

ON THE MAXIMAL DISPLACEMENT OF SOME CRITICAL BRANCHING LÉVY PROCESSES WITH STABLE OFFSPRING DISTRIBUTION

CHRISTOPHE PROFETA

ABSTRACT. Let X be a critical branching Lévy process whose offspring distribution is in the domain of attraction of a stable random variable. We study the tail probability of the maximum location ever reached by a particle in two different situations : first when the underlying Lévy process L admits moments of order at least two and is not centered, and then when the distribution of L has a regularly varying tail. This work complements some earlier results in which either L was centered or the offspring distribution was assumed to have moments of order three.

1. STATEMENT OF THE MAIN RESULT

1.1. Introduction. We consider a one-dimensional branching Lévy process X . It is a continuous-time particle system in which the individuals move according to independent Lévy processes, and split at exponential times of parameter 1 into a random number \mathbf{p} of children.

More precisely, an initial particle starts at $t = 0$ from the point $x = 0$ and move accordingly to the law of a Lévy process L . After an exponential time with parameter 1, the particle dies and gives birth to a random number \mathbf{p} of children, whose lives start at the location of their parent's death. The children then behave independently one from another and follow the same stochastic pattern as their parents : they move according to L and branch at rate 1.

We assume that the offspring distribution $\mathbf{p} = (p_k)_{k \geq 0}$ is critical, i.e. $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{p}] = 1$: this implies that the branching process X will die out a.s. As a consequence, one may define its overall maximum \mathbf{M} , that is, the maximum location ever attained by one of the particle. Many papers have been devoted to the study of the asymptotics of \mathbf{M} , generally under the assumption that $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{p}^3] < +\infty$. Such a problem was first introduced when L is a Brownian motion in [6] to model the propagation of a mutant allele in a population. Several generalizations have then been proposed, either for α -stable processes [10, 11] or for spectrally negative Lévy processes [12]. In all these papers, the choice of the offspring distribution plays no real role in the tail asymptotics of \mathbf{M} , as it only appears as a multiplicative constant of its variance.

We shall remove here the condition on the moments of \mathbf{p} and rather assume that \mathbf{p} is in the domain of attraction of a β -stable random variable with $\beta \in (1, 2)$:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} n^\beta \sum_{k=n}^{+\infty} p_k = c_\beta > 0. \quad (1.1)$$

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60J80 ; 60G40 ; 60G51 ; 60G52.

Key words and phrases. Branching Lévy processes ; Maximal displacement ; Stable processes.

In this case, it was recently proven in [8] that if L is centered and admits moments of order strictly greater than $\frac{2\beta}{\beta-1}$, then

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{M} \geq x) \underset{x \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} x^{-\frac{2}{\beta-1}} \times \left(\frac{(\beta+1)\sigma^2}{c_\beta(\beta-1)\Gamma(2-\beta)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \quad (1.2)$$

where σ^2 denotes the variance of L .

Our purpose in this paper is thus twofold. We shall first look at the case when L is not centered in order to complement Formula (1.2), and then a situation when L no longer admits moments of order 2. In the following, we shall assume that all the processes and random variables are defined on the same probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, and we shall denote by \mathbb{P} , with an abuse of notation, both the laws of X and L when started from 0. Also, to avoid trivialities, we always exclude the case where $-L$ is a subordinator (in which case $\mathbf{M} = 0$ a.s.).

Theorem 1. *Let L be a Lévy process which is not a compound Poisson process.*

(1) *If $\mathbb{E}[L_1] > 0$, we assume that there exists $\delta^* > 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}\left[|L_1|^{\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}+\delta^*}\right] < +\infty$. Then,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{M} \geq x) \underset{x \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} x^{-\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \times \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}[L_1]}{c_\beta \Gamma(2-\beta)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}}.$$

(2) *If $\mathbb{E}[L_1] < 0$, we assume that there exists $0 < \omega < +\infty$ such that $\Psi(\omega) = 0$ and that Ψ is analytic in a neighborhood of ω . Then,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{M} \geq x) \underset{x \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} \kappa_\beta \times e^{-\omega x}$$

for some (implicit) constant $\kappa_\beta > 0$.

Theorem 1 along with Formula (1.2) thus shows that there exist three regimes according to the sign of $\mathbb{E}[L_1]$, as is usually the case for standard Lévy processes. Note that when $\mathbb{E}[L_1] < 0$, the exponential decay in Point (2) is the same as that of a free Lévy process L , see [3].

We now look at a situation when L no longer admits moments of order 2 and we shall thus make the following assumption :

Assumption 2. *Set $S_t = \sup_{s \leq t} L_s$ and let \mathbf{e} be an exponential random variable of parameter 1 independent from L .*

(1) *We assume that the asymptotics of $S_{\mathbf{e}}$ and $L_{\mathbf{e}}$ are equivalent and regularly varying of order $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, i.e. that there exists a slowly varying function ℓ_α such that:*

$$\mathbb{P}(S_{\mathbf{e}} \geq x) \underset{x \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} \mathbb{P}(L_{\mathbf{e}} \geq x) \underset{x \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} \ell_\alpha(x)x^{-\alpha}. \quad (1.3)$$

To simplify, we assume that when $\alpha = 1$, the function ℓ_1 is constant.

(2) *We shall also need a control on the negative tail, hence we assume that there exists a finite constant $C_\alpha > 0$ such that:*

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}(L_{\mathbf{e}} \leq -x)}{\mathbb{P}(L_{\mathbf{e}} \geq x)} \leq C_\alpha. \quad (1.4)$$

Under this assumption, we have the following asymptotics for the distribution of \mathbf{M} .

Theorem 3. *Let L be a Lévy process such that Assumption 2 holds. Then, the asymptotics of \mathbf{M} is given by:*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{M} \geq x) \underset{x \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} \ell_{\alpha}^{\frac{1}{\beta}}(x) x^{-\frac{\alpha}{\beta}} \times \left(\frac{\beta - 1}{c_{\beta} \Gamma(2 - \beta)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}.$$

Remark 4. Note that letting formally $\beta \uparrow 2$, we obtain an asymptotic of order $\frac{\alpha}{2}$ which was the order obtained in [11] when L was an α -stable Lévy process and the offspring distribution was supposed to have moments of order at least 3.

