

CONCENTRATION AND FLUCTUATION PHENOMENA IN THE LOCALIZED PHASE OF THE PINNING MODEL

GIAMBATTISTA GIACOMIN AND MARCO ZAMPARO

ABSTRACT. We revisit and expand the analysis in [15] of the localized phase of disordered pinning models. The arguments are developed for i.i.d. site disorder on which we assume only that the moment generating function is bounded in a neighborhood of the origin. Quantitative C^∞ estimates on the free energy density are established, showing in particular that the regularity class is at least Gevrey-3. After explaining how a quenched concentration bound and the quenched Central Limit Theorem (CLT) on the number of the pinned sites, i.e., the *contact number*, can be extracted from the regularity estimates on the free energy, we establish a quenched Local CLT for the same quantity. The centering in these CLTs is random in the sense that it is disorder dependent and a concentration bound and the CLT are established also for the centering sequence, as well as a Hardy–Littlewood random walk type-estimate for its fluctuations.

AMS subject classification (2020 MSC): 60K37, 82B44, 60K35, 60F05

Keywords: Disordered Pinning Model, Localized Phase, Concentration Bounds, Local Central Limit Theorem

CONTENTS

1. The pinning model and its localized phase	1
1.1. The pinning model	1
1.2. The main results	3
1.3. Further comments on the results and comparisons with [15]	6
1.4. Organization of the rest of the paper	8
2. Some basic facts	8
2.1. Conditional independence in the pinning model	8
2.2. A concentration bound under subexponential conditions	10
2.3. First consequences of concentration	11
3. Correlation estimates	14
3.1. First consequences of the correlation estimates	24
4. Regularity estimates and the CLT for the contact number	29
5. The local CLT for the contact number	33
6. A concentration bound and the CLT for the centering variable	39
6.1. Cumulants of the centering variable	39
6.2. More on the mean and the variance	41
6.3. Quenched fluctuations	52
Acknowledgments	53
References	53

1. THE PINNING MODEL AND ITS LOCALIZED PHASE

1.1. **The pinning model.** Set $\mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, \dots\}$ and $\mathbb{N}_0 := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and let T_1, T_2, \dots be i.i.d. random variables on a probability space $(\mathcal{S}, \mathfrak{G}, \mathbb{P})$ valued in $\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. Set $S_0 := 0$ and $S_i := T_1 + \dots + T_i$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Regarding S_0, S_1, \dots as renewal times with inter-arrival

times T_1, T_2, \dots , the number of renewals by the time $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ is

$$L_n := \sup \{i \in \mathbb{N}_0 : S_i \leq n\}.$$

Given a parameter $h \in \mathbb{R}$ and a real sequence $\omega := \{\omega_a\}_{a \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, that we call *charges* and that model impurities or disorder present in the system, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we introduce the probability *pinning model*

$$\frac{d\mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega}}{d\mathbb{P}} := \frac{1}{Z_{n,h}(\omega)} e^{\sum_{i=1}^{L_n} (h + \omega_{S_i})} \mathbb{1}_{\{n \in \{S_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0}\}},$$

provided that $Z_{n,h}(\omega) := \mathbb{E}[e^{\sum_{i=1}^{L_n} (h + \omega_{S_i})} \mathbb{1}_{\{n \in \{S_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0}\}}] > 0$. Here and in what follows we make the usual convention that empty sums are 0 and empty products are 1. We refer to [11, 12, 18, 28] for an explanation of the origin and relevance of pinning models in applied sciences, notably physics and biology. In short, we just point out that the renewal set is interpreted as the ensemble of points, the *contacts* or *pinned sites*, at which a polymer, an interface, or another linear structure enters in contact with a *defect line*, receiving a penalty at the contact point a if $h + \omega_a < 0$, or a reward if $h + \omega_a > 0$. The size of the contact set L_n is henceforth referred to as *contact number*.

The assumptions on the law of inter-arrival times and the charges are the following.

Assumption 1.1. $p(t) := \mathbb{P}[T_1 = t] = \ell(t)/t^{\alpha+1}$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\alpha \geq 1$ and a slowly varying function at infinity ℓ . Moreover, $p(t) > 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$.

We recall that a real measurable function ℓ , defined on $[1, +\infty)$ in our case, is slowly varying at infinity if $\ell(z) > 0$ for all sufficiently large z and $\lim_{z \uparrow +\infty} \ell(\lambda z)/\ell(z) = 1$ for every $\lambda > 0$ [3]. Besides this, we require that $p(t) > 0$, i.e., $\ell(t) > 0$, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$, which in particular guarantees that $Z_{n,h}(\omega) > 0$ for every n and every ω . We believe that there is no substantial difficulty in dropping this further hypothesis, thus generalizing our results to the case in which $p(t) > 0$ only for t sufficiently large. This however would add one more step of complexity to arguments that are already rather technical. We remark also that we do not require that $\sum_{t \in \mathbb{N}} p(t) = 1 - \mathbb{P}[T_1 = \infty] = 1$, so the law $p(\cdot)$ is a sub-probability on \mathbb{N} , but this is just a presentation choice because it is well known that there is no loss of generality in assuming $\mathbb{P}[T_1 = \infty] = 0$ (see, e.g., [12] pages 14-15).

Assumption 1.2. The disorder sequence $\omega := \{\omega_a\}_{a \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is sampled from a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ in such a way that the canonical projections $\omega \mapsto \omega_a$ form a sequence of i.i.d. random variables. Furthermore, $\int_{\Omega} e^{\eta|\omega_0|} \mathbb{P}[d\omega] < +\infty$ for some number $\eta > 0$ and $\int_{\Omega} \omega_0 \mathbb{P}[d\omega] = 0$.

We say that the model is *pure* or *non disordered* if $\mathbb{P}[\{\omega = 0\}] = 1$, which is tantamount to the condition $\int_{\Omega} \omega_0^2 \mathbb{P}[d\omega] = 0$. In this case the model is explicitly solvable (see [11, 12, 18]).

Under Assumptions 1.1 and 1.2, a superadditivity argument shows that the limit defining the *free energy density* (we will simply say *free energy* henceforth)

$$f(h) := \lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \log Z_{n,h} \right]$$

exists for all $h \in \mathbb{R}$ (see [11], Theorem 4.6) and introduces a finite non-decreasing convex function f over \mathbb{R} . The bounds $Z_{n,h}(\omega) \geq e^{h+\omega_n} p(n)$ and $Z_{n,h}(\omega) \geq e^{\sum_{a=1}^n (h+\omega_a)} p(1)^n$ give $f(h) \geq \max\{0, h + \log p(1)\}$. The bound $Z_{n,h}(\omega) \leq e^{\sum_{a=1}^n \max\{0, h+\omega_a\}}$ yields $f(h) \leq \int_{\Omega} \max\{0, h + \omega_0\} \mathbb{P}[d\omega]$. Thus, putting $h_c := \inf\{h \in \mathbb{R} : f(h) > 0\}$, we deduce that $-\infty \leq h_c < +\infty$, that $\lim_{h \downarrow h_c} f(h) = 0$, and that $f(h) = 0$ for $h \leq h_c$ (when $h_c > -\infty$). We say that the model is

- *delocalized*, or that it is in the *delocalized phase*, if $h < h_c$ (when $h_c > -\infty$);
- *critical* if $h = h_c$ (when $h_c > -\infty$);
- *localized*, or that it is in the *localized phase*, if $h > h_c$.

This terminology is easily justified by exploiting the convexity properties of the free energy that, together with the definition of h_c , readily yield that the contact density $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{n,h},[L_n/n]] = (1/n)\mathbb{E}[\partial_h \log Z_{n,h}]$ satisfies $\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{n,h},[L_n/n]] = 0$ for $h < h_c$ (when $h_c > -\infty$) and $\limsup_{n \uparrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{n,h},[L_n/n]] > 0$ for $h > h_c$. Convexity also assures that the superior limit is a limit except possibly for a countable set of values of h : we will see that a byproduct of our analysis is that it is a limit in full generality. We refer to [11, 12, 18, 28] for much more precise results and extensive discussions, including several open questions (for the delocalized phase we add [2] and references therein).

The results we propose here represent a progress in the understanding of the localized phase of the pinning model. We underline that much of the existing literature focuses on the case in which $\int_{\Omega} e^{\xi|\omega_0|} \mathbb{P}[d\omega] < +\infty$ for every $\xi > 0$, and this implies that $h_c > -\infty$. In fact, it suffices that $c := \log \int_{\Omega} e^{\omega_0} \mathbb{P}[d\omega] < +\infty$ to have $h_c \geq -c > -\infty$ because of the annealed bound, which is Jensen's inequality:

$$\mathbb{E}[\log Z_{n,h}] \leq \log \mathbb{E}[Z_{n,h}] = \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{(h+c)L_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{n \in \{S_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0}\}} \right] \leq (h+c)n \quad (1.1)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Next is a more general, almost optimal, result for deciding whether $h_c > -\infty$ or $h_c = -\infty$. We set

$$\varrho := \sup \left\{ z \geq 0 : \int_{\Omega} e^{z\omega_0} \mathbb{P}[d\omega] < +\infty \right\} \in [\eta, +\infty], \quad (1.2)$$

where $\eta > 0$ is introduced in Assumption 1.2.

Proposition 1.1. *If $(\alpha+1)\varrho > 1$, then $h_c > -\infty$. If instead $(\alpha+1)\varrho < 1$, then $h_c = -\infty$.*

The first part of Proposition 1.1 follows from the basic fractional moment bound [27], while the second part is obtained via a lower bound on the partition function by restricting to the renewal trajectory that makes contacts at the points a such that $\omega_a > \lambda$ with a suitably large number λ (see, e.g., [4], Theorem 3.18). One can tackle the case $(\alpha+1)\varrho = 1$ and decide whether $h_c > -\infty$ or not in a number of cases, but we are not aware of a necessary and sufficient condition when $(\alpha+1)\varrho = 1$.

We remark that in [22] the analysis of a class of pinning models with heavy-tailed disorder law is considered, addressing the issue of disorder relevance, i.e., the role of disorder at criticality. Sharper conditions of the tail behaviour of the charges are imposed with respect to Assumption 1.2, but in the language of Proposition 1.1 we see that in [22] it is assumed that $\varrho > 1$. Therefore, in particular, [22] is restricted to the case in which $h_c > -\infty$, and this follows directly from (1.1) without the need of Proposition 1.1.

1.2. The main results. Most of our results rely, directly or indirectly, on correlation estimates that generalize analogous results proved in [15]. In spite of the fact that they are central to our analysis and that ultimately they can be resumed by saying that *in the localized phase correlations decay exponentially fast*, they are rather technical and we refer the reader directly to Section 3.

Here we focus on the following consequences.

Theorem 1.2. *The free energy f is infinitely differentiable on $(h_c, +\infty)$ and the following property holds for \mathbb{P} -a.e. ω : for every compact set $H \subset (h_c, +\infty)$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$*

$$\limsup_{n \uparrow \infty} \sup_{h \in H} \left| \frac{1}{n} \partial_h^r \log Z_{n,h}(\omega) - \partial_h^r f(h) \right| = \limsup_{n \uparrow \infty} \sup_{h \in H} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \partial_h^r \log Z_{n,h} \right] - \partial_h^r f(h) \right| = 0.$$

Moreover, f is of class Gevrey-3 on $(h_c, +\infty)$, i.e., for every $H \subset (h_c, +\infty)$ compact there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\sup_{h \in H} \left| \partial_h^r f(h) \right| \leq c^r (r!)^3.$$

We stress that Theorem 1.2, like all the results that follow, is uniform with respect to the parameter h : we identify a set of charges of full probability for which the results hold for every $h > h_c$. Note that (the $r = 0$ case of) Theorem 1.2 improves also the usual result on existence of the free energy.

Remark 1.3. In [21] it is claimed that the pinning model exhibits a Griffiths singularity in the localized phase. Mathematically, this is an open problem. In [13], motivated by the arguments in [21], a toy pinning model is introduced and studied: notably for $\alpha = 1/2$ this model exhibits a Griffiths singularity whose precise behaviour is established, in particular the free energy is in the Gevrey-(3/2) class. In spite of not being completely implausible that the toy model result holds for the true model, establishing this appears to be very challenging and how the Gevrey class depends on the exponent α remains elusive even in the toy model.

We will then show that from Theorem 1.2 one can extract a quenched concentration bound and a quenched Central Limit Theorem (CLT) for the contact number in the localized phase, i.e., a concentration bound and a CLT for the contact number in the localized phase conditional on a typical realization of the charges.

Theorem 1.4. *The following properties hold for \mathbb{P} -a.e. ω :*

(i) *for every $H \subset (h_c, +\infty)$ compact there exists a constant $\kappa > 0$ such that for all $u \geq 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\sup_{h \in H} \mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega} \left[|L_n - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n]| > u \right] \leq 2 \exp \left\{ -\kappa \frac{u^2}{n + u^{5/3}} \right\};$$

(ii) *for every $h > h_c$ the sequence*

$$\left\{ \frac{L_n - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n]}{\sqrt{n}} \right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$$

converges in distribution, with respect to the law $\mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega}$, to a Gaussian random variable with mean 0 and variance $v_h := \partial_h^2 f(h) > 0$.

But one can go beyond and we establish also a quenched Local CLT for the contact number in the localized phase.

Theorem 1.5. *The following property holds for \mathbb{P} -a.e. ω : for every $h > h_c$*

$$\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \sup_{l \in \mathbb{N}_0} \left| \sqrt{2\pi v_h n} \mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n = l] - \exp \left\{ -\frac{(l - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n])^2}{2v_h n} \right\} \right| = 0.$$

The proof of Theorem 1.5 is established by estimating the characteristic function of the relevant random variable. This is a well known approach for independent random variables and it has been extended for spin averages in non-disordered Gibbs models under suitable conditions on the interaction and assuming that the CLT holds: the case of local interactions is discussed in [8] and the case of infinite-range pair interactions is tackled in [5]. The pinning model can be recast in a binary spin model language and the contact number becomes the total magnetization (see, e.g., [29]), but the potentials involved contain arbitrarily many body interactions. Moreover, our model is disordered.

So we cannot apply the results in [5, 8] and we have to exploit the specific structure of one-dimensional pinning models.

Both Theorem 1.4 and Theorem 1.5 involve the random centering $\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]$. It is therefore natural to address the size of this centering: as a matter of fact, without control on the centering the CLT turns out to be void of interest for certain questions (this is in particular the case for some of the applications in [17]). To this aim we propose for the centering variable a concentration bound, a control on the expectation, and the CLT.

Theorem 1.6. *The following conclusions hold:*

(i) *for every $H \subset (h_c, +\infty)$ compact there exists a constant $\kappa > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $u \geq 0$*

$$\sup_{h \in H} \mathbb{P} \left[\left| \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]] \right| > u \right] \leq 2 \exp \left\{ -\kappa \frac{u^2}{n + u^{5/3}} \right\};$$

(ii) *for every $H \subset (h_c, +\infty)$ compact there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\sup_{h \in H} \left| \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]] - \rho_h n \right| \leq c$$

with $\rho_h := \partial_h f(h) > 0$;

(iii) *for every $h > h_c$ the sequence*

$$\left\{ \frac{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n] - \rho_h n}{\sqrt{n}} \right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$$

converges in distribution, with respect to the law \mathbb{P} , to a Gaussian random variable with mean 0 and variance w_h . Moreover, $w_h > 0$ if $\int_{\Omega} \omega_0^2 \mathbb{P}[d\omega] > 0$.

In the absence of disorder the random centering $\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]$ is of course constant, so parts (i) and (iii) of Theorem 1.6 are trivial, as well as Proposition 1.7 below. On the other hand, Theorem 1.6 assures among others that the limiting distribution of the random centering is non degenerate, i.e., $w_h > 0$ for $h > h_c$, as soon as the model is disordered. Thus, the fact that $w_h > 0$, unlike for v_h , is disorder dependent in the sense that $w_h = 0$ for the pure model. The analysis of the variance of $\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]$ and establishing the positivity of w_h in the presence of disorder, which are important preliminary results in view of formulating the CLT, require a specific and demanding study. In particular, the positivity of w_h can be established in a rather straightforward way when the charges are Gaussian variables via integration by parts, but leaving the Gaussian framework is not at all straightforward.

We are also able to provide an upper bound for the magnitude of the fluctuations of the centering for typical realizations of the charges, in the spirit of Hardy–Littlewood estimates for random walks [19].

Proposition 1.7. *The following property holds for \mathbb{P} -a.e. ω : for every $H \subset (h_c, +\infty)$ compact there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\sup_{h \in H} \frac{|\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n] - \rho_h n|}{\sqrt{n \ln n}} \leq c.$$

We complete the presentation of our results by an aspect that may appear at first more specific and less central than the previous ones: the definition of an *alternative free energy* $\mu(h)$. This impression, which is due to the fact that we have decided not to present the decay of correlation estimates in the introduction, is however false because they are the crucial building block of our analysis and, in turn, their exponential decay relies on the strict positivity of $\mu(h)$. As already explained in [1, 15], $\mu(h)$ is another natural free energy

associated to our model, and we let the following statement introduce it, where we use $Z_{n,h}^-(\omega) := Z_{n,h}(\omega)e^{-h-\omega_n}$.

Proposition 1.8. *For every $h \in \mathbb{R}$ the limit*

$$-\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{Z_{n,h}^-} \right] =: \mu(h) \quad (1.3)$$

exists. Moreover, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $c \min\{f(h), f(h)^2\} \leq \mu(h) \leq f(h)$ for all h . Hence, $\mu(h) = 0$ for $h \leq h_c$ and $\mu(h) > 0$ for $h > h_c$.

A direct consequence of the bounds relating $\mu(h)$ and $f(h)$ in Proposition 1.8 is that the function μ is equivalent to f as far as detecting the phase transition is concerned, but whether their behaviour approaching criticality is the same or not is an open problem when disorder is *relevant* (see [16], notably Theorem 2.4, also for the notion of disorder relevance). This point is further discussed in [6], and in [6, 15, 16] it is also explained why both $1/\mu(h)$ and $1/f(h)$ are two natural correlation lengths for the system: in fact, $\mu(h)$ directly enters the correlation bounds we give and use starting from the next section. One of the important properties of $\mu(h)$ is that it determines the maximal polymer excursion $M_n := \max\{T_1, \dots, T_{L_n}\}$ in the localized phase as follows.

Proposition 1.9. *The following property holds for \mathbb{P} -a.e. ω : for every $h > h_c$ the sequence*

$$\left\{ \frac{M_n}{\log n} \right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$$

converges in probability, with respect to the law $\mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega}$, to $1/\mu(h)$.

Propositions 1.8 and 1.9 generalize part (1) and part (2), respectively, of Theorem 2.5 in [15]. While Proposition 1.8 generalizes part (1) of this theorem only for the weaker assumptions on the charges (see however Remark 1.10 below), Proposition 1.9 improves part (2) also because it establishes convergence in probability for almost all the realizations of the disorder: in fact, the upper bound on the size of the maximal excursion in [15] is obtained only in probability with respect to the disorder.

Remark 1.10. The definition of $\mu(h)$ in [1, 15] is rather $-\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} (1/n) \log \mathbb{E}[1/Z_{n,h}]$. The two definitions are equivalent if and only if $\int_{\Omega} e^{-\omega_0} \mathbb{P}[d\omega] < +\infty$, otherwise $\mathbb{E}[1/Z_{n,h}] = +\infty$. For several reasons, see in particular Corollary 2.6, considering $\mathbb{E}[1/Z_{n,h}^-]$ is more natural, and even necessary if $\int_{\Omega} e^{-\omega_0} \mathbb{P}[d\omega] = +\infty$, but we point out that the superadditivity argument in [1, 15] for the existence of $\mu(h)$ does not work when $\int_{\Omega} e^{-\omega_0} \mathbb{P}[d\omega] = +\infty$ and needs to be modified.

1.3. Further comments on the results and comparisons with [15]. Theorem 1.2 generalizes Theorem 2.1 in [15], while Propositions 1.8 and 1.9 generalize analogous results stated in [15] by Theorem 2.5 as already pointed out. On the other hand, Theorems 1.4, 1.5, and 1.6 are new, as well as Proposition 1.7. We list here a number of comments about our findings:

- (1) In comparison to [15], our hypotheses on disorder are substantially weaker and completely explicit. In fact, in [15] it is asked that disorder has the property that Lipschitz convex functions of the charges satisfy a suitable concentration inequality. This property is used to show that $\mu(h) > 0$ for $h > h_c$ by means of a concentration bound for the finite-volume free energy. In particular, the concentration inequality assumed in [15] requires (super-)Gaussian tail decay of the charge distribution. Here we just assume the simple and explicit exponential tail condition of Assumption 1.2. We

achieve a concentration bound for the finite-volume free energy via a version of the McDiarmid's inequality for functions of independent random variables [23].

- (2) The correlation estimates in Section 3 are the technical basis of our results. They build on the ideas in [15], whose estimates are generalized and made explicit in order to accommodate the more general set up and to achieve new results. In particular, with respect to [15], the estimates are improved so that they are amenable to be used in a Birkhoff-sum approach, to which we resort here to prove the almost sure results with respect to disorder. Furthermore, they are also improved in the direction of stronger mixing estimates, like those in Lemma 3.4, that are needed for establishing the CLT for the centering variable.

The mentioned Birkhoff-sum approach, which we use starting from Section 3.1, turns out to be a powerful tool. We believe that the applications of such approach are not restricted to the results of this paper and that it could provide further insight into the localized phase of pinning models in future works. Moreover, the Birkhoff-sum approach might be of interest also for the study of pinning models subjected to correlated disorder with good mixing properties (see [7] and references therein).

- (3) We stress once more that we have taken care of providing almost sure results that are uniform in the parameter h : by this we mean that we have identified a set of charges of full probability that works for every $h > h_c$. This is another byproduct of the Birkhoff-sum approach. The pinning model is usually presented as a model with two free parameters [11, 12, 18, 28]: h and an amplitude $\beta \geq 0$ of the charges, so ω_a enters the model via $\beta\omega_a$, and then one fixes $\int_{\Omega} \omega_0^2 \mathbb{P}[d\omega] = 1$. In this framework, the localized phase is a region of the plane where the free energy is strictly positive. For the sake of simplifying the formulas, we have decided to set $\beta = 1$, but we have not fixed the variance of the charges. There is therefore no loss of generality except that one may wonder about the uniformity of the results with respect to both h and β together: our approach generalizes in a straightforward way to obtain such a uniform result.
- (4) Compared to Theorem 2.1 in [15], our estimates in Theorem 1.2 control the dependence on the bounds on (all) the derivatives of the free energy in such a way that a Gevrey class to which the free energy belongs is identified. The Gevrey class we find is the same for all the models we consider. Obtaining the optimal Gevrey class, most probably dependent on details of the model such as the regular variation class of the inter-arrival law and the regularity properties of the law of the disorder, is a particular case of the very challenging issue of understanding Griffiths singularities.
- (5) We prove a Local CLT for the key observable of pinning models, i.e., the contact number. The proof is inspired by [5, 8], which deal with block spin averages under Gibbs measures for non-disordered discrete spin systems. Disorder induces a number of technical difficulties, but also a substantial one: since we want to prove the results for typical realization of the environment, the *centering constant* $\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n]$ depends on the realization ω of the environment. A full result includes therefore a control on the behaviour of $\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n]$. For this reason we establish a CLT also for this variable, as well as a Hardy-Littlewood type-estimate, and we show that the limiting distribution is degenerate only in the absence of disorder. Non degeneracy can be demonstrated in a rather straightforward way when disorder is Gaussian (via integration by parts), but we do extend the proof to general disorder laws. We stress also the very different nature of the CLTs in Theorems 1.4 and 1.6: the fluctuations of the contact number for a typical environment are thermal, whereas the fluctuations of the centering are due to the disorder.
- (6) In the forthcoming work [17] we are going to exploit the estimates we develop here, notably the CLTs for the contact number and the control on the centering, to study

the pinning model conditioned on the number of pinned sites. The aim is to obtain sharp results on the effect of disorder on the so called *big-jump* phenomenon that has been widely studied in the absence of disorder (see [14, 31] and references therein).

1.4. Organization of the rest of the paper. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we discuss some basic facts of the model, such as the fundamental property of conditional independence between consecutive stretches of the polymer and a concentration bound for the finite-volume free energy. The latter is then used to prove Proposition 1.8. Section 3 presents some correlation estimates, a first application of which is the proof of Proposition 1.9. In Section 4 we develop some regularity estimates for the free energy, which allows us to prove Theorem 1.2 and, on the basis of general results about cumulants, also Theorem 1.4. Theorem 1.5 is demonstrated in Section 5 through an analysis of the characteristic function of the contact number. Finally, in Section 6 we study the cumulants of the centering variable involved in Theorem 1.4 and Theorem 1.5, with particular attention to the mean and variance, proving Theorem 1.6 and Proposition 1.7.

2. SOME BASIC FACTS

2.1. Conditional independence in the pinning model. The renewal nature of the pinning model implies a conditional independence between consecutive stretches of the polymer. We state this fundamental property in terms of the random variables $X_a := \mathbb{1}_{\{a \in \{S_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0}\}}$ for $a \in \mathbb{N}_0$, which take value 1 at the contact sites and value 0 at the other sites. Note that $X_0 = 1$ as $S_0 := 0$ by definition, which can be interpreted by saying that there is a contact on the left of any site $a \in \mathbb{N}$. Also note that the model can be recast as

$$\frac{d\mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega}}{d\mathbb{P}} = \frac{1}{Z_{n,h}(\omega)} e^{\sum_{a=1}^n (h+\omega_a) X_a} X_n,$$

with $Z_{n,h}(\omega) := \mathbb{E}[e^{\sum_{i=1}^n (h+\omega_a) X_a} X_n]$. In this setting, the contact number reads $L_n = \sum_{a=1}^n X_a$.

The following lemma introduces the mentioned conditional independence, whose standard proof is omitted (see, e.g., [30], Proposition 3.1). Let \mathcal{M}_n be the set of functions $\phi : \{0, 1\}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $|\phi(x_0, \dots, x_n)| \leq 1$ for all $x_0, \dots, x_n \in \{0, 1\}$ and denote by ϑ the left shift that maps the sequence $\omega := \{\omega_a\}_{a \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \Omega$ to $\vartheta\omega := \{\omega_{a+1}\}_{a \in \mathbb{N}_0}$.

Lemma 2.1. *For every $h \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$, integers $0 \leq a \leq n$, and functions $\phi \in \mathcal{M}_a$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{M}_{n-a}$*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\phi(X_0, \dots, X_a) \psi(X_a, \dots, X_n) \middle| X_a = 1 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{a,h,\omega} \left[\phi(X_0, \dots, X_a) \right] \mathbb{E}_{n-a,h,\vartheta^a \omega} \left[\psi(X_0, \dots, X_{n-a}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\phi(X_0, \dots, X_a) \psi(X_a, \dots, X_n) \middle| X_a = 1 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\phi(X_0, \dots, X_a) \middle| X_a = 1 \right] \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\psi(X_a, \dots, X_n) \middle| X_a = 1 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.1 is at the basis of a technical estimate that we use all over the paper to compare configurations where a site is not a contact with configurations where that site becomes a contact. In order to present such estimate in the next lemma, we observe that the properties of slowly varying functions (see [3], Theorem 1.2.1 and Proposition 1.3.6) imply that there exists a constant $\xi > 0$ such that for all $t, \tau \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\frac{p(t+\tau)}{p(t)p(\tau)} \leq \xi \min\{t^\xi, \tau^\xi\}. \quad (2.1)$$

Recall our convention that empty sums are equal to 0 and empty products are equal to 1.

Lemma 2.2. *For every $h \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega := \{\omega_b\}_{b \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \Omega$, integers $0 < a < n$, and non-negative functions $\phi \in \mathcal{M}_{a-1}$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{M}_{n-a-1}$*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\phi(X_0, \dots, X_{a-1})(1 - X_a)\psi(X_{a+1}, \dots, X_n) \right] \\ & \leq \xi e^{-h-\omega_a} \min \{a^\xi, (n-a)^\xi\} \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\phi(X_0, \dots, X_{a-1})X_a\psi(X_{a+1}, \dots, X_n) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, for each $\lambda > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\phi(X_0, \dots, X_{a-1})\mathbb{1}_{\{T_{L_{a+1}} \leq \lambda\}}(1 - X_a)\psi(X_{a+1}, \dots, X_n) \right] \\ & \leq \xi e^{-h-\omega_a} \min \{\lambda^\xi, a^\xi, (n-a)^\xi\} \\ & \quad \times \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\phi(X_0, \dots, X_{a-1})\mathbb{1}_{\{T_{L_a} + T_{L_{a+1}} \leq \lambda\}}X_a\psi(X_{a+1}, \dots, X_n) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 2.2. It suffices to prove the second part of the lemma. In fact, the first part follows from the second one with a number $\lambda \geq n$ since for $0 < a < n$ we have $T_{L_{a+1}} \leq n$ and $T_{L_a} + T_{L_{a+1}} \leq n$ almost surely with respect to the polymer measure $\mathbf{P}_{n,h,\omega}$.

Pick $h \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega := \{\omega_b\}_{b \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \Omega$, integers $0 < a < n$, and $\lambda > 0$. The lemma uses a standard trick to introduce the indicator function that there is a contact at site a at the expense of a multiplicative constant that depends on the charge at a and on a power of a or $n - a$. In detail, we are going to exploit the two identities

$$\mathbb{1}_{\{T_{L_{a+1}} \leq \lambda\}}(1 - X_a) = \sum_{i=0}^{a-1} \sum_{j=a+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{\{j-i \leq \lambda\}} X_i \prod_{k=i+1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k) X_j, \quad (2.2)$$

and

$$\mathbb{1}_{\{T_{L_a} + T_{L_{a+1}} \leq \lambda\}} X_a = \sum_{i=0}^{a-1} \sum_{j=a+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{\{j-i \leq \lambda\}} X_i \prod_{k=i+1}^{a-1} (1 - X_k) X_a \prod_{k=a+1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k) X_j. \quad (2.3)$$

The (2.2) decomposes the event that the site a is in a polymer excursion of size at most λ , but there is no contact in a , as a disjoint union of the events that there is a contact at $i < a$, a contact at $j > a$ with $j - i \leq \lambda$, and no contact between i and j . Similarly, (2.3) decomposes the event that the site a is a contact separating two excursions of total size at most λ according to the positions i and j of the first contacts on the left and on the right of a , respectively. Also in this case $j - i \leq \lambda$.

Fix non-negative functions $\phi \in \mathcal{M}_{a-1}$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{M}_{n-a-1}$ and put $\Phi := \phi(X_0, \dots, X_{a-1})$ and $\Psi := \psi(X_{a+1}, \dots, X_n)$ for brevity. For $i < a < j$ also put $\Phi_i := \phi(X_0, \dots, X_i, 0, \dots, 0)$ and $\Psi_j := \psi(0, \dots, 0, X_j, \dots, X_n)$. Since $X_n = 1$ almost surely under the polymer measure, the identity (2.2) implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\Phi \mathbb{1}_{\{T_{L_{a+1}} \leq \lambda\}}(1 - X_a)\Psi \right] \\ & = \sum_{i=0}^{a-1} \sum_{j=a+1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{j-i \leq \lambda\}} \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\Phi X_i \prod_{k=i+1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k) X_j \right] \\ & = \sum_{i=0}^{a-1} \sum_{j=a+1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{j-i \leq \lambda\}} \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\Phi_i X_i \prod_{k=i+1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k) X_j \Psi_j \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We can invoke Lemma 2.1 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\Phi \mathbb{1}_{\{T_{L_{a+1}} \leq \lambda\}} (1 - X_a) \Psi \right] \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{a-1} \sum_{j=a+1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{j-i \leq \lambda\}} \mathbb{E}_{j,h,\omega} [\Phi_i X_i] \mathbb{E}_{j-i,h,\vartheta^i \omega} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-i-1} (1 - X_k) \right] \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} [X_j \Psi_j] \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{a-1} \sum_{j=a+1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{j-i \leq \lambda\}} \mathbb{E}_{j,h,\omega} [\Phi_i X_i] \frac{p(j-i)e^{h+\omega_j}}{Z_{j-i,h}(\vartheta^i \omega)} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} [X_j \Psi_j]. \tag{2.4}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, (2.3) and Lemma 2.1 show that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\Phi \mathbb{1}_{\{T_{L_a} + T_{L_{a+1}} \leq \lambda\}} X_a \Psi \right] \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{a-1} \sum_{j=a+1}^n \mathbb{E}_{j,h,\omega} [\Phi_i X_i] \mathbb{E}_{j-i,h,\vartheta^i \omega} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{a-i-1} (1 - X_k) X_{a-i} \prod_{k=a-i+1}^{j-i-1} (1 - X_k) \right] \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} [X_j \Psi_j] \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{a-1} \sum_{j=a+1}^n \mathbb{E}_{j,h,\omega} [\Phi_i X_i] \frac{p(a-i)p(j-a)e^{2h+\omega_a+\omega_j}}{Z_{j-i,h}(\vartheta^i \omega)} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} [X_j \Psi_j]. \tag{2.5}
\end{aligned}$$

Now we observe that if $i < a < j$ with $j - i \leq \lambda$, then the inequality (2.1) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
p(j-i) &\leq \xi \min \{ (a-i)^\xi, (j-a)^\xi \} p(a-i)p(j-a) \\
&\leq \xi \min \{ \lambda^\xi, a^\xi, (n-a)^\xi \} p(a-i)p(j-a). \tag{2.6}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, plugging (2.6) in (2.4), and then comparing with (2.5), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\Phi \mathbb{1}_{\{T_{L_{a+1}} \leq \lambda\}} (1 - X_a) \Psi \right] \\
&\leq \xi e^{-h-\omega_a} \min \{ \lambda^\xi, a^\xi, (n-a)^\xi \} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\Phi \mathbb{1}_{\{T_{L_a} + T_{L_{a+1}} \leq \lambda\}} X_a \Psi \right]. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.3. The first part of Lemma 2.2 is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\phi(X_0, \dots, X_{a-1}) \psi(X_{a+1}, \dots, X_n) \right] \\
&\leq \left[1 + \xi e^{-h-\omega_a} \min \{ a^\xi, (n-a)^\xi \} \right] \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\phi(X_0, \dots, X_{a-1}) X_a \psi(X_{a+1}, \dots, X_n) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

This bound with ϕ and ψ identically equal to 1 reads

$$\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} [X_a] \geq \frac{1}{1 + \xi e^{-h-\omega_a} \min \{ a^\xi, (n-a)^\xi \}}.$$

The latter, which trivially holds even if $a = 0$ or $a = n$, is a refinement of Lemma A.1 in [15].

2.2. A concentration bound under subexponential conditions. A version of the McDiarmid's inequality for functions of independent random variables under subexponential conditions is provided in [23]. We use this result to obtain a concentration bound for the finite-volume free energies $\log Z_{n,h}$ and $\log Z_{n,h}^-$. Recall that $Z_{n,h}^-(\omega) := Z_{n,h}(\omega) e^{-h-\omega_n}$. Also note that

$$\left| \log Z_{n,h}(\omega) - \log Z_{n,h'}(\omega') \right| \leq n|h - h'| + \sum_{a=1}^n |\omega_a - \omega'_a| \tag{2.7}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, h and h' in \mathbb{R} , and $\omega := \{\omega_a\}_{a \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ and $\omega' := \{\omega'_a\}_{a \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ in Ω . The same holds if $Z_{n,h}$ is replaced by $Z_{n,h}^-$. In particular, bound (2.7) gives $|f(h) - f(h')| \leq |h - h'|$.

Theorem 2.4. *There exists a constant $\kappa > 0$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $h \in \mathbb{R}$, and $u \geq 0$*

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\left| \log Z_{n,h} - \mathbb{E}[\log Z_{n,h}] \right| > u \right] \leq 2e^{-\frac{\kappa u^2}{n+u}},$$

and the very same bound holds if $Z_{n,h}$ is replaced by $Z_{n,h}^-$.

Proof of Theorem 2.4. We develop the argument for $Z_{n,h}$, as the argument for $Z_{n,h}^-$ is identical. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $h \in \mathbb{R}$, and $u \geq 0$. For every $\varpi := \{\varpi_b\}_{b \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \Omega$ and $a \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ let $\Lambda_{\varpi,a}$ be the random variable on Ω that maps $\omega := \{\omega_b\}_{b \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ to

$$\Lambda_{\varpi,a}(\omega) := \log Z_{n,h}(\{\varpi_0, \dots, \varpi_{a-1}, \omega_a, \varpi_{a+1}, \dots\}),$$

i.e., $\Lambda_{\varpi,a}(\omega)$ is the finite-volume free energy for a system that at site b has the charge ϖ_b if $b \neq a$ and ω_a if $b = a$. An analog of the McDiarmid's inequality for functions of independent random variables under subexponential conditions (see [23], Theorem 4) states that if there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for every $\varpi \in \Omega$, $a \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and $q \geq 1$ we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \Lambda_{\varpi,a} - \mathbb{E}[\Lambda_{\varpi,a}] \right|^q \right] \leq (cq)^q, \quad (2.8)$$

then

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\left| \log Z_{n,h} - \mathbb{E}[\log Z_{n,h}] \right| > u \right] \leq 2e^{-\frac{u^2}{(2ec)^2 n + 2ecu}}.$$

Let us show that (2.8) is satisfied with $c := (2/\eta e) \int_{\Omega} e^{\eta|\omega_0|} \mathbb{P}[d\omega]$ and η as in Assumption 1.2. This proves the theorem with $1/\kappa := \max\{2ec, (2ec)^2\}$.

Bound (2.7) yields $|\Lambda_{\varpi,a}(\omega) - \Lambda_{\varpi,a}(\omega')| \leq |\omega_a - \omega'_a|$ for $\omega := \{\omega_b\}_{b \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ and $\omega' := \{\omega'_b\}_{b \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ in Ω , which thanks to Hölder's inequality gives for $q \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \Lambda_{\varpi,a}(\omega) - \mathbb{E}[\Lambda_{\varpi,a}] \right|^q &\leq \int_{\Omega} \left| \Lambda_{\varpi,a}(\omega) - \Lambda_{\varpi,a}(\omega') \right|^q \mathbb{P}[d\omega'] \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} |\omega_a - \omega'_a|^q \mathbb{P}[d\omega'] \leq 2^{q-1} |\omega_a|^q + 2^{q-1} \int_{\Omega} |\omega'_0|^q \mathbb{P}[d\omega']. \end{aligned}$$

Using the inequality $\zeta^q \leq (q/\eta e)^q e^{\eta\zeta}$ for $\zeta \geq 0$ we finally get

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \Lambda_{\varpi,a} - \mathbb{E}[\Lambda_{\varpi,a}] \right|^q \right] \leq 2^q \int_{\Omega} |\omega_0|^q \mathbb{P}[d\omega] \leq \left(\frac{2q}{\eta e} \right)^q \int_{\Omega} e^{\eta|\omega_0|} \mathbb{P}[d\omega] = (cq)^q. \quad \square$$

2.3. First consequences of concentration. The first consequence of the concentration bounds for the free energies is the lower bound on $\mu(h)$ in Proposition 1.8, which is proved in this section. The superadditivity property exploited in [1, 15] to establish the existence of $\mu(h)$ is no longer available because now we work with $Z_{n,h}^-$. However, one can show that the sequence $\{\log \mathbb{E}[1/Z_{n,h}^-]\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is nearly superadditive and nearly subadditive: we choose to show the second property because it follows directly from Lemma 2.2.

Proof of Proposition 1.8. Fix $h \in \mathbb{R}$ and a number λ so large that $\int_{\Omega} \mathbb{1}_{\{h+\omega_0 \leq \lambda\}} \mathbb{P}[d\omega] \geq 1/2$. Consider the sequence whose n^{th} term is $\log[2^{\xi+1}(e^\lambda + \xi n^\xi)] - \log \mathbb{E}[1/Z_{n,h}^-]$, where the number ξ has been defined in (2.1). We show that this sequence is subadditive, so that the limit $\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} -(1/n) \log \mathbb{E}[1/Z_{n,h}^-] =: \mu(h)$ exists as a consequence. To begin with, we appeal to Lemma 2.2, through Remark 2.3, to state that for all $\omega \in \Omega$ and $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathbb{E}_{m+n,h,\omega}[X_m] \geq \frac{1}{1 + \xi e^{-h-\omega_m} \min\{m^\xi, n^\xi\}}.$$

Then we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{m+n,h,\omega}[X_m] &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[X_m e^{\sum_{a=1}^{m+n} (h+\omega_a) X_a} X_{m+n}]}{Z_{m+n,h}(\omega)} = \frac{Z_{m,h}(\omega) Z_{n,h}(\vartheta^m \omega)}{Z_{m+n,h}(\omega)} \\ &= e^{h+\omega_m} \frac{Z_{m,h}^-(\omega) Z_{n,h}^-(\vartheta^m \omega)}{Z_{m+n,h}^-(\omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the renewal property in the second equality. Therefore

$$\frac{1}{Z_{m+n,h}^-(\omega)} \geq \frac{1}{e^{h+\omega_m} + \xi \min\{m^\xi, n^\xi\}} \frac{1}{Z_{m,h}^-(\omega)} \frac{1}{Z_{n,h}^-(\vartheta^m \omega)},$$

and to obtain the desired subadditivity property it suffices to note that the three factors in the right-hand side are statistically independent, so by integrating with respect to $\mathbb{P}[d\omega]$ and exploiting that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{e^{h+\omega_0} + \xi \min\{m^\xi, n^\xi\}} \mathbb{P}[d\omega] &\geq \int_{\Omega} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{h+\omega_0 \leq \lambda\}}}{e^\lambda + \xi \min\{m^\xi, n^\xi\}} \mathbb{P}[d\omega] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{e^\lambda + \xi \min\{m^\xi, n^\xi\}} \geq \frac{e^\lambda + \xi(m+n)^\xi}{2^{\xi+1}(e^\lambda + \xi m^\xi)(e^\lambda + \xi n^\xi)} \end{aligned}$$

we complete the task.

The inequality $\mu(h) \leq f(h)$ follows from Jensen's inequality. For a lower bound on $\mu(h)$, let $\kappa > 0$ be the constant of Theorem 2.4 and put $c := 1 - 1/\sqrt{1 + \kappa}$. Since $p(n)/Z_{n,h}^-(\omega) \leq 1$, because the left-hand side is the probability $\mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega}[T_1 = n] = e^{h+\omega_n} p(n)/Z_{n,h}(\omega)$, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $h \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\omega \in \Omega$ we have

$$\frac{p(n)}{Z_{n,h}^-(\omega)} \leq \mathbb{1}_{\{\log Z_{n,h}^-(\omega) - \mathbb{E}[\log Z_{n,h}^-] < -(1-c)f(h)n\}} + p(n) e^{(1-c)f(h)n - \mathbb{E}[\log Z_{n,h}^-]}. \quad (2.9)$$

At the same time, since $\mathbb{E}[\log Z_{n,h}^-] = \mathbb{E}[\log Z_{n,h}] - h$, we can state that $\mathbb{E}[\log Z_{n,h}^-] \geq f(h)n - \delta n$ for any given $\delta > 0$ and all sufficiently large n . Thus, integrating (2.9) with respect to $\mathbb{P}[d\omega]$ and invoking Theorem 2.4, we find for all sufficiently large n

$$\begin{aligned} p(n) \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{Z_{n,h}^-} \right] &\leq 2e^{-\frac{\kappa(1-c)^2 f(h)^2 n}{1+(1-c)f(h)}} + p(n) e^{-cf(h)n + \delta n} \\ &\leq 2e^{-c \min\{f(h), f(h)^2\}} + p(n) e^{-cf(h)n + \delta n}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the logarithm, dividing by n , and then sending n to infinity, this bound allows us to conclude that $\mu(h) \geq c \min\{f(h), f(h)^2\} - \delta$, which gives the desired lower bound on $\mu(h)$ thanks to the arbitrariness of δ . \square

Remark 2.5. The quantity $\mu(h)$ is non decreasing with respect to h , as $Z_{n,h}^-(\omega)$ has the same property. Moreover, since $\partial_h Z_{n,h}^-(\omega) \leq n Z_{n,h}^-(\omega)$, it is easy to verify that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $h, h' \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{Z_{n,h}^-} \right] - \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{Z_{n,h'}^-} \right] \right| \leq |h - h'|.$$

It follows that $|\mu(h) - \mu(h')| \leq |h - h'|$.

In the proof of Proposition 1.8 we have observed that $\mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega}[T_1 = n] = p(n)/Z_{n,h}^-(\omega)$. As direct consequence, Proposition 1.8 has the following corollary.

Corollary 2.6. *For every $h \in \mathbb{R}$*

$$\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}_{n,h,\cdot}[T_1 = n] \right] = -\mu(h).$$

Corollary 2.6 implies that the contact fraction for $h > h_c$ is small with exponentially small probability. We let the following lemma to state a precise result.

Lemma 2.7. *For every $h > h_c$ there exist constants $\delta > 0$, $\gamma > 0$, and $G > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{P}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n < \delta n]\right] \leq Ge^{-\gamma n}.$$

Proof of Lemma 2.7. Fix $h > h_c$. Since $\mu(h) > 0$, Corollary 2.6 shows that there exist constants $\gamma_o > 0$ and $G_o > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{P}_{n,h,\cdot}[T_1 = n]\right] \leq G_o e^{-\gamma_o n} \quad (2.10)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Put $\gamma := \frac{\gamma_o}{3}$ and take $\delta > 0$ so small that $G_o \leq e^{\frac{\gamma}{\delta}}(e^\gamma - 1)$. We claim that the lemma holds with such γ and with $G := 1/(1 - e^{-\frac{\gamma}{\delta}})$. In fact, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n < \delta n] = \sum_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\{l < \delta n\}} \sum_{0=a_0 < a_1 < \dots < a_l = n} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\prod_{i=1}^l X_{a_{i-1}} \prod_{k=a_{i-1}+1}^{a_i-1} (1 - X_k) X_{a_i} \right].$$

On the other hand, repeated applications of Lemma 2.1 show that for all integers $0 = a_0 < a_1 < \dots < a_l = n$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\prod_{i=1}^l X_{a_{i-1}} \prod_{k=a_{i-1}+1}^{a_i-1} (1 - X_k) X_{a_i} \right] \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^l \mathbb{E}_{a_i - a_{i-1}, h, \vartheta^{a_{i-1}} \omega} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{a_i - a_{i-1} - 1} (1 - X_k) \right] \mathbb{E}_{a_i, h, \omega} [X_{a_{i-1}}] \\ &\leq \prod_{i=1}^l \mathbb{E}_{a_i - a_{i-1}, h, \vartheta^{a_{i-1}} \omega} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{a_i - a_{i-1} - 1} (1 - X_k) \right] \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^l \mathbb{P}_{a_i - a_{i-1}, h, \vartheta^{a_{i-1}} \omega} [T_1 = a_i - a_{i-1}]. \end{aligned}$$

In this way, integrating with respect to $\mathbb{P}[d\omega]$, the statistical independence of the factors $\mathbb{P}_{a_i - a_{i-1}, h, \vartheta^{a_{i-1}} \omega} [T_1 = a_i - a_{i-1}]$ combined with bound (2.10) leads us to the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{P}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n < \delta n]\right] &\leq \sum_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\{l < \delta n\}} \binom{n-1}{l-1} G_o^l e^{-\gamma_o n} \\ &\leq \sum_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\{l < \delta n\}} \binom{n-1}{l-1} (e^\gamma - 1)^l e^{\frac{\gamma}{\delta} l - 3\gamma n}. \end{aligned}$$

The Newton formula $\sum_{l=0}^n \binom{n}{l} \zeta^l (1 - \zeta)^{n-l} = 1$ yields $\binom{n}{l} \leq \zeta^{-l} (1 - \zeta)^{l-n}$ for $\zeta \in (0, 1)$, which directly implies that $\binom{n-1}{l-1} \leq \zeta^{-l} (1 - \zeta)^{l-n}$. The choice $\zeta := 1 - e^{-\gamma}$ finally gives

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{P}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n < \delta n]\right] \leq \sum_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\{l < \delta n\}} e^{\frac{\gamma}{\delta} l - 2\gamma n} \leq \frac{e^{-\gamma n}}{1 - e^{-\frac{\gamma}{\delta}}}. \quad \square$$

3. CORRELATION ESTIMATES

This section introduces the correlation estimates that we use for the main proofs of the paper. The first lemma we present is concerned with the covariance of two observables under the polymer measure $\mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega}$: given two measurable complex functions Φ and Ψ over $(\mathcal{S}, \mathfrak{S})$ we define their covariance as

$$\text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[\Phi, \Psi] := \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[\Phi\Psi] - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[\Phi]\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[\Psi],$$

provided that all the expectations exist. The lemma involves two independent copies of the polymer, so let $\{S_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ and $\{S'_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be two independent copies of the renewal process, defined on the product probability space $(\mathcal{S}^2, \mathfrak{S}^{\otimes 2}, \mathbb{P}^{\otimes 2})$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $h \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\omega \in \Omega$, consider on $(\mathcal{S}^2, \mathfrak{S}^{\otimes 2})$ also the product measure $\mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega}^{\otimes 2}$ and denote by $\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}^{\otimes 2}$ the corresponding expectation.

Lemma 3.1. *For every $h \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega := \{\omega_c\}_{c \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \Omega$, integers $0 \leq a \leq b \leq n$, and functions $\phi \in \mathcal{M}_a$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{M}_{n-b}$*

$$\left| \text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[\phi(X_0, \dots, X_a), \psi(X_b, \dots, X_n)] \right| \leq 2 \sum_{i=0}^{a-1} \sum_{j=b+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{j-i,h,\vartheta^i \omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-i-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right].$$

Moreover

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{|\text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a, X_b]|}{\min\{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a], \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_b]\}} \\ & \leq 2 \sum_{j=b+1}^{\infty} \left[1 + \xi(j-a)^\xi e^{-h-\omega_a} \right] \mathbb{E}_{j-a,h,\vartheta^a \omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-a-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \\ & \quad + 2 \sum_{i=0}^{a-1} \left[1 + \xi(b-i)^\xi e^{-h-\omega_b} \right] \mathbb{E}_{b-i,h,\vartheta^i \omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{b-i-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 3.1. Fix $h \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega := \{\omega_c\}_{c \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \Omega$, and integers $0 \leq a \leq b \leq n$. To begin with, given the functions $\phi \in \mathcal{M}_a$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{M}_{n-b}$, we claim that

$$\text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[\Phi, \Psi] = \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}^{\otimes 2}[\Phi\Psi - \Phi\Psi'] = \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\Phi(\Psi - \Psi') \prod_{k=a}^b (1 - X_k X'_k) \right], \quad (3.1)$$

where we have set $\Phi := \phi(X_0, \dots, X_a)$, $\Psi := \psi(X_b, \dots, X_n)$, and $\Psi' := \psi(X'_b, \dots, X'_n)$ for brevity. The first equality is immediate. Regarding the second equality, we use the identity

$$\prod_{k=a}^b (1 - X_k X'_k) - \sum_{\mathcal{A} \subseteq \{a, \dots, b\}} (-1)^{|\mathcal{A}|} \prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} X_k X'_k = 1$$

to write down

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[\Phi\Psi - \Phi\Psi'] &= \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\Phi(\Psi - \Psi') \prod_{k=a}^b (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \\ & \quad - \sum_{\mathcal{A} \subseteq \{a, \dots, b\}} (-1)^{|\mathcal{A}|} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\Phi(\Psi - \Psi') \prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} X_k X'_k \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The desired result is due to the fact that $\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}^{\otimes 2}[\Phi(\Psi - \Psi') \prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} X_k X'_k] = 0$ for any given set $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \{a, \dots, b\}$. To prove this fact we invoke Lemma 2.1 to state that

$$\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\Phi \prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} X_k \Psi \right] = \frac{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} [\Phi \prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} X_k] \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} [\prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} X_k \Psi]}{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} [\prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} X_k]},$$

which entails

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\Phi(\Psi - \Psi') \prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} X_k X'_k \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\Phi \prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} X_k \Psi \right] \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} X_k \right] - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\Phi \prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} X_k \right] \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} X_k \Psi \right] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let us verify the first part of the lemma. Formula (3.1) shows that

$$\left| \text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[\Phi, \Psi] \right| \leq 2 \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=a}^b (1 - X_k X'_k) \right].$$

The identity

$$\prod_{k=a}^b (1 - X_k X'_k) = \sum_{i=0}^{a-1} \sum_{j=b+1}^n X_i X'_i \prod_{k=i+1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) X_j X'_j + \prod_{k=a}^n (1 - X_k X'_k),$$

together with the fact that $X_n = 1$ and $X'_n = 1$ almost surely under the two-polymers measure $\mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega}^{\otimes 2}$, yields

$$\left| \text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[\Phi, \Psi] \right| \leq 2 \sum_{i=0}^{a-1} \sum_{j=b+1}^n \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[X_i X'_i \prod_{k=i+1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) X_j X'_j \right].$$

Finally, we appeal once again to Lemma 2.1 to get the bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[X_i X'_i \prod_{k=i+1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) X_j X'_j \right] \\ &= \sum_{x_i \in \{0,1\}} \cdots \sum_{x_j \in \{0,1\}} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[X_i \prod_{k=i+1}^{j-1} (1 - x_k X_k) X_j \right] \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[X_i X_j \prod_{k=i}^j \mathbb{1}_{\{X_k = x_k\}} \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{x_i \in \{0,1\}} \cdots \sum_{x_j \in \{0,1\}} \mathbb{E}_{j-i,h,\vartheta^i \omega} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-i-1} (1 - x_{k+i} X_k) \right] \mathbb{E}_{j-i,h,\vartheta^i \omega} \left[\prod_{k=0}^{j-i} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_k = x_{k+i}\}} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{j-i,h,\vartheta^i \omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-i-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Let us move to the second part of the lemma. Bound (3.1) shows that both

$$\left| \text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a, X_b] \right| \leq 2 \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[X_a \prod_{k=a+1}^b (1 - X_k X'_k) \right]$$

and

$$\left| \text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a, X_b] \right| \leq 2 \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=a}^{b-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) X_b \right].$$

Then, the identities

$$\prod_{k=a+1}^b (1 - X_k X'_k) = \sum_{j=b+1}^n \prod_{k=a+1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) X_j X'_j + \prod_{k=a+1}^n (1 - X_n X'_n)$$

and

$$\prod_{k=a}^{b-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) = \sum_{i=0}^{a-1} X_i X'_i \prod_{k=i+1}^{b-1} (1 - X_k X'_k),$$

together with the fact that $X_n = 1$ and $X'_n = 1$ almost surely under the two-polymers measure, give

$$\left| \text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a, X_b] \right| \leq 2 \sum_{j=b+1}^n \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[X_a \prod_{k=a+1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) X_j X'_j \right] \quad (3.2)$$

and

$$\left| \text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a, X_b] \right| \leq 2 \sum_{i=0}^{a-1} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[X_i X'_i \prod_{k=i+1}^{b-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) X_b \right]. \quad (3.3)$$

We shall verify that (3.2) implies the bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a, X_b] \right| \\ & \leq 2 \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a] \sum_{j=b+1}^{\infty} \left[1 + \xi(j-a)^\xi e^{-h-\omega_a} \right] \mathbb{E}_{j-a,h,\vartheta^a \omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-a-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right], \end{aligned}$$

whereas (3.3) provides

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a, X_b] \right| \\ & \leq 2 \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_b] \sum_{i=0}^{a-1} \left[1 + \xi(b-i)^\xi e^{-h-\omega_b} \right] \mathbb{E}_{b-i,h,\vartheta^i \omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{b-i-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The latter inequalities demonstrate the second part of the lemma.

We develop the argument for (3.2), as the argument for (3.3) is identical. We write the terms in the right-hand side of (3.2) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[X_a \prod_{k=a+1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) X_j X'_j \right] \\ & = \sum_{x_a \in \{0,1\}} \cdots \sum_{x_j \in \{0,1\}} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[X_a \prod_{k=a}^j \mathbb{1}_{\{X_k = x_k\}} X_j \right] \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\prod_{k=a+1}^{j-1} (1 - x_k X_k) X_j \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Repeated applications of Lemma 2.1 give

$$\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[X_a \prod_{k=a}^j \mathbb{1}_{\{X_k = x_k\}} X_j \right] \leq \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a] \mathbb{E}_{j-a,h,\vartheta^a \omega} \left[\prod_{k=0}^{j-a} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_k = x_{a+k}\}} \right]$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\prod_{k=a+1}^{j-1} (1 - x_k X_k) X_j \right] \leq \mathbb{E}_{j,h,\omega} \left[\prod_{k=a+1}^{j-1} (1 - x_k X_k) \right]. \quad (3.4)$$

At this point, we invoke Lemma 2.2, through Remark 2.3, to enforce in (3.4) the constraint the a is a contact site, which in turn allows a further application of Lemma 2.1:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{j,h,\omega} \left[\prod_{k=a+1}^{j-1} (1 - x_k X_k) \right] &\leq \left[1 + \xi(j-a)^\xi e^{-h-\omega_a} \right] \mathbb{E}_{j,h,\omega} \left[X_a \prod_{k=a+1}^{j-1} (1 - x_k X_k) \right] \\ &\leq \left[1 + \xi(j-a)^\xi e^{-h-\omega_a} \right] \mathbb{E}_{j-a,h,\vartheta^a \omega} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-a-1} (1 - x_{a+k} X_k) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Putting the pieces together, for the terms in the right-hand side of (3.2) we find the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[X_a \prod_{k=a+1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) X_j X'_j \right] \\ \leq \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} [X_a] \left[1 + \xi(j-a)^\xi e^{-h-\omega_a} \right] \mathbb{E}_{j-a,h,\vartheta^a \omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-a-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right]. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

In the light of Lemma 3.1, the next lemma entails that correlations decay exponentially fast in the localized phase.

Lemma 3.2. *For every compact set $H \subset (h_c, +\infty)$ there exist constants $\gamma > 0$ and $G > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{h \in H} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \right] \leq G e^{-\gamma n}.$$

Measurability of the variable of which we are taking the expectation in Lemma 3.2 holds because $\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}^{\otimes 2} [\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1 - X_k X'_k)]$ is continuous with respect to h for any ω , so that we can approach the supremum over H by replacing it with the finite sets $H_i := \{\lfloor ih \rfloor / i : h \in H\}$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and then by letting i go to infinity.

The proof of Lemma 3.2 follows the proof of Lemma 3.1 in [15] and relies on the following technical result, which states the possibility to cover most of the sites with inter-arrival times of finite length.

Lemma 3.3. *For every $h > h_c$ and $\chi > 0$ there exist constants $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma > 0$, and $G > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}_{n,h,\cdot} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{L_n} T_i \mathbf{1}_{\{T_i > \tau\}} \geq \chi n \right] \right] \leq G e^{-\gamma n}.$$

Proof of Lemma 3.3. Fix $h > h_c$ and $\chi > 0$. According to Corollary 2.6, there exist constants $\gamma_o > 0$ and $G_o > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}_{n,h,\cdot} [T_1 = n] \right] \leq G_o e^{-\gamma_o n} \quad (3.5)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Put $\gamma := \gamma_o \chi / 3$ and take $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$ so large that $G_o \leq e^{\gamma(\tau-1)} (e^\gamma - 1)^2$. We claim that the lemma holds with such γ and τ and with $G := 1/(1 - e^{-\gamma\tau})$. In fact, since

$\tau \sum_{i=1}^{L_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_i > \tau\}} < \sum_{i=1}^{L_n} T_i \mathbb{1}_{\{T_i > \tau\}} \leq S_{L_n} \leq n$, we can write for all $\omega \in \Omega$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{L_n} T_i \mathbb{1}_{\{T_i > \tau\}} \geq \chi n \right] \\ &= \sum_{r \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\{r < \frac{n}{\tau}\}} \mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{L_n} T_i \mathbb{1}_{\{T_i > \tau\}} \geq \chi n, \sum_{i=1}^{L_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_i > \tau\}} = r \right]. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, the conditions $\sum_{i=1}^{L_n} T_i \mathbb{1}_{\{T_i > \tau\}} \geq \chi n$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{L_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_i > \tau\}} = r$ imply that there are r inter-arrival times that cover more than χn sites, namely, there are integers $0 \leq a_1 < b_1 \leq \dots \leq a_r < b_r \leq n$ with $\sum_{s=1}^r (b_s - a_s) \geq \chi n$ such that $X_{a_s} = X_{b_s} = 1$ for all s and, when $a_s + 1 < b_s$, $X_{a_s+1} = \dots = X_{b_s-1} = 0$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{L_n} T_i \mathbb{1}_{\{T_i > \tau\}} \geq \chi n, \sum_{i=1}^{L_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_i > \tau\}} = r \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{0 \leq a_1 < b_1 \leq \dots \leq a_r < b_r \leq n} \mathbb{1}_{\{\sum_{s=1}^r (b_s - a_s) \geq \chi n\}} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\prod_{s=1}^r X_{a_s} \prod_{k=a_s+1}^{b_s-1} (1 - X_k) X_{b_s} \right], \end{aligned}$$

and Lemma 2.1 gives for every $0 \leq a_1 < b_1 \leq \dots \leq a_r < b_r \leq n$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\prod_{s=1}^r X_{a_s} \prod_{k=a_s+1}^{b_s-1} (1 - X_k) X_{b_s} \right] & \leq \prod_{s=1}^r \mathbb{E}_{b_s - a_s, h, \vartheta^{a_s} \omega} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{b_s - a_s - 1} (1 - X_k) \right] \\ & = \prod_{s=1}^r \mathbb{P}_{b_s - a_s, h, \vartheta^{a_s} \omega} [T_1 = b_s - a_s]. \end{aligned}$$

In this way, integrating with respect to $\mathbb{P}[d\omega]$ and using the statistical independence of the factors $\mathbb{P}_{b_s - a_s, h, \vartheta^{a_s} \omega} [T_1 = b_s - a_s]$, (3.5) and an estimate of the number of possible ways one can place r stretches in $\{1, \dots, n\}$ give

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}_{n,h,\cdot} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{L_n} T_i \mathbb{1}_{\{T_i > \tau\}} > \chi n \right] \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{r \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\{r < \frac{n}{\tau}\}} \sum_{0 \leq a_1 < b_1 \leq \dots \leq a_r < b_r \leq n} \mathbb{1}_{\{\sum_{s=1}^r (b_s - a_s) \geq \chi n\}} \prod_{s=1}^r \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}_{b_s - a_s, h, \cdot} [T_1 = b_s - a_s] \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{r \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\{r < \frac{n}{\tau}\}} \sum_{0 \leq a_1 < b_1 \leq \dots \leq a_r < b_r \leq n} \mathbb{1}_{\{\sum_{s=1}^r (b_s - a_s) \geq \chi n\}} G_o^r e^{-\gamma_o \sum_{s=1}^r (b_s - a_s)} \\ & \leq \sum_{r \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\{r < \frac{n}{\tau}\}} \binom{n+r}{2r} G_o^r e^{-\gamma_o \chi n}. \end{aligned}$$

As $\binom{n+r}{2r} \leq \zeta^{-2r} (1-\zeta)^{r-n}$ for all $\zeta \in (0, 1)$ and $G_o \leq e^{\gamma(\tau-1)} (e^\gamma - 1)^2$, the choice $\zeta = 1 - e^{-\gamma}$ finally shows that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}_{n,h,\cdot} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{L_n} T_i \mathbb{1}_{\{T_i > \tau\}} \geq \chi n \right] \right] \leq \sum_{r \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\{r < \frac{n}{\tau}\}} e^{r\gamma\tau - 2\gamma n} \leq \frac{e^{-\gamma n}}{1 - e^{-\gamma\tau}}. \quad \square$$

Proof of Lemma 3.2. We shall show that for every $h > h_c$ there exist constants $\gamma_h > 0$ and $G_h > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \right] \leq G_h e^{-\gamma_h n}. \quad (3.6)$$

This proves the lemma as follows. Put $\delta_h := \gamma_h/3$ and pick a compact set $H \subset (h_c, +\infty)$. By compactness there exists finitely many points h_1, \dots, h_r in $(h_c, +\infty)$ with the property that $H \subseteq \cup_{s=1}^r (h_s - \delta_{h_s}, h_s + \delta_{h_s})$. We claim that the lemma is verified with $\gamma := \min\{\delta_{h_1}, \dots, \delta_{h_r}\}$ and $G := \sum_{s=1}^r G_{h_s}$. In fact, for any $h \in H$ we can find $s \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ such that $|h - h_s| < \delta_{h_s}$, which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] &= \frac{\mathbb{E}^{\otimes 2} [\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) e^{\sum_{a=1}^n (h+\omega_a)(X_a+X'_a)} X_n X'_n]}{\mathbb{E}^{\otimes 2} [e^{\sum_{a=1}^n (h+\omega_a)(X_a+X'_a)} X_n X'_n]} \\ &\leq e^{2\delta_{h_s} n} \frac{\mathbb{E}^{\otimes 2} [\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) e^{\sum_{a=1}^n (h_s+\omega_a)(X_a+X'_a)} X_n X'_n]}{\mathbb{E}^{\otimes 2} [e^{\sum_{a=1}^n (h_s+\omega_a)(X_a+X'_a)} X_n X'_n]} \\ &= e^{2\delta_{h_s} n} \mathbb{E}_{n,h_s,\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can state that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\sup_{h \in H} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \leq \sum_{s=1}^r e^{2\delta_{h_s} n} \mathbb{E}_{n,h_s,\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right].$$

Integrating with respect to $\mathbb{P}[d\omega]$ and appealing to (3.6), we deduce that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{h \in H} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \right] &\leq \sum_{s=1}^r e^{2\delta_{h_s} n} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_{n,h_s,\cdot}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{s=1}^r G_{h_s} e^{-\delta_{h_s} n} \leq G e^{-\gamma n}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us move to prove (3.6), which constitutes the core of the lemma. Fix $h > h_c$. Lemmas 2.7 and 3.3 ensure us that there exist constants $\delta > 0$, $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma_o > 0$, and $G_o > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}_{n,h,\cdot} [L_n < \delta n] \right] \leq G_o e^{-\gamma_o n} \quad (3.7)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}_{n,h,\cdot} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{L_n} T_i \mathbf{1}_{\{T_i > \tau\}} \geq \frac{\delta}{2} n \right] \right] \leq G_o e^{-\gamma_o n}. \quad (3.8)$$

Moreover, if we pick a number $\lambda < 0$ so large in modulus that $\int_{\Omega} \mathbf{1}_{\{\omega_0 < \lambda\}} \mathbb{P}[d\omega] \leq \delta/8$, then a Chernoff-type bound yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{1}_{\{\sum_{a=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{\omega_a < \lambda\}} > \frac{\delta}{4} n\}} \mathbb{P}[d\omega] &\leq e^{-\frac{\delta \log 3}{4} n} \int_{\Omega} e^{\log 3 \sum_{a=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{\omega_a < \lambda\}}} \mathbb{P}[d\omega] \\ &= e^{-\frac{\delta \log 3}{4} n} \left(1 + 2 \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{1}_{\{\omega_0 < \lambda\}} \mathbb{P}[d\omega] \right)^n \\ &\leq e^{-\frac{\delta \log 3}{4} n} \left(1 + \frac{\delta}{4} \right)^n \leq e^{-\frac{\log 3 - 1}{4} \delta n}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

We will show below that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega := \{\omega_a\}_{a \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \Omega$

$$\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\{\sum_{a=1}^{n-1} X'_a \mathbf{1}_{\{\omega_a \geq \lambda, T_{L_{a+1}} \leq \tau\}} \geq \frac{\delta}{4} n\}} \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \leq 2\tau \left(\frac{\xi \tau^\xi}{\xi \tau^\xi + e^{h+\lambda}} \right)^{\frac{\delta n}{8\tau} - 1}, \quad (3.10)$$

where ξ is the number introduced in (2.1). Bounds (3.7), (3.8), (3.9), and (3.10) imply (3.6) as follows. The conditions $\sum_{a=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{\omega_a < \lambda\}} \leq n\delta/4$, $L'_n = \sum_{a=1}^n X'_a \geq \delta n$, and

$\sum_{a=1}^{n-1} X'_a \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_a \geq \lambda, T_{L_{a+1}} \leq \tau\}} < n\delta/4$ give $\sum_{a=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_{L_{a+1}} > \tau\}} \geq n\delta/2$. In turn, the latter yields for $n \in \{S_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0}$

$$\frac{\delta}{2}n \leq \sum_{a=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_{L_{a+1}} > \tau\}} = \sum_{i=1}^{L_n} \sum_{a=S_{i-1}}^{S_i-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_{L_{a+1}} > \tau\}} = \sum_{i=1}^{L_n} T_i \mathbb{1}_{\{T_i > \tau\}}.$$

Thus, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega := \{\omega_a\}_{a \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \Omega$ we find

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{1}_{\left\{ \sum_{a=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_a < \lambda\}} > \frac{\delta}{4}n \right\}} + \mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n < \delta n] + \mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{L_n} T_i \mathbb{1}_{\{T_i > \tau\}} \geq \frac{\delta}{2}n \right] \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\left\{ \sum_{a=1}^{n-1} X'_a \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_a \geq \lambda, T_{L_{a+1}} \leq \tau\}} \geq \frac{\delta}{4}n \right\}} \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{1}_{\left\{ \sum_{a=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_a < \lambda\}} > \frac{\delta}{4}n \right\}} + \mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n < \delta n] + \mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{L_n} T_i \mathbb{1}_{\{T_i > \tau\}} \geq \frac{\delta}{2}n \right] \\ & \quad + 2\tau \left(\frac{\xi \tau^\xi}{\xi \tau^\xi + e^{h+\lambda}} \right)^{\frac{\delta n}{8\tau} - 1}. \end{aligned}$$

After integrating with respect to $\mathbb{P}[d\omega]$, this inequality shows that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \right] \leq e^{-\frac{\log 3 - 1}{4} \delta n} + 2G_o e^{-\gamma_o n} + 2\tau \left(\frac{\xi \tau^\xi}{\xi \tau^\xi + e^{h+\lambda}} \right)^{\frac{\delta n}{8\tau} - 1},$$

which verifies (3.6) with the constants

$$\gamma_h := \min \left\{ \frac{\log 3 - 1}{4} \delta, \gamma_o, \frac{\delta}{8\tau} \log \frac{\xi \tau^\xi + e^{h+\lambda}}{\xi \tau^\xi} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad G_h := 1 + 2G_o + \frac{2\xi \tau^\xi + 2e^{h+\lambda}}{\xi \tau^\xi - 1}.$$

In order to demonstrate (3.10), we introduce for $a \in \{\tau, \dots, n - \tau\}$ the variable

$$\begin{aligned} Y_a &:= X_a \mathbb{1}_{\{T_{L_a} + T_{L_{a+1}} \leq \tau\}} + (1 - X_a) \mathbb{1}_{\{T_{L_{a+1}} \leq \tau\}} \\ &= \sum_{i=a+1-\tau}^{a-1} \sum_{j=a+1}^{i+\tau} X_i \prod_{\substack{k=i+1 \\ k \neq a}}^{j-1} (1 - X_k) X_j, \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

namely, Y_a is the indicator function that the distance between the first contact before a and the first contact after a is at most τ . The variable Y_a has the following nice property, which is a direct consequence of Lemma 2.2: for every non-negative functions $\phi \in \mathcal{M}_{a-1}$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{M}_{n-a-1}$

$$\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} [\Phi (1 - X_a) Y_a \Psi] \leq \frac{\xi \tau^\xi}{\xi \tau^\xi + e^{h+\omega_a}} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} [\Phi Y_a \Psi], \tag{3.12}$$

where we have set $\Phi := \phi(X_0, \dots, X_{a-1})$ and $\Psi := \psi(X_{a+1}, \dots, X_n)$ for brevity. This bound shows how the constraint $X_a = 0$ can be relaxed when Y_a is involved. For its proof we invoke Lemma 2.2 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} [\Phi (1 - X_a) Y_a \Psi] &= \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\Phi (1 - X_a) \mathbb{1}_{\{T_{L_{a+1}} \leq \tau\}} \Psi \right] \\ &\leq \xi \tau^\xi e^{-h-\omega_a} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\Phi X_a \mathbb{1}_{\{T_{L_a} + T_{L_{a+1}} \leq \tau\}} \Psi \right] \\ &= \xi \tau^\xi e^{-h-\omega_a} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} [\Phi X_a Y_a \Psi], \end{aligned}$$

which is nothing but a different way to write (3.12).

Let us put the variables Y_a into context. Since $X'_a Y_a = X'_a \mathbb{1}_{\{T_{L_{a+1}} \leq \tau\}}$ under the condition that $X_a = 0$ if $X'_a = 1$, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega := \{\omega_a\}_{a \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \Omega$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\left\{ \sum_{a=1}^{n-1} X'_a \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_a \geq \lambda, T_{L_{a+1}} \leq \tau\}} \geq \frac{\delta}{4}n \right\}} \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\left\{ \sum_{a=\tau}^{n-\tau} X'_a Y_a \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_a \geq \lambda\}} \geq \frac{\delta}{4}n - 2\tau \right\}} \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

For a reason that will be clear in a moment, we prefer that the index a in the last expression runs over sublattices with spacing 2τ . For $r \in \{\tau, \dots, 3\tau - 1\}$ put $\mathbb{A}_r := \{r + 2\tau i : i \in \mathbb{N}_0 \text{ and } r + 2\tau i \leq n - \tau\}$. Since $\cup_{r=\tau}^{3\tau-1} \mathbb{A}_r = \{\tau, \dots, n - \tau\}$, the condition $\sum_{a=\tau}^{n-\tau} X'_a Y_a \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_a \geq \lambda\}} \geq n\delta/4 - 2\tau$ entails that there exists r such that $\sum_{a \in \mathbb{A}_r} X'_a Y_a \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_a \geq \lambda\}} \geq n\delta/8\tau - 1$. In this way, we find

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\left\{ \sum_{a=1}^{n-1} X'_a \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_a \geq \lambda, T_{L_{a+1}} \leq \tau\}} \geq \frac{\delta}{4}n \right\}} \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{r=\tau}^{3\tau-1} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\left\{ \sum_{a \in \mathbb{A}_r} X'_a Y_a \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_a \geq \lambda\}} \geq \frac{\delta}{8\tau}n - 1 \right\}} \prod_{a \in \mathbb{A}_r} (1 - X_a X'_a) \right] \\ & = \sum_{r=\tau}^{3\tau-1} \sum_{x_1 \in \{0,1\}} \cdots \sum_{x_n \in \{0,1\}} {}^r E_{n,h,\omega}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\prod_{k=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{X_k = x_k\}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

with

$${}^r E_{n,h,\omega}(x_1, \dots, x_n) := \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\left\{ \sum_{a \in \mathbb{A}_r} x_a Y_a \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_a \geq \lambda\}} \geq \frac{\delta}{8\tau}n - 1 \right\}} \prod_{a \in \mathbb{A}_r} (1 - x_a X_a) \right].$$

The last step to obtain bound (3.10) is to show that

$${}^r E_{n,h,\omega}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leq \left(\frac{\xi \tau^\xi}{\xi \tau^\xi + e^{h+\lambda}} \right)^{\frac{\delta}{8\tau}n - 1} \quad (3.13)$$

uniformly with respect to r and x_1, \dots, x_n . This is facilitated by the fact that Y_a and Y_b for different a and b in a sublattice of spacing 2τ do not overlap, in the sense that depend on the non-overlapping sets $\{X_{a-\tau+1}, \dots, X_{a+\tau-1}\}$ and $\{X_{b-\tau+1}, \dots, X_{b+\tau-1}\}$ of binary variables as (3.11) makes evident. Given $r \in \{\tau, \dots, 3\tau - 1\}$ and $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \{0, 1\}$, to prove (3.13) we expand the indicator function in ${}^r E_{n,h,\omega}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} & {}^r E_{n,h,\omega}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \\ & \leq \sum_{\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{A}_r} \mathbb{1}_{\{|\mathcal{A}| \geq \frac{\delta}{8\tau}n - 1\}} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\prod_{a \in \mathcal{A}} x_a (1 - X_a) Y_a \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_a \geq \lambda\}} \prod_{a \in \mathbb{A}_r \setminus \mathcal{A}} (1 - x_a Y_a \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_a \geq \lambda\}}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We are going to relax the constraints that $X_a = 0$ for $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Bearing in mind that Y_a and Y_b for distinct $a, b \in \mathbb{A}_r$ do not overlap, repeated applications of (3.12) yield for any

$\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{A}_r$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\prod_{a \in \mathcal{A}} x_a (1 - X_a) Y_a \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_a \geq \lambda\}} \prod_{a \in \mathbb{A}_r \setminus \mathcal{A}} (1 - x_a Y_a \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_a \geq \lambda\}}) \right] \\ & \leq \prod_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{\xi \tau^\xi}{\xi \tau^\xi + e^{h+\omega_a}} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\prod_{a \in \mathcal{A}} x_a Y_a \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_a \geq \lambda\}} \prod_{a \in \mathbb{A}_r \setminus \mathcal{A}} (1 - x_a Y_a \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_a \geq \lambda\}}) \right] \\ & \leq \left(\frac{\xi \tau^\xi}{\xi \tau^\xi + e^{h+\lambda}} \right)^{|\mathcal{A}|} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\prod_{a \in \mathcal{A}} x_a Y_a \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_a \geq \lambda\}} \prod_{a \in \mathbb{A}_r \setminus \mathcal{A}} (1 - x_a Y_a \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_a \geq \lambda\}}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & {}^r \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \\ & \leq \left(\frac{\xi \tau^\xi}{\xi \tau^\xi + e^{h+\lambda}} \right)^{\frac{\delta}{8\tau} n - 1} \mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\sum_{a \in \mathbb{A}_r} x_a Y_a \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_a \geq \lambda\}} \geq \frac{\delta}{8\tau} n - 1 \right], \end{aligned}$$

which proves (3.13), thus completing the proof of Lemma 3.2. \square

We can now go into the first application of Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2.

Lemma 3.4. *For each compact set $H \subset (h_c, +\infty)$ there exist constants $\gamma > 0$ and $G > 0$ such that for every integers $0 \leq a \leq b \leq n$*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{h \in H} \frac{|\text{cov}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_a, X_b]|}{\min\{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_a], \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_b]\}} \right] \leq G e^{-\gamma(b-a)}.$$

Proof of Lemma 3.4. Fix any $H \subset (h_c, +\infty)$ compact. Lemma 3.2 ensures us the existence of two constants $\gamma_o > 0$ and $G_o > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{h \in H} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \right] \leq G_o e^{-\gamma_o n}. \quad (3.14)$$

The second part of Lemma 3.1 states that for every $h \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega := \{\omega_c\}_{c \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \Omega$, and integers $0 \leq a \leq b \leq n$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{|\text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a, X_b]|}{\min\{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a], \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_b]\}} \\ & \leq 2 \sum_{j=b+1}^{\infty} \left[1 + \xi(j-a)^\xi e^{-h-\omega_a} \right] \mathbb{E}_{j-a,h,\vartheta^a \omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-a-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \\ & \quad + 2 \sum_{i=0}^{a-1} \left[1 + \xi(b-i)^\xi e^{-h-\omega_b} \right] \mathbb{E}_{b-i,h,\vartheta^i \omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{b-i-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

Since the left-hand side of (3.15) is smaller than or equal to 1, we can further state that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{|\text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a, X_b]|}{\min\{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a], \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_b]\}} \\ & \leq \mathbb{1}_{\{|\omega_a| > \frac{\gamma_0}{3}(b-a)\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{|\omega_b| > \frac{\gamma_0}{3}(b-a)\}} \\ & \quad + 2 \sum_{j=b+1}^{\infty} \left[1 + \xi(j-a)^\xi e^{-h + \frac{\gamma_0}{3}(b-a)} \right] \mathbb{E}_{j-a,h,\vartheta^a \omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-a-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \\ & \quad + 2 \sum_{i=0}^{a-1} \left[1 + \xi(b-i)^\xi e^{-h + \frac{\gamma_0}{3}(b-a)} \right] \mathbb{E}_{b-i,h,\vartheta^i \omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{b-i-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In this way, taking the supremum over H , setting $h_o := \inf\{H\} > -\infty$, and then integrating with respect to $\mathbb{P}[d\omega]$, we get thanks to (3.14) and to a Chernoff-type bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{h \in H} \frac{|\text{cov}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_a, X_b]|}{\min\{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_a], \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_b]\}} \right] \\ & \leq 2 \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{1}_{\{|\omega_0| > \frac{\gamma_0}{3}(b-a)\}} \mathbb{P}[d\omega] \\ & \quad + 2G_o \sum_{j=b+1}^{\infty} \left[1 + \xi(j-a)^\xi e^{-h_o + \frac{\gamma_0}{3}(b-a)} \right] e^{-\gamma_o(j-a)} \\ & \quad + 2G_o \sum_{i=0}^{a-1} \left[1 + \xi(b-i)^\xi e^{-h_o + \frac{\gamma_0}{3}(b-a)} \right] e^{-\gamma_o(b-i)} \\ & \leq 2 \int_{\Omega} e^{\eta|\omega_0| - \frac{\eta\gamma_0}{3}(b-a)} \mathbb{P}[d\omega] + 4G_o \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} (1 + \xi j^\xi e^{-h_o}) e^{-\frac{\gamma_0}{3}(b-a) - \frac{\gamma_0}{3}j}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that the lemma holds with $\gamma := \min\{\frac{\eta\gamma_0}{3}, \frac{\gamma_0}{3}\}$ and some $G > 0$. \square

One corollary of Lemma 3.4 is the following.

Corollary 3.5. *For each compact set $H \subset (h_c, +\infty)$ there exist constants $\gamma > 0$ and $G > 0$ such that for every integers $0 \leq a \leq b \leq n$*

$$\sup_{h \in H} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_a] \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_b] \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_a] \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_b] \right] \right| \leq G e^{-\gamma(b-a)}.$$

Proof of Corollary 3.5. Fix a compact $H \subset (h_c, +\infty)$ and integers $0 \leq a \leq b \leq n$. Put $m := \lfloor \frac{a+b}{2} \rfloor$. Lemma 2.1 gives for all $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a] &= \frac{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a X_m]}{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_m]} - \frac{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a X_m] - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a] \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_m]}{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_m]} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{m,h,\omega}[X_a] - \frac{\text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a, X_m]}{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_m]} \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_b] &= \frac{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_m X_b]}{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_m]} - \frac{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_m X_b] - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_m] \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_b]}{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_m]} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{n-m,h,\vartheta^m \omega}[X_{b-m}] - \frac{\text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_m, X_b]}{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_m]}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

Lemma 3.4 implies that there exist constants $\gamma_o > 0$ and $G_o > 0$ independent of a , b , and n such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{h \in H} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|\text{cov}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_a, X_m]|}{\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_m]} \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{h \in H} \frac{|\text{cov}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_a, X_m]|}{\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_m]} \right] \leq G_o e^{-\gamma_o(m-a)} \\ &\leq G_o e^{-\frac{\gamma_o}{2}(b-a) + \gamma_o} \end{aligned}$$

and, similarly,

$$\sup_{h \in H} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|\text{cov}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_m, X_b]|}{\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_m]} \right] \leq G_o e^{-\gamma_o(b-m)} \leq G_o e^{-\frac{\gamma_o}{2}(b-a)}.$$

In this way, since the expectation $\mathbf{E}_{m,h,\cdot}[X_a]$ and $\mathbf{E}_{n-m,h,\cdot}[X_{b-m}]$ are statistically independent, we can conclude from (3.16) and (3.17) that for all $h \in H$

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_a] \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_b] \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_a] \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_b] \right] \right| \\ &\leq 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|\text{cov}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_a, X_m]|}{\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_m]} \right] + 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|\text{cov}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_m, X_b]|}{\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_m]} \right] \leq 2G_o(e^{\gamma_o} + 1)e^{-\frac{\gamma_o}{2}(b-a)}, \end{aligned}$$

which proves the corollary with $\gamma := \gamma_o/2$ and $G := 2G_o(e^{\gamma_o} + 1)$. \square

3.1. First consequences of the correlation estimates. In this section we investigate the maximal polymer excursion $M_n := \max\{T_1, \dots, T_{L_n}\}$ in the localized phase, so providing a first application of the correlation bounds and proving Proposition 1.9.

Proof of Proposition 1.9. We shall show that for every $h_o > h_c$ and $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta_o > 0$ such that for \mathbb{P} -a.e. ω

$$\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \sup_{h \in (h_o - \delta_o, h_o + \delta_o)} \mathbf{P}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\left| \frac{M_n}{\log n} - \frac{1}{\mu(h)} \right| > \epsilon \right] = 0. \quad (3.18)$$

This proves the proposition as follows. For $h > h_c$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote by ${}^i\delta_h$ the number δ_o that (3.18) associates with $h_o = h$ and $\epsilon = 1/i$. We also let ${}^i\Omega_h \in \mathcal{F}$ be a set of charges with full probability, i.e., $\mathbb{P}[{}^i\Omega_h] = 1$, for which (3.18) is valid. Putting ${}^iU_h := (h - {}^i\delta_h, h + {}^i\delta_h)$ for brevity, Lindelöf's lemma ensures us that from the open cover $\{{}^iU_h\}_{h \in (h_c, +\infty)}$ of $(h_c, +\infty)$ we can extract countably many elements corresponding to the points ${}^i h_1, {}^i h_2, \dots$ such that $(h_c, +\infty) \subseteq \cup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} {}^iU_{h_j}$. Define $\Omega_o := \cap_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \cap_{j \in \mathbb{N}} {}^i\Omega_{h_j}$, which satisfies $\mathbb{P}[\Omega_o] = 1$. Then, for every $\omega \in \Omega_o$, $h > h_c$, and $\epsilon > 0$ there exist $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\epsilon > 1/i$, $h \in {}^iU_{h_j}$, and $\omega \in \Omega_{h_j}$, so that

$$\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \mathbf{P}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\left| \frac{M_n}{\log n} - \frac{1}{\mu(h)} \right| > \epsilon \right] \leq \lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \sup_{h' \in {}^iU_{h_j}} \mathbf{P}_{n,h',\omega} \left[\left| \frac{M_n}{\log n} - \frac{1}{\mu(h')} \right| > \frac{1}{i} \right] = 0.$$

This limit demonstrates that, as n goes to infinity, $M_n/\log n$ converges in probability to $1/\mu(h)$ with respect to the polymer measure $\mathbf{P}_{n,h,\omega}$ for all $\omega \in \Omega_o$ and $h > h_c$.

Let us prove (3.18). Fix $h_o > h_c$ and $\epsilon > 0$ and put $\delta_o := \mu_o^2 \epsilon / (4 + 3\mu_o \epsilon)$ with $\mu_o := \mu(h_o) > 0$. We show at first that for \mathbb{P} -a.e. ω

$$\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \sup_{h \in (h_o - \delta_o, h_o + \delta_o)} \mathbf{P}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\frac{M_n}{\log n} > \frac{1}{\mu(h)} + \epsilon \right] = 0. \quad (3.19)$$

To this aim, noting that $\mu(h) \leq \mu_o + \delta_o$ for $h \in (h_o - \delta_o, h_o + \delta_o)$ by Remark 2.5 and setting $m_n := \lfloor \{\epsilon + 1/(\mu_o + \delta_o)\} \log n \rfloor$ for brevity, we write for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $h \in (h_o - \delta_o, h_o + \delta_o)$, and $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\frac{M_n}{\log n} > \frac{1}{\mu(h)} + \epsilon \right] &\leq \mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\frac{M_n}{\log n} > \frac{1}{\mu_o + \delta_o} + \epsilon \right] \\ &= \mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega} [M_n > m_n] \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-m_n-1} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[X_i \prod_{k=i+1}^{i+m_n} (1 - X_k) \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{n-m_n-1} \sum_{j=i+m_n+1}^n \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[X_i \prod_{k=i+1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k) X_j \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is due to the fact that the condition $M_n > m_n$ implies that there is a contact site $i \in \{0, \dots, n - m_n - 1\}$ followed by an excursion of size at least m_n , while the last equality exploits the identity

$$X_i \prod_{k=i+1}^{i+m_n} (1 - X_k) = \sum_{j=i+m_n+1}^n X_i \prod_{k=i+1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k) X_j + \prod_{k=i+1}^n (1 - X_k),$$

as well as the fact that $X_n = 1$ almost surely with respect to the polymer measure $\mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega}$. An application of Lemma 2.1 first and a Chernoff-type bound later give

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\frac{M_n}{\log n} > \frac{1}{\mu(h)} + \epsilon \right] &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-m_n-1} \sum_{j=i+m_n+1}^n \mathbb{P}_{j-i,h,\vartheta^a \omega} [T_1 = j - i] \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=m_n+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_{j,h,\vartheta^i \omega} [T_1 = j] \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} e^{\zeta j - \zeta(m_n+1)} \mathbb{P}_{j,h,\vartheta^i \omega} [T_1 = j], \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

where we have introduced the number $\zeta := \mu_o(4 + \mu_o\epsilon)/(4 + 3\mu_o\epsilon)$. We now note that for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $h \in (h_o - \delta_o, h_o + \delta_o)$, and $\omega := \{\omega_a\}_{a \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \Omega$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{j,h,\omega} [T_1 = j] &= \frac{e^{h+\omega_j}}{\mathbb{E}[e^{\sum_{a=1}^j (h+\omega_a) X_a} X_j]} \\ &\leq e^{\delta_o j} \frac{e^{h_o+\omega_j}}{\mathbb{E}[e^{\sum_{a=1}^j (h_o+\omega_a) X_a} X_j]} = e^{\delta_o j} \mathbb{P}_{j,h_o,\omega} [T_1 = j]. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{j,h,\omega} [T_1 = j] \geq e^{-\delta_o j} \mathbb{P}_{j,h_o,\omega} [T_1 = j]. \quad (3.21)$$

Thus, (3.20) finally yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{h \in (h_o - \delta_o, h_o + \delta_o)} \mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\frac{M_n}{\log n} > \frac{1}{\mu(h)} + \epsilon \right] &\leq e^{-\zeta(m_n+1)} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} e^{(\zeta+\delta_o)j} \mathbb{P}_{j,h_o,\vartheta^i \omega} [T_1 = j] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n^{\zeta(\frac{1}{\mu_o+\delta_o} + \epsilon)}} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \Lambda(\vartheta^i \omega), \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

Λ being the random variable on Ω defined as

$$\Lambda := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} e^{(\zeta+\delta_o)j} \mathbb{P}_{j,h_o,\cdot} [T_1 = j].$$

Since $\zeta + \delta_o = \mu_o(4 + 2\mu_o\epsilon)/(4 + 3\mu_o\epsilon) < \mu_o$, where we have used the explicit expressions $\delta_o := \mu_o^2\epsilon/(4 + 3\mu_o\epsilon)$ and $\zeta := \mu_o(4 + \mu_o\epsilon)/(4 + 3\mu_o\epsilon)$, Corollary 2.6 shows that $\mathbb{E}[\Lambda] < +\infty$. At the same time, expliciting again δ_o and ζ we find

$$\zeta \left(\frac{1}{\mu_o + \delta_o} + \epsilon \right) = \left(1 + \frac{\mu_o\epsilon}{4} \right) \frac{4 + 7\mu_o\epsilon + 4(\mu_o\epsilon)^2}{4 + 7\mu_o\epsilon + 3(\mu_o\epsilon)^2} \geq 1 + \frac{\mu_o\epsilon}{4}.$$

In this way, (3.19) follows from (3.22) thanks to Birkhoff's ergodic theorem.

To conclude the proof of (3.18), we verify that for \mathbb{P} -a.e. ω

$$\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \sup_{h \in (h_o - \delta_o, h_o + \delta_o)} \mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\frac{M_n}{\log n} < \frac{1}{\mu(h)} - \epsilon \right] = 0. \quad (3.23)$$

The correlation estimates enter the proof of (3.23) because in order to exclude that all the excursions are below a certain threshold it suffices to take into account only the excursions that are included on well separated segments of the polymer. The dilution procedure that we implement is even more drastic than this because takes into account only excursions of very specific size. For this we start by remarking that there is no restriction to suppose that ϵ is small and, in particular, we can suppose that ϵ is so small that $h_o - \delta_o > h_c$, $\delta_o < \mu_o$, and $\epsilon < 1/(\mu_o - \delta_o)$, as $\delta_o := \mu_o^2\epsilon/(4 + 3\mu_o\epsilon)$ goes to 0 when ϵ goes to 0. Then, planning to deal with r_n excursions of size m_n and spacing d_n , we define $m_n := \lfloor \{1/(\mu_o - \delta_o) - \epsilon\} \log n \rfloor + 1$, $d_n := \lfloor (\log n)^2 \rfloor + 1$, and $r_n := \lfloor n/(m_n + d_n) \rfloor$. Set $l_s := s(m_n + d_n)$ for $s \in \{0, \dots, r_n - 1\}$. Bearing in mind that $\mu(h) \geq \mu_o - \delta_o$ for $h \in (h_o - \delta_o, h_o + \delta_o)$ by Remark 2.5, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $h \in (h_o - \delta_o, h_o + \delta_o)$, and $\omega \in \Omega$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\frac{M_n}{\log n} < \frac{1}{\mu(h)} - \epsilon \right] &\leq \mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\frac{M_n}{\log n} \leq \frac{1}{\mu_o - \delta_o} - \epsilon \right] \\ &= \mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega} [M_n < m_n] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\prod_{s=0}^{r_n-1} \left\{ 1 - X_{l_s} \prod_{k=l_s+1}^{l_s+m_n-1} (1 - X_k) X_{l_s+m_n} \right\} \right], \end{aligned}$$

since the condition $M_n < m_n$ implies that an excursion from the position l_s to the position $l_s + m_n$ cannot occur for any choice of s . This bound is the essence of the dilution procedure. Repeated applications of the first part of Lemma 3.1 give

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\frac{M_n}{\log n} < \frac{1}{\mu(h)} - \epsilon \right] &\leq \prod_{s=0}^{r_n-1} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[1 - X_{l_s} \prod_{k=l_s+1}^{l_s+m_n-1} (1 - X_k) X_{l_s+m_n} \right] \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{s=0}^{r_n-2} \sum_{i=0}^{l_s+m_n-1} \sum_{j=l_s+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{j-i,h,\vartheta^i\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-i-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right]. \quad (3.24) \end{aligned}$$

We are going to show that for \mathbb{P} -a.e. ω

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \sup_{h \in (h_o - \delta_o, h_o + \delta_o)} \prod_{s=0}^{r_n-1} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[1 - X_{l_s} \prod_{k=l_s+1}^{l_s+m_n-1} (1 - X_k) X_{l_s+m_n} \right] \\ &\leq \lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \prod_{s=0}^{r_n-1} \left\{ 1 - \inf_{h \in (h_o - \delta_o, h_o + \delta_o)} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[X_{l_s} \prod_{k=l_s+1}^{l_s+m_n-1} (1 - X_k) X_{l_s+m_n} \right] \right\} = 0 \quad (3.25) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \sup_{h \in (h_o - \delta_o, h_o + \delta_o)} \sum_{s=0}^{r_n-2} \sum_{i=0}^{l_s+m_n-1} \sum_{j=l_s+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{j-i,h,\vartheta^i\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-i-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] = 0. \quad (3.26)$$

These limits demonstrate (3.23) via (3.24).

Let us prove (3.26) first, which is the simplest limit among the two. As $h_o - \delta_o > h_c$, according to Lemma 3.2 there exist constants $\gamma > 0$ and $G > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{h \in [h_o - \delta_o, h_o + \delta_o]} \mathbb{E}_{j,h}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \right] \leq G e^{-\gamma j}$$

for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. In this way, introducing the random variable

$$\Lambda := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} e^{\frac{\gamma}{2}j} \sup_{h \in [h_o - \delta_o, h_o + \delta_o]} \mathbb{E}_{j,h}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right],$$

we have $\mathbb{E}[\Lambda] < +\infty$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{h \in (h_o - \delta_o, h_o + \delta_o)} \sum_{s=0}^{r_n-2} \sum_{i=0}^{l_s+m_n-1} \sum_{j=l_{s+1}}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{j-i,h,\vartheta^i\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-i-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \\ & \leq r_n \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=d_n}^{\infty} \sup_{h \in [h_o - \delta_o, h_o + \delta_o]} \mathbb{E}_{j,h,\vartheta^i\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \\ & \leq r_n e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}d_n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \Lambda(\vartheta^i\omega), \end{aligned}$$

for all $\omega \in \Omega$. Thus, (3.26) is due to Birkhoff's ergodic theorem since $r_n \leq n$ and $d_n \geq (\log n)^2$.

Regarding (3.25), we use Lemma 2.1 to write down for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $h \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$, and $s \in \{0, \dots, r_n - 1\}$ the identity

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[X_{l_s} \prod_{k=l_s+1}^{l_s+m_n-1} (1 - X_k) X_{l_s+m_n} \right] \\ = \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} [X_{l_s}] \mathbb{P}_{m_n,h,\vartheta^{l_s}\omega} [T_1 = m_n] \mathbb{E}_{n-l_s,h,\vartheta^{l_s}\omega} [X_{m_n}]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

The second part of Lemma 2.2 entails for $0 < a < n$ and $\lambda > 0$

$$\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\{T_{L_a+1} \leq \lambda\}} (1 - X_a) \right] \leq \xi e^{-h-\omega_a} \lambda^\xi \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\{T_{L_a+T_{L_a+1}} \leq \lambda\}} X_a \right],$$

namely

$$\mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega} [T_{L_a+1} \leq \lambda] \leq \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\{T_{L_a+1} \leq \lambda\}} X_a \right] + \xi e^{-h-\omega_a} \lambda^\xi \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\{T_{L_a+T_{L_a+1}} \leq \lambda\}} X_a \right].$$

This shows that

$$\mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega} [M_n \leq \lambda] \leq \mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega} [T_{L_a+1} \leq \lambda] \leq (1 + \xi e^{-h-\omega_a} \lambda^\xi) \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} [X_a],$$

which trivially holds even for $a = 0$ and $a = n$. In this way, the choice $\lambda = [1/\mu(h) + \epsilon] \log n$ yields

$$\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} [X_{l_s}] \geq \frac{\mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\frac{M_n}{\log n} \leq \frac{1}{\mu(h)} + \epsilon \right]}{1 + \xi e^{-h-\omega_{l_s}} \left[\frac{1}{\mu(h)} + \epsilon \right]^\xi (\log n)^\xi} \geq \mathbf{1}_{\{\omega_{l_s} \geq 0\}} \frac{1 - \mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\frac{M_n}{\log n} > \frac{1}{\mu(h)} + \epsilon \right]}{1 + \xi e^{-h} \left[\frac{1}{\mu(h)} + \epsilon \right]^\xi (\log n)^\xi}.$$

Lemma 2.2, through Remark 2.3, also shows that

$$\mathbb{E}_{n-l_s,h,\vartheta^{l_s}\omega} [X_{m_n}] \geq \frac{1}{1 + \xi e^{-h-\omega_{l_s+m_n}} m_n^\xi} \geq \mathbf{1}_{\{\omega_{l_s+m_n} \geq 0\}} \frac{1}{1 + \xi e^{-h} m_n^\xi}.$$

Thus, having a glance at (3.21) and recalling that $\mu(h) \geq \mu_o - \delta_o$ for $h \in (h_o - \delta_o, h_o + \delta_o)$, from (3.27) we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{h \in (h_o - \delta_o, h_o + \delta_o)} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[X_{l_s} \prod_{k=l_s+1}^{l_s+m_n-1} (1 - X_k) X_{l_s+m_n} \right] \\ & \geq 2\zeta_n \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_{l_s} \geq 0, \omega_{l_s+m_n} \geq 0\}} \left(1 - \sup_{h \in (h_o - \delta_o, h_o + \delta_o)} \mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\frac{M_n}{\log n} > \frac{1}{\mu(h)} + \epsilon \right] \right) \\ & \quad \times e^{-\delta_o m_n} \mathbb{P}_{m_n, h_o, \vartheta^{l_s} \omega} [T_1 = m_n], \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

where we have defined the numerical factor

$$\zeta_n := \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{1 + \xi e^{-h_o + \delta_o} \left(\frac{1}{\mu_o - \delta_o} + \epsilon \right)^\xi (\log n)^\xi} \frac{1}{1 + \xi e^{-h_o + \delta_o} m_n^\xi}.$$

Now we remark that (3.19) implies that for \mathbb{P} -a.e. ω the upper bound

$$\sup_{h \in (h_o - \delta_o, h_o + \delta_o)} \mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\frac{M_n}{\log n} > \frac{1}{\mu(h)} + \epsilon \right] \leq \frac{1}{2}$$

is valid for all sufficiently large n . In this way, (3.28) yields for \mathbb{P} -a.e. ω

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{n \uparrow \infty} \prod_{s=0}^{r_n-1} \left\{ 1 - \inf_{h \in (h_o - \delta_o, h_o + \delta_o)} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[X_{l_s} \prod_{k=l_s+1}^{l_s+m_n-1} (1 - X_k) X_{l_s+m_n} \right] \right\} \\ & \leq \limsup_{n \uparrow \infty} \prod_{s=0}^{r_n-1} \left(1 - \zeta_n \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_{l_s} \geq 0, \omega_{l_s+m_n} \geq 0\}} e^{-\delta_o m_n} \mathbb{P}_{m_n, h_o, \vartheta^{l_s} \omega} [T_1 = m_n] \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

In order to demonstrate (3.25) we must prove that the right-hand side of (3.29) is 0 for \mathbb{P} -a.e. ω . This is due to the Borel–Cantelli Lemma since we are going to show that $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E_n < +\infty$ with

$$E_n := \int_{\Omega} \prod_{s=0}^{r_n-1} \left(1 - \zeta_n \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_{l_s} \geq 0, \omega_{l_s+m_n} \geq 0\}} e^{-\delta_o m_n} \mathbb{P}_{m_n, h_o, \vartheta^{l_s} \omega} [T_1 = m_n] \right) \mathbb{P}[d\omega]$$

being the expectation of the right-hand side of (3.29). Note that $c := \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_0 \geq 0\}} \mathbb{P}[d\omega] > 0$ since $\int_{\Omega} \omega_0 \mathbb{P}[d\omega] = 0$ and that $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}_{m_n, h_o, \cdot} [T_1 = m_n]] \geq e^{-(\mu_o + \delta_o)(m_n - 1) + \delta_o}$ for all sufficiently large n by Corollary 2.6. Also note that all the factors in the right-hand side of (3.29) are statistically independent as $\mathbb{P}_{m_n, h_o, \vartheta^{l_s} \omega} [T_1 = m_n]$ depends on $\omega := \{\omega_a\}_{a \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ only through the components $\omega_{l_s+1}, \dots, \omega_{l_s+m_n-1}$. Thus, carrying out the integration and recalling that $m_n := \lfloor \{1/(\mu_o - \delta_o) - \epsilon\} \log n \rfloor + 1$, for all sufficiently large n we find

$$\begin{aligned} E_n & = \left(1 - c^2 \zeta_n e^{-\delta_o m_n} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}_{m_n, h_o, \cdot} [T_1 = m_n] \right] \right)^{r_n} \\ & \leq \left(1 - c^2 \zeta_n e^{-(\mu_o + 2\delta_o)(m_n - 1)} \right)^{r_n} \leq \exp \left\{ -c^2 \zeta_n r_n e^{-(\mu_o + 2\delta_o)(m_n - 1)} \right\} \\ & \leq \exp \left\{ -c^2 \frac{\zeta_n r_n}{n^{(\mu_o + 2\delta_o) \left(\frac{1}{\mu_o - \delta_o} - \epsilon \right)}} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, using $\delta_o := \mu_o^2 \epsilon / (4 + 3\mu_o \epsilon)$ we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu_o + 2\delta_o) \left(\frac{1}{\mu_o - \delta_o} - \epsilon \right) & = 1 - \mu_o \epsilon \frac{4 + 19\mu_o \epsilon + 10(\mu_o \epsilon)^2}{16 + 20\mu_o \epsilon + 6(\mu_o \epsilon)^2} \\ & \leq 1 - \mu_o \epsilon \frac{4 + 19\mu_o \epsilon + 10(\mu_o \epsilon)^2}{16 + 76\mu_o \epsilon + 40(\mu_o \epsilon)^2} = 1 - \frac{\mu_o \epsilon}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

In conclusion, for all sufficiently large n we have

$$E_n \leq \exp \left\{ -c^2 \frac{\zeta_n r_n}{n^{1-\frac{\mu_0 \epsilon}{4}}} \right\},$$

which proves that $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E_n < +\infty$ because $\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} (\log n)^{2\xi+2} \zeta_n r_n / n > 0$. \square

4. REGULARITY ESTIMATES AND THE CLT FOR THE CONTACT NUMBER

In this section we prove Theorem 1.2 about the differentiability of the free energy and, as a consequence, the quenched concentration bound and the quenched CLT stated by Theorem 1.4. The first step is to bound the derivatives of $\log Z_{n,h}(\omega)$ with respect to h by means of a Birkhoff sum. The following result is due to Lemma 3.1.

Lemma 4.1. *For every $n, r \in \mathbb{N}$, $h \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\omega \in \Omega$*

$$\left| \partial_h^r \log Z_{n,h}(\omega) \right| \leq 2^r (r!)^2 \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} j^r \mathbf{E}_{j,h,\vartheta^i \omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right].$$

Proof of Lemma 4.1. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $h \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\omega := \{\omega_a\}_{a \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \Omega$. The bound holds in the case $r = 1$ since $|\partial_h \log Z_{n,h}(\omega)| \leq n$ on the one hand, and $\mathbf{E}_{j,h,\vartheta^i \omega}^{\otimes 2} [\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k)] = 1$ for $j = 1$ by convention on the other hand. For $r \geq 2$ we have

$$\partial_h^r \log Z_{n,h}(\omega) = \sum_{a_1=1}^n \cdots \sum_{a_r=1}^n U_{n,h,\omega}(a_1, \dots, a_r)$$

with $U_{n,h,\omega}(a_1, \dots, a_r) := \partial_{\omega_{a_1}} \cdots \partial_{\omega_{a_r}} \log Z_{n,h}(\omega)$ the joint cumulant of X_{a_1}, \dots, X_{a_r} with respect to the probability measure $\mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega}$, also known in statistical mechanics with the name of *Ursell function* (see, e.g., [10, 25, 26]). An explicit expression is

$$U_{n,h,\omega}(a_1, \dots, a_r) = \sum_{l=1}^r \sum_{\{\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_l\} \in \mathcal{P}_l} (-1)^{l-1} (l-1)! \prod_{j=1}^l \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\prod_{k \in \mathcal{C}_j} X_k \right],$$

where \mathcal{P}_l is the collection of all the partitions of the set $\{a_1, \dots, a_r\}$ into l components (see [24], Proposition 3.2.1).

Since $U_{n,h,\omega}(a_1, \dots, a_r)$ is symmetric in its arguments we can state that

$$\left| \partial_h^r \log Z_{n,h}(\omega) \right| \leq r! \sum_{1 \leq a_1 \leq \dots \leq a_r \leq n} \left| U_{n,h,\omega}(a_1, \dots, a_r) \right|. \quad (4.1)$$

We shall verify later that, given an integer $s \in \{1, \dots, r-1\}$, the cumulant $U_{n,h,\omega}(a_1, \dots, a_r)$ with $1 \leq a_1 \leq \dots \leq a_r \leq n$ can be written by adding and subtracting less than $2^{r-1}(r-1)!$ terms of the form

$$\text{cov}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} X_k, \prod_{k \in \mathcal{B}} X_k \right] \prod_{j=1}^l \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\prod_{k \in \mathcal{C}_j} X_k \right]$$

with sets $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \{a_1, \dots, a_s\}$, $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \{a_{s+1}, \dots, a_r\}$, and $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_l$ constituting a partition of $\{a_1, \dots, a_r\} \setminus \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$. Since by Lemma 3.1

$$\left| \text{cov}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} X_k, \prod_{k \in \mathcal{B}} X_k \right] \right| \leq 2 \sum_{i=0}^{a_s-1} \sum_{j=a_{s+1}+1}^{\infty} \mathbf{E}_{j-i,h,\vartheta^i \omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-i-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right],$$

we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| U_{n,h,\omega}(a_1, \dots, a_r) \right| \\
& \leq 2^r (r-1)! \sum_{i=0}^{a_s-1} \sum_{j=a_{s+1}+1}^{\infty} \mathbf{E}_{j-i,h,\vartheta^i\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-i-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \\
& \leq 2^r (r-1)! \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{\{i < a_s \leq j, a_{s+1} - a_s < j - i\}} \mathbf{E}_{j-i,h,\vartheta^i\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-i-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \\
& = 2^r (r-1)! \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\{i < a_s \leq j+i, a_{s+1} - a_s < j\}} \mathbf{E}_{j,h,\vartheta^i\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

In this way, the arbitrariness of s gives for $1 \leq a_1 \leq \dots \leq a_r \leq n$

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| U_{n,h,\omega}(a_1, \dots, a_r) \right| & \leq 2^r (r-1)! \sum_{s=1}^{r-1} \prod_{t=1}^{r-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{a_{t+1} - a_t \leq a_{s+1} - a_s\}} \\
& \quad \times \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\{i < a_s \leq j+i, a_{s+1} - a_s < j\}} \mathbf{E}_{j,h,\vartheta^i\omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right]. \quad (4.2)
\end{aligned}$$

The latter in combination with (4.1) proves the lemma since for every i and j

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{1 \leq a_1 \leq \dots \leq a_r \leq n} \sum_{s=1}^{r-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{i < a_s \leq i+j, a_{s+1} - a_s < j\}} \prod_{t=1}^{r-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{a_{t+1} - a_t \leq a_{s+1} - a_s\}} \\
& \leq \sum_{-\infty < a_1 \leq \dots \leq a_r < \infty} \sum_{s=1}^{r-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{0 < a_s \leq j\}} \prod_{t=1}^{r-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{a_{t+1} - a_t < j\}} = (r-1)^{j^r}. \quad (4.3)
\end{aligned}$$

To conclude, let us demonstrate that for every $r \geq 2$, $s \in \{1, \dots, r-1\}$, and integers $1 \leq a_1 \leq \dots \leq a_r \leq n$ the cumulant $U_{n,h,\omega}(a_1, \dots, a_r)$ can be written by adding and subtracting less than $2^{r-1}(r-1)!$ terms of the form

$$\text{cov}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} X_k, \prod_{k \in \mathcal{B}} X_k \right] \prod_{j=1}^l \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\prod_{k \in \mathcal{C}_j} X_k \right] \quad (4.4)$$

with sets $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \{a_1, \dots, a_s\}$, $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \{a_{s+1}, \dots, a_r\}$, and $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_l$ constituting a partition of $\{a_1, \dots, a_r\} \setminus \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$. We proceed by induction over r . For $r = 2$ the claim is trivially true as $U_{n,h,\omega}(a_1, a_2) = \text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_{a_1}, X_{a_2}]$. Given $r > 2$, $s \in \{1, \dots, r-1\}$, and integers $1 \leq a_1 \leq \dots \leq a_r \leq n$, put $\sigma := \min\{s+1, r-1\}$ and note that

$$U_{n,h,\omega}(a_1, \dots, a_r) = \partial_{\omega_\sigma} U_{n,h,\omega}(a_1, \dots, a_{\sigma-1}, a_{\sigma+1}, \dots, a_r).$$

If the claim is true for $U_{n,h,\omega}(a_1, \dots, a_{\sigma-1}, a_{\sigma+1}, \dots, a_r)$, then we can write this cumulant by adding and subtracting less than $2^{r-2}(r-2)!$ terms of the form

$$\text{cov}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} X_k, \prod_{k \in \mathcal{B}} X_k \right] \prod_{j=1}^l \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\prod_{k \in \mathcal{C}_j} X_k \right] \quad (4.5)$$

with sets $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \{a_1, \dots, a_{\sigma-1}\}$, $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \{a_{\sigma+1}, \dots, a_r\}$, and $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_l$ constituting a partition of $\{a_1, \dots, a_{\sigma-1}, a_{\sigma+1}, \dots, a_r\} \setminus \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$. Simple calculations show that the derivative of (4.5) with respect to ω_σ originates $2l+3 < 2r-2$ terms of the form (4.4). \square

We use Lemma 4.1 in combination with Lemma 3.2 to prove Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. For $s \in \mathbb{N}$, put $\alpha_s := -s$ and $\beta_s := s$ if $h_c = -\infty$ or $\alpha_s := h_c + 1/s$ and $\beta_s := h_c + s$ if $h_c > -\infty$. By Lemma 3.2 there exist constants $\gamma_s > 0$ and $G_s > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{h \in [\alpha_s, \beta_s]} \mathbb{E}_{j,h}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \right] \leq G_s e^{-\gamma_s j}$$

for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. This shows that the random variables

$$\Lambda_s := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} e^{\frac{\gamma_s}{2} j} \sup_{h \in [\alpha_s, \beta_s]} \mathbb{E}_{j,h}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right]$$

possess finite expectation. Lemma 4.1, together with the inequality $\zeta^r \leq r! e^\zeta$ for $\zeta \geq 0$, gives for every $n, r, s \in \mathbb{N}$, $h \in [\alpha_s, \beta_s]$, and $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \partial_h^r \log Z_{n,h}(\omega) \right| &\leq 2^r (r!)^2 \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} j^r \mathbb{E}_{j,h,\vartheta^i \omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \\ &\leq \left(\frac{4}{\gamma_s} \right)^r (r!)^3 \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \Lambda_s(\vartheta^i \omega). \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

This bound is the key for proving the theorem.

We first deal with the expectation $\mathbb{E}[\log Z_{n,h}]$ of the finite-volume free energy. Let $f_n^{(r)}$ for $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$ be the function that maps $h \in \mathbb{R}$ to $f_n^{(r)}(h) := \mathbb{E}[(1/n) \partial_h^r \log Z_{n,h}]$. We know that $\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} f_n^{(0)}(h) = f(h)$ for all $h \in \mathbb{R}$ (see [11], Theorem 4.6) and, by definition, we have $f_n^{(r)}(h) - f_n^{(r)}(h') = \int_h^{h'} f_n^{(r+1)}(\zeta) d\zeta$ for every $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $h, h' \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, bound (4.6) yields $\sup_{h \in [\alpha_s, \beta_s]} |f_n^{(r)}(h)| \leq (4/\gamma_s)^r (r!)^3 \mathbb{E}[\Lambda_s]$ for all $n, r, s \in \mathbb{N}$. Given $s \in \mathbb{N}$, the latter allows an application of the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem, which, in combination with a diagonalization argument, implies the existence of continuous functions $f^{(0)}, f^{(1)}, \dots$ on the interval $[\alpha_s, \beta_s]$ and of an increasing sequence $\{n_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathbb{N} such that $\lim_{i \uparrow \infty} \sup_{h \in [\alpha_s, \beta_s]} |f_{n_i}^{(r)}(h) - f^{(r)}(h)| = 0$ for all $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$. It follows that $f^{(0)}(h) = f(h)$ and that $f^{(r)}(h) - f^{(r)}(h') = \int_h^{h'} f^{(r+1)}(\zeta) d\zeta$ for every $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $h, h' \in [\alpha_s, \beta_s]$. Thus, f turns out to be infinitely differentiable on $[\alpha_s, \beta_s]$, and hence on $(h_c, +\infty)$ because s is arbitrary. Furthermore, $f^{(r)}(h) = \partial_h^r f(h)$ for every $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $h \in [\alpha_s, \beta_s]$, which entails

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{h \in [\alpha_s, \beta_s]} \left| \partial_h^r f(h) \right| &\leq \sup_{h \in [\alpha_s, \beta_s]} \left| f_{n_i}^{(r)}(h) \right| + \sup_{h \in [\alpha_s, \beta_s]} \left| f_{n_i}^{(r)}(h) - f^{(r)}(h) \right| \\ &\leq \left(\frac{4}{\gamma_s} \right)^r (r!)^3 \mathbb{E}[\Lambda_s] + \sup_{h \in [\alpha_s, \beta_s]} \left| f_{n_i}^{(r)}(h) - f^{(r)}(h) \right|, \end{aligned}$$

which in turn gives $\sup_{h \in [\alpha_s, \beta_s]} |\partial_h^r f(h)| \leq (4/\gamma_s)^r (r!)^3 \mathbb{E}[\Lambda_s]$ after that i goes to infinity. Thus, considering a compact set $H \subset (h_c, +\infty)$, supposing s so large that $H \subseteq [\alpha_s, \beta_s]$, and putting $c := (4/\gamma_s) \max\{1, \mathbb{E}[\Lambda_s]\}$, we have $\sup_{h \in H} |\partial_h^r f(h)| \leq c^r (r!)^3$ for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$. This shows that f is of class Gevrey-3 on $(h_c, +\infty)$.

To prove the statement of theorem that is concerned with the expectation of the finite-volume free energy, we finally verify that $\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \sup_{h \in [\alpha_s, \beta_s]} |f_n^{(r)}(h) - \partial_h^r f(h)| = 0$ for all $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Given $H \subset (h_c, +\infty)$ compact and supposing s so large that $H \subseteq [\alpha_s, \beta_s]$, this limit shows that $\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \sup_{h \in H} |f_n^{(r)}(h) - \partial_h^r f(h)| = 0$. We proceed by contradiction. Assume that there exist $r_o \in \mathbb{N}$, $\epsilon > 0$, and a sequence $\{n_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ with the property that $\sup_{h \in [\alpha_s, \beta_s]} |f_{n_i}^{(r_o)}(h) - \partial_h^{r_o} f(h)| \geq \epsilon$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. By repeating all the above arguments, we can find a subsequence $\{n_{i_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $\{n_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\lim_{j \uparrow \infty} \sup_{h \in [\alpha_s, \beta_s]} |f_{n_{i_j}}^{(r)}(h) - \partial_h^r f(h)| = 0$ for all $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$, which is a contradiction when $r = r_o$.

Let us move to discuss the typical behaviour of the finite-volume free energy. Since $\mathbb{E}[\Lambda_s] < +\infty$, Birkhoff's ergodic theorem states that there exists $\Omega_o \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\mathbb{P}[\Omega_o] = 1$ such that for every $\omega \in \Omega_o$ and $s \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \Lambda_s(\vartheta^i \omega) < +\infty. \quad (4.7)$$

As for each $h \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} (1/n) \log Z_{n,h}(\omega) = f(h)$ for \mathbb{P} -a.e. ω (see [11], Theorem 4.6) and as the set \mathbb{Q} of rational numbers is countable, we can even suppose that the limit $\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} (1/n) \log Z_{n,h}(\omega) = f(h)$ holds for all $\omega \in \Omega_o$ and $h \in \mathbb{Q}$. Then, recalling the bounds $|(1/n) \log Z_{n,h}(\omega) - (1/n) \log Z_{n,h'}(\omega)| \leq |h - h'|$ and $|f(h) - f(h')| \leq |h - h'|$ valid for all n, ω, h , and h' , we deduce that $\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} (1/n) \log Z_{n,h}(\omega) = f(h)$ for all $\omega \in \Omega_o$ and $h \in \mathbb{R}$. Fixing $\omega \in \Omega_o$, setting $f_n^{(r)}(h) := (1/n) \partial_h^r \log Z_{n,h}(\omega)$ for $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and combining (4.6) with (4.7), a repetition of all the above arguments shows that $\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \sup_{h \in H} |f_n^{(r)}(h) - \partial_h^r f(h)| = 0$ for all $H \subset (h_c, +\infty)$ compact and $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$. \square

The arguments of the proof of Theorem 1.2 also give the concentration inequality of part (i) of Theorem 1.4.

Proof of part (i) of Theorem 1.4. The basic remark is that for each $r \geq 2$ the derivative $\partial_h^r \log Z_{n,h}(\omega)$ is the cumulant of order r of $L_n - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n]$, and also of $-L_n + \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n]$ except possibly for a minus sign.

Let $\alpha_s, \beta_s, \gamma_s, \Lambda_s$, and Ω_o be as in the proof of Theorem 1.2. Then, for all $s \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega \in \Omega_o$ we have

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \Lambda_s(\vartheta^i \omega) < +\infty.$$

Given $\omega \in \Omega_o$ and a compact set $H \in (h_c, +\infty)$, identifying an s such that $[\alpha_s, \beta_s] \supseteq H$, and combining bound (4.6) with Theorem 2.5 of [9], we realize that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $h \in H$, and $u \geq 0$

$$\mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega} \left[|L_n - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n]| > u \right] \leq 2e^{-\frac{u^2}{An+bu^{5/3}}}$$

with

$$A := \frac{256}{\gamma_s^2} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \Lambda_s(\vartheta^i \omega) \quad \text{and} \quad b := 2 \left(\frac{4}{\gamma_s} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}}.$$

This prove part (i) of Theorem 1.4 with $1/\kappa := \max\{A, b\}$. \square

Theorem 1.2 states that the functions that map $h > h_c$ to $\rho_h := \partial_h f(h)$ and to $v_h := \partial_h^2 f(h)$ are infinitely differentiable, the former being non decreasing and the latter being non negative as f is convex. Since $\partial_h \log Z_{n,h}(\omega)$ and $\partial_h^2 \log Z_{n,h}(\omega)$ are the mean and the variance of the contact number L_n under the polymer law $\mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega}$, respectively, Theorem 1.2 also shows that the following holds for \mathbb{P} -a.e. ω : for every $h > h_c$

$$\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n]}{n} = \lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]}{n} \right] = \rho_h \quad (4.8)$$

and

$$\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\left(\frac{L_n - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n]}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^2 \right] = \lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot} \left[\left(\frac{L_n - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^2 \right] \right] = v_h. \quad (4.9)$$

Based on a convexity argument, in Section 1.1 we claimed that $\limsup_{n \uparrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n/n]] = \rho_h > 0$ for $h > h_c$, which can be also regarded as a consequence of Lemma 2.7. Determining whether $v_h > 0$ for $h > h_c$ is non trivial, and we appeal to Corollary 5.3 of Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2 in the next section for the finding that $v_h > 0$ for $h > h_c$. Apart from the strictly

positivity of the variance, the quenched CLT of part (ii) of Theorem 1.4 is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.2, thanks to Theorem 1 of [20].

Proof of part (ii) of Theorem 1.4. Since $\partial_h^r \log Z_{n,h}(\omega)/n^{\frac{r}{2}}$ is the cumulant of order $r \geq 2$ of $(L_n - \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n])/\sqrt{n}$, Theorem 1.2 shows that there exists $\Omega_o \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\mathbb{P}[\Omega_o] = 1$ such that for all $\omega \in \Omega_o$ and $h > h_c$ the cumulant of order $r \geq 3$ of $(L_n - \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n])/\sqrt{n}$ goes to 0 when n is sent to infinity, while the cumulant of order 2 goes to v_h . Corollary 5.3 states that $v_h > 0$. In this way, part (ii) of Theorem 1.4 follows by applying Theorem 1 of [20]. \square

5. THE LOCAL CLT FOR THE CONTACT NUMBER

In this section we prove the quenched local CLT stated by Theorem 1.5. This requires to investigate the characteristic function of L_n with respect to the polymer measure $\mathbf{P}_{n,h,\omega}$. Put for brevity $\#_n := \lfloor (n-1)/2 \rfloor$ and

$$J_{n,h,\omega} := \sum_{k=1}^{\#_n} \frac{2e^{h+\omega_{2k}} p(1)^2 p(2)}{[p(2) + e^{h+\omega_{2k}} p(1)^2]^2} X_{2k-1} X_{2k+1}.$$

The following lemma, which is partly inspired by Theorem B.1 in [14] and partly by Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3 in [5], is the starting point.

Lemma 5.1. *For every $n \geq 3$, $h \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$, and $z \in [-\pi, \pi]$*

$$\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[(L_n - \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n])^2 \right] \geq \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} [J_{n,h,\omega}]$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} [e^{izL_n}] \right| &\leq \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[e^{-\frac{z^2}{\pi^2} J_{n,h,\omega}} \right] \\ &\leq e^{-\frac{z^2}{2\pi^2} \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} [J_{n,h,\omega}]} + \frac{4\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} [(J_{n,h,\omega} - \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega}[J_{n,h,\omega}])^2]}{\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} [J_{n,h,\omega}]^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 5.1. Fix $n \geq 3$, $h \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$, and $z \in [-\pi, \pi]$. The third inequality is due to Chebyshev's inequality, which entails

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[e^{-\frac{z^2}{\pi^2} J_{n,h,\omega}} \right] &\leq e^{-\frac{z^2}{2\pi^2} \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} [J_{n,h,\omega}]} + \mathbf{P}_{n,h,\omega} \left[J_{n,h,\omega} \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} [J_{n,h,\omega}] \right] \\ &\leq e^{-\frac{z^2}{2\pi^2} \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} [J_{n,h,\omega}]} + \frac{4\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} [(J_{n,h,\omega} - \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega}[J_{n,h,\omega}])^2]}{\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} [J_{n,h,\omega}]^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us prove the first and second inequality. Denoting by \mathfrak{D} the σ -algebra generated by X_1, X_3, X_5, \dots , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[(L_n - \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n])^2 \right] &= \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} [L_n^2] - \left(\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} [\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n|\mathfrak{D}]] \right)^2 \\ &\geq \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} [L_n^2] - \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} [\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n|\mathfrak{D}]^2] \\ &= \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\{L_n - \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n|\mathfrak{D}]\}^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{\#_n} (X_{2k} - \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_{2k}|\mathfrak{D}]) \right\}^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\left| \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} [e^{izL_n}] \right| \leq \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\left| \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[e^{iz \sum_{k=1}^{\#_n} X_{2k}} \middle| \mathfrak{D} \right] \right| \right].$$

In order to get the desired inequalities, we are going to demonstrate that

$$\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{\#n} (X_{2k} - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_{2k}|\mathfrak{D}]) \right\}^2 \middle| \mathfrak{D} \right] \geq \frac{1}{2} J_{n,h,\omega} \quad (5.1)$$

and

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[e^{iz \sum_{k=1}^{\#n} X_{2k}} \middle| \mathfrak{D} \right] \right| \leq e^{-\frac{z^2}{\pi^2} J_{n,h,\omega}}. \quad (5.2)$$

Bounds (5.1) and (5.2) are trivial if at most one variable among $X_1, X_3, \dots, X_{2\#n+1}$ takes value 1 since $J_{n,h,\omega} = 0$ in this case. Then, suppose that at least two of these variables take value 1 and let $2l_1 + 1 < \dots < 2l_r + 1$ with $r \geq 2$ be the sites where the values 1 are attained. In this way, bound (5.1) is tantamount to

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{\#n} (X_{2k} - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_{2k}|\mathfrak{D}]) \right\}^2 \middle| \mathfrak{D} \right] \\ & \geq \sum_{s=2}^r \mathbb{1}_{\{l_s=l_{s-1}+1\}} \frac{e^{h+\omega 2l_s} p(1)^2 p(2)}{[p(2) + e^{h+\omega 2l_s} p(1)^2]^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

Similarly, bound (5.2) is tantamount to

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[e^{iz \sum_{k=1}^{\#n} X_{2k}} \middle| \mathfrak{D} \right] \right| \\ & \leq \prod_{s=2}^r \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{l_s > l_{s-1}+1\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{l_s=l_{s-1}+1\}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{2z^2 e^{h+\omega 2l_s} p(1)^2 p(2)}{\pi^2 [p(2) + e^{h+\omega 2l_s} p(1)^2]^2} \right\} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

Let us verify bounds (5.3) and (5.4). Starting with (5.3), we observe that conditioning makes the sums $\sum_{k=1}^{l_1} X_{2k}, \sum_{k=l_1+1}^{l_2} X_{2k}, \dots, \sum_{k=l_{r-1}+1}^{l_r} X_{2k}, \sum_{k=l_r+1}^{\#n} X_{2k}$ independent thanks to Lemma 2.1, so that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{\#n} (X_{2k} - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_{2k}|\mathfrak{D}]) \right\}^2 \middle| \mathfrak{D} \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{l_1} (X_{2k} - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_{2k}|\mathfrak{D}]) \right\}^2 \middle| \mathfrak{D} \right] \\ & \quad + \sum_{s=2}^r \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\left\{ \sum_{k=l_{s-1}+1}^{l_s} (X_{2k} - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_{2k}|\mathfrak{D}]) \right\}^2 \middle| \mathfrak{D} \right] \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\left\{ \sum_{k=l_r+1}^{\#n} (X_{2k} - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_{2k}|\mathfrak{D}]) \right\}^2 \middle| \mathfrak{D} \right] \\ & \geq \sum_{s=2}^r \mathbb{1}_{\{l_s=l_{s-1}+1\}} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\{X_{2l_s} - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_{2l_s}|\mathfrak{D}]\}^2 \middle| \mathfrak{D} \right] \\ & = \sum_{s=2}^r \mathbb{1}_{\{l_s=l_{s-1}+1\}} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_{2l_s}|\mathfrak{D}] \left(1 - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_{2l_s}|\mathfrak{D}] \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

On the other hand, when $l_s = l_{s-1} + 1$ Lemma 2.1 also shows that

$$\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_{2l_s}|\mathfrak{D}] = \mathbb{E}_{2l_s+1,h,\omega}[X_{2l_s}|\mathfrak{D}] = \mathbb{E}_{2,h,\vartheta^{2l_s-1}\omega}[X_1] = \frac{p(2)}{p(2) + p(1)^2 e^{h+\omega 2l_s}}. \quad (5.6)$$

We obtain (5.3) by combining (5.5) with (5.6).

Moving to (5.4), exploiting again the conditional independence of the sums $\sum_{k=1}^{l_1} X_{2k}$, $\sum_{k=l_1+1}^{l_2} X_{2k}, \dots, \sum_{k=l_{r-1}+1}^{l_r} X_{2k}, \sum_{k=l_r+1}^{\#n} X_{2k}$ we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[e^{iz \sum_{k=1}^{\#n} X_{2k}} \middle| \mathfrak{D} \right] \right| &= \left| \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[e^{iz \sum_{k=1}^{l_1} X_{2k}} \middle| \mathfrak{D} \right] \right| \\ &\quad \times \prod_{s=2}^r \left| \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[e^{iz \sum_{k=l_{s-1}+1}^{l_s} X_{2k}} \middle| \mathfrak{D} \right] \right| \\ &\quad \times \left| \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[e^{iz \sum_{k=l_r+1}^{\#n} X_{2k}} \middle| \mathfrak{D} \right] \right| \\ &\leq \prod_{s=2}^r \left\{ \mathbb{1}_{\{l_s > l_{s-1}+1\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{l_s = l_{s-1}+1\}} \left| \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[e^{iz X_{2l_s}} \middle| \mathfrak{D} \right] \right| \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

Under the hypothesis $l_s = l_{s-1} + 1$ Lemma 2.1 yields

$$\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[e^{iz X_{2l_s}} \middle| \mathfrak{D} \right] = \mathbb{E}_{2,h,\vartheta^{2l_s-1}\omega} \left[e^{iz X_1} \right] = \frac{p(2) + e^{iz+h+\omega_{2l_s}} p(1)^2}{p(2) + e^{h+\omega_{2l_s}} p(1)^2},$$

and the bounds $\cos z \leq 1 - \frac{2z^2}{\pi^2}$, as $z \in [-\pi, \pi]$, and $\sqrt{1-\zeta} \leq e^{-\frac{\zeta}{2}}$ for $\zeta \in [0, 1]$ give

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[e^{iz X_{2l_s}} \middle| \mathfrak{D} \right] \right| &= \frac{\sqrt{p(2)^2 + e^{2h+2\omega_{2l_s}} p(1)^4 + 2e^{h+\omega_{2l_s}} p(1)^2 p(2) \cos z}}{p(2) + e^{h+\omega_{2l_s}} p(1)^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{1 - \frac{4z^2 e^{h+\omega_{2l_s}} p(1)^2 p(2)}{\pi^2 [p(2) + e^{h+\omega_{2l_s}} p(1)^2]^2}} \\ &\leq \exp \left\{ -\frac{2z^2 e^{h+\omega_{2l_s}} p(1)^2 p(2)}{\pi^2 [p(2) + e^{h+\omega_{2l_s}} p(1)^2]^2} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

We find (5.4) by combining (5.7) with (5.8). \square

The next step is to investigate the mean and the variance of $J_{n,h,\omega}$.

Lemma 5.2. *The following properties hold for \mathbb{P} -a.e. ω :*

- (1) $\liminf_{n \uparrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} [J_{n,h,\omega}] > 0$ for all $h > h_c$;
- (2) $\limsup_{n \uparrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[(J_{n,h,\omega} - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} [J_{n,h,\omega}])^2 \right] < +\infty$ for all $h > h_c$.

Proof of Lemma 5.2. In order to prove part (1), we deduce at first a convenient lower bound for the expectation $\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} [X_{2k-1} X_{2k+1}]$ with $1 \leq k \leq \#n := \lfloor (n-1)/2 \rfloor$. Lemma 2.1 shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} [X_{2k-1} X_{2k+1}] &= \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} [X_{2k-1} | X_{2k+1} = 1] \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} [X_{2k+1}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{2k+1,h,\omega} [X_{2k-1}] \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} [X_{2k+1}] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} [X_{2k+1}] &\geq \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} [X_{2k} X_{2k+1}] = \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} [X_{2k+1} | X_{2k} = 1] \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} [X_{2k}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{n-2k,h,\vartheta^{2k}\omega} [X_1] \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} [X_{2k}]. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_{2k-1}X_{2k+1}] &\geq \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{2k+1,h,\omega}[X_{2k-1}]\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_{2k+1}] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{2k+1,h,\omega}[X_{2k-1}]\mathbb{E}_{n-2k,h,\vartheta^{2k}\omega}[X_1]\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_{2k}] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{2k+1,h,\omega}[X_{2k-1}]\mathbb{E}_{n-2k,h,\vartheta^{2k}\omega}[X_1]\left(\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_{2k}] + \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_{2k+1}]\right). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.2, through Remark 2.3, gives

$$\mathbb{E}_{2k+1,h,\omega}[X_{2k-1}] \geq \frac{1}{1 + \xi 2^\xi e^{-h-\omega_{2k-1}}} \geq \frac{e^{-|h|}}{1 + \xi 2^\xi e^{-\omega_{2k-1}}}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_{n-2k,h,\vartheta^{2k}\omega}[X_1] \geq \frac{1}{1 + \xi e^{-h-\omega_{2k+1}}} \geq \frac{e^{-|h|}}{1 + \xi e^{-\omega_{2k+1}}}.$$

Then, putting the pieces together, we can write down the convenient lower bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_{2k-1}X_{2k+1}] &\geq \frac{e^{-2|h|}}{2} \frac{1}{1 + \xi 2^\xi e^{-\omega_{2k-1}}} \frac{1}{1 + \xi e^{-\omega_{2k+1}}} \left(\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_{2k}] + \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_{2k+1}]\right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

which holds for every $n \geq 3$, $h \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$, and $1 \leq k \leq \#n$.

Let us move to investigate $\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[J_{n,\omega}]$. Thanks to (5.9), we find for every $n \geq 3$, $h \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[J_{n,h,\omega}] &= \sum_{k=1}^{\#n} \frac{2e^{h+\omega_{2k}} p(1)^2 p(2)}{[p(2) + e^{h+\omega_{2k}} p(1)^2]^2} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_{2k-1}X_{2k+1}] \\ &\geq e^{-3|h|} \sum_{k=1}^{\#n} \frac{2e^{\omega_{2k}} p(1)^2 p(2)}{[p(2) + e^{\omega_{2k}} p(1)^2]^2} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_{2k-1}X_{2k+1}] \\ &\geq e^{-5|h|} \sum_{k=1}^{\#n} \Lambda(\vartheta^{2k-1}\omega) \left(\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_{2k}] + \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_{2k+1}]\right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

where we have introduced the random variable Λ that maps $\omega := \{\omega_a\}_{a \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \Omega$ to

$$\Lambda(\omega) := \frac{e^{\omega_1} p(1)^2 p(2)}{[p(2) + e^{\omega_1} p(1)^2]^2} \frac{1}{1 + \xi 2^\xi e^{-\omega_0}} \frac{1}{1 + \xi e^{-\omega_2}}.$$

We stress that Λ is independent of h . Recalling now that for $h > h_c$ the contact density ρ_h is strictly positive and non decreasing with respect to h , for every $h > h_c$ we can find a strictly positive number λ_h that satisfies $\mathbb{P}[\Lambda < \lambda_h] \leq \rho_h/3$ and that is non decreasing with respect to h . We put λ_h into context by replacing (5.10) with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[J_{n,h,\omega}] &\geq \lambda_h e^{-5|h|} \sum_{k=1}^{\#n} \mathbb{1}_{\{\Lambda(\vartheta^{2k-1}\omega) \geq \lambda_h\}} \left(\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_{2k}] + \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_{2k+1}]\right) \\ &\geq \lambda_h e^{-5|h|} \sum_{k=1}^{\#n} \left(\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_{2k}] + \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_{2k+1}]\right) \\ &\quad - 2\lambda_h e^{-5|h|} \sum_{k=1}^{\#n} \mathbb{1}_{\{\Lambda(\vartheta^{2k-1}\omega) < \lambda_h\}} \\ &\geq \lambda_h e^{-5|h|} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n] - 2\lambda_h - 2\lambda_h e^{-5|h|} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{\Lambda(\vartheta^k\omega) < \lambda_h\}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

At this point, we note that Theorem 1.2 and Birkhoff's ergodic theorem ensure us that there exists a set $\Omega_o \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\mathbb{P}[\Omega_o] = 1$ such that $\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n/n] = \rho_h$ for all $\omega \in \Omega_o$ and $h > h_c$ and $\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{\Lambda(\vartheta^k \omega) < \lambda_h\}} = \mathbb{P}[\Lambda < \lambda_h] \leq \rho_h/3$ for all $\omega \in \Omega_o$ and rational numbers $h > h_c$. Thus, given any $\omega \in \Omega_o$, $h > h_c$, and rational number $h' \geq h$, as $\lambda_h \leq \lambda_{h'}$ we get from (5.11)

$$\liminf_{n \uparrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[J_{n,h,\omega}]}{n} \geq \lambda_h e^{-5|h|} \rho_h - \frac{2}{3} \lambda_h e^{-5|h|} \rho_{h'}.$$

The arbitrariness of the rational $h' \geq h$ and the continuity of ρ_h with respect to $h > h_c$ finally show that

$$\liminf_{n \uparrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[J_{n,h,\omega}]}{n} \geq \frac{1}{3} \lambda_h e^{-5|h|} \rho_h > 0.$$

Regarding part (2) of the lemma, note that $2e^{h+\omega_{2k}} p(1)^2 p(2) \leq [p(2) + e^{h+\omega_{2k}} p(1)^2]^2$, so for every $n \geq 3$, $h \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\omega \in \Omega$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\left(J_{n,h,\omega} - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[J_{n,h,\omega}] \right)^2 \right] \leq 2 \sum_{a=1}^{\#n} \sum_{b=a}^{\#n} \left| \text{cov}_{n,h,\omega} [X_{2a-1} X_{2a+1}, X_{2b-1} X_{2b+1}] \right|.$$

The first part of Lemma 3.1 gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\left(J_{n,h,\omega} - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[J_{n,h,\omega}] \right)^2 \right] \\ & \leq 2\#n + 4 \sum_{a=1}^{\#n-1} \sum_{b=a+1}^{\#n} \sum_{i=0}^{2a} \sum_{j=2b}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{j-i,h,\vartheta^i \omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-i-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \\ & \leq n + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} j^2 \mathbb{E}_{j,h,\vartheta^i \omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

We can now proceed in a way that is similar to the proof of Theorem 1.2. For $s \in \mathbb{N}$, define $\alpha_s := -s$ and $\beta_s := s$ if $h_c = -\infty$ and $\alpha_s := h_c + 1/s$ and $\beta_s := h_c + s$ if $h_c > -\infty$. Consider the random variables

$$\Lambda_s := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} j^2 \sup_{h \in [\alpha_s, \beta_s]} \mathbb{E}_{j,h,\cdot}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right],$$

which possess finite expectation by Lemma 3.2. Then, Birkhoff's ergodic theorem ensures us that there exists $\Omega_o \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\mathbb{P}[\Omega_o] = 1$ such that for every $\omega \in \Omega_o$ and $s \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \Lambda_s(\vartheta^i \omega) < +\infty.$$

At the same time, for all $\omega \in \Omega_o$ and $h \in [\alpha_s, \beta_s]$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\left(J_{n,h,\omega} - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[J_{n,h,\omega}] \right)^2 \right] \leq n + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \Lambda_s(\vartheta^i \omega)$$

by (5.12). For every $\omega \in \Omega_o$ and $h > h_c$ there exists $s \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $[\alpha_s, \beta_s] \ni h$, so that

$$\limsup_{n \uparrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\left(J_{n,h,\omega} - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[J_{n,h,\omega}] \right)^2 \right] < +\infty. \quad \square$$

Theorem 1.2 and Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2 show that for each $h > h_c$ there exists $\omega \in \Omega$ such that

$$v_h := \partial_h^2 f(h) = \lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[\left(\frac{L_n - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n]}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^2 \right] \geq \liminf_{n \uparrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[J_{n,h,\omega}]}{2n} > 0.$$

Thus, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 5.3. $v_h := \partial_h^2 f(h) > 0$ for all $h > h_c$.

We are now able to prove Theorem 1.5.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. By Lemma 5.2 and part (ii) of Theorem 1.4 there exists a set $\Omega_o \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\mathbb{P}[\Omega_o] = 1$ such that the following properties hold for every $\omega \in \Omega_o$ and $h > h_c$:

- (1) $\liminf_{n \uparrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[J_{n,h,\omega}] > 0$;
- (2) $\limsup_{n \uparrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[(J_{n,h,\omega} - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[J_{n,h,\omega}])^2 \right] < +\infty$;
- (3) $\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[e^{iz \frac{L_n - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n]}{\sqrt{v_h n}}} \right] = e^{-\frac{1}{2}z^2}$ for all $z \in \mathbb{R}$.

Pick $\omega \in \Omega_o$, $h > h_c$, and $\lambda > 0$. The identities

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{2\pi v_h n} \mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n = l] &= \sqrt{\frac{v_h n}{2\pi}} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[e^{iz L_n} \right] e^{-izl} dz \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\pi\sqrt{v_h n}}^{\pi\sqrt{v_h n}} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[e^{iz \frac{L_n - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n]}{\sqrt{v_h n}}} \right] e^{iz \frac{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n] - l}{\sqrt{v_h n}}} dz, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\exp \left\{ -\frac{(l - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n])^2}{2v_h n} \right\} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{iz \frac{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n] - l}{\sqrt{v_h n}} - \frac{1}{2}z^2} dz,$$

which are valid for every $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$, give for all integers $n > \lambda^2/(\pi^2 v_h)$

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{l \in \mathbb{N}_0} \left| \sqrt{2\pi v_h n} \mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n = l] - \exp \left\{ -\frac{(l - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n])^2}{2v_h n} \right\} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\pi\sqrt{v_h n}}^{\pi\sqrt{v_h n}} \left| \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[e^{iz \frac{L_n - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n]}{\sqrt{v_h n}}} \right] - e^{-\frac{1}{2}z^2} \right| dz + \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \int_{\pi\sqrt{v_h n}}^{+\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{2}z^2} dz \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\lambda}^{\lambda} \left| \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[e^{iz \frac{L_n - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n]}{\sqrt{v_h n}}} \right] - e^{-\frac{1}{2}z^2} \right| dz \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \int_{\lambda}^{\pi\sqrt{v_h n}} \left| \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[e^{iz \frac{L_n - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n]}{\sqrt{v_h n}}} \right] \right| dz + \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \int_{\lambda}^{+\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{2}z^2} dz. \end{aligned}$$

Properties (1) and (2) show that $\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[J_{n,h,\omega}] \geq n/c$ and $\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[(J_{n,h,\omega} - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[J_{n,h,\omega}])^2] \leq cn$ for every $n > n_o$ with some numbers $c > 0$ and $n_o \geq 3$ independent of λ . Then, Lemma 5.1 implies for $n > n_o$ and $z \in [-\pi\sqrt{v_h n}, \pi\sqrt{v_h n}]$

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[e^{i \frac{z}{\sqrt{v_h n}} L_n} \right] \right| \leq e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2\pi^2 v_h} z^2} + \frac{4c^3}{n}.$$

It therefore follows that for $n > \max\{\lambda^2/\pi^2 v_h, n_o\}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{l \in \mathbb{N}_0} \left| \sqrt{2\pi v_h n} \mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n = l] - \exp \left\{ -\frac{(l - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n])^2}{2v_h n} \right\} \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\lambda}^{\lambda} \left| \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega} \left[e^{iz \frac{L_n - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n]}{\sqrt{v_h n}}} \right] - e^{-\frac{1}{2}z^2} \right| dz \\ & \quad + \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \int_{\lambda}^{+\infty} e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2\pi^2 v_h} z^2} dz + \frac{16c^3 \sqrt{v_h}}{\sqrt{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \int_{\lambda}^{+\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{2}z^2} dz. \end{aligned}$$

Appealing to property (3) and to the dominated convergence theorem, we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{n \uparrow \infty} \sup_{l \in \mathbb{N}_0} \left| \sqrt{2\pi v_h n} \mathbb{P}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n = l] - \exp \left\{ -\frac{(l - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n])^2}{2v_h n} \right\} \right| \\ & \leq \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \int_{\lambda}^{+\infty} e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2\pi^2 v_h} \zeta^2} d\zeta + \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \int_{\lambda}^{+\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{2}z^2} dz. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 1.5 follows from here because λ can be chosen arbitrarily large. \square

6. A CONCENTRATION BOUND AND THE CLT FOR THE CENTERING VARIABLE

In this section we study the centering variable $\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n]$ in order to prove Theorem 1.6 and Proposition 1.7. Basic tools to this aim are the following formulas due to Lemma 2.1: for every $h \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$, and integers $0 \leq a \leq m \leq b \leq n$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a] &= \frac{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a X_m]}{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_m]} - \frac{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a X_m] - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a] \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_m]}{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_m]} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{m,h,\omega}[X_a] - \frac{\text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a, X_m]}{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_m]} \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_b] &= \frac{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_m X_b]}{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_m]} - \frac{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_m X_b] - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_m] \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_b]}{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_m]} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{n-m,h,\omega}[X_{b-m}] - \frac{\text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_m, X_b]}{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_m]}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

We shall use these formulas several times in combination with Lemma 3.4.

6.1. Cumulants of the centering variable. Let ${}^r \kappa_{n,h}$ be the cumulant of order r of $\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n]$ with respect to the law \mathbb{P} . The following lemma provides an overall description of ${}^r \kappa_{n,h}$.

Lemma 6.1. *For each compact set $H \subset (h_c, +\infty)$ there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for all $r, n \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\sup_{h \in H} |{}^r \kappa_{n,h}| \leq c^r (r!)^3 n.$$

Proof of Lemma 6.1. Fix any $H \subset (h_c, +\infty)$ compact. According to Lemma 3.4, there exist constants $\gamma > 0$ and $G > 0$ such that for every integers $1 \leq a \leq b \leq n$

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{h \in H} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|\text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a, X_b]|}{\min\{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a], \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_b]\}} \right] & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{h \in H} \frac{|\text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a, X_b]|}{\min\{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a], \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_b]\}} \right] \\ & \leq G e^{-\gamma(b-a)}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

Put $c := \max\{1, 4e/\gamma, 4eGe^{2\gamma}\}$. We are going to prove that $\sup_{h \in H} |{}^r\kappa_{n,h}| \leq c^r (r!)^3 n$ for all $r, n \in \mathbb{N}$.

The case $r = 1$ is trivial as ${}^1\kappa_{n,h} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]] \leq n$ and $c \geq 1$ by construction. Suppose $r \geq 2$ and fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We have

$${}^r\kappa_{n,h} = \sum_{a_1=1}^n \cdots \sum_{a_r=1}^n U_{n,h}(a_1, \dots, a_r),$$

$U_{n,h}(a_1, \dots, a_r)$ being the joint cumulant of $\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_{a_1}], \dots, \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_{a_r}]$ with respect to the probability measure \mathbb{P} . The symmetry of $U_{n,h}(a_1, \dots, a_r)$ yields

$$|{}^r\kappa_{n,h}| \leq r! \sum_{1 \leq a_1 \leq \dots \leq a_r \leq n} \left| U_{n,h}(a_1, \dots, a_r) \right|. \quad (6.4)$$

Repeating some of the arguments of the proof of Lemma 4.1 we can state that, given an integer $s \in \{1, \dots, r-1\}$, the cumulant $U_{n,h}(a_1, \dots, a_r)$ with $1 \leq a_1 \leq \dots \leq a_r \leq n$ can be written by adding and subtracting less than $2^{r-1}(r-1)!$ terms of the form

$$\left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_k] \prod_{k \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_k] \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{E}_{n,h}[X_k] \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{k \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_k] \right] \right\} \\ \times \prod_{j=1}^l \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{k \in \mathcal{C}_j} \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_k] \right], \quad (6.5)$$

with sets $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \{a_1, \dots, a_s\}$, $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \{a_{s+1}, \dots, a_r\}$, and $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_l$ constituting a partition of $\{a_1, \dots, a_r\} \setminus \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$. We claim that for $h \in H$ the modulus of these terms is bounded above by $2rGe^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}(a_{s+1}-a_s)+\gamma}$, so that

$$\sup_{h \in H} \left| U_{n,h}(a_1, \dots, a_r) \right| \leq 2^r r! Ge^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}(a_{s+1}-a_s)+\gamma}. \quad (6.6)$$

In fact, bearing in mind that $|\prod_{i=1}^l v_i - \prod_{i=1}^l u_i| \leq \sum_{i=1}^l |v_i - u_i|$ for every $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $u_1, \dots, u_l, v_1, \dots, v_l \in [0, 1]$, formula (6.1) with $m := \lfloor (a_s + a_{s+1})/2 \rfloor$ gives for all $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\left| \prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_k] - \prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{E}_{m,h,\omega}[X_k] \right| \leq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}} \left| \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_k] - \mathbf{E}_{m,h,\omega}[X_k] \right| \\ \leq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{|\text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_k, X_m]|}{\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_m]}.$$

Similarly, formula (6.2) with $m := \lfloor (a_s + a_{s+1})/2 \rfloor$ yields for all $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\left| \prod_{k \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_k] - \prod_{k \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbf{E}_{n-m,h,\vartheta^m \omega}[X_{k-m}] \right| \leq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{B}} \left| \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_k] - \mathbf{E}_{n-m,h,\vartheta^m \omega}[X_{k-m}] \right| \\ \leq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{B}} \frac{|\text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_m, X_k]|}{\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_m]}.$$

Importantly, $\prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_k]$ and $\prod_{k \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbf{E}_{n-m,h,\vartheta^m \cdot}[X_{k-m}]$ are statistically independent. Then, by replacing in (6.5) the products $\prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_k]$ and $\prod_{k \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_k]$ with the products $\prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{E}_{m,h,\cdot}[X_k]$ and $\prod_{k \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbf{E}_{n-m,h,\vartheta^m \cdot}[X_{k-m}]$, respectively, thanks to (6.3) we

find for $h \in H$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_k] \prod_{k \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_k] \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{k \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E}_{n,h}[X_k] \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{k \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_k] \right] \right| \\
& \leq 2 \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|\text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_k, X_m]|}{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_m]} \right] + 2 \sum_{k \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|\text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_m, X_k]|}{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[X_m]} \right] \\
& \leq 2 \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}} G e^{-\gamma(m-k)} + 2 \sum_{k \in \mathcal{B}} G e^{-\gamma(k-m)} \\
& \leq 2s G e^{-\gamma(m-a_s)} + 2(r-s) G e^{-\gamma(a_{s+1}-m)} \leq 2r G e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}(a_{s+1}-a_s)+\gamma}.
\end{aligned}$$

The arbitrariness of $s \in \{1, \dots, r-1\}$ in (6.6) gives for all $1 \leq a_1 \leq \dots \leq a_r \leq n$

$$\sup_{h \in H} \left| U_{n,h}(a_1, \dots, a_r) \right| \leq 2^r r! G e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2(r-1)} \sum_{s=1}^{r-1} (a_{s+1}-a_s)+\gamma}.$$

Combining this bound with (6.4) and bearing in mind that $\frac{1}{1-e^{-\zeta}} \leq \frac{e^\zeta}{\zeta}$ for $\zeta > 0$ and that $(r-1)^{r-1} \leq r! e^r$, we finally find

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{h \in H} |{}^r \kappa_{n,h}| & \leq r! \sum_{1 \leq a_1 \leq \dots \leq a_r \leq n} \sup_{h \in H} \left| U_{n,h}(a_1, \dots, a_r) \right| \\
& \leq \frac{2^r (r!)^2 G e^\gamma}{(1 - e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2(r-1)}})^{r-1}} n \leq 2^r (r!)^2 G e^{2\gamma} \left[\frac{2(r-1)}{\gamma} \right]^{r-1} n \\
& \leq \gamma G e^{2\gamma} \left(\frac{4e}{\gamma} \right)^r (r!)^3 n \leq c^r (r!)^3 n. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

The acquired control of the cumulants of $\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]$ immediately implies the concentration inequality presented in part (i) of Theorem 1.6.

Proof of part (i) of Theorem 1.6. Lemma 6.1 states that for each $H \subset (h_c, +\infty)$ compact there exist a constant $c > 0$ such that $\sup_{h \in H} |{}^r \kappa_{n,h}| \leq c^r (r!)^3 n$ for all $r, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since ${}^r \kappa_{n,h}$ is the cumulant of $\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]]$ for $r \geq 2$, and also of $-\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]]$ except possibly for a minus sign, Theorem 2.5 of [9] shows that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $h \in H$, and $u \geq 0$

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\left| \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]] \right| > u \right] \leq 2e^{-\frac{u^2}{16c^2 n + 2c^{-1/3} u^{5/3}}}.$$

Thus, part (i) of Theorem 1.6 holds with $1/\kappa := \max \{16c^2, 2c^{-1/3}\}$. \square

6.2. More on the mean and the variance. We now deepen the study of the first two cumulants of $\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]$. First of all, we describe the convergence of $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n/n]]$ towards $\rho_h := \partial_h f(h)$ as n goes to infinity, thus proving part (ii) of Theorem 1.6.

Proof of part (ii) of Theorem 1.6. Fix a compact set $H \subset (h_c, +\infty)$. According to Lemma 3.4, there exist constants $\gamma > 0$ and $G > 0$ such that for all integers $1 \leq a \leq 2n$

$$\sup_{h \in H} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|\text{cov}_{2n,h,\cdot}[X_a, X_n]|}{\mathbb{E}_{2n,h,\cdot}[X_n]} \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{h \in H} \frac{|\text{cov}_{2n,h,\cdot}[X_a, X_n]|}{\mathbb{E}_{2n,h,\cdot}[X_n]} \right] \leq G e^{-\gamma|n-a|}.$$

We shall show in a moment that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $h \in H$

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]] - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{2n,h,\cdot}[L_{2n}]] \right| \leq \frac{G}{1 - e^{-\gamma}}. \quad (6.7)$$

Iterating this bound we get for all $n, i \in \mathbb{N}$, and $h \in H$

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]] - \frac{1}{2^i} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{E}_{2^i n, h, \cdot}[L_{2^i n}]] \right| \leq \frac{2G}{1 - e^{-\gamma}}.$$

The latter proves the lemma with $c := 2G/(1 - e^{-\gamma})$ by sending i to infinity thanks to Theorem 1.2 and (4.8).

Let us verify (6.7). Formula (6.1) gives for every $\omega \in \Omega$ and $a \in \{1, \dots, n\}$

$$\mathbf{E}_{2n, h, \omega}[X_a] = \mathbf{E}_{n, h, \omega}[X_a] - \frac{\text{cov}_{2n, h, \omega}[X_a, X_n]}{\mathbf{E}_{2n, h, \omega}[X_n]}.$$

Formula (6.2) gives for every $\omega \in \Omega$ and $a \in \{n+1, \dots, 2n\}$

$$\mathbf{E}_{2n, h, \omega}[X_a] = \mathbf{E}_{n, h, \vartheta^n \omega}[X_{a-n}] - \frac{\text{cov}_{2n, h, \omega}[X_a, X_n]}{\mathbf{E}_{2n, h, \omega}[X_n]}.$$

Taking the sum over a and integrating with respect to $\mathbb{P}[d\omega]$, we realize that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $h \in H$

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{E}_{2n, h, \cdot}[L_{2n}]] - 2\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{E}_{n, h, \cdot}[L_n]] \right| \leq \sum_{a=1}^{2n} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|\text{cov}_{2n, h, \cdot}[X_a, X_n]|}{\mathbf{E}_{2n, h, \cdot}[X_n]} \right] \leq \frac{2G}{1 - e^{-\gamma}}. \quad \square$$

Next, we investigate the asymptotics of the variance of $\mathbf{E}_{n, h, \cdot}[L_n]$.

Lemma 6.2. *For each $h > h_c$ the following limit exists and is finite:*

$$\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathbf{E}_{n, h, \cdot}[L_n] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{E}_{n, h, \cdot}[L_n]] \right)^2 \right] =: w_h.$$

Proof of Lemma 6.2. Given a random variable Λ on Ω , here we denote $\Lambda - \mathbb{E}[\Lambda]$ by $\bar{\Lambda}$ for brevity. Fix $h > h_c$ and put $\nu_n := \mathbb{E}[\overline{\mathbf{E}_{2n, h, \cdot}[L_n]^2}]$. We shall show that there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\nu_{m+n} \leq \nu_m + \nu_n + c(\sqrt{\nu_{\min\{m, n\}}} + 1) \quad (6.8)$$

and

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[\overline{\mathbf{E}_{n, h, \cdot}[L_n]^2}] - \nu_n \right| \leq c(\sqrt{\nu_n} + 1). \quad (6.9)$$

Bounds (6.8) and (6.9) prove the lemma as follows. The former entails that $\nu_{n+1} \leq \nu_n + \nu_1 + c(\sqrt{\nu_1} + 1) \leq \nu_n + 1 + 2c$, which in turn gives $\nu_n \leq (1 + 2c)n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, since $\sqrt{\min\{m, n\}} \leq 2(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{n} - \sqrt{m+n})$, we deduce from (6.8) that $\nu_n + 2c\sqrt{(1+2c)n} + c$ is the n^{th} term of a subadditive sequence. It therefore follows that $\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \nu_n/n =: w_h$ exists and is finite. Bound (6.9) implies that $\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} (1/n) \mathbb{E}[\overline{\mathbf{E}_{n, h, \cdot}[L_n]^2}] = w_h$.

We point out that the sequence with n^{th} term $\mathbb{E}[\overline{\mathbf{E}_{n, h, \cdot}[L_n]^2}]$ does not appear to have a direct subadditivity property like (6.8). For this reason, we found it convenient to double the system size and work with ν_n in place of $\mathbb{E}[\overline{\mathbf{E}_{n, h, \cdot}[L_n]^2}]$, and then to come back to $\mathbb{E}[\overline{\mathbf{E}_{n, h, \cdot}[L_n]^2}]$ by means of (6.9).

Let us verify (6.8). To begin with, we note that by Lemma 3.4 and Corollary 3.5 there exist constants $\gamma > 0$ and $G > 0$ such that for every integers $0 \leq a \leq b \leq l$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|\text{cov}_{l, h, \cdot}[X_a, X_b]|}{\min\{\mathbf{E}_{l, h, \cdot}[X_a], \mathbf{E}_{l, h, \cdot}[X_b]\}} \right] \leq G e^{-\gamma(b-a)} \quad (6.10)$$

and

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{E}_{l, h, \cdot}[X_a] \mathbf{E}_{l, h, \cdot}[X_b]] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{E}_{l, h, \cdot}[X_a]] \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{E}_{l, h, \cdot}[X_b]] \right| \leq G e^{-\gamma(b-a)}. \quad (6.11)$$

Pick positive integers $m \leq n$. Decomposing L_{m+n} as the sum of L_n and $L_{m+n} - L_n$ we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{m+n} &:= \mathbb{E} \left[\overline{\mathbf{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[L_{m+n}]^2} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\overline{\mathbf{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[L_n]^2} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\overline{\mathbf{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[L_{m+n} - L_n]^2} \right] \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\overline{\mathbf{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[L_n] \mathbf{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[L_{m+n} - L_n]} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (6.12)$$

Regarding the third term in the right-hand side of (6.12), bound (6.11) shows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\overline{\mathbf{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[L_n] \mathbf{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[L_{m+n} - L_n]} \right] \\ &= \sum_{a=1}^n \sum_{b=n+1}^{m+n} \mathbb{E} \left[\overline{\mathbf{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[X_a] \mathbf{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[X_b]} \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{a=1}^n \sum_{b=n+1}^{m+n} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[X_a] \mathbf{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[X_b] \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[X_a] \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[X_b] \right] \right| \\ &\leq \frac{Ge^\gamma}{(e^\gamma - 1)^2} \leq \frac{G}{\gamma(1 - e^{-\gamma})}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, (6.12) implies

$$\nu_{m+n} \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\overline{\mathbf{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[L_n]^2} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\overline{\mathbf{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[L_{m+n} - L_n]^2} \right] + \frac{2G}{\gamma(1 - e^{-\gamma})}. \quad (6.13)$$

We now analyze the first term in the right-hand side of (6.13). Decomposing $\mathbf{E}_{2m+2n,h,\omega}[L_n]$ as the sum of $\mathbf{E}_{2n,h,\omega}[L_n]$ and $\mathbf{E}_{2m+2n,h,\omega}[L_n] - \mathbf{E}_{2n,h,\omega}[L_n]$ and bearing in mind that $0 \leq L_n \leq n$ we deduce the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\overline{\mathbf{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[L_n]^2} \right] &= \nu_n + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\overline{\mathbf{E}_{2n,h,\cdot}[L_n] \mathbf{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[L_n] - \mathbf{E}_{2n,h,\cdot}[L_n]} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\overline{\mathbf{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[L_n] - \mathbf{E}_{2n,h,\cdot}[L_n]}^2 \right] \\ &\leq \nu_n + 3n\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \overline{\mathbf{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[L_n] - \mathbf{E}_{2n,h,\cdot}[L_n]} \right| \right] \\ &\leq \nu_n + 6n\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \mathbf{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[L_n] - \mathbf{E}_{2n,h,\cdot}[L_n] \right| \right]. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, formula (6.1) and bound (6.10) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \mathbf{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[L_n] - \mathbf{E}_{2n,h,\cdot}[L_n] \right| \right] &\leq \sum_{a=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \mathbf{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[X_a] - \mathbf{E}_{2n,h,\cdot}[X_a] \right| \right] \\ &= \sum_{a=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|\text{cov}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[X_a, X_{2n}]|}{\mathbf{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[X_{2n}]} \right] \leq \frac{Ge^{-\gamma n}}{1 - e^{-\gamma}}. \end{aligned}$$

It therefore follows that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\overline{\mathbf{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[L_n]^2} \right] \leq \nu_n + \frac{6G}{1 - e^{-\gamma}} ne^{-\gamma n} \leq \nu_n + \frac{3G}{\gamma(1 - e^{-\gamma})},$$

and (6.13) entails

$$\nu_{m+n} \leq \nu_n + \mathbb{E} \left[\overline{\mathbf{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[L_{m+n} - L_n]^2} \right] + \frac{5G}{\gamma(1 - e^{-\gamma})}. \quad (6.14)$$

To conclude, we investigate the second term in the right-hand side of (6.14). Decomposing the expectation $\mathbf{E}_{2m+2n,h,\omega}[L_{m+n} - L_n]$ as the sum of the expectation $\mathbf{E}_{2m,h,\vartheta^n \omega}[L_m]$

and the difference $\mathbb{E}_{2m+2n,h,\omega}[L_{m+n} - L_n] - \mathbb{E}_{2m,h,\vartheta^n\omega}[L_m]$ and appealing to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\overline{\mathbb{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[L_{m+n} - L_n]}^2 \right] \\ &= \nu_m + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\overline{\mathbb{E}_{2m,h,\vartheta^n}[L_m]} \overline{\mathbb{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[L_{m+n} - L_n] - \mathbb{E}_{2m,h,\vartheta^n}[L_m]} \right] \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\overline{\mathbb{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[L_{m+n} - L_n] - \mathbb{E}_{2m,h,\vartheta^n}[L_m]}^2 \right] \\ & \leq \nu_m + 2\sqrt{\nu_m} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\overline{\mathbb{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[L_{m+n} - L_n] - \mathbb{E}_{2m,h,\vartheta^n}[L_m]}^2 \right]} \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\overline{\mathbb{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[L_{m+n} - L_n] - \mathbb{E}_{2m,h,\vartheta^n}[L_m]}^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, decomposing the difference $\mathbb{E}_{2m+2n,h,\omega}[L_{m+n} - L_n] - \mathbb{E}_{2m,h,\vartheta^n\omega}[L_m]$ as the sum of $\mathbb{E}_{2m+2n,h,\omega}[L_{m+n} - L_n] - \mathbb{E}_{2m+n,h,\vartheta^n\omega}[L_m]$ and $\mathbb{E}_{2m+n,h,\omega}[L_m] - \mathbb{E}_{2m,h,\omega}[L_m]$, and then recalling that $0 \leq L_m \leq m$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\overline{\mathbb{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[L_{m+n} - L_n] - \mathbb{E}_{2m,h,\vartheta^n}[L_m]}^2 \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[L_{m+n} - L_n] - \mathbb{E}_{2m,h,\vartheta^n}[L_m] \right)^2 \right] \\ & \leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[L_{m+n} - L_n] - \mathbb{E}_{2m+n,h,\vartheta^n}[L_m] \right)^2 \right] \\ & \quad + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{2m+n,h,\cdot}[L_m] - \mathbb{E}_{2m,h,\cdot}[L_m] \right)^2 \right] \\ & \leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[L_{m+n} - L_n] - \mathbb{E}_{2m+n,h,\vartheta^n}[L_m] \right)^2 \right] \\ & \quad + 2m\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \mathbb{E}_{2m+n,h,\cdot}[L_m] - \mathbb{E}_{2m,h,\cdot}[L_m] \right| \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{6.15}$$

The first term in the right-hand side of (6.15) reads

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[L_{m+n} - L_n] - \mathbb{E}_{2m+n,h,\vartheta^n}[L_m] \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \sum_{a=1}^m \sum_{b=1}^m \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[X_{n+a}] - \mathbb{E}_{2m+n,h,\vartheta^n}[X_a] \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times \left(\mathbb{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[X_{n+b}] - \mathbb{E}_{2m+n,h,\vartheta^n}[X_b] \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Formula (6.2) and bound (6.10) give for $a, b \in \{1, \dots, m\}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[X_{n+a}] - \mathbb{E}_{2m+n,h,\vartheta^n}[X_a] \right) \left(\mathbb{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[X_{n+b}] - \mathbb{E}_{2m+n,h,\vartheta^n}[X_b] \right) \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \mathbb{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[X_{n+a}] - \mathbb{E}_{2m+n,h,\vartheta^n}[X_a] \right| \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|\text{COV}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[X_n, X_{n+a}]|}{\mathbb{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[X_n]} \right] \leq Ge^{-\gamma a}. \end{aligned}$$

By changing a with b we realize that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[X_{n+a}] - \mathbb{E}_{2m+n,h,\vartheta^n}[X_a] \right) \left(\mathbb{E}_{2m+2n,h,\cdot}[X_{n+b}] - \mathbb{E}_{2m+n,h,\vartheta^n}[X_b] \right) \right] \\ & \leq Ge^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}(a+b)}, \end{aligned} \tag{6.16}$$

and hence

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{2m+2n, h, \cdot} [L_{m+n} - L_n] - \mathbb{E}_{2m+n, h, \vartheta^n} [L_m] \right)^2 \right] \leq \frac{G}{(e^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} - 1)^2} \leq \frac{4G}{\gamma(1 - e^{-\gamma})}.$$

Moving to the second term in the right-hand side of (6.15), we invoke (6.1) and (6.10) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \mathbb{E}_{2m+n, h, \cdot} [L_m] - \mathbb{E}_{2m, h, \cdot} [L_m] \right| \right] &\leq \sum_{a=1}^m \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \mathbb{E}_{2m+n, h, \cdot} [X_a] - \mathbb{E}_{2m, h, \cdot} [X_a] \right| \right] \\ &= \sum_{a=1}^m \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|\text{COV}_{2m+n, h, \cdot} [X_a, X_{2m}]|}{\mathbb{E}_{2m+n, h, \cdot} [X_{2m}]} \right] \leq \frac{Ge^{-\gamma m}}{1 - e^{-\gamma}}. \end{aligned}$$

In this way, (6.15) shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\overline{\mathbb{E}_{2m+2n, h, \cdot} [L_{m+n} - L_n] - \mathbb{E}_{2m, h, \vartheta^n} [L_m]}^2 \right] &\leq \frac{8G}{\gamma(1 - e^{-\gamma})} + \frac{2G}{1 - e^{-\gamma}} me^{-\gamma m} \\ &\leq \frac{9G}{\gamma(1 - e^{-\gamma})}, \end{aligned}$$

which in turn yields

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\overline{\mathbb{E}_{2m+2n, h, \cdot} [L_{m+n} - L_n]}^2 \right] \leq \nu_m + \sqrt{\nu_m} \sqrt{\frac{36G}{\gamma(1 - e^{-\gamma})}} + \frac{9G}{\gamma(1 - e^{-\gamma})}.$$

Combining this inequality with (6.14) we finally find

$$\nu_{m+n} \leq \nu_m + \nu_n + \sqrt{\nu_m} \sqrt{\frac{36G}{\gamma(1 - e^{-\gamma})}} + \frac{14G}{\gamma(1 - e^{-\gamma})},$$

which proves (6.8) with

$$c := \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{36G}{\gamma(1 - e^{-\gamma})}}, \frac{14G}{\gamma(1 - e^{-\gamma})} \right\}. \quad (6.17)$$

It remains to demonstrate (6.9). To this aim, we fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and write for all $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\mathbb{E}_{n, h, \omega} [L_n]}^2 - \overline{\mathbb{E}_{2n, h, \omega} [L_n]}^2 &= 2 \overline{\mathbb{E}_{2n, h, \omega} [L_n] \mathbb{E}_{n, h, \omega} [L_n] - \mathbb{E}_{2n, h, \omega} [L_n]} \\ &\quad + \overline{\mathbb{E}_{n, h, \omega} [L_n] - \mathbb{E}_{2n, h, \omega} [L_n]}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6.18)$$

Integrating with respect to $\mathbb{P}[d\omega]$ and applying the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\overline{\mathbb{E}_{n, h, \cdot} [L_n]}^2 \right] - \nu_n \right| &\leq 2\sqrt{\nu_n} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\overline{\mathbb{E}_{2n, h, \cdot} [L_n] - \mathbb{E}_{n, h, \cdot} [L_n]}^2 \right]} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\overline{\mathbb{E}_{2n, h, \cdot} [L_n] - \mathbb{E}_{n, h, \cdot} [L_n]}^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly to (6.16), we can make use of formula (6.1) and bound (6.10) to show that for $a, b \in \{1, \dots, n\}$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{2n, h, \cdot} [X_a] - \mathbb{E}_{n, h, \cdot} [X_a] \right) \left(\mathbb{E}_{2n, h, \cdot} [X_b] - \mathbb{E}_{n, h, \cdot} [X_b] \right) \right] \leq Ge^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}(a+b)},$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\overline{\mathbb{E}_{2n,h,\cdot}[L_n] - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]}^2 \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{2n,h,\cdot}[L_n] - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n] \right)^2 \right] \\
& = \sum_{a=1}^n \sum_{b=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{2n,h,\cdot}[X_a] - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_a] \right) \left(\mathbb{E}_{2n,h,\cdot}[X_b] - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_b] \right) \right] \\
& \leq \frac{G}{(e^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} - 1)^2} \leq \frac{4G}{\gamma(1 - e^{-\gamma})}.
\end{aligned}$$

In conclusion, we find

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\overline{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]}^2 \right] - \nu_n \right| \leq \sqrt{\nu_n} \sqrt{\frac{16G}{\gamma(1 - e^{-\gamma})}} + \frac{4G}{\gamma(1 - e^{-\gamma})} \leq c(\sqrt{\nu_n} + 1)$$

with c as in (6.17). □

The following lemma demonstrates that the number w_h defined by Lemma 6.2 is strictly positive in the localized phase $h > h_c$ unless the model is non disordered.

Lemma 6.3. *$w_h > 0$ for all $h > h_c$ provided that $\int_{\Omega} \omega_0^2 \mathbb{P}[d\omega] > 0$.*

Before going into the the proof of Lemma 6.3, let us point out that if ω_0 is Gaussian distributed with standard deviation $\beta > 0$, then one can exploit Gaussian integration by parts and obtain $w_h \geq (\beta v_h)^2 > 0$ for $h > h_c$. We give the argument here because it inspired the (substantially more involved) proof for general disorder laws. The Cauchy–Schwarz inequality gives for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $h \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Omega} \sum_{a=1}^n \omega_a \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n] \mathbb{P}[d\omega] &= \int_{\Omega} \sum_{a=1}^n \omega_a \left(\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]] \right) \mathbb{P}[d\omega] \\
&\leq \beta \sqrt{n} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]] \right)^2 \right]}. \tag{6.19}
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, Gaussian integration by parts yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Omega} \sum_{a=1}^n \omega_a \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n] \mathbb{P}[d\omega] &= \beta^2 \int_{\Omega} \sum_{a=1}^n \partial_{\omega_a} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n] \mathbb{P}[d\omega] \\
&= \beta^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot} \left[(L_n - \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n])^2 \right] \right]. \tag{6.20}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (6.19) with (6.20), dividing by n , and then letting n go to infinity we find $w_h \geq (\beta v_h)^2$ for $h > h_c$ thanks to Lemma 6.2 and (4.9).

Proof of Lemma 6.3. To begin with, we present some formulas that make explicit the dependence of the expectation of observables on the charge at a given site. Given $\omega := \{\omega_b\}_{b \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \Omega$ and $a \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by ${}^a \omega := \{\omega_0, \dots, \omega_{a-1}, 0, \omega_{a+1}, \dots\}$ a system of charges where the charge at site a is suppressed. Exploiting the binary nature of X_a , for

any bounded measurable function Φ on $(\mathcal{S}, \mathfrak{S})$ we find

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[\Phi] &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[\Phi e^{\sum_{c=1}^n (h+\omega_c) X_c} X_n]}{\mathbb{E}[e^{\sum_{c=1}^n (h+\omega_c) X_c} X_n]} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}_{n,h,a\omega}[\Phi] + (e^{\omega_a} - 1)\mathbb{E}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a \Phi]}{1 + (e^{\omega_a} - 1)\mathbb{E}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a]} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{n,h,a\omega}[\Phi] + \frac{e^{\omega_a} - 1}{1 + (e^{\omega_a} - 1)\mathbb{E}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a]} \text{cov}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a, \Phi]. \end{aligned} \quad (6.21)$$

This formula shows how to isolate ω_a . Taking the derivative with respect to ω_a we also find

$$\text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a, \Phi] = \frac{e^{\omega_a}}{\{1 + (e^{\omega_a} - 1)\mathbb{E}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a]\}^2} \text{cov}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a, \Phi]. \quad (6.22)$$

We are now ready to present the proof of the lemma.

Fix $h > h_c$ and assume that $\int_{\Omega} \omega_0^2 \mathbb{P}[d\omega] > 0$. According to Lemma 3.4 there exist constants $\gamma > 0$ and $G > 0$ such that for every integers $1 \leq a \leq b \leq n$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|\text{cov}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_a, X_b]|\right] \leq G e^{-\gamma(b-a)}, \quad (6.23)$$

and by elementary considerations we can find a $\lambda > 0$ so large that

$$\sqrt{G \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{1}_{\{|\omega_0| > \lambda\}} \mathbb{P}[d\omega]} \frac{1 + e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}}}{1 - e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}}} \leq v_h \quad (6.24)$$

with $v_h := \partial_h^2 f(h) > 0$. We note that $\int_{\Omega} \omega_0 \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_0 \leq 0\}} \mathbb{P}[d\omega] < 0$ and $\int_{\Omega} \omega_0 \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_0 > 0\}} \mathbb{P}[d\omega] > 0$ since $\int_{\Omega} \omega_0 \mathbb{P}[d\omega] = 0$ and $\int_{\Omega} \omega_0^2 \mathbb{P}[d\omega] > 0$. In this way, we can take λ so large to have also $q_- := -\int_{\Omega} \omega_0 \mathbb{1}_{\{-\lambda < \omega_0 \leq 0\}} \mathbb{P}[d\omega] > 0$ and $q_+ := \int_{\Omega} \omega_0 \mathbb{1}_{\{0 < \omega_0 \leq \lambda\}} \mathbb{P}[d\omega] > 0$. Put $q(\zeta) := q_- \zeta \mathbb{1}_{\{0 < \zeta \leq \lambda\}} + q_+ \zeta \mathbb{1}_{\{-\lambda < \zeta \leq 0\}}$ for $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$ and note that $\int_{\Omega} q(\omega_0) \mathbb{P}[d\omega] = 0$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ define the random variable $\Lambda_{n,a}$ that maps $\omega := \{\omega_b\}_{b \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \Omega$ to

$$\Lambda_{n,a}(\omega) := q(\omega_a) \text{cov}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a, L_n].$$

We have $\mathbb{E}[\Lambda_{n,a}] = 0$ as $\text{cov}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a, L_n]$ is independent of ω_a and $\int_{\Omega} q(\omega_0) \mathbb{P}[d\omega] = 0$.

The starting point to prove the lemma is the following bound due to the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality: for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{a=1}^n \Lambda_{n,a} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{a=1}^n \Lambda_{n,a} \left(\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]]\right)\right] \\ &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{a=1}^n \Lambda_{n,a}\right)^2\right]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]]\right)^2\right]}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $w_h > 0$ follows if we show that

$$\liminf_{n \uparrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{a=1}^n \Lambda_{n,a} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]\right] > 0 \quad (6.25)$$

and

$$\limsup_{n \uparrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{a=1}^n \Lambda_{n,a}\right)^2\right] < +\infty. \quad (6.26)$$

Let us prove (6.25) first. Formula (6.21) gives for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega := \{\omega_b\}_{b \in \mathbb{N}_0}$

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{n,a}(\omega) \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n] &= \Lambda_{n,a}(\omega) \mathbb{E}_{n,h,a\omega}[L_n] \\ &\quad + \frac{q(\omega_a)(e^{\omega_a} - 1)}{1 + (e^{\omega_a} - 1)\mathbb{E}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a]} \left(\text{cov}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a, L_n]\right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then, since $q(\zeta)(e^\zeta - 1) \geq q_- \zeta (e^\zeta - 1) \mathbf{1}_{\{0 < \zeta \leq \lambda\}} \geq q_- \zeta^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{0 < \zeta \leq \lambda\}}$, we can state that

$$\Lambda_{n,a}(\omega) \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n] \geq \Lambda_{n,a}(\omega) \mathbf{E}_{n,h,a\omega}[L_n] + q_- e^{-\lambda} \mathbf{1}_{\{0 < \omega_a \leq \lambda\}} \omega_a^2 \left(\mathbf{cov}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a, L_n] \right)^2.$$

In this way, integrating with respect to $\mathbb{P}[d\omega]$ and bearing in mind that $\int_{\Omega} q(\omega_0) \mathbb{P}[d\omega] = 0$ and that both $\mathbf{cov}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a, L_n]$ and $\mathbf{E}_{n,h,a\omega}[L_n]$ are independent of ω_a , we get for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{a=1}^n \Lambda_{n,a} \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n] \right] &\geq q_- e^{-\lambda} \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{1}_{\{0 < \omega_0 \leq \lambda\}} \omega_0^2 \mathbb{P}[d\omega] \int_{\Omega} \sum_{a=1}^n \left(\mathbf{cov}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a, L_n] \right)^2 \mathbb{P}[d\omega] \\ &\geq q_- q_+^2 e^{-\lambda} \int_{\Omega} \sum_{a=1}^n \left(\mathbf{cov}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a, L_n] \right)^2 \mathbb{P}[d\omega]. \end{aligned} \quad (6.27)$$

At the same time, formula (6.22) entails

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\mathbf{cov}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a, L_n] \right)^2 &= e^{-2\omega_a} \left\{ 1 + (e^{\omega_a} - 1) \mathbf{E}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a] \right\}^4 \left(\mathbf{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a, L_n] \right)^2 \\ &\geq e^{-2|\omega_a|} \left(\mathbf{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a, L_n] \right)^2 \\ &\geq e^{-2\lambda} \mathbf{1}_{\{|\omega_a| \leq \lambda\}} \left(\mathbf{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a, L_n] \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the second step follows by considering separately the values of ω_a positive and negative. Plugging this bound into (6.27), two applications of the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality yield

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{a=1}^n \Lambda_{n,a} \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n] \right] &\geq q_- q_+^2 e^{-3\lambda} \int_{\Omega} \sum_{a=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{|\omega_a| \leq \lambda\}} \left(\mathbf{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a, L_n] \right)^2 \mathbb{P}[d\omega] \\ &\geq \frac{q_- q_+^2 e^{-3\lambda}}{n} \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{a=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{|\omega_a| \leq \lambda\}} \mathbf{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a, L_n] \right)^2 \mathbb{P}[d\omega] \\ &\geq \frac{q_- q_+^2 e^{-3\lambda}}{n} \left(\int_{\Omega} \sum_{a=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{|\omega_a| \leq \lambda\}} \mathbf{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a, L_n] \mathbb{P}[d\omega] \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{q_- q_+^2 e^{-3\lambda}}{n} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{cov}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n, L_n] \right] - \int_{\Omega} \sum_{a=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{|\omega_a| > \lambda\}} \mathbf{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a, L_n] \mathbb{P}[d\omega] \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6.28)$$

Finally, a further use of the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, combined with the fact that $|\mathbf{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a, X_b]| \leq 1$, gives thanks to (6.23) and (6.24)

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega} \sum_{a=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{|\omega_a| > \lambda\}} \mathbf{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a, L_n] \mathbb{P}[d\omega] \\ &= \sum_{a=1}^n \sum_{b=1}^n \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{1}_{\{|\omega_a| > \lambda\}} \mathbf{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a, X_b] \mathbb{P}[d\omega] \\ &\leq \sum_{a=1}^n \sum_{b=1}^n \sqrt{\int_{\Omega} \mathbf{1}_{\{|\omega_0| > \lambda\}} \mathbb{P}[d\omega]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \mathbf{cov}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_a, X_b] \right| \right]} \\ &\leq n \sqrt{G \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{1}_{\{|\omega_0| > \lambda\}} \mathbb{P}[d\omega]} \frac{1 + e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}}}{1 - e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}}} \leq n \frac{v_h}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

In this way, (6.28) and (4.9) allow us to conclude that

$$\liminf_{n \uparrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{a=1}^n \Lambda_{n,a} \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot} [L_n] \right] \geq \frac{q_-(q_+v_h)^2 e^{-3\lambda}}{4},$$

which demonstrates (6.25).

Let us move to (6.26). Writing for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{a=1}^n \Lambda_{n,a} \right)^2 \right] = \sum_{a=1}^n \mathbb{E} [\Lambda_{n,a}^2] + 2 \sum_{a=1}^{n-1} \sum_{b=a+1}^n \mathbb{E} [\Lambda_{n,a} \Lambda_{n,b}], \quad (6.29)$$

we analyze separately the expectations $\mathbb{E}[\Lambda_{n,a}^2]$ for $1 \leq a \leq n$ and $\mathbb{E}[\Lambda_{n,a} \Lambda_{n,b}]$ for $1 \leq a < b \leq n$. Regarding the former, the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and the fact that $|\text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a, X_c]| \leq 1$ give for any a

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\Lambda_{n,a}^2] &= \sum_{c=1}^n \sum_{d=1}^n \int_{\Omega} q(\omega_a)^2 \text{cov}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a, X_c] \text{cov}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a, X_d] \mathbb{P}[d\omega] \\ &\leq \left\{ \sum_{c=1}^n \sqrt{\int_{\Omega} q(\omega_a)^2 |\text{cov}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a, X_c]| \mathbb{P}[d\omega]} \right\}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6.30)$$

On the other hand, formula (6.22) allows us to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega} q(\omega_a)^2 |\text{cov}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a, X_c]| \mathbb{P}[d\omega] \\ &= \int_{\Omega} q(\omega_a)^2 e^{-\omega_a} \left\{ 1 + (e^{\omega_a} - 1) \mathbb{E}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a] \right\}^2 |\text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a, X_c]| \mathbb{P}[d\omega] \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} q(\omega_a)^2 e^{|\omega_a|} |\text{cov}_{n,h,\omega}[X_a, X_c]| \mathbb{P}[d\omega]. \end{aligned} \quad (6.31)$$

Thus, since $|q(\zeta)| \leq \max\{q_-, q_+\} \lambda$ for $\zeta \in (-\lambda, \lambda]$ and $q(\zeta) = 0$ for $\zeta \notin (-\lambda, \lambda]$, from (6.30) and (6.31) first and (6.23) later we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\Lambda_{n,a}^2] &\leq \max\{q_-^2, q_+^2\} \lambda^2 e^{\lambda} \left\{ \sum_{c=1}^n \sqrt{|\text{cov}_{n,h,\cdot}[X_a, X_c]|} \right\}^2 \\ &\leq Ge^{\lambda} \left(\max\{q_-, q_+\} \lambda \frac{1 + e^{-\frac{\lambda}{2}}}{1 - e^{-\frac{\lambda}{2}}} \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6.32)$$

The study of the expectations $\mathbb{E}[\Lambda_{n,a} \Lambda_{n,b}]$ is more involved. Fix integers $1 \leq a < b \leq n$ and denote by ${}^{a,b}\omega$ the system of charges $\{\omega_0, \dots, \omega_{a-1}, 0, \omega_{a+1}, \dots, \omega_{b-1}, 0, \omega_{b+1}, \dots\}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\Lambda_{n,a} \Lambda_{n,b}] &= \int_{\Omega} q(\omega_a) q(\omega_b) \text{cov}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a, L_n] \text{cov}_{n,h,b\omega}[X_b, L_n] \mathbb{P}[d\omega] \\ &= \int_{\Omega} q(\omega_a) q(\omega_b) \left\{ \text{cov}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a, L_n] - \text{cov}_{n,h,a,b\omega}[X_a, L_n] \right\} \\ &\quad \times \left\{ \text{cov}_{n,h,b\omega}[X_b, L_n] - \text{cov}_{n,h,a,b\omega}[X_b, L_n] \right\} \mathbb{P}[d\omega] \end{aligned}$$

because $\int_{\Omega} q(\omega_0) \mathbb{P}[d\omega] = 0$ and because $\text{cov}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a, L_n]$ and $\text{cov}_{n,h,b\omega}[X_b, L_n]$ are independent of ω_a and ω_b , respectively, while $\text{cov}_{n,h,a,b\omega}[X_a, L_n]$ and $\text{cov}_{n,h,a,b\omega}[X_b, L_n]$ are independent of both ω_a and ω_b . The Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, combined with the fact that $|\text{cov}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a, X_c] - \text{cov}_{n,h,a,b\omega}[X_a, X_c]| \leq 2$ and $|\text{cov}_{n,h,b\omega}[X_b, X_d] - \text{cov}_{n,h,a,b\omega}[X_b, X_d]| \leq 2$,

yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[\Lambda_{n,a}\Lambda_{n,b}] \\
&= \sum_{c=1}^n \sum_{d=1}^n \int_{\Omega} q(\omega_a)q(\omega_b) \left\{ \text{cov}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a, X_c] - \text{cov}_{n,h,a,b\omega}[X_a, X_c] \right\} \\
&\quad \times \left\{ \text{cov}_{n,h,b\omega}[X_b, X_d] - \text{cov}_{n,h,a,b\omega}[X_b, X_d] \right\} \mathbb{P}[d\omega] \\
&\leq 2 \sum_{c=1}^n \sqrt{\int_{\Omega} q(\omega_a)q(\omega_b) \left| \text{cov}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a, X_c] - \text{cov}_{n,h,a,b\omega}[X_a, X_c] \right| \mathbb{P}[d\omega]} \\
&\quad \times \sum_{d=1}^n \sqrt{\int_{\Omega} q(\omega_a)q(\omega_b) \left| \text{cov}_{n,h,b\omega}[X_b, X_d] - \text{cov}_{n,h,a,b\omega}[X_b, X_d] \right| \mathbb{P}[d\omega]}. \quad (6.33)
\end{aligned}$$

The two factors in the right-hand side of (6.33) just differ because $a \neq b$, but they can be treated in the same way. Let us look at the first. We use that $\partial_{\omega_b} \text{cov}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a, X_c] = U_{n,h,a\omega}(a, b, c) = U_{n,h,a\omega}(l, m, r)$, where $U_{n,h,a\omega}(a, b, c)$ is the joint cumulant of X_a, X_b , and X_c with respect to the law $\mathbf{P}_{n,h,a\omega}$ and (l, m, r) is a permutation of (a, b, c) such that $l \leq m \leq r$. Therefore, for every $\omega := \{\omega_e\}_{e \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \Omega$ and $c \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ there exists $u \in [0, 1]$ that verifies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{cov}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a, X_c] - \text{cov}_{n,h,a,b\omega}[X_a, X_c] \\
&= \omega_b U_{n,h,\{\omega_0, \dots, \omega_{a-1}, 0, \omega_{a+1}, \dots, \omega_{b-1}, u\omega_b, \omega_{b+1}, \dots\}}(l, m, r).
\end{aligned}$$

Setting $\varpi := \{\omega_0, \dots, \omega_{a-1}, 0, \omega_{a+1}, \dots, \omega_{b-1}, u\omega_b, \omega_{b+1}, \dots\}$ for brevity, bound (4.2) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
|U_{n,h,\varpi}(l, m, r)| &\leq 16 \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{\{i < l \leq j+i, r-m \leq m-l < j\}} \mathbb{E}_{j,h,\vartheta^i \varpi}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \\
&\quad + 16 \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{\{i < m \leq j+i, m-l \leq r-m < j\}} \mathbb{E}_{j,h,\vartheta^i \varpi}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right],
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{j,h,\vartheta^i \varpi}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] &= \frac{\mathbb{E}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) e^{\sum_{e=1}^j (h+\varpi_{i+e})(X_e + X'_e)} X_j X'_j \right]}{\mathbb{E}^{\otimes 2} \left[e^{\sum_{e=1}^j (h+\varpi_{i+e})(X_e + X'_e)} X_j X'_j \right]} \\
&\leq e^{2|\omega_a|+2|\omega_b|} \frac{\mathbb{E}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) e^{\sum_{e=1}^j (h+\omega_{i+e})(X_e + X'_e)} X_j X'_j \right]}{\mathbb{E}^{\otimes 2} \left[e^{\sum_{e=1}^j (h+\omega_{i+e})(X_e + X'_e)} X_j X'_j \right]} \\
&= e^{2|\omega_a|+2|\omega_b|} \mathbb{E}_{j,h,\vartheta^i \omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Putting the pieces together we find

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \text{cov}_{n,h,a\omega}[X_a, X_c] - \text{cov}_{n,h,a,b\omega}[X_a, X_c] \right| \\
&\leq 16|\omega_b| e^{2|\omega_a|+2|\omega_b|} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{\{i < l \leq j+i, r-m \leq m-l < j\}} \mathbb{E}_{j,h,\vartheta^i \omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \\
&\quad + 16|\omega_b| e^{2|\omega_a|+2|\omega_b|} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{\{i < m \leq j+i, m-l \leq r-m < j\}} \mathbb{E}_{j,h,\vartheta^i \omega}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Next, recalling that $|q(\zeta)| \leq \max\{q_-, q_+\}\lambda$ for $\zeta \in (-\lambda, \lambda]$ and $q(\zeta) = 0$ for $\zeta \notin (-\lambda, \lambda]$, multiplying by $q(\omega_a)q(\omega_b)$ and integrating with respect to $\mathbb{P}[d\omega]$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} q(\omega_a)q(\omega_b) \left| \text{cov}_{n,h,a,\omega}[X_a, X_c] - \text{cov}_{n,h,a,b,\omega}[X_a, X_c] \right| \mathbb{P}[d\omega] \\ & \leq \lambda^3 \left(4 \max\{q_-, q_+\} e^{2\lambda} \right)^2 \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\{i < l \leq j+i, r-m \leq m-l < j\}} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_{j,h,\cdot}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \right] \\ & \quad + \lambda^3 \left(4 \max\{q_-, q_+\} e^{2\lambda} \right)^2 \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\{i < m \leq j+i, m-l \leq r-m < j\}} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_{j,h,\cdot}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \right] \\ & \leq 2\lambda^3 \left(4 \max\{q_-, q_+\} e^{2\lambda} \right)^2 \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{1}_{\{j > \max\{m-l, r-m\}\}} j \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_{j,h,\cdot}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \right] \\ & \leq \frac{2\lambda^3 \left(4 \max\{q_-, q_+\} e^{2\lambda} \right)^2}{\max\{(m-l+1)^4, (r-m+1)^4\}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} j^5 \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_{j,h,\cdot}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by extracting the square root and carrying out the sum over c we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{c=1}^n \sqrt{\int_{\Omega} q(\omega_a)q(\omega_b) \left| \text{cov}_{n,h,a,\omega}[X_a, X_c] - \text{cov}_{n,h,a,b,\omega}[X_a, X_c] \right| \mathbb{P}[d\omega]} \\ & \leq \frac{\sqrt{2\lambda^3} 64 \max\{q_-, q_+\} e^{2\lambda}}{b-a} \sqrt{\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} j^5 \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_{j,h,\cdot}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \right]}. \end{aligned}$$

The same arguments show that the very same bound holds for the second factor in the right-hand side of (6.33), so that

$$\mathbb{E}[\Lambda_{n,a}\Lambda_{n,b}] \leq \lambda^3 \left(\frac{128 \max\{q_-, q_+\} e^{2\lambda}}{b-a} \right)^2 \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} j^5 \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_{j,h,\cdot}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \right]. \quad (6.34)$$

In conclusion, starting from (6.29), the inequalities (6.32) and (6.34) give

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{a=1}^n \Lambda_{n,a} \right)^2 \right] & \leq G e^\lambda \left(\max\{q_-, q_+\} \lambda \frac{1 + e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}}}{1 - e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}}} \right)^2 \\ & \quad + \lambda^3 \left(128 \pi \max\{q_-, q_+\} e^{2\lambda} \right)^2 \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} j^5 \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_{j,h,\cdot}^{\otimes 2} \left[\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - X_k X'_k) \right] \right], \end{aligned}$$

which proves (6.26) thanks to the arbitrariness of n and Lemma 3.2. \square

Putting the pieces together, we are finally able to demonstrate the CLT for the centering variable $\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]$, which is the last statement of Theorem 1.6.

Proof of part (iii) of Theorem 1.6. Thanks to Lemmas 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3, Theorem 1 of [20] shows that for each $h > h_c$ the ratio $(\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]])/\sqrt{n}$ converges in distribution to a Gaussian random variable with mean 0 and variance w_h as n goes to infinity. Actually, as $\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} (\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]] - \rho_h n)/\sqrt{n} = 0$ by part (ii) of Theorem 1.6, Slutsky's theorem states that also the ratio $(\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n] - \rho_h n)/\sqrt{n}$ converges in distribution to a Gaussian random variable with mean 0 and variance w_h . Lemma 6.3 assures us that $w_h > 0$ if $\int_{\Omega} \omega_0^2 \mathbb{P}[d\omega] > 0$. \square

6.3. Quenched fluctuations. The concentration bound in part (i) of Theorem 1.6 allows us to provide a rough estimate of the rate by which $\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n]$ approaches ρ_h for typical ω as n goes to infinity, as stated by Proposition 1.7.

Proof of Proposition 1.7. We show that there exists $\Omega_o \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\mathbb{P}[\Omega_o] = 1$ such that for all $\omega \in \Omega_o$ and $H \subset (h_c, +\infty)$ compact

$$\limsup_{n \uparrow \infty} \sup_{h \in H} \frac{|\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]]|}{\sqrt{n \ln n}} < +\infty. \quad (6.35)$$

Then, the proposition follows from part (ii) of Theorem 1.6.

For $s \in \mathbb{N}$, put $\alpha_s := -s$ and $\beta_s := s$ if $h_c = -\infty$ and $\alpha_s := h_c + 1/s$ and $\beta_s := h_c + s$ if $h_c > -\infty$. According to part (i) of Theorem 1.6 there exists a constant $\gamma_s > 0$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $u \geq 0$

$$\sup_{h \in [\alpha_s, \beta_s]} \mathbb{P} \left[\left| \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]] \right| > u \right] \leq 2e^{-\frac{\gamma_s u^2}{n+u^{5/3}}}.$$

Let $\Lambda_{n,s}$ be the random variable that maps $\omega \in \Omega$ to

$$\Lambda_{n,s}(\omega) := \max_{i \in \{0, \dots, n^2\}} \left\{ \left| \mathbf{E}_{n, (1-\frac{i}{n^2})\alpha_s + \frac{i}{n^2}\beta_s, \omega}[L_n] - \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{E}_{n, (1-\frac{i}{n^2})\alpha_s + \frac{i}{n^2}\beta_s, \cdot}[L_n] \right] \right| \right\}.$$

Putting $\lambda_s := 8/\gamma_s$ for brevity, for all sufficiently large n we have $(\lambda_s n \ln n)^{\frac{5}{6}} \leq n$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left[\Lambda_{n,s} > \sqrt{\lambda_s n \ln n} \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{i=0}^{n^2} \mathbb{P} \left[\left| \mathbf{E}_{n, (1-\frac{i}{n^2})\alpha_s + \frac{i}{n^2}\beta_s, \cdot}[L_n] - \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{E}_{n, (1-\frac{i}{n^2})\alpha_s + \frac{i}{n^2}\beta_s, \cdot}[L_n] \right] \right| > \sqrt{\lambda_s n \ln n} \right] \\ & \leq 2(n^2 + 1)e^{-\frac{\gamma_s \lambda_s n \ln n}{n + (\lambda_s n \ln n)^{5/6}}} \leq 4n^2 e^{-\frac{\gamma_s \lambda_s}{2} \ln n} = \frac{4}{n^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the Borel–Cantelli lemma ensures us that there exists $\Omega_o \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\mathbb{P}[\Omega_o] = 1$ such that

$$\limsup_{n \uparrow \infty} \frac{\Lambda_{n,s}(\omega)}{\sqrt{\lambda_s n \ln n}} \leq 1 \quad (6.36)$$

for all $\omega \in \Omega_o$ and $s \in \mathbb{N}$. This implies (6.35). In fact, given $\omega \in \Omega_o$ and $H \subset (h_c, +\infty)$ compact there exists $s \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $[\alpha_s, \beta_s] \supseteq H$. In turn, for every $h \in H$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $i \in \{0, \dots, n^2\}$ such that $(1 - i/n^2)\alpha_s + (i/n^2)\beta_s \leq h \leq (1 - i/n^2 - 1/n^2)\alpha_s + (i/n^2 + 1/n^2)\beta_s$. It follows that

$$\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n] = \frac{\mathbf{E}[L_n e^{\sum_{a=1}^n (h+\omega_a) X_a} X_n]}{\mathbf{E}[e^{\sum_{a=1}^n (h+\omega_a) X_a} X_n]} \leq e^{\frac{\beta_s - \alpha_s}{n}} \mathbf{E}_{n, (1-\frac{i}{n^2})\alpha_s + \frac{i}{n^2}\beta_s, \omega}[L_n].$$

Recalling that $e^\zeta \leq 1 + \zeta e^\zeta$ for $\zeta \geq 0$ and that $L_n \leq n$ we find

$$\mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n] \leq \mathbf{E}_{n, (1-\frac{i}{n^2})\alpha_s + \frac{i}{n^2}\beta_s, \omega}[L_n] + (\beta_s - \alpha_s) e^{\beta_s - \alpha_s}. \quad (6.37)$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n] & \geq e^{-\frac{\beta_s - \alpha_s}{n}} \mathbf{E}_{n, (1-\frac{i}{n^2})\alpha_s + \frac{i}{n^2}\beta_s, \omega}[L_n] \\ & \geq \mathbf{E}_{n, (1-\frac{i}{n^2})\alpha_s + \frac{i}{n^2}\beta_s, \omega}[L_n] - (\beta_s - \alpha_s). \end{aligned} \quad (6.38)$$

Bounds (6.37) and (6.38) show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]] \right| \\ & \leq \left| \mathbb{E}_{n,(1-\frac{i}{n^2})\alpha_s + \frac{i}{n^2}\beta_s,\omega}[L_n] - \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_{n,(1-\frac{i}{n^2})\alpha_s + \frac{i}{n^2}\beta_s,\cdot}[L_n] \right] \right| + (\beta_s - \alpha_s)(1 + e^{\beta_s - \alpha_s}) \\ & \leq \Lambda_{n,s}(\omega) + (\beta_s - \alpha_s)(1 + e^{\beta_s - \alpha_s}), \end{aligned}$$

and the arbitrariness of h and n gives

$$\limsup_{n \uparrow \infty} \sup_{h \in H} \frac{|\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\omega}[L_n] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{n,h,\cdot}[L_n]]|}{\sqrt{\lambda_s n \ln n}} \leq 1$$

thanks to (6.36). □

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Quentin Berger and Hubert Lacoin for insightful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Albeverio and X. Y. Zhou, Free energy and some sample path properties of a random walk with random potential, *J. Stat. Phys.* **83** (1996), 573–622.
- [2] K. S. Alexander and N. Zygouras, Path properties of the disordered pinning model in the delocalized regime, *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **24** (2014), 599–615.
- [3] N. H. Bingham, C. M. Goldie, and J. L. Teugels, *Regular Variation* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989).
- [4] Q. Berger, *Interfaces et Polymères Aléatoires*, lecture notes (2023).
- [5] M. Campanino, D. Capocaccia, and B. Tirozzi, The local central limit theorem for Gibbs random fields, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **70** (1979), 125–132.
- [6] F. Caravenna, G. Giacomin and F. L. Toninelli, Copolymers at selective interfaces: settled issues and open problems, *Springer Proc. Math.* **11** (2012), 289–311.
- [7] D. Cheliotis, Y. Chino and J. Poisat, Julien, The random pinning model with correlated disorder given by a renewal set, *Ann. H. Lebesgue* **2** (2019), 281–329.
- [8] R. L. Dobrushin and B. Tirozzi, The central limit theorem and the problem of equivalence of ensembles, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **54** (1977), 173–192.
- [9] H. Döring, S. Jansen, and K. Schubert, The method of cumulants for the normal approximation, *Probab. Surv.* **19** (2022), 185–270.
- [10] H. von Dreifus, A. Klein, and J. Fernando Perez, Taming Griffiths’ singularities: infinite differentiability of quenched correlation functions, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **170** (1995), 21–39.
- [11] G. Giacomin, *Random Polymer Models* (Imperial College Press, World Scientific, 2007).
- [12] G. Giacomin, *Disorder and critical phenomena through basic probability models*, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **2025** (Springer, Heidelberg, 2011).
- [13] G. Giacomin and R. L. Greenblatt, The zeros of the partition function of the pinning model, *Math. Phys. Anal. Geom.* **25** (2022), 16.
- [14] G. Giacomin and B. Havret, Localization, big-jump regime and the effect of disorder for a class of generalized pinning models, *J. Stat. Phys.* **181** (2020), 2015–2049.
- [15] G. Giacomin and F. L. Toninelli, The localized phase of disordered copolymers with adsorption, *Lat. Am. J. Probab.* **1** (2006), 149–180.
- [16] G. Giacomin and F. L. Toninelli, On the irrelevant disorder regime of pinning models *Ann. Probab.* **37** (2009), 1841–1875.
- [17] G. Giacomin and M. Zamparo, The effect of disorder on the big-jump phenomenon in the pinning model, in preparation.
- [18] F. den Hollander, *Random polymers*, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **1974** (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009).
- [19] W. Feller, The general form of the so-called law of the iterated logarithm, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **54** (1943), 373–402.
- [20] S. Janson, Normal convergence by higher semiinvariants with applications to sums of dependent random variables and random graphs, *Ann. Probab.* **16** (1988), 305–312.
- [21] Y. Kafri and D. Mukamel, Griffiths singularities in unbinding of strongly disordered polymers, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91** (2003), 055502.

- [22] H. Lacoïn and J. Sohier, Disorder relevance without Harris criterion: the case of pinning model with γ -stable environment, *Electron. J. Probab.* **22** (2017), 50.
- [23] A. Maurer and M. Pontil, Concentration inequalities under sub-gaussian and sub-exponential conditions, *Adv. Neural Inf. Process.* **34** (2021), 7588–97.
- [24] G. Peccati and M. S. Taqqu, *Wiener Chaos: Moments, Cumulants and Diagrams - A survey with computer implementation* (Springer, Milan, 2011).
- [25] S. B. Shlosman, Signs of the Ising model Ursell functions, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **102** (1986), 679–686.
- [26] G. S. Sylvester, Representations and inequalities for Ising model Ursell functions. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **42** (1975), 209–220.
- [27] F.L. Toninelli, Disordered pinning models and copolymers: beyond annealed bounds, *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **18** (2008), 1569–1587.
- [28] Y. Velenik, Localization and delocalization of random interfaces, *Probab. Surv.* **3** (2006), 112–169.
- [29] M. Zamparo, Large deviations in renewal models of statistical mechanics, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **52** (2019), 495004.
- [30] M. Zamparo, Renewal model for dependent binary sequences, *J. Stat. Phys.* **187** (2022), 5.
- [31] M. Zamparo, Critical fluctuations in renewal models of statistical mechanics, *J. Math. Phys.* **62** (2021), 113301.

UNIVERSITÉ PARIS CITÉ, LABORATOIRE DE PROBABILITÉS, STATISTIQUES ET MODÉLISATION, UMR 8001, F-75205 PARIS, FRANCE

Email address: `giacomini@lpsm.paris`

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DEL PIEMONTE ORIENTALE, DIPARTIMENTO DI SCIENZE E INNOVAZIONE TECNOLOGICA, VIALE TERESA MICHEL 11, I-15121 ALESSANDRIA, ITALY

Email address: `marco.zamparo@uniupo.it`