n^{(j)})=x_j \text{ for } j \in [m]\}} \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^m \sum_{B_j \subset A_j} (-1)^{|A_j| - |B_j|} 1_{\{\Theta^{B_j} X(e_n^{(j)})=x_j\}} \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^m \nabla^{A_j} 1_{\{X(e_n^{(j)})=x_j\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\nabla^A 1_{\{X(e_n)=i\}} = \sum_{(x_1, \dots, x_m) \in \Xi_i} \prod_{j=1}^m \nabla^{A_j} 1_{\{X(e_n^{(j)})=x_j\}}.$$

Hence we have (3). □

Let us introduce some notation again. For $v \in \mathbb{T}_0$ and $n \geq 1$, let v_n denote the unique descendant of v in generation n . For $u \in \mathbb{T}$ and $A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^u$, set

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{O}_{u,A} &:= \{v_i : v \in A, 1 \leq i \leq |u|\}, \\ \mathbb{L}_{u,A} &:= \{v^{(j)} : v \in \mathbb{O}_{u,A}, 1 \leq j \leq m\} \setminus (\mathbb{O}_{u,A} \cup A).\end{aligned}$$

Then $A \cup \mathbb{O}_{u,A}$ is the set of vertices of the smallest subtree of \mathbb{T} which contains $A \cup \{u\}$ if $|u| \geq 1$, while $\mathbb{O}_{u,A} = \emptyset$ if $|u| = 0$. By observed, all \mathbb{T}^v , $v \in A \cup \mathbb{L}_{u,A}$ are disjoint subsets of \mathbb{T}^u . Since $v_i \in \{v_{i+1}^{(j)} : 1 \leq j \leq m\}$ for any $v \in \mathbb{T}_0$ and $i \geq 0$, we have

$$|\mathbb{L}_{u,A} \cap \mathbb{T}_i| \leq (m-1)|A|, \quad i \geq 0.$$

Lemma 3.4. *Let $n \geq 0$. Then for each $i \geq 0$ and $A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}$ with $A \neq \emptyset$, conditioned on event $\{\nabla^A 1_{\{X(e_n)=i\}} \neq 0\}$,*

$$\Theta^A X(e_n) = \sum_{v \in \mathbb{L}_{e_n,A}} X(v) + \sum_{u \in A} X_0^*(u) - |\mathbb{O}_{e_n,A}|. \quad (3.9)$$

Proof. We will prove (3.9) by reduction to n . It is true for (3.9) when $n = 0$ since $\mathbb{T}_0^{e_0} = \{e_0\}$, $\Theta^{\{e_0\}} X(e_0) = X_0^*(e_0)$ and $\mathbb{O}_{e_0,\{e_0\}} = \emptyset = \mathbb{L}_{e_0,\{e_0\}}$. Let $\ell \geq 1$. Assume that (3.9) holds true for $n = \ell - 1$, and we will prove it still holds true for $n = \ell$.

Fix $i \geq 0$ and $A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{e_\ell}$ with $A \neq \emptyset$. As before, set $[m] = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$, $A_j = A \cap \mathbb{T}_0^{e_\ell^{(j)}}$ for $j \in [m]$ and $I = \{j \in [m] : A_j \neq \emptyset\}$. Suppose event $\{\nabla^A 1_{\{X(e_\ell)=i\}} \neq 0\}$ occurs.

By (2) of Lemma 3.3, we have $\Theta^A(e_\ell) \geq 1$, which implies

$$\Theta^A(e_\ell) = \sum_{j=1}^m \Theta^A X(e_\ell^{(j)}) - 1 = \sum_{j \in I} \Theta^{A_j} X(e_\ell^{(j)}) + \sum_{j \in [m] \setminus I} X(e_\ell^{(j)}) - 1.$$

By (3) of Lemma 3.3, there exist some integers $x_1 \geq 0, \dots, x_m \geq 0$ such that

$$\nabla^{A_j} 1_{\{X(e_\ell^{(j)})=x_j\}} \neq 0 \text{ for all } j \in [m]. \quad (3.10)$$

Note that $|e_\ell^{(j)}| = \ell - 1$ and $A_j \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{e_\ell^{(j)}}$ with $A_j \neq \emptyset$ for $j \in I$. So by (3.10) and the assumption that (3.9) holds true for $n = \ell - 1$, we can get

$$\Theta^{A_j} X(e_\ell^{(j)}) = \sum_{v \in \mathbb{L}_{e_\ell^{(j)}, A_j}} X(v) + \sum_{u \in A_j} X_0^*(u) - |\mathbb{O}_{e_\ell^{(j)}, A_j}|, \quad j \in I.$$

Combining these equalities together, we obtain that conditioned on $\{\nabla^A 1_{\{X(e_\ell)=i\}} \neq 0\}$,

$$\Theta^A(e_\ell) = \sum_{j \in I} \left(\sum_{v \in \mathbb{L}_{e_\ell^{(j)}, A_j}} X(v) + \sum_{u \in A_j} X_0^*(u) - |\mathbb{O}_{e_\ell^{(j)}, A_j}| \right) + \sum_{j \in [m] \setminus I} X(e_\ell^{(j)}) - 1.$$

Since $A = \bigcup_{j \in I} A_j$, $\mathbb{O}_{e_\ell, A} = \{e_\ell\} \cup \bigcup_{j \in I} \mathbb{O}_{e_\ell^{(j)}, A_j}$ and $\mathbb{L}_{e_\ell, A} = \{e_\ell^{(j)} : j \in [m] \setminus I\} \cup \bigcup_{j \in I} \mathbb{L}_{e_\ell^{(j)}, A_j}$, we obtain further

$$\Theta^A(e_\ell) = \sum_{v \in \mathbb{L}_{e_\ell, A}} X(v) + \sum_{u \in A} X_0^*(u) - |\mathbb{O}_{e_\ell, A}|.$$

Such we prove that (3.9) holds true for $n = \ell$, and finish the proof of the lemma. \square

By Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4, $\sum_{v \in \mathbb{L}_{e_n, A}} X(v) + \sum_{u \in A} X_0^*(u) - |\mathbb{O}_{e_n, A}| \geq 1$ conditioned on $\{\nabla^A 1_{\{X(e_n)=0\}} \neq 0\}$. So, we go ahead to study some quantity related to those $|\mathbb{O}_{e_n, A}|$.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $k \geq 0$. Then*

$$\sum_{A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n} : |A|=k} m^{-|\mathbb{O}_{e_n, A}|} \leq m^{k^m} n^{(k-1)^+}, \quad n \geq 1. \quad (3.11)$$

Proof. We will prove (3.11) by induction to k . When $n \geq 1$ and $A = \emptyset$, we have $\mathbb{O}_{e_n, A} = \emptyset$ and so (3.11) holds true for $k = 0$. When $n \geq 1$ and $v \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}$, we have $\mathbb{O}_{e_n, \{v\}} = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$. So

$$\sum_{A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n} : |A|=1} m^{-|\mathbb{O}_{e_n, A}|} = \sum_{v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}} m^{-|\mathbb{O}_{e_n, \{v\}}|} = \sum_{v \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}} m^{-n} = 1.$$

Hence (3.11) holds true for $k = 1$.

Now let $\ell \geq 2$ and assume that (3.11) holds true for each $k < \ell$, and we will show it still holds true for $k = \ell$. Let $n \geq 1$, $A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}$ with $|A| = \ell$. Denote by w the first common offspring of A , and set $A_j = A \cap \mathbb{T}_0^{w^{(j)}}$ for each $1 \leq j \leq m$. Then

$$\sum_{j=1}^m |A_j| = \ell, \quad |\mathbb{O}_{e_n, A}| = n - |w| + 1 + \sum_{j=1}^m |\mathbb{O}_{w^{(j)}, A_j}|.$$

Since $|A| = \ell \geq 2$, we have $1 \leq |w| \leq n$, $\sum_{j=1}^m (|A_j| - 1)^+ \leq \ell - 2$ and $\max_{1 \leq j \leq m} |A_j| \leq \ell - 1$. So,

writing $\Lambda_\ell = \{(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_m) : \sum_{j=1}^m \ell_j = \ell, \sum_{j=1}^m (\ell_j - 1)^+ \leq \ell - 2 \text{ and } 0 \leq \ell_j \leq \ell - 1 \text{ for } j\}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n} : |A| = \ell} m^{-\mathbb{O}_{e_n, A}} &= \sum_{h=1}^n \sum_{w \in \mathbb{T}_h^{e_n}} \sum_{(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_m) \in \Lambda_\ell} \sum_{A_j \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{w^{(j)}} \text{ with } |A_j| = \ell_j \text{ for } j \leq m} m^{-n+h-1 - \sum_{j=1}^m |\mathbb{O}_{w^{(j)}, A_j}|} \\ &= \sum_{h=1}^n \sum_{w \in \mathbb{T}_h^{e_n}} m^{-n+h-1} \sum_{(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_m) \in \Lambda_\ell} \prod_{j=1}^m \left(\sum_{A_j \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{w^{(j)}} \text{ with } |A_j| = \ell_j} m^{-|\mathbb{O}_{w^{(j)}, A_j}|} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let $1 \leq j \leq m$. If $w \in \mathbb{T}_1^{e_n}$, then $\mathbb{T}_0^{w^{(j)}} = \{w^{(j)}\}$ and $\mathbb{O}_{w^{(j)}, A_j} = \emptyset$, which implies

$$\sum_{A_j \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{w^{(j)}} \text{ with } |A_j| = \ell_j} m^{-|\mathbb{O}_{w^{(j)}, A_j}|} = 1_{\{\ell_j \leq 1\}} \leq m^{\ell_j^m} |w|^{(\ell_j - 1)^+}.$$

While if $w \in \mathbb{T}^{e_n} \setminus (\mathbb{T}_0 \cup \mathbb{T}_1)$ then $|w^{(j)}| \geq 1$. By $\ell_j \leq \ell - 1$, we can use the assumption that (3.11) holds true for $k < \ell$ to get

$$\sum_{A_j \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{w^{(j)}} \text{ with } |A_j| = \ell_j} m^{-|\mathbb{O}_{w^{(j)}, A_j}|} \leq m^{\ell_j^m} (|w^{(j)}|)^{(\ell_j - 1)^+} \leq m^{\ell_j^m} |w|^{(\ell_j - 1)^+}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n} : |A| = \ell} m^{-\mathbb{O}_{e_n, A}} &\leq \sum_{h=1}^n \sum_{w \in \mathbb{T}_h^{e_n}} m^{-n+h-1} \sum_{(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_m) \in \Lambda_\ell} \prod_{j=1}^m (m^{\ell_j^m} |w|^{(\ell_j - 1)^+}) \\ &\leq \sum_{h=1}^n \sum_{w \in \mathbb{T}_h^{e_n}} m^{-n+h-1} \sum_{(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_m) \in \Lambda_\ell} m^{\sum_{j=1}^m \ell_j^m} n^{\sum_{j=1}^m (\ell_j - 1)^+}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_m) \in \Lambda_\ell$, we have $\sum_{j=1}^m (\ell_j - 1)^+ \leq \ell - 2$ and $\sum_{j=1}^m \ell_j = \ell$. Noting that $(a + b - 1)^m + 1 = a^m + \sum_{r=1}^m \binom{m}{r} a^{m-r} (b - 1)^r + 1 \geq a^m + \sum_{r=1}^m \binom{m}{r} (b - 1)^r + 1 = a^m + b^m$ for any $a \geq 1, b \geq 1$ and $m \geq 2$, we get $\sum_{j=1}^m \ell_j^m \leq (\ell - 1)^m + 1 \leq \ell^m - \ell$. Hence

$$\sum_{A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n} : |A| = \ell} m^{-\mathbb{O}_{e_n, A}} \leq \sum_{h=1}^n |\mathbb{T}_h^{e_n}| m^{-n+h-1} |\Lambda_\ell| m^{\ell^m - \ell} n^{\ell - 2}.$$

Hence by $|\mathbb{T}_h^{e_n}| = m^{n-h}$ and $|\Lambda_\ell| \leq m^\ell$, we obtain

$$\sum_{A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n} : |A| = \ell} m^{-\mathbb{O}_{e_n, A}} \leq m^{\ell^m - 1} n^{\ell - 1}.$$

Such (3.11) holds true for $k = \ell$ and we finish the proof. \square

Now we are readily to prove Proposition 2.3.

Proof of Proposition 2.3. Let $n \geq 1$ and $k \geq 1$. To be conciseness, for $A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{\text{en}}$ with $|A| = k$ we set

$$E_A := \left\{ \sum_{v \in \mathbb{L}_{e_n, A}} X(v) + \sum_{u \in A} X_0^*(u) - |\mathbb{O}_{e_n, A}| \geq 1 \right\},$$

$$P_A := \mathbf{P}(X(e_n) = 0, X(v) \leq n - |v| \text{ for any } v \in \mathbb{L}_{e_n, A}, X|_A = 0, E_A).$$

Then by Lemmas 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{d^k}{dp^k} \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0) \right| &\leq \frac{2^k k!}{(1-p)^k} \sum_{A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{\text{en}}: |A|=k} \mathbf{P}(\nabla^A \mathbf{1}_{\{X_n=0\}} \neq 0, X|_A = 0) \\ &\leq \frac{2^k k!}{(1-p)^k} \sum_{A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{\text{en}}: |A|=k} \mathbf{P}(X(v) \leq n - |v| \text{ for any } v \in \mathbb{T}^{\text{en}}, X|_A = 0, E_A) \\ &\leq \frac{2^k k!}{(1-p)^k} \sum_{A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{\text{en}}: |A|=k} P_A. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Next, we will prove the statements (1), (2) and (3) of Proposition 2.3 separately.

(1) Since $P_A \leq \mathbf{P}(X(e_n) = 0) = \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0)$ for $A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{\text{en}}$ with $|A| = k$,

$$\left| \frac{d^k}{dp^k} \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0) \right| \leq \frac{2^k k!}{(1-p)^k} \sum_{A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{\text{en}}: |A|=k} \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0) \leq \frac{2^k k!}{(1-p)^k} m^{kn} \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0).$$

(2) Since $X(e_n) \geq \sum_{v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{\text{en}}} X(v) - m^n$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} P_A &\leq \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{\text{en}}} X(v) - m^n \leq 0, X|_A = 0 \right) \\ &= \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{v \in \mathbb{T}_0^{\text{en}} \setminus A} X(v) \leq m^n \right) \prod_{v \in A} \mathbf{P}(X(v) = 0) \\ &= \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m^n - k} X_{0,i} \leq m^n \right) (1-p)^k, \end{aligned}$$

where $X_{0,i}, i \geq 1$ are i.i.d copies of X_0 . Taking the above inequality with (3.12) and $|\{A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n} : |A| = k\}| \leq m^{nk}$, we obtain (2).

(3) Fix $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $c_2 := \mathbf{E}(m^{(1-\delta)X_0^*}) < \infty$. Choose

$$n_1 := \min\{n \geq 10 : 2kc_2 m^{\delta^{-4}(1+\ln n)^2(m-1)} m^{k^{m-1}} n \leq m^{\delta n}\}.$$

Let $n \geq n_1$. Since $m^{(1-2\delta)(\sum_{v \in \mathbb{L}_{e_n, A}} X(v) + \sum_{u \in A} X_0^*(u) - |\mathbb{O}_{e_n, A}|)} \geq 1_{E_A}$,

$$P_A \leq \mathbf{E} \left(m^{(1-2\delta)(\sum_{v \in \mathbb{L}_{e_n, A}} X(v) + \sum_{u \in A} X_0^*(u) - |\mathbb{O}_{e_n, A}|)} \prod_{u \in A} 1_{\{X(u)=0\}} \prod_{v \in \mathbb{L}_{e_n, A}} 1_{\{X(v) \leq n - |v|\}} \right).$$

Since these $X_0^*(u), 1_{\{X(u)=0\}}, X(v)$ for $u \in A$ and $v \in \mathbb{L}_{e_n, A}$ are independent,

$$\begin{aligned} P_A &\leq \prod_{u \in A} [\mathbf{E}(m^{(1-2\delta)X_0^*(u)}) \mathbf{P}(X(u) = 0)] \cdot \prod_{v \in \mathbb{L}_{e_n, A}} [\mathbf{E}(m^{(1-2\delta)X(v)} 1_{\{X(v) \leq n - |v|\}})] \cdot m^{(2\delta-1)|\mathbb{O}_{e_n, A}|} \\ &= [\mathbf{E}(m^{(1-2\delta)X_0^*})(1-p)]^{|A|} \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} [\mathbf{E}(m^{(1-2\delta)X_i} 1_{\{X_i \leq n-i\}})]^{|\mathbb{L}_{e_n, A} \cap \mathbb{T}_i|} m^{(2\delta-1)|\mathbb{O}_{e_n, A}|}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbf{E}(m^{(1-2\delta)X_0^*}) \leq \mathbf{E}(m^{(1-\delta)X_0^*}) = c_2$, $|A| = k$, $|\mathbb{O}_{e_n, A}| \leq |A|n$ and $|\mathbb{L}_{e_n, A} \cap \mathbb{T}_i| \leq (m-1)|A|$ for $i < n$, the above inequality can be simplified as

$$P_A \leq [c_2(1-p)]^k \left(\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{E}(m^{(1-2\delta)X_i} 1_{\{X_i \leq n-i\}}) \right)^{(m-1)k} m^{2\delta nk - |\mathbb{O}_{e_n, A}|}. \quad (3.13)$$

So we need estimate $\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{E}(m^{(1-2\delta)X_i} 1_{\{X_i \leq n-i\}})$. Write $M := \lfloor n - \delta^{-1} \ln n \rfloor$ and $X_i^{(M)} := X_i \wedge (M-i)$ for each $i < M$. Then for $i \leq \lfloor n - \delta^{-2}(1 + \ln n) \rfloor$,

$$\begin{aligned} (1-\delta)X_i^{(M)} - (1-2\delta)X_i 1_{\{X_i \leq n-i\}} &\geq (1-\delta)(M-i) - (1-2\delta)(n-i) \\ &= -(1-\delta)(n-M) + \delta(n-i) \\ &\geq -(1+\delta^{-1} \ln n) + \delta \cdot \delta^{-2}(1 + \ln n) \\ &= \delta^{-1} - 1 > 0. \end{aligned}$$

It follows $\mathbf{E}(m^{(1-2\delta)X_i} 1_{\{X_i \leq n-i\}}) \leq \mathbf{E}(m^{(1-\delta)X_i^{(M)}})$ for $i \leq \lfloor n - \delta^{-2}(1 + \ln n) \rfloor$. On the other

hand, for $\lfloor n - \delta^{-2}(1 + \ln n) \rfloor < i < n$ we have $m^{(1-2\delta)X_i} 1_{\{X_i \leq n-i\}} \leq m^{\delta^{-2}(1+\ln n)}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{E}(m^{(1-2\delta)X_i} 1_{\{X_i \leq n-i\}}) &\leq \prod_{i=\lfloor n-\delta^{-2} \ln n \rfloor + 1}^{n-1} m^{\delta^{-2}(1+\ln n)} \prod_{i=0}^{\lfloor n-\delta^{-2}(1+\ln n) \rfloor} \mathbf{E}(m^{(1-\delta)X_i^{(M)}}). \\ &\leq m^{\delta^{-4}(1+\ln n)^2} \prod_{i=0}^{M-1} \mathbf{E}(m^{(1-\delta)X_i^{(M)}}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence by (3.13), we have

$$P_A \leq [c_2(1-p)]^k \left(m^{\delta^{-4}(1+\ln n)^2} \prod_{i=0}^{M-1} \mathbf{E}(m^{(1-\delta)X_i^{(M)}}) \right)^{(m-1)k} m^{2\delta nk - |\mathbb{O}_{e_n, A}|}.$$

By Lemma 3.5, we have $\sum_{A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}: |A|=k} m^{-|\mathbb{O}_{e_n, A}|} \leq m^{k^m} n^{(k-1)^+}$. So, by (3.12),

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{d^k}{dp^k} \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0) \right| &\leq \frac{2^k k!}{(1-p)^k} \sum_{A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}: |A|=k} P_A \\ &\leq 2^k k! c_2^k \left(m^{\delta^{-4}(1+\ln n)^2} \prod_{i=0}^{M-1} \mathbf{E}(m^{(1-\delta)X_i^{(M)}}) \right)^{(m-1)k} \sum_{A \subset \mathbb{T}_0^{e_n}: |A|=k} m^{2\delta nk - |\mathbb{O}_{e_n, A}|} \\ &\leq [2k c_2 m^{\delta^{-4}(1+\ln n)^2 (m-1)}]^k \left(\prod_{i=0}^{M-1} \mathbf{E}(m^{(1-\delta)X_i^{(M)}}) \right)^{(m-1)k} m^{2\delta nk} m^{k^m} n^{(k-1)^+}. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of n_1 , we then prove that (3) holds true for $n \geq n_1$. We have completed the proof of the proposition. \square

4 Proof of Proposition 2.4

Proposition 2.4, crudely speaking, tells us $\prod_{i=0}^{M-1} \mathbf{E}(m^{(1-\delta)(X_i \wedge (M-i))})^{m-1}$ growing to infinity with speed at most $m^{o(M)}$ uniformly in $p \in (0, 1)$ as $M \rightarrow \infty$ or $\mathbf{P}(X_n = 0)$ decaying with at least doubly exponential speed eventually.

The idea of estimating the upper bounds of $\prod_{i=0}^{M-1} \mathbf{E}(m^{(1-\delta)(X_i \wedge (M-i))})^{m-1}$ comes from [8], [5] and [3]. Inequality $\prod_{i=0}^{M-1} \mathbf{E}(m^{X_i})^{m-1} \leq cM^2$ was proved to be true for all $M \geq 1$ if system

$\{X_n, n \geq 0\}$ is subcritical or critical, see Collet, Eckmann, Glaser and Martin [8] and Chen, Derrida, Hu, Lifshitz and Shi [5]. Recently in [3], Chen, Dagard, Derrida, Hu, Lifshitz and Shi showed that when $p \rightarrow p_c+$, it keeps $\prod_{i=0}^{M-1} \mathbf{E}(m^{X_i})^{m-1} \leq c'M^2$ for $1 \leq M \leq c''(p - p_c)^{-1/2}$. However, we need a uniform upper bounds in $p \in (0, 1)$ as $M \rightarrow \infty$ in the current paper. We have to exclude some situation; Luckily, this situation play a role under which $\mathbf{P}(X_n = 0)$ decays with at least doubly exponential speed eventually, see Theorem 4.5.

To obtain the decay speed of $\mathbf{P}(X_n = 0)$ as required, we collect some properties for general Derrida-Retaux systems; See Fact 4.1, Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.3 below. There, we use $K_i, 1 \leq i \leq 6$ to stand for some constants which are independent of n .

Fact 4.1. (*[3, Theorem 6.5 and Lemma 2.4]*) Fix $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1, \gamma > 0$ and $\eta \in (0, \frac{1}{3(m-1)}]$. Let $\{X_n, n \geq 0\}$ and $\{Y_n, n \geq 0\}$ be two Derrida-Retaux systems with $(m-1)\mathbf{E}(Y_0 m^{Y_0}) = \mathbf{E}(m^{Y_0})$ and $\mathbf{P}(X_0 = k) \geq \mathbf{P}(Y_0 = k)$ for all $k \geq 1$. Assume that $\mathbf{P}(Y_0 = 0) \in [\alpha, \beta]$, $\mathbf{E}(Y_0^3 m^{Y_0}) \leq \gamma$ and $\mathbf{E}(X_0 - Y_0) \geq \eta$. Then there exists some constant $K_1 = K_1(m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \eta) \in \mathbf{Z}^+$ such that

$$\max_{0 \leq j \leq K_1} \mathbf{E}(X_j) \geq 2.$$

Lemma 4.2. Fix $\lambda \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$ and $\theta > 0$. Let $\{X_n, n \geq 0\}$ be a Derrida-Retaux system with $X_0 \leq \lambda$ and $\mathbf{E}(((m-1)X_0 - 1)m^{X_0}) \geq \theta$. Then there exist some constants $K_2 = K_2(m, \lambda, \theta) \in \mathbf{Z}^+$ and $K_3 = K_3(m, \lambda, \theta) > 0$ such that

$$\mathbf{P}(X_{K_2+n} = 0) \leq e^{-K_3 m^n}, \quad n \geq 0.$$

Proof. Assume $X_0 \leq \lambda$ and $(m-1)\mathbf{E}(X_0 m^{X_0}) - \mathbf{E}(m^{X_0}) \geq \theta > 0$. Then

$$\mathbf{P}(X_0 \geq 1) \geq \frac{(m-1)\mathbf{E}(X_0 m^{X_0})}{(m-1)\lambda m^\lambda} \geq \frac{\mathbf{E}(m^{X_0}) + \theta}{(m-1)\lambda m^\lambda} \geq \frac{1}{(m-1)\lambda m^\lambda}.$$

Let Z_0 be a Bernoulli random variable which satisfies $\mathbf{P}(Z_0 = 0) = \frac{(m-1)\mathbf{E}(X_0 m^{X_0}) - \mathbf{E}(m^{X_0})}{1 + (m-1)\mathbf{E}(X_0 m^{X_0}) - \mathbf{E}(m^{X_0})}$ and $\mathbf{P}(Z_0 = 1) = \frac{1}{1 + (m-1)\mathbf{E}(X_0 m^{X_0}) - \mathbf{E}(m^{X_0})}$. Then

$$\mathbf{P}(Z_0 = 0) \geq \frac{\theta}{1 + \theta} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{P}(Z_0 = 1) \geq \frac{1}{1 + (m-1)\lambda m^\lambda}.$$

Assume further Z_0 is independent of X_0 and let $\{Y_n, n \geq 0\}$ be the Derrida-Retaux system with $Y_0 := X_0 Z_0$. Then system $\{Y_n, n \geq 0\}$ is critical, this is because

$$\mathbf{E}(((m-1)Y_0 - 1)m^{Y_0}) = \mathbf{E}(((m-1)X_0 - 1)m^{X_0})\mathbf{P}(Z_0 = 1) - \mathbf{P}(Z_0 = 0) = 0.$$

We want to apply Fact 4.1 for systems $\{X_n, n \geq 0\}$ and $\{Y_n, n \geq 0\}$, so that we should check those conditions. By construction, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(Y_0 = k) &= \mathbf{P}(Z_0 = 1)\mathbf{P}(X_0 = k) \leq \mathbf{P}(X_0 = k) \text{ for } k \geq 1; \\ \mathbf{P}(Y_0 = 0) &\geq \mathbf{P}(Z_0 = 0) \geq \frac{\theta}{1 + \theta}; \\ \mathbf{P}(Y_0 = 0) &= 1 - \mathbf{P}(X_0 \geq 1)\mathbf{P}(Z_0 = 1) \leq 1 - \frac{1}{(m-1)\lambda m^\lambda (1 + (m-1)\lambda m^\lambda)}; \\ \mathbf{E}(Y_0^3 m^{Y_0}) &\leq \mathbf{E}(X_0^3 m^{X_0}) \leq \lambda^3 m^\lambda; \text{ and} \\ \mathbf{E}(X_0 - Y_0) &\geq \mathbf{E}(1_{\{X_0 \geq 1, Z_0 = 0\}}) = \mathbf{P}(X_0 \geq 1)\mathbf{P}(Z_0 = 0) \geq \frac{\theta}{(m-1)\lambda m^\lambda (1 + \theta)}. \end{aligned}$$

So, we can apply Fact 4.1 with $\alpha = \frac{\theta}{1+\theta}$, $\beta = 1 - \frac{1}{(m-1)\lambda m^\lambda (1+(m-1)\lambda m^\lambda)}$, $\gamma = \lambda^3 m^\lambda$ and $\eta = \frac{\theta}{(m-1)\lambda m^\lambda (1+\theta)}$ to get

$$\max_{0 \leq j \leq K_1(m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \eta)} \mathbf{E}(X_n) \geq 2.$$

We choose $K_2 := K_1(m, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \eta)$, so that the value of K_2 depends only on (m, λ, θ) . Since $m \geq 2$ and $\mathbf{E}(X_{n+1}) \geq m\mathbf{E}(X_n) - 1$ for all n , we have $\mathbf{E}(X_{K_2}) \geq 2$ always.

Since $0 \leq X_0 \leq \lambda$, we have $0 \leq X_{K_2} \leq m^{K_2}\lambda$. Let $n \geq 0$. Since X_{K_2+n} is stochastically greater than $\sum_{i=1}^{m^n} X_{K_2, i} - m^n$,

$$\mathbf{P}(X_{K_2+n} = 0) \leq \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m^n} X_{K_2, i} - m^n \leq 0\right),$$

where $X_{K_2, i}$, $i \geq 1$ are i.i.d copies of X_{K_2} . By $\mathbf{E}(X_{K_2}) \geq 2$ and $0 \leq X_{K_2} \leq m^{K_2}\lambda$, we apply the Hoeffding's inequality to get

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m^n} X_{K_2, i} \leq m^n\right) \leq \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m^n} X_{K_2, i} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m^n} \mathbf{E}(X_{K_2, i}) - m^n\right) \leq e^{-\frac{2m^n}{(m^{K_2}\lambda)^2}}.$$

Taking $K_3 := \frac{2}{m^{2K_2}\lambda^2}$, we draw out the conclusion of the lemma. \square

Lemma 4.3. *Fix $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $\theta > 0$. Let $\{X_n, n \geq 0\}$ be a Derrida-Retaux system. Assume that $\mathbf{E}(((m-1)X_0 - 1)s^{X_0}) \geq 0$, $\mathbf{E}(((m-1)X_0 - 1)s^{X_0} 1_{\{X_0 \geq 1\}}) \geq \theta$ and $X_0 \leq M$ for some $s \in [1, m - \delta]$ and some $M \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$. Then there exist some constants $K_4 = K_4(m, \delta, \theta) \in \mathbf{Z}^+$ and $K_5 = K_5(m, \delta, \theta) > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbf{P}(X_{M+K_4+n} = 0) \leq e^{-K_5 m^n}, \quad n \geq 0.$$

Proof. Fix $s \in [1, m - \delta]$ and $M \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$ which satisfy $\mathbf{E}(((m-1)X_0 - 1)s^{X_0}) \geq 0$, $\mathbf{E}(((m-1)X_0 - 1)s^{X_0} 1_{\{X_0 \geq 1\}}) \geq \theta$ and $X_0 \leq M$. Since $X_0 \leq M$, we need only consider Case I ($\max_{1 \leq k \leq M} m^k \mathbf{P}(X_0 = k+2) \geq 1$) and Case II ($\sup_{k \geq 1} m^k \mathbf{P}(X_0 = k+2) \leq 1$).

Case I: Suppose there exists some $1 \leq k \leq M$ such that $\mathbf{P}(X_0 = k+2) \geq m^{-k}$. Since X_k is stochastically greater than $\max_{1 \leq i \leq m^k} X_{0,i} - k$, where $X_{0,i}$, $i \geq 1$ are i.i.d copies of X_0 ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(X_k \geq 2) &\geq \mathbf{P}(X_{0,i} = k+2 \text{ for some } 1 \leq i \leq m^k) \\ &= 1 - (1 - \mathbf{P}(X_0 = k+2))^{m^k} \\ &\geq 1 - (1 - m^{-k})^{m^k}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\sup_{x \in (0,1)} (1-x)^{x^{-1}} = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} (1-x)^{x^{-1}} = e^{-1}$, we have $\mathbf{P}(X_k \geq 2) \geq 1 - e^{-1}$. Let $\{\tilde{X}_n, n \geq 0\}$ be the Derrida-Retaux system with $\tilde{X}_0 := X_k \wedge 2$. Then $\tilde{X}_0 \leq 2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}(((m-1)\tilde{X}_0 - 1)m^{\tilde{X}_0}) &\geq (2(m-1) - 1)m^2 \mathbf{P}(X_k \geq 2) - \mathbf{P}(X_k = 0) \\ &\geq 2^2(1 - e^{-1}) - 1 \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

So, we can apply Lemma 4.2 for system $\{\tilde{X}_n, n \geq 0\}$ to get

$$\mathbf{P}(\tilde{X}_{K_2(m,2,1)+n} = 0) \leq e^{-K_3(m,2,1)m^n}, \quad n \geq 0.$$

Since $\tilde{X}_0 \leq X_k$, we have $\tilde{X}_n \leq X_{k+n}$ for all $n \geq 0$. So,

$$\mathbf{P}(X_{k+K_2(m,2,1)+n} = 0) \leq \mathbf{P}(\tilde{X}_{K_2(m,2,1)+n} = 0) \leq e^{-K_3(m,2,1)m^n}.$$

Since $k \leq M$, the above inequality can be rewrote as

$$\mathbf{P}(X_{M+K_2(m,2,1)+n} = 0) \leq e^{-K_3(m,2,1)m^{n+M-k}} \leq e^{-K_3(m,2,1)m^n}.$$

Case II: Suppose $\mathbf{P}(X_0 = k+2) \leq m^{-k}$ for $k \geq 1$. Write $t = m - \frac{1}{2}\delta$ and set

$$K_6 := \min\{\ell \geq 2 : \sum_{k=\ell+1}^{\infty} ((m-1)k - 1) \left(\frac{t}{m}\right)^k \leq \frac{\theta\delta}{4m^3}\}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}(((m-1)X_0 - 1)t^{X_0}1_{\{X_0 \geq K_6+1\}}) &= \sum_{k=K_6+1}^{\infty} ((m-1)k - 1)t^k \mathbf{P}(X_0 = k) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=K_6+1}^{\infty} ((m-1)k - 1)t^k m^{-k+2} \\
&\leq \frac{\theta\delta}{4m}.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, $\frac{t}{s} \geq \frac{m-\frac{\delta}{2}}{m-\delta} \geq 1 + \frac{\delta}{2m}$ since $s \in [1, m-\delta]$. By $\mathbf{E}(((m-1)X_0 - 1)s^{X_0}) \geq 0$ and $\mathbf{E}(((m-1)X_0 - 1)s^{X_0}1_{\{X_0 \geq 1\}}) \geq \theta$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}(((m-1)X_0 - 1)t^{X_0}) \\
&= \mathbf{E}(((m-1)X_0 - 1)(t^{X_0} - s^{X_0})1_{\{X_0 \geq 1\}}) + \mathbf{E}(((m-1)X_0 - 1)s^{X_0}) \\
&\geq \frac{\delta}{2m} \mathbf{E}(((m-1)X_0 - 1)s^{X_0}1_{\{X_0 \geq 1\}}) \\
&\geq \frac{\theta\delta}{2m}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\mathbf{E}(((m-1)X_0 - 1)t^{X_0}1_{\{0 \leq X_0 \leq K_6\}}) \geq \frac{\theta\delta}{2m} - \frac{\theta\delta}{4m} = \frac{\theta\delta}{4m}.$$

Let $\{\hat{X}_n, n \geq 0\}$ be the Derrida-Retaux system with $\hat{X}_0 := X_0 \wedge K_6$. Then $\hat{X}_0 \leq K_6$ and

$$\mathbf{E}(((m-1)X_0 - 1)m^{\hat{X}_0}) \geq \mathbf{E}(((m-1)X_0 - 1)t^{X_0}1_{\{0 \leq X_0 \leq K_6\}}) \geq \frac{\theta\delta}{4m}.$$

So we can apply Lemma 4.2 for system $\{\hat{X}_n, n \geq 0\}$ to get

$$\mathbf{P}(\hat{X}_{K_2(m, K_6, \frac{\theta\delta}{4m})+n} = 0) \leq e^{-K_3(m, K_6, \frac{\theta\delta}{4m})m^n}, \quad n \geq 0.$$

Since $\hat{X}_0 \leq X_0$ we have $\hat{X}_n \leq X_n$ for all $n \geq 0$ which implies

$$\mathbf{P}(X_{M+K_2(m, K_6, \frac{\theta\delta}{4m})+n} = 0) \leq \mathbf{P}(\hat{X}_{M+K_2(m, K_6, \frac{\theta\delta}{4m})+n} = 0) \leq e^{-K_3(m, K_6, \frac{\theta\delta}{4m})m^n}.$$

We have obtained the estimates for both cases. Taking $K_4 := K_2(m, 2, 1) \vee K_2(m, K_6, \frac{\theta\delta}{4m})$ and $K_5 := K_3(m, 2, 1) \wedge K_3(m, K_6, \frac{\theta\delta}{4m})$, we finish the proof of the lemma. \square

Now we return back to our setting. Recall that $c_1 := \mathbf{P}(X_0^* \geq 2) > 0$. When $m = 2$, the Derrida-Retaux system has a fix point δ_1 , whose support is focused on set $\{1\}$. We have to cope with the special case. Set $n_2 := \lfloor \frac{\log(\frac{1}{\mathbf{P}(X_0^* \geq 2)})}{\log(\frac{5}{4})} \rfloor + 1$.

Lemma 4.4. *If $m = 2$, then $\mathbf{P}(X_n = 1) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for any $n \geq n_2$.*

Proof. Fix $m = 2$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(X_{n+1} = 1) &= 2\mathbf{P}(X_n = 2)\mathbf{P}(X_n = 0) + \mathbf{P}(X_n = 1)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{P}(X_n = 2) + \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0))^2 + \mathbf{P}(X_n = 1)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}(1 - \mathbf{P}(X_n = 1))^2 + \mathbf{P}(X_n = 1)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

Set $\ell := \inf\{n \geq 0 : \mathbf{P}(X_n = 1) \leq \frac{1}{2}\}$. Then $\mathbf{P}(X_n = 1) > \frac{1}{2}$ for $0 \leq n < \ell$. So, by (4.1) for $0 \leq n < \ell$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \mathbf{P}(X_{n+1} = 1) &\geq 1 - \left(\frac{1}{2}(1 - \mathbf{P}(X_n = 1))^2 + \mathbf{P}(X_n = 1)^2\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(1 + 3\mathbf{P}(X_n = 1))(1 - \mathbf{P}(X_n = 1)) \\ &\geq \frac{5}{4}(1 - \mathbf{P}(X_n = 1)). \end{aligned}$$

It follows immediately,

$$1 - \mathbf{P}(X_{n+1} = 1) \geq \left(\frac{5}{4}\right)^{n+1}(1 - \mathbf{P}(X_0 = 1)), \quad 0 \leq n < \ell.$$

Since $\mathbf{P}(X_0^* \geq 2) > 0$, we have $1 - \mathbf{P}(X_0 = 1) \geq 1 - \mathbf{P}(X_0^* = 1) \geq \mathbf{P}(X_0^* \geq 2) > 0$. Hence ℓ is finite and satisfies

$$1 - \mathbf{P}(X_\ell = 1) \geq \left(\frac{5}{4}\right)^\ell(1 - \mathbf{P}(X_0 = 1)) \geq \left(\frac{5}{4}\right)^\ell \mathbf{P}(X_0^* \geq 2).$$

So,

$$\ell \leq \frac{\log(\frac{1}{\mathbf{P}(X_0^* \geq 2)})}{\log(\frac{5}{4})} \leq n_2.$$

On the other hand, by the definition of ℓ , we have $\mathbf{P}(X_\ell = 1) \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Using (4.1) and the inequality $\frac{1}{2}(1 - x)^2 + x^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for $x \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, we show that $\mathbf{P}(X_{n+1} = 1) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ once $\mathbf{P}(X_n = 1) \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Therefore, $\mathbf{P}(X_n = 1) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for $n \geq \ell$. We have completed the proof of the

lemma. □

We do not directly apply Lemma 4.3 for system $\{X_n, n \geq 0\}$ since that X_n is unbounded in general. We need a truncation. Set

$$X_i^{(M)} := X_i \wedge (M - i), \quad M > i \geq 0.$$

Theorem 4.5. *Fix $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and let $M \geq n_2 + 2$. Assume $\mathbf{E}([(m-1)X_i^{(M)} - 1]s^{X_i^{(M)}}) \geq 0$ for some $i \in [n_2, M-2] \cap \mathbf{Z}$ and some $s \in [1, m-\delta]$. Then there exist constants $c_i = c_i(m, \delta) > 0$, $i \in \{6, 7\}$ such that*

$$\mathbf{P}(X_n = 0) \leq c_7 e^{-c_6 m^{n-M}}, \quad n \geq M. \quad (4.2)$$

Proof. Fix $M \geq n_2 + 2$, $n_2 \leq i \leq M-2$ and $s \in [1, m-\delta]$ with $\mathbf{E}([(m-1)X_i^{(M)} - 1]s^{X_i^{(M)}}) \geq 0$. Then it is true for the following statement whose proof will be given a little later:

$$\mathbf{E}([(m-1)X_i^{(M)} - 1]s^{X_i^{(M)}} 1_{\{X_i^{(M)} \geq 1\}}) \geq \frac{1}{4}. \quad (4.3)$$

By admitting (4.3), we can apply Lemma 4.3 for the Derrida-Retaux system $(\tilde{X}_n, n \geq 0)$ with $\tilde{X}_0 := X_i^{(M)}$ to get

$$\mathbf{P}(\tilde{X}_{(M-i)+K_4(m, \delta, \frac{1}{4})+n} = 0) \leq e^{-K_5(m, \delta, \frac{1}{4})m^n}, \quad n \geq 0.$$

Since $\tilde{X}_0 \leq X_i$, we have $\tilde{X}_n \leq X_{n+i}$ for all $n \geq 0$. It follows immediately for any $n \geq M + K_4(m, \delta, \frac{1}{4})$,

$$\mathbf{P}(X_n = 0) \leq \mathbf{P}(\tilde{X}_{n-i} = 0) \leq e^{-K_5(m, \delta, \frac{1}{4})m^{n-M-K_4(m, \delta, \frac{1}{4})}}.$$

Set $c_6 := K_5(m, \delta, \frac{1}{4})m^{-K_4(m, \delta, \frac{1}{4})}$ and $c_7 := e^{K_5(m, \delta, \frac{1}{4})}$. Using the above inequality and the fact $\mathbf{P}(X_n = 0) \leq 1$ for all n , we draw out the conclusion of (4.2).

We are left to prove (4.3). If $m \geq 3$, then $((m-1)X_i^{(M)} - 1)1_{\{X_i^{(M)} \geq 1\}} \geq \frac{1}{2}(m-1)X_i^{(M)}$. By $\mathbf{E}(((m-1)X_i^{(M)} - 1)s^{X_i^{(M)}}) \geq 0$ and $s \geq 1$, we then have

$$\mathbf{E}(((m-1)X_i^{(M)} - 1)s^{X_i^{(M)}} 1_{\{X_i^{(M)} \geq 1\}}) \geq \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{E}((m-1)X_i^{(M)} s^{X_i^{(M)}}) \geq \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{E}(s^{X_i^{(M)}}) \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Now let $m = 2$. Since $i \geq n_2$, we apply Lemma 4.4 to get $\mathbf{P}(X_i = 1) \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Since $M - i \geq 2$,

$$\mathbf{P}(X_i^{(M)} = 1) = \mathbf{P}(X_i = 1) \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Since $s \geq 1$, we have $\mathbf{E}(((m-1)X_i^{(M)} - 1)s^{X_i^{(M)}} 1_{\{X_i^{(M)} \geq 1\}}) \geq \mathbf{P}(X_i^{(M)} \geq 2)$. Since $\mathbf{E}(((m-1)X_i^{(M)} - 1)s^{X_i^{(M)}}) \geq 0$, we have $\mathbf{E}(((m-1)X_i^{(M)} - 1)s^{X_i^{(M)}} 1_{\{X_i^{(M)} \geq 1\}}) \geq \mathbf{P}(X_i^{(M)} = 0)$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}(((m-1)X_i^{(M)} - 1)s^{X_i^{(M)}} 1_{\{X_i^{(M)} \geq 1\}}) &\geq \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{P}(X_i^{(M)} = 0) + \mathbf{P}(X_i^{(M)} \geq 2)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(1 - \mathbf{P}(X_i^{(M)} = 1)) \geq \frac{1}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

Such (4.3) holds true for any $m \geq 2$, and we complete the proof of the theorem. \square

We will use the method developed by Collet, Eckmann, Glaser and Martin [8] to obtain an upper bound of $\prod_{i=0}^{M-1} \mathbf{E}(m^{(1-\delta)X_i^{(M)}})$. Write $H_i^{(M)}(s) := \mathbf{E}(s^{X_i^{(M)}})$ for $0 \leq i < M$ and $s \geq 0$. As in [8], set

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_i^{(M)}(s) &:= [H_i^{(M)}(s) - s(s-1)H_i^{(M)'}(s)] \\ &\quad - \frac{(m-1)(m-s)}{m} [2sH_i^{(M)'}(s) + s^2H_i^{(M)''}(s)]. \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Lemma 4.6. Fix $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{16m})$ and $s = m^{1-\delta}$. Let $n_2 \leq i \leq M-2$ and set $s_i > 0$ for the value which satisfies $\mathbf{E}([(m-1)X_i^{(M)} - 1]s_i^{X_i^{(M)}}) = 0$. If $s_i \geq m - m\delta^3$, then

$$[H_i^{(M)}(s) - (m-1)sH_i^{(M)'}(s)]^2 \leq 2H_i^{(M)}(0)\Delta_i^{(M)}(s); \tag{4.5}$$

$$\Delta_i^{(M)}(s) \geq \frac{\delta^2}{128}. \tag{4.6}$$

Proof. Fix $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{16m})$, $s = m^{1-\delta}$ and $n_2 \leq i \leq M-2$ with $s_i \geq m - m\delta^3$. Write $x_i = \frac{s}{s_i}$ for conciseness. Then

$$x_i \leq \frac{m^{1-\delta}}{m - m\delta^3} = \frac{m^{-\delta}}{1 - \delta^3} \leq \frac{2^{-\delta}}{1 - \delta^3} \leq 1 - \frac{\delta}{4}.$$

Since $\mathbf{E}(((m-1)X_i^{(M)} - 1)s_i^{X_i^{(M)}}) = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} H_i^{(M)}(s) &= (m-1)s_i H_i^{(M)'}(s_i) - H_i^{(M)}(s_i) + H_i^{(M)}(s) \\ &= \sum_{k \geq 1} (km - k - 1 + x_i^k) s_i^k \mathbf{P}(X_i^{(M)} = k). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$H_i^{(M)}(0) = \sum_{k \geq 1} (km - k - 1) s_i^k \mathbf{P}(X_i^{(M)} = k),$$

$$H_i^{(M)}(s) - (m-1)sH_i^{(M)'}(s) = \sum_{k \geq 1} (1-x_i^k)(km-k-1)s_i^k \mathbf{P}(X_i^{(M)} = k)$$

and

$$\Delta_i^{(M)}(s) = \sum_{k \geq 1} (1 - (k+1)x_i^k + \frac{s_i}{m} kx_i^{k+1})(km-k-1)s_i^k \mathbf{P}(X_i^{(M)} = k).$$

By $s_i \geq m - m\delta^3$, we get

$$\Delta_i^{(M)}(s) \geq \sum_{k \geq 1} (1 - (k+1)x_i^k + kx_i^{k+1} - \delta^3 kx_i^{k+1})(km-k-1)s_i^k \mathbf{P}(X_i^{(M)} = k). \quad (4.7)$$

Set $\eta := \sup_{k \geq 1} \frac{(1-x_i^k)^2}{1-(k+1)x_i^k + kx_i^{k+1} - \delta^3 kx_i^{k+1}}$. Then by the Cauchy inequality,

$$[H_i^{(M)}(s) - (m-1)sH_i^{(M)'}(s)]^2 \leq \eta H_i^{(M)}(0) \Delta_i^{(M)}(s).$$

We need an upper bound of η . An elementary calculation gives for $k \geq 1$ and $x \in \mathbf{R}$,

$$2(1 - (k+1)x^k + kx^{k+1}) - (1-x^k)^2 = k(1-x)^2 x^{k-1} + (1-x) \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} (x^\ell - x^k)(1-x^{k-1-\ell}).$$

Since $0 \leq x_i \leq 1 - \frac{1}{4}\delta$ and $\delta < \frac{1}{16m} \leq \frac{1}{32}$, we have

$$2(1 - (k+1)x_i^k + kx_i^{k+1}) - (1-x_i^k)^2 \geq k(1-x_i)^2 x_i^{k-1} \geq k\left(\frac{\delta}{4}\right)^2 x_i^{k+1} \geq 2\delta^3 kx_i^{k+1}.$$

So,

$$(1-x_i^k)^2 \leq 2(1 - (k+1)x_i^k + kx_i^{k+1} - \delta^3 kx_i^{k+1}), \quad k \geq 1, \quad (4.8)$$

which implies $\eta \leq 2$. So we have (4.5).

We are left to prove (4.6). By (4.7) and (4.8) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_i^{(M)}(s) &\geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \geq 1} (1-x_i^k)^2 (km-k-1) s_i^k \mathbf{P}(X_i^{(M)} = k) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} (1-x_i)^2 \sum_{k \geq 1} (km-k-1) s_i^k \mathbf{P}(X_i^{(M)} = k). \end{aligned}$$

By $n_2 \leq i \leq M-2$, $s_i \geq m - m\delta^3 \geq 1$ and $\mathbf{E}([(m-1)X_i^{(M)} - 1]s_i^{X_i^{(M)}}) = 0$, we have

$$\mathbf{E}(\left(\left(\left(m-1\right)X_i^{(M)} - 1\right)s_i^{X_i^{(M)}}\right)1_{\{X_i^{(M)} \geq 1\}}) \geq \frac{1}{4},$$

see (4.3). Hence

$$\Delta_i^{(M)}(s) \geq \frac{1}{8}(1-x_i)^2 \geq \frac{\delta^2}{128}.$$

□

Now, we make full prepare for the proof of Proposition 2.4.

Proof of Proposition 2.4. Fix $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{16m})$ and $c_2 := \mathbf{E}(m^{(1-\delta)X_0^*}) < \infty$. Let $i \geq 0$ and $M \geq i + 2$. Set $s_i > 0$ for the value which satisfies $\mathbf{E}([(m-1)X_i^{(M)} - 1]s_i^{X_i^{(M)}}) = 0$ as before. we will show that (2.1) holds true with $c_3 := 128c_2^{m^{n_2+1}}m^{m-1}\delta^{-2}$, $c_4 := c_6(m, m\delta^3)$ and $c_5 := c_7(m, m\delta^3)$.

Since X_i is stochastically less than $\sum_{j=1}^{m^i} X_{0,j}$ for each $i \geq 0$, we have

$$\mathbf{E}(m^{(1-\delta)X_i}) \leq \mathbf{E}(m^{(1-\delta)X_0})^{m^i} \leq \mathbf{E}(m^{(1-\delta)X_0^*})^{m^i} = c_2^{m^i}.$$

Hence

$$\prod_{i=0}^{M-1} \mathbf{E}(m^{(1-\delta)X_i})^{m-1} \leq \prod_{i=0}^{M-1} c_2^{m^i(m-1)} \leq c_2^{m^M}.$$

By definition, $c_2^{m^{n_2+1}} \leq c_3$. So, (2.1) is true for $M \leq n_2 + 1$.

If $M \geq n_2 + 2$ and if $s_i \leq m - m\delta^3$ for some $n_2 \leq i \leq M - 2$, then $1 \leq (s_i \vee 1) \leq m - m\delta^3$ and $\mathbf{E}(((m-1)X_i^{(M)} - 1)(s_i \vee 1)^{X_i^{(M)}}) \geq \mathbf{E}(((m-1)X_i^{(M)} - 1)s_i^{X_i^{(M)}}) = 0$. So, we can apply Theorem 4.5 by replacing (m, δ) with $(m, m\delta^3)$ to get

$$\mathbf{P}(X_n = 0) \leq c_7(m, m\delta^3)e^{-c_6(m, m\delta^3)m^{n-M}}, \quad n \geq M.$$

Such (2.1) holds true in this situation, too.

We are left to prove the case: $M \geq n_2 + 2$ and $s_i > m - m\delta^3$ for any $n_2 \leq i \leq M - 2$. Let $s \in (1, m]$. Recall the definition of $\Delta_i^{(M)}(s)$ in (4.4). Set

$$f_s(k) := [1 - (s-1)k - \frac{(m-1)(m-s)}{m}k(k+1)]s^k, \quad k \in \mathbf{Z}^+.$$

Then $\Delta_i^{(M)}(s) = \mathbf{E}(f_s(X_i^{(M)}))$. Since $m \geq 2$ and $s \in (1, m]$,

$$-f_s(1) = [-1 + (s-1) + 2\frac{(m-1)(m-s)}{m}]s = \frac{m-2}{m}(2m-s)s \geq 0.$$

By observed, $k \rightarrow -1 + (s-1)k + \frac{(m-1)(m-s)}{m}k(k+1)$ and $k \rightarrow s^k$ are increasing. Since $f_s(0) = 1$, we also have $-f_s(0) \leq -f_s(1)$. So that, $-f_s(k)$ is increasing in $k \in \mathbf{Z}^+$. Set $X_{i,j}^{(M)} := X_{i,j} \wedge (M-i)$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$. Since $X_{i+1} = (X_{i,1} + \cdots + X_{i,m} - 1)^+$,

$$X_{i+1}^{(M)} = X_{i+1} \wedge (M-i-1) \leq (X_{i,1}^{(M)} + \cdots + X_{i,m}^{(M)} - 1)^+.$$

By the property of $-f_s(\cdot)$, we obtain $f_s(X_{i+1}^{(M)}) \geq f_s((X_{i,1}^{(M)} + \cdots + X_{i,m}^{(M)} - 1)^+)$, and so

$$\Delta_{i+1}^{(M)}(s) = \mathbf{E}(f_s(X_{i+1}^{(M)})) \geq \mathbf{E}(f_s((X_{i,1}^{(M)} + \cdots + X_{i,m}^{(M)} - 1)^+)).$$

On the other hand, set $H_i^{(M)}(s) := \mathbf{E}(s^{X_i^{(M)}})$ as before. Since $X_{i,j}^{(M)}, 1 \leq j \leq m$ are i.i.d copies of $X_i^{(M)}$, we have $\mathbf{E}(s^{(X_{i,1}^{(M)} + \cdots + X_{i,m}^{(M)} - 1)^+}) = \frac{1}{s} H_i^{(M)}(s)^m + (1 - \frac{1}{s}) H_i^{(M)}(0)^m$. So, as (29) in [8] and (29) in [5], we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E}(f_s((X_{i,1}^{(M)} + \cdots + X_{i,m}^{(M)} - 1)^+)) \\ &= \frac{m}{s} \Delta_i^{(M)}(s) H_i^{(M)}(s)^{m-1} - \frac{m-s}{s} [(m-1)s H_i^{(M)'}(s) - H_i^{(M)}(s)]^2 H_i^{(M)}(s)^{m-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{i+1}^{(M)}(s) &\geq \frac{m}{s} \Delta_i^{(M)}(s) H_i^{(M)}(s)^{m-1} \\ &\quad - \frac{m-s}{s} [(m-1)s H_i^{(M)'}(s) - H_i^{(M)}(s)]^2 H_i^{(M)}(s)^{m-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Choose $s = m^{1-\delta}$ now. Since $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{16m})$ and $s_i > m - m\delta^3$, applying Lemma 4.6 gives

$$[(m-1)s H_i^{(M)'}(s) - H_i^{(M)}(s)]^2 \leq 2H_i^{(M)}(0) \Delta_i^{(M)}(s) \leq 2\Delta_i^{(M)}(s).$$

Therefore, for $n_2 \leq i \leq M-2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{i+1}^{(M)}(s) &\geq \frac{m}{s} \Delta_i^{(M)}(s) H_i^{(M)}(s)^{m-1} - 2\frac{m-s}{s} \Delta_i^{(M)}(s) H_i^{(M)}(s)^{m-1} \\ &= \frac{2s-m}{s} \Delta_i^{(M)}(s) H_i^{(M)}(s)^{m-1}. \end{aligned}$$

By $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{16m})$ and $m \geq 2$, we have $\frac{2s-m}{s} = 2 - m^\delta \geq m^{-2\delta}$. So,

$$\Delta_{i+1}^{(M)}(s) \geq m^{-2\delta} \Delta_i^{(M)}(s) H_i^{(M)}(s)^{m-1}.$$

Iterating the above inequalities from $i = n_2$ to $i = M - 2$ gives

$$\Delta_{M-1}^{(M)}(s) \geq m^{-2\delta(M-1-n_2)} \Delta_{n_2}^{(M)}(s) \prod_{i=n_2}^{M-2} H_i^{(M)}(s)^{m-1},$$

which implies

$$\prod_{i=n_2}^{M-2} H_i^{(M)}(s)^{m-1} \leq \frac{\Delta_{M-1}^{(M)}(s)}{\Delta_{n_2}^{(M)}(s)} m^{2\delta(M-1-n_2)}.$$

By (4.6), we have $\Delta_{n_2}^{(M)}(s) \geq \frac{\delta^2}{128}$. Since $f(x, s) \leq f(0, s) = 1$ for all $x \in \mathbf{Z}^+$, we have $\Delta_{M-1}^{(M)}(s) = \mathbf{E}(f(X_{M-1}^{(M)}, s)) \leq 1$. Such we obtain

$$\prod_{i=n_2}^{M-2} H_i^{(M)}(s)^{m-1} \leq \frac{128}{\delta^2} m^{2\delta M}. \quad (4.9)$$

Taking $\prod_{i=0}^{n_2-1} H_i^{(M)}(s)^{m-1} \leq c_2^{m^{n_2}}$, $H_{M-1}^{(M)}(s) = \mathbf{E}(s^{X_{M-1} \wedge 1}) \leq s \leq m$ and (4.9) together, we draw out

$$\prod_{i=0}^{M-1} H_i^{(M)}(s)^{m-1} \leq c_2^{m^{n_2}} \cdot \frac{128}{\delta^2} m^{2\delta M} \cdot m^{m-1} \leq c_3 m^{2\delta M}.$$

We have completed the proof of the proposition. \square

5 Some further remark

Recall $P_{X_0} = (1-p)\delta_0 + pP_{X_0^*}$ which was defined in (1.1). By Remarks 1.4 and 1.3, under certain situation

$$\frac{d^k}{dp^k} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{E}(X_n)}{m^n} \Big|_{p=p_c} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d^k}{dp^k} \frac{\mathbf{E}(X_n)}{m^n} \Big|_{p=p_c} = 0, \quad k \geq 0.$$

Intuitively, the derivative operation and the limit operation are exchangeable with respect to $\frac{\mathbf{E}(X_n)}{m^n}$ at $p = p_c$. It is also interesting to study $\mathbf{E}(X_n)$ itself, see our previous papers [6, 7]. We will ask a similar question for $\mathbf{E}(X_n)$ but under a different definition of X_0 .

We say a probability measure μ on \mathbf{Z}^+ is subcritical if $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} ((m-1)k-1)m^k \mu(\{k\}) < 0$, critical if $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} ((m-1)k-1)m^k \mu(\{k\}) = 0$ and supercritical if $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} ((m-1)k-1)m^k \mu(\{k\}) > 0$.

So, the choice of P_{X_0} which satisfies (1.1) is just a linear combination of a subcritical δ_0 and a supercritical $P_{X_0^*}$.

Now we consider another choice of X_0 . Let μ and λ be two critical probability measures on \mathbf{Z}^+ with $\mu \neq \lambda$. Let $\{X_n, n \geq 0\}$ be the Derrida-Retaux system which satisfies $P_{X_0} = (1-p)\mu + p\lambda$, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{P}(X_0 = k) = (1-p)\mu(k) + p\lambda(k), \quad k \geq 0, \quad p \in (0, 1).$$

So that P_{X_0} is a linear combination of two critical probability measures now. It implies P_{X_0} is critical, that is to say, $\mathbf{E}(m^{X_0}) = (m-1)\mathbf{E}(X_0 m^{X_0}) < \infty$ for $p \in (0, 1)$. By Theorem A,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}(X_n) = 0.$$

We wonder whether the derivative operation and the limit operation are still exchangeable with respect to $\mathbf{E}(X_n)$, so that, there is a question.

Question 5.1. *Under certain integrability condition for μ and λ , do we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d}{dp} \mathbf{E}(X_n) = 0$ for $p \in (0, 1)$?*

Acknowledgments. We are grateful to Zhan Shi for suggesting the problem and helpful discussion. This work was partially supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China grant No. 12271351.

References

- [1] Aldous, D. J. and Bandyopadhyay, A. (2005). A survey of max-type recursive distributional equations. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **15**, 1047-1110.
- [2] Aldous, D. J., Contat, A., Curien, N., Hénard, O. (2023), Parking on the infinite binary tree, *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, **187**, 481-504.
- [3] Chen, X., Dagard, V., Derrida, B., Hu, Y., Lifshits, M. and Shi, Z. (2021). The Derrida-Retaux Conjecture on Recursive models, *Ann. Probab.*, 49, 637-670.
- [4] Chen, X., Dagard, V., Derrida, B. and Shi, Z. (2020) The critical behaviors and the scaling functions of a coalescence equation, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.*, 53, 195202.
- [5] Chen, X., Derrida, B., Hu, Y., Lifshits, M. and Shi, Z. (2019). A max-type recursive model: some properties and open questions. In: *Sojourns in Probability Theory and Statistical Physics-III* (pp. 166–186). Springer, Singapore.

- [6] Chen, X., Hu, Y. and Shi, Z. (2022), The sustainability probability for the critical Derrida–Retaux model, *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 182:641–684.
- [7] Chen, X., Hu, Y. and Shi, Z. (2024), The dual Derrida–Retaux conjecture, *Stoch. Proc. Appl.*, 171, 104332.
- [8] Collet, P., Eckmann, J.P., Glaser, V. and Martin, A. (1984). Study of the iterations of a mapping associated to a spin-glass model. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **94**, 353–370.
- [9] Costin, O., Costin, R.D., and Grünfeld, C.P. (1990), Infinite-order phase transition in a classical spin system, *J. Statist. Phys.* **59**, 1531–1546.
- [10] Costa, R.A., Dorogovtsev, S. N., Goltsev, A. V. and Mendes, J. F. F. (2015), Solution of the explosive percolation quest. II. Infinite-order transition produced by the initial distributions of clusters, *Phys. Rev. E* **91**, 032140.
- [11] Derrida, B. and Retaux, M. (2014). The depinning transition in presence of disorder: a toy model. *J. Statist. Phys.* **156**, 268–290.
- [12] Derrida, B. and Shi, Z. (2020). Results and conjectures on a toy model of depinning, *Moscow Mathematical Journal*, **20**, 695–709.
- [13] Hu, Y., Mallein, B. and Pain, M. (2020). An exactly solvable continuous-time Derrida–Retaux model. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **375**, 605–651.
- [14] Hu, Y. and Shi, Z. (2018). The free energy in the Derrida–Retaux recursive model. *J. Statist. Phys.* **172**, 718–741.
- [15] Li, D. and Rogers, T.D. (1999). Asymptotic behavior for iterated functions of random variables. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **9**, 1175–1201.
- [16] Russo, L. (1978), A note on percolation, *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie verw Gebiete*, **43**, 39–48.
- [17] Peter, W. and Rémy, P. (2023+), $\mathbb{H}^{2|2}$ -model and Vertex-Reinforced Jump Process the Regular Trees: Infinite-Order Transition and an Intermediate Phase, arXiv:2309.01221