1.2. Comments on the hypotheses. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, let us define the Laplace exponent $\Psi(i\lambda) = \ln \mathbb{E} [e^{i\lambda L_1}]$ of the Lévy process L by

$$\Psi(\lambda) = a\lambda + \frac{\eta^2}{2}\lambda^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(e^{\lambda x} - 1 - \lambda x 1_{\{|x| < 1\}} \right) \nu(dx)$$

where $a \in \mathbb{R}$ is the drift coefficient, $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ the Gaussian coefficient and the Lévy measure ν satisfies $\int_{\mathbb{R}} (x^2 \wedge 1) \nu(dx) < +\infty$. With these notations, we have $\mathbb{E}[L_1] = \Psi'(0^+)$ provided the derivative exists. It is known, see [14], that if the tail of the Lévy measure ν of L is regularly varying, i.e.

$$\nu(x, +\infty) \underset{x \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} \ell_{\alpha}(x) x^{-\alpha}$$

then for any fixed $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(S_t \geq x) \underset{x \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} \mathbb{P}(L_t \geq x) \underset{x \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} t \nu(x, +\infty). \quad (1.5)$$

Assumption (1.3) thus supposes that one can integrate this asymptotics in t . This is known to be the case if $\alpha \in (1, 2)$. Indeed, in this case the random variable L_t admits a finite expectation for every $t \geq 0$. Applying [1, Theorem 2.1], we deduce since \mathbf{e} is exponentially distributed with parameter 1 that

$$\mathbb{P}(S_{\mathbf{e}} \geq x) \underset{t \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} \mathbb{P}(L_{\mathbf{e}} \geq x) \underset{t \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{e}] \nu(x, +\infty)$$

which is the expected formula. Another example is obtained when L is a stable Lévy process admitting positive jumps. Indeed, in this case, from Bertoin [2, Chapter VIII, Prop. 4], it is known that there exists a constant κ_{α} such that

$$\mathbb{P}(S_1 \geq x) \underset{x \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} \mathbb{P}(L_1 \geq x) \underset{x \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} \kappa_{\alpha} x^{-\alpha}.$$

Assumption (1.3) then follows from the scaling property and Karamata's Tauberian theorem [4, Theorem 1.7.6] which states that for $\gamma > 0$ and f a positive and decreasing function :

$$\mathcal{L}[f](\lambda) \underset{\lambda \rightarrow 0}{\sim} \frac{1}{\lambda^{\gamma}} \ell \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \right) \iff f(x) \underset{x \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} \frac{1}{\Gamma(\gamma)} x^{\gamma-1} \ell(x), \quad (1.6)$$

where \mathcal{L} denotes the usual Laplace transform on $(0, +\infty)$ and ℓ is a slowly varying function.

1.3. An integral equation. The proof of both theorems relies on the study of an integral equation satisfied by $u(x) := \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{M} \geq x)$ for $x \geq 0$.

Lemma 5. *The function $u : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ satisfies the equation*

$$u(x) = \mathbb{P}(S_{\mathbf{e}} \geq x) + \mathbb{E} [1_{\{S_{\mathbf{e}} < x\}} u(x - L_{\mathbf{e}})] - \mathbb{E} [1_{\{S_{\mathbf{e}} < x\}} F(u(x - L_{\mathbf{e}}))] \quad (1.7)$$

where the function F is defined by

$$F(z) := z - 1 + \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} p_n (1-z)^n = \frac{z^2}{2} \int_0^1 (1-t) \sum_{n=2}^{+\infty} n(n-1) p_n (1-tz)^{n-2} dt.$$

Proof. We start by applying the Markov property at the first branching event :

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{M} < x) = p_0 \mathbb{P}(S_{\mathbf{e}} < x) + \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} p_n \mathbb{P}\left(S_{\mathbf{e}} < x, L_{\mathbf{e}} + \mathbf{M}^{(1)} < x, \dots, L_{\mathbf{e}} + \mathbf{M}^{(n)} < x\right)$$

where the random variables $(\mathbf{M}^{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are independent copies of \mathbf{M} , which are also independent of the pair $(L_{\mathbf{e}}, S_{\mathbf{e}})$. As a consequence, we obtain the integral equation :

$$1 - u(x) = p_0 \mathbb{P}(S_{\mathbf{e}} < x) + \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} p_n \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\{S_{\mathbf{e}} < x\}} (1 - u(x - L_{\mathbf{e}}))^n \right]. \quad (1.8)$$

Plugging into (1.8) the Taylor expansion

$$(1-u)^n = 1 - nu + \frac{n(n-1)}{2} u^2 \int_0^1 (1-ut)^{n-2} (1-t) dt \quad (1.9)$$

then yields, since $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{p}] = \sum np_n = 1$,

$$1 - u(x) = \mathbb{P}(S_{\mathbf{e}} < x) - \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\{S_{\mathbf{e}} < x\}} u(x - L_{\mathbf{e}}) \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\{S_{\mathbf{e}} < x\}} F(u(x - L_{\mathbf{e}})) \right].$$

This is Equation (1.7), after rearranging the terms. \square

We gather below some properties of the function F .

Lemma 6. *The function $F : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is increasing and satisfies:*

- (1) For all $z \in [0, 1]$: $F(z) \leq z$
- (2) The function $z \rightarrow z - F(z)$ is increasing on $[0, 1]$
- (3) F has the asymptotics :

$$F(z) \underset{z \downarrow 0}{\sim} c_{\beta} \frac{\Gamma(2-\beta)}{\beta-1} z^{\beta}.$$

Proof. The fact that F is increasing follows from a change of variable :

$$F(z) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^z (z-s) \sum_{n=2}^{+\infty} n(n-1) p_n (1-s)^{n-2} ds.$$

Points (1) and (2) follow from the observation that for $z \in [0, 1]$,

$$z - F(z) = 1 - \sum_{n \geq 0} (1-z)^n p_n \geq 1 - \sum_{n \geq 0} p_n = 0.$$

Finally, the asymptotics given in Point (3) is classic and we refer to [8, Lemma 3.1] for instance. \square

Remark 7. Before tackling the proofs, we briefly show how one can heuristically recover Formula (1.2) and the formulae of Theorem 1 starting from Lemma 5.

- (1) **Case** $\mathbb{E}[L_1] = 0$. Assume that $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{M} \geq x) \underset{x \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} ax^{-\gamma}$ for $a, \gamma > 0$. Plugging this asymptotics into (1.7) and using Lemma 6, we obtain, neglecting the terms in $S_{\mathbf{e}}$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{a}{(x - L_{\mathbf{e}})^{\gamma}} \right] - ax^{-\gamma} \simeq c_{\beta} \frac{\Gamma(2 - \beta)}{\beta - 1} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{a^{\beta}}{(x - L_{\mathbf{e}})^{\beta\gamma}} \right].$$

Using a Taylor expansion and the fact that L is centered, this yields

$$\frac{a}{x^{\gamma}} \frac{\gamma(\gamma + 1)}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{L_{\mathbf{e}}}{x} \right)^2 \right] \simeq c_{\beta} \frac{\Gamma(2 - \beta)}{\beta - 1} \frac{a^{\beta}}{x^{\beta\gamma}}.$$

By identification of the power of x , we see that $\gamma + 2 = \beta\gamma$, i.e. $\gamma = \frac{2}{\beta - 1}$ and then

$$\frac{\beta + 1}{\beta - 1} \mathbb{E}[L_{\mathbf{e}}^2] = c_{\beta} \Gamma(2 - \beta) a^{\beta - 1}$$

i.e. setting $\sigma^2 = \mathbb{E}[L_{\mathbf{e}}^2] = \mathbb{E}[L_1^2]$ since L is centered, we finally obtain

$$a = \left(\frac{(\beta + 1)\sigma^2}{c_{\beta}(\beta - 1)\Gamma(2 - \beta)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta - 1}}$$

which is the asymptotics (1.2) obtained in [8].

- (2) **Case** $\mathbb{E}[L_1] > 0$. Assuming again that $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{M} \geq x) \underset{x \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} ax^{-\gamma}$ the same heuristic argument yields

$$\frac{a}{x^{\gamma}} \gamma \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{L_{\mathbf{e}}}{x} \right) \right] \simeq c_{\beta} \frac{\Gamma(2 - \beta)}{\beta - 1} \frac{a^{\beta}}{x^{\beta\gamma}},$$

i.e, by identification :

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{M} \geq x) \underset{x \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} x^{-\frac{1}{\beta - 1}} \times \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}[L_{\mathbf{e}}]}{c_{\beta} \Gamma(2 - \beta)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta - 1}}.$$

- (3) **Case** $\mathbb{E}[L_1] < 0$. In this case, we assume that $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{M} \geq x) \underset{x \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} \kappa e^{-\omega x}$ with $\kappa, \omega > 0$. Plugging this asymptotics in (1.7), using Lemma 6 and neglecting again the terms in $S_{\mathbf{e}}$, we obtain :

$$\kappa \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\omega(x - L_{\mathbf{e}})} \right] - \kappa e^{-\omega x} \simeq c_{\beta} \frac{\Gamma(2 - \beta)}{\beta - 1} \kappa^{\beta} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\beta\omega(x - L_{\mathbf{e}})} \right]$$

which requires to hold that $\mathbb{E}[e^{\omega L_{\mathbf{e}}}] = 1$. Note that since \mathbf{e} is independent from L , this condition, known as Cramér's condition, is equivalent to $\mathbb{E}[e^{\omega L_1}] = 1$, or also to $\Psi(\omega) = 0$ as stated in the Theorem.

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

The proof of Theorem 1 is similar to that of [11]. We set $u(x) = 0$ for $x < 0$ and rewrite Equation (1.7) under the form

$$u(x) = \mathbb{E} [1_{\{L_{\mathbf{e}} < x\}} u(x - L_{\mathbf{e}})] - \mathbb{E} [1_{\{L_{\mathbf{e}} < x\}} F(u(x - L_{\mathbf{e}}))] + R(x) \quad (2.1)$$

where the remainder R is given by

$$R(x) = \mathbb{P}(S_{\mathbf{e}} \geq x) + \mathbb{E} \left[(1_{\{S_{\mathbf{e}} < x\}} - 1_{\{L_{\mathbf{e}} < x\}}) (u(x - L_{\mathbf{e}}) - F(u(x - L_{\mathbf{e}}))) \right] - 1_{\{x < 0\}}.$$

Note the presence of the indicator function to take into account that u is null on $(-\infty, 0)$.

Lemma 8. *The remainder R satisfies the following properties :*

- (1) *The function R is negative on $(-\infty, 0)$ and positive on $(0, +\infty)$.*
- (2) *For every $x \geq 0$: $R(x) \leq u(x)$.*
- (3) *There are the bounds*

$$|R(x)| \leq \begin{cases} \mathbb{P}(S_{\mathbf{e}} \geq x) & \text{if } x > 0 \\ \mathbb{P}(L_{\mathbf{e}} < x) & \text{if } x < 0. \end{cases}$$

Proof. By definition, for $x < 0$, we have since $S_{\mathbf{e}} \geq 0$ a.s.

$$R(x) = -\mathbb{E} [1_{\{L_{\mathbf{e}} < x\}} (u(x - L_{\mathbf{e}}) - F(u(x - L_{\mathbf{e}})))] < 0 \quad (2.2)$$

which is negative from Lemma 6. Also, for $x > 0$, since u is null on $(-\infty, 0)$ and $F(0) = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} R(x) &= \mathbb{P}(S_{\mathbf{e}} \geq x) - \mathbb{E} [1_{\{S_{\mathbf{e}} \geq x, L_{\mathbf{e}} < x\}} (u(x - L_{\mathbf{e}}) - F(u(x - L_{\mathbf{e}})))] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[1_{\{S_{\mathbf{e}} \geq x\}} \sum_{n \geq 0} (1 - u(x - L_{\mathbf{e}}))^n p_n \right] \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

which proves Point (1). To prove Point (2), observe that going back to (2.1)

$$u(x) - R(x) = \mathbb{E} [1_{\{L_{\mathbf{e}} < x\}} (u(x - L_{\mathbf{e}}) - F(u(x - L_{\mathbf{e}})))] \geq 0$$

which is positive from Lemma 6. Finally, the bounds on R are direct consequences of (2.2) and (2.3). \square

We now tackle the proof of Theorem 1. In both cases $\mathbb{E}[L_1] > 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[L_1] < 0$, the idea is to transform Formula (2.8) into a more tractable equation from which the asymptotics may be obtained.

2.1. The case $\mathbb{E}[L_1] > 0$. Let us come back to (2.1) and take the Fourier transform of both sides. Applying Lemma 3.4 in [12] to compute the convolution products, we obtain for $\xi \neq 0$:

$$\mathcal{F}[u](\xi) = \mathbb{E} [e^{i\xi L_{\mathbf{e}}}] \mathcal{F}[u](\xi) - \mathbb{E} [e^{i\xi L_{\mathbf{e}}}] \mathcal{F}[F \circ u](\xi) + \mathcal{F}[R](\xi)$$

where the Fourier transform of a function f is defined by

$$\mathcal{F}[f](\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i\xi x} f(x) dx.$$

Note that although we do not know yet that u is integrable, the Fourier transforms of u and $F \circ u$ are nevertheless well-defined for $\xi \neq 0$ since both functions are positive and decreasing on $(0, +\infty)$. Similarly, the Fourier transform of R is well-defined since R is integrable thanks to Point (3) of Lemma 8. By definition of the characteristic function Ψ , we have

$$\mathbb{E} [e^{i\xi L_{\mathbf{e}}}] = \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-t} e^{t\Psi(i\xi)} dt = \frac{1}{1 - \Psi(i\xi)}$$

which yields the equation

$$\mathcal{F}[F \circ u - R](\xi) = \Psi(i\xi) \mathcal{F}[u - R](\xi). \quad (2.4)$$

Let us next define the running infimum $I_t = \inf_{s \leq t} L_s$ of the Lévy process L . Applying the Wiener-Hopf factorisation since L is not a compound Poisson process, see [9, Section 6.4], we have

$$\frac{q}{q - \Psi(i\xi)} = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i\xi I_{e_q}} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i\xi S_{e_q}} \right]$$

where e_q denotes an exponential r.v. of parameter q , independent from L . Since $\mathbb{E}[L_1] > 0$, the Lévy process L converges a.s. to $+\infty$. As a consequence, the random variable $I_\infty = \inf_{t \geq 0} L_t$ is well-defined, and passing to the limit as $q \downarrow 0$, we deduce that

$$-\frac{1}{\Psi(i\xi)} = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i\xi I_\infty} \right] \frac{k}{\kappa(0, -i\xi)} \quad (2.5)$$

where $k > 0$ is some normalization constant and $\kappa(0, -i\xi)$ is the characteristic exponent of the ladder height process H associated to L , i.e.

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{i\xi H_t} \right] = e^{-\kappa(0, -i\xi)t}.$$

In particular, since H is a subordinator, $\kappa(0, -i\xi)$ admits the representation

$$\kappa(0, -i\xi) = b(-i\xi) + \int_0^{+\infty} (1 - e^{i\xi y}) \pi(dy) = (-i\xi) \left(b + \int_0^{+\infty} e^{i\xi y} \bar{\pi}(y) dy \right)$$

where π denotes the Lévy measure of H , $\bar{\pi}(y) = \pi((y, +\infty))$ and b is some non-negative constant. Note also that multiplying (2.5) by ξ and letting $\xi \downarrow 0$ yields the identity

$$b + \int_0^{+\infty} \bar{\pi}(y) dy = k\Psi'(0^+). \quad (2.6)$$

Also, since $\mathbb{E}[|L_1|^{\frac{\beta}{\beta-1} + \delta^*}] < \infty$, we deduce from [13, Théorème 6.2.3] that $\int_0^{+\infty} y^{\frac{1}{\beta-1} + \delta^*} \bar{\pi}(y) dy < +\infty$ which implies, since $\bar{\pi}$ is positive and decreasing, that there exists a constant $C_\pi > 0$ such that for all $x > 0$,

$$\bar{\pi}(x) \leq C_\pi x^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta-1} - \delta^*}. \quad (2.7)$$

Now, plugging (2.5) into (2.4) and integrating by parts, Formula (2.4) becomes

$$k\mathbb{E} \left[e^{i\xi I_\infty} \right] \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i\xi x} \int_x^{+\infty} (F(u(z)) - R(z)) dz = \left(b + \int_0^{+\infty} e^{i\xi y} \bar{\pi}(y) dy \right) \mathcal{F}[u - R](\xi).$$

Inverting the Fourier transforms and using the Fubini-Tonelli theorem, we obtain the key equation:

$$k \int_x^{+\infty} (F(u(y)) - R(y)) \mathbb{P}(I_\infty \geq x - y) dy = b(u(x) - R(x)) + \int_{-\infty}^x (u(z) - R(z)) \bar{\pi}(x - z) dz. \quad (2.8)$$

Note that since u is null on $(-\infty, 0)$, we deduce from Lemma 8 that the last term is the sum of two positive terms

$$\int_{-\infty}^x (u(z) - R(z)) \bar{\pi}(x - z) dz = - \int_{-\infty}^0 R(z) \bar{\pi}(x - z) dz + \int_0^x (u(z) - R(z)) \bar{\pi}(x - z) dz.$$

We now study Equation (2.8). The main difficulty here is to deal with the remainder R and show that it is negligible with respect to u . A first estimate is given by Lemma 8. Indeed, using Etemadi's

inequality (see [7, Theorem 5.11]) and the Markov inequality, we have for $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(S_t \geq 3x) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{s \leq t} |L_s| \geq 3x\right) \leq 3\mathbb{P}(|L_t| \geq x) \leq 3\mathbb{E}\left[|L_t|^{\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}+\delta^*}\right] x^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}-\delta^*}. \quad (2.9)$$

Then, from the independent increments of Lévy processes and the standard inequality $(a+b)^c \leq 2^c(a^c + b^c)$ for $a, b, c > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[|L_t|^{\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}+\delta^*}\right] &\leq 2^{\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}+\delta^*} \left(\mathbb{E}\left[|L_{t-[t]}|^{\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}+\delta^*}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[|L_{[t]}|^{\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}+\delta^*}\right]\right) \\ &\leq 2^{\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}+\delta^*} \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{s \leq 1} |L_s|^{\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}+\delta^*}\right] + [t]^{\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}+\delta^*} \mathbb{E}\left[|L_1|^{\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}+\delta^*}\right]\right) \end{aligned}$$

where $[t]$ denotes the integer part of t and where the last term comes from Minkowski inequality. As a consequence, integrating (2.9) against an exponential function, we deduce from Lemma 8 that there exists a constant $C_R > 0$ such that

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}, \quad |R(x)| \leq C_R |x|^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}-\delta^*}. \quad (2.10)$$

The rest of the proof is decomposed in two steps : starting from (2.8), we first obtain some crude asymptotics on u , which combined with (2.10) will show that R is indeed negligible, and then compute the exact asymptotics.

2.1.1. First bounds.

Lemma 9. *There exist two positive constants κ_1, κ_2 such that*

$$\kappa_1 x^{-\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \leq u(x) \leq \kappa_2 x^{-\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Note that since $\beta \in (1, 2)$, this implies that $\int_0^{+\infty} u(x) dx = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{M}]$ is finite.

Proof. We start with the upper bound. Take $A > 0$ large enough. From Lemma 6, we have for $x \geq A$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_x^{+\infty} F(u(y)) \mathbb{P}(I_\infty \geq x-y) dy &= x \int_1^{+\infty} F(u(xz)) \mathbb{P}(I_\infty \geq x(1-z)) dz \\ &\geq x F(u(2x)) \int_1^2 \mathbb{P}(I_\infty \geq A(1-z)) dz \geq K_0 x (u(2x))^\beta \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $K_0 > 0$. As a consequence, we obtain from (2.8), since R is positive on $(0, \infty)$:

$$k K_0 x (u(2x))^\beta \leq bu(x) + \int_0^x u(x-z) \bar{\pi}(z) dz + kx \int_1^{+\infty} R(xz) dz + \int_{-\infty}^0 |R(z)| \bar{\pi}(x-z) dz.$$

We now set $\gamma(x) = x^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} u(x)$. Multiplying the above expression by $x^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}}$, we obtain on the right-hand side :

$$\begin{aligned} x^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \int_0^x u(x-z) \bar{\pi}(z) dz &\leq 2^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \int_0^x (x-z)^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} u(x-z) \bar{\pi}(z) dz + 2^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \int_0^x z^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} u(x-z) \bar{\pi}(z) dz \\ &\leq 2^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \int_0^x \gamma(x-z) \bar{\pi}(z) dz + 2^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \int_0^{+\infty} z^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \bar{\pi}(z) dz \\ &\leq 2^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \sup_{y \in (0, x)} \gamma(y) \int_0^{+\infty} \bar{\pi}(z) dz + 2^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \int_0^{+\infty} z^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \bar{\pi}(z) dz \end{aligned}$$

and, using the bound (2.10),

$$\begin{aligned}
& kx^{\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}} \int_1^{+\infty} R(xy)dy + x^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \int_{-\infty}^0 |R(z)|\bar{\pi}(x-z)dz \\
& \leq kC_R x^{-\delta^*} \int_1^{+\infty} y^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}-\delta^*} dy + x^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \int_x^{+\infty} |R(x-z)|\bar{\pi}(z)dz \\
& \leq \frac{kC_R}{\frac{1}{\beta-1} + \delta^*} A^{-\delta^*} + \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} |R(z)| \int_0^{+\infty} z^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \bar{\pi}(z) dz.
\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, for x large enough, there exist two positive constants K_1 and K_2 such that

$$K_1 \gamma^\beta(2x) \leq b\gamma(x) + 2^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \sup_{y \in (0,x)} \gamma(y) \int_0^{+\infty} \bar{\pi}(z) dz + K_2.$$

We now take the supremum on x in (A, n) with $n > A$,

$$K_1 \sup_{x \in (2A, 2n)} \gamma^\beta(x) \leq b \sup_{x \in (A, n)} \gamma(x) + 2^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \sup_{x \in (0, n)} \gamma(x) \int_0^{+\infty} \bar{\pi}(z) dz + K_2$$

i.e., there exists a constant $K_3 > 0$, independent from n , such that

$$K_1 \sup_{x \in (2A, 2n)} \gamma^\beta(x) \leq \left(b + 2^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \int_0^{+\infty} \bar{\pi}(z) dz \right) \sup_{x \in (2A, 2n)} \gamma(x) + K_3.$$

Finally, we deduce that

$$K_1 \sup_{x \in (2A, 2n)} \gamma^{\beta-1}(x) \leq \left(b + 2^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \int_0^{+\infty} \bar{\pi}(z) dz \right) + \frac{K_3}{\sup_{x \in (2A, 2n)} \gamma(x)}$$

and letting $n \rightarrow +\infty$ yields

$$\sup_{x \in (2A, +\infty)} \gamma^{\beta-1}(x) < +\infty.$$

This gives the upper bound since $\beta > 1$.

We now look at the lower bound. Observe first from Lemmas 6 and 8 that for $x \geq 0$

$$u(x) - R(x) \geq \mathbb{E}[1_{\{0 \leq L_e \leq x\}} (u(x - L_e) - F(u(x - L_e)))] \geq \mathbb{P}(0 \leq L_e < x) (u(x) - F(u(x))).$$

Using the asymptotics of F and the fact that $-L$ is not a subordinator, we deduce that there exists $A > 0$ large enough and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\forall x \geq A, \quad u(x) - R(x) \geq \gamma u(x). \quad (2.11)$$

We now go back to (2.8) and write for $x \geq A$:

$$k \int_x^{+\infty} (F(u(y)) - R(y)) \mathbb{P}(I_\infty \geq x - y) dy \geq b\gamma u(x) + \gamma \int_A^x u(z) \bar{\pi}(x - z) dz.$$

Since u is decreasing and R is positive on $(0, +\infty)$, we further obtain :

$$k \int_x^{+\infty} F(u(y)) dy \geq \gamma \left(b + \int_0^{x-A} \bar{\pi}(z) dz \right) u(x). \quad (2.12)$$

Applying Lemma 6, we then obtain that there exists a constant $K_4 > 0$ such that for $x \geq 2A$,

$$K_4 \geq \frac{u(x)}{\int_x^{+\infty} u^\beta(y) dy}.$$

Elevating both sides to the power β and then integrating on $(2A, z)$ with $z > 2A$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} K_4^\beta(z - 2A) &\geq \left[\frac{1}{\beta - 1} \left(\int_x^{+\infty} u^\beta(y) dy \right)^{1-\beta} \right]_{2A}^z \\ &= \frac{1}{\beta - 1} \left(\int_z^{+\infty} u^\beta(y) dy \right)^{1-\beta} - \frac{1}{\beta - 1} \left(\int_{2A}^{+\infty} u^\beta(y) dy \right)^{1-\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, there exists a constant $K_5 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for z large enough

$$\left(\frac{1}{(\beta - 1)K_4^\beta z + K_5} \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \leq \int_z^{+\infty} u^\beta(y) dy.$$

Finally, for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, we have from the first part of the proof

$$\int_z^{+\infty} u^\beta(y) dy \leq u^\varepsilon(z) \int_z^{+\infty} u^{\beta-\varepsilon}(y) dy \leq \kappa_2(u(z))^\varepsilon z^{-\frac{1-\varepsilon}{\beta-1}}$$

for some constant $\kappa_2 > 0$, hence

$$u(z) \geq \kappa_2^{-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} \left(\frac{1}{(\beta - 1)K_4^\beta z + K_5} \right)^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon(\beta-1)}} z^{\frac{1-\varepsilon}{\varepsilon(\beta-1)}}$$

and

$$\liminf_{z \rightarrow +\infty} z^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} u(z) \geq \left(\kappa_2((\beta - 1)K_4^\beta)^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \right)^{-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} > 0$$

which concludes the proof of the lower bound of Lemma 9. \square

2.1.2. *The asymptotics of Theorem 1 when $\mathbb{E}[L_1] > 0$.*

Lemma 10. *It holds*

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} x^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \int_x^{+\infty} u^\beta(y) dy = (\beta - 1) \left(\frac{\Psi'(0^+)}{c_\beta \Gamma(2 - \beta)} \right)^{\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}}.$$

Point (1) of Theorem 1 then follows from Lemma 10 using the monotone density theorem for regularly varying functions, since the function $x \rightarrow \int_x^{+\infty} u^\beta(y) dy$ has a monotone derivative, see for instance [4, Theorem 1.7.2].

Proof. Notice first that from Lemma 6, it is equivalent to show that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} x^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \int_x^{+\infty} F(u(y)) dy = \left(\frac{(\Psi'(0^+))^\beta}{c_\beta \Gamma(2 - \beta)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}}.$$

Also, from Lemma 9, there exist two constants $\kappa_1, \kappa_2 > 0$ such that for x large enough

$$\kappa_1 x^{-\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \leq \int_x^{+\infty} F(u(y)) dy \leq \kappa_2 x^{-\frac{1}{\beta-1}}. \quad (2.13)$$

We start with the lower bound, going back to (2.8). Since u is decreasing, we have

$$k \int_x^{+\infty} F(u(y))dy \geq \left(b + \int_0^x \bar{\pi}(y)dy \right) u(x) - bR(x) - \int_0^x R(z)\bar{\pi}(x-z)dz.$$

i.e.

$$\frac{1}{\left(b + \int_0^x \bar{\pi}(y)dy \right)} \left(k + \frac{bR(x) + \int_0^x R(z)\bar{\pi}(x-z)dz}{\int_x^{+\infty} F(u(y))dy} \right) \geq \frac{u(x)}{\int_x^{+\infty} F(u(y))dy}.$$

From (2.7) and (2.10), we have the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^x R(z)\bar{\pi}(x-z)dz &\leq \bar{\pi}\left(\frac{x}{2}\right) \int_0^{x/2} R(z)dz + C_R \int_{x/2}^x z^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}-\delta^*} \bar{\pi}(x-z)dz \\ &\leq 2^{\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}+\delta^*} C_\pi x^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}-\delta^*} \int_0^{+\infty} R(z)dz + C_R x^{-\frac{1}{\beta-1}-\delta^*} \int_{1/2}^1 z^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}-\delta^*} \bar{\pi}(x(1-z))dz. \end{aligned}$$

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. As a consequence of the previous inequality and (2.6), we may take $A > 0$ large enough such that for any $x \geq A$:

$$\left| \frac{bR(x) + \int_0^x R(z)\bar{\pi}(x-z)dy}{\int_x^{+\infty} F(u(y))dy} \right| \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad b + \int_0^x \bar{\pi}(y)dy \geq k\Psi'(0^+) - \varepsilon.$$

This yields, from Lemma 6 and x large enough

$$\frac{k + \varepsilon}{k\Psi'(0^+) - \varepsilon} \geq \frac{u(x)}{\int_x^{+\infty} F(u(y))dy} \geq \frac{\beta - 1}{c_\beta \Gamma(2 - \beta)(1 + \varepsilon)} \frac{u(x)}{\int_x^{+\infty} u^\beta(y)dy}.$$

Elevating both sides to the power β and integrating on (A, z) with $z > A$, we obtain as before

$$\left(c_\beta \frac{\Gamma(2 - \beta)}{\beta - 1} \frac{(k + \varepsilon)(1 + \varepsilon)}{k\Psi'(0^+) - \varepsilon} \right)^\beta (z - A) \geq \frac{1}{\beta - 1} \left(\int_z^{+\infty} u^\beta(y)dy \right)^{1-\beta} - \frac{1}{\beta - 1} \left(\int_A^{+\infty} u^\beta(y)dy \right)^{1-\beta}$$

i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_z^{+\infty} u^\beta(y)dy &\geq (\beta - 1)^{-\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \left(\left(c_\beta \frac{\Gamma(2 - \beta)}{\beta - 1} \frac{(k + \varepsilon)(1 + \varepsilon)}{k\Psi'(0^+) - \varepsilon} \right)^\beta (z - A) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{\beta - 1} \left(\int_A^{+\infty} u^\beta(y)dy \right)^{1-\beta} \right)^{-\frac{1}{\beta-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying both sides by $z^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}}$ and letting $z \rightarrow +\infty$, we deduce that

$$\liminf_{z \rightarrow +\infty} z^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \int_z^{+\infty} u^\beta(y)dy \geq (\beta - 1) \left(\frac{k\Psi'(0^+) - \varepsilon}{c_\beta \Gamma(2 - \beta)(k + \varepsilon)(1 + \varepsilon)} \right)^{\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}}$$

which gives the limit inferior by letting $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$.

We now look at the upper bound. Take $\varepsilon > 0$ and observe first that since u is decreasing and R is positive on $(0, +\infty)$,

$$k \int_{x(1+\varepsilon)}^{+\infty} (F(u(y)) - R(y)) \mathbb{P}(I_\infty \geq x(1 + \varepsilon) - y) dy$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq bu(x) + \int_0^x u(z)\bar{\pi}(x(1+\varepsilon)-z)dz + \int_x^{x(1+\varepsilon)} u(z)\bar{\pi}(x(1+\varepsilon)-z)dz - \int_{-\infty}^0 R(z)\bar{\pi}(x(1+\varepsilon)-z)dz \\
&\leq \left(b + \int_x^{x(1+\varepsilon)} \bar{\pi}(x(1+\varepsilon)-z)dz \right) u(x) + \bar{\pi}(x\varepsilon) \int_0^x u(z)dz + \int_{-\infty}^0 |R(z)|\bar{\pi}(x(1+\varepsilon)-z)dz \\
&\leq k\Psi'(0^+)u(x) + \bar{\pi}(x\varepsilon)\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{M}] + \bar{\pi}(x) \int_{-\infty}^0 |R(z)|dz.
\end{aligned}$$

We now rewrite this expression under the form

$$k \int_x^{+\infty} F(u(y))dy \leq k\Psi'(0^+)u(x) + \bar{\pi}(x\varepsilon)\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{M}] + \bar{\pi}(x) \int_{-\infty}^0 |R(z)|dz + \Delta_R(x) + \Delta_F(x) \quad (2.14)$$

where

$$\Delta_R(x) := k \int_{x(1+\varepsilon)}^{+\infty} R(y)\mathbb{P}(I_\infty \geq x(1+\varepsilon)-y) dy$$

and

$$\Delta_F(x) := k \int_x^{x(1+\varepsilon)} F(u(y))dy + k \int_{x(1+\varepsilon)}^{+\infty} F(u(y))\mathbb{P}(I_\infty < x(1+\varepsilon)-y) dy.$$

We now proceed as for the lower bound and start by controlling the remainders thanks to (2.13). From (2.10), we have, using a change of variables,

$$\left| \frac{\Delta_R(x)}{k \int_x^{+\infty} F(u(y))dy} \right| \leq \frac{1}{\kappa_1} C_R x^{-\delta^*} \int_{1+\varepsilon}^{+\infty} z^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}-\delta^*} dz \xrightarrow{x \rightarrow +\infty} 0$$

while, using Lemmas 6 and 9, as well as the monotone convergence theorem,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{\Delta_F(x)}{k \int_x^{+\infty} F(u(y))dy} \right| &\leq \frac{\kappa_2}{\kappa_1} x^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \left(\int_x^{x(1+\varepsilon)} y^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}} dy + \int_{x(1+\varepsilon)}^{+\infty} y^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}} \mathbb{P}(I_\infty < x(1+\varepsilon)-y) dy \right) \\
&\leq \frac{\kappa_2}{\kappa_1} \left(\varepsilon + \int_{1+\varepsilon}^{+\infty} z^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}} \mathbb{P}(I_\infty < x(1+\varepsilon)-xz) dz \right) \\
&\xrightarrow{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\kappa_2}{\kappa_1} \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

From (2.7), the last terms are also negligible :

$$\left| \frac{\bar{\pi}(x\varepsilon)\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{M}] + \bar{\pi}(x) \int_{-\infty}^0 |R(z)|dz}{\int_x^{+\infty} F(u(y))dy} \right| \leq \frac{C\pi}{\kappa_1} x^{-1-\delta^*} \left(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{M}] \varepsilon^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}-\delta^*} + \int_{-\infty}^0 |R(z)|dz \right) \xrightarrow{x \rightarrow +\infty} 0.$$

As a consequence,

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow +\infty} G_\varepsilon(x) := \limsup_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\bar{\pi}(x\varepsilon)\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{M}] + \bar{\pi}(x) \int_{-\infty}^0 |R(z)|dz + \Delta_R(x) + \Delta_F(x)}{k \int_x^{+\infty} F(u(y))dy} \leq \frac{\kappa_2}{\kappa_1} \varepsilon.$$

Finally, taking $A > 0$ large enough, we may rewrite Equation (2.14) for $x \geq A$ under the form :

$$\frac{1 - \sup_{r \geq A} G_\varepsilon(r)}{\Psi'(0^+)} \leq \frac{u(x)}{\int_x^{+\infty} F(u(y))dy} \leq \frac{\beta-1}{c_\beta \Gamma(2-\beta)(1-\varepsilon)} \frac{u(x)}{\int_x^{+\infty} u^\beta(y)dy}.$$

Elevating to the power β and integrating on (A, z) with $z > A$, we deduce that

$$(\beta-1) \left(\frac{c_\beta \Gamma(2-\beta)(1-\varepsilon)(1-\sup_{r \geq A} G_\varepsilon(r))}{(\beta-1)\Psi'(0^+)} \right)^\beta (z-A) \leq \left(\int_z^{+\infty} u^\beta(y) dy \right)^{1-\beta} - \left(\int_A^{+\infty} u^\beta(y) dy \right)^{1-\beta}$$

and proceeding as before, we obtain that

$$\limsup_{z \rightarrow +\infty} z^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \int_z^{+\infty} u^\beta(y) dy \leq (\beta-1) \left(\frac{\Psi'(0^+)}{c_\beta \Gamma(2-\beta)(1-\varepsilon)(1-\sup_{r \geq A} G_\varepsilon(r))} \right)^{\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}}.$$

The upper bound follows by letting $A \uparrow +\infty$ and $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. \square

2.2. The case $\mathbb{E}[L_1] < 0$. The situation where $\mathbb{E}[L_1] < 0$ is easier to deal with as the assumption that L admits some (positive) exponential moments will allow us to work with Laplace transforms. We first check that u is indeed at least exponentially decreasing.

Lemma 11. *It holds*

$$\int_0^{+\infty} e^{\omega z} F(u(z)) dz < +\infty.$$

Proof. Notice first that Ψ being convex, we have $\Psi(\lambda) \leq 0$ for all $\lambda \in [0, \omega]$. In particular, $\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda L_e}] = 1/(1-\Psi(\lambda)) < +\infty$ and we deduce from the Wiener Hopf factorisation that $\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda S_e}]$ is also finite for $\lambda \in [0, \omega]$. Using Lemma 8, this implies that

$$\int_0^{+\infty} e^{\omega x} R(x) dx \leq \frac{1}{\omega} \mathbb{E}[e^{\omega S_e}] < +\infty.$$

Now, to prove Lemma 11, we start by integrating Equation (2.1) against $\exp(\omega x - \frac{1}{n} e^{\omega x})$ on $(0, +\infty)$, where $n > 0$. This yields, after a change of variables

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{+\infty} 1_{\{z \geq -L_e\}} e^{\omega L_e} e^{\omega z - \frac{1}{n} e^{\omega z + \omega L_e}} F(u(z)) dz \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{+\infty} 1_{\{z \geq -L_e\}} e^{\omega L_e} e^{\omega z - \frac{1}{n} e^{\omega z + \omega L_e}} u(z) dz \right] - \int_0^{+\infty} e^{\omega x - \frac{1}{n} e^{\omega x}} (u(x) - R(x)) dx \end{aligned}$$

i.e., since F is positive,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{+\infty} 1_{\{L_e \geq 0\}} e^{\omega L_e} e^{\omega z - \frac{1}{n} e^{\omega z + \omega L_e}} F(u(z)) dz \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{+\infty} e^{\omega L_e} e^{\omega z - \frac{1}{n} e^{\omega z + \omega L_e}} u(z) dz \right] - \int_0^{+\infty} e^{\omega x - \frac{1}{n} e^{\omega x}} (u(x) - R(x)) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating by parts the terms in u on the right-hand side, we obtain

$$\frac{n}{\omega} \left[\left(e^{-\frac{1}{n} e^{\omega z}} - e^{-\frac{1}{n} e^{\omega z + \omega L_e}} \right) u(z) \right]_0^{+\infty} + \frac{n}{\omega} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{+\infty} \left(e^{-\frac{1}{n} e^{\omega z + \omega L_e}} - e^{-\frac{1}{n} e^{\omega z}} \right) u'(z) dz \right].$$

Since u' is negative, we deduce from Jensen inequality and the definition of ω that this last expression is smaller than

$$\frac{n}{\omega} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{1}{n} e^{\omega L_e}} - e^{-\frac{1}{n}} \right] + \int_0^{+\infty} \left(e^{-\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[e^{\omega z + \omega L_e}]} - e^{-\frac{1}{n} e^{\omega z}} \right) u'(z) dz = \frac{n}{\omega} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{1}{n} e^{\omega L_e}} - e^{-\frac{1}{n}} \right] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} 0.$$

As a consequence, we obtain the upper bound

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{+\infty} 1_{\{L_e \geq 0\}} e^{\omega L_e} e^{\omega z - \frac{1}{n} e^{\omega z + \omega L_e}} F(u(z)) dz \right] \leq \int_0^{+\infty} e^{\omega x} R(x) dx < +\infty.$$

Letting $n \rightarrow +\infty$ and applying the monotone convergence theorem yields

$$\mathbb{E} [1_{\{L_e \geq 0\}} e^{\omega L_e}] \int_0^{+\infty} e^{\omega z} F(u(z)) dz < +\infty$$

which proves from Lemma 6 that u is at least exponentially decreasing. \square

Taking the two-sided Laplace transform of Equation (2.1) for λ small enough, we obtain :

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\lambda x} u(x) dx = \mathbb{E} [e^{\lambda L_e}] \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\lambda x} u(x) dx - \mathbb{E} [e^{\lambda L_e}] \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\lambda x} F(u(x)) dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\lambda x} R(x) dx$$

i.e., from the definition of Ψ as the Laplace exponent of L ,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\lambda x} (F(u(x)) - R(x)) dx = \Psi(\lambda) \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\lambda x} (u(x) - R(x)) dx. \quad (2.15)$$

Furthermore, for $0 < \lambda < \omega$,

$$-\frac{1}{\Psi(\lambda)} = \int_0^{+\infty} e^{t\Psi(\lambda)} dt = \int_0^{+\infty} \int_0^{+\infty} e^{\lambda z} \mathbb{P}(L_t \in dz) dt = \int_0^{+\infty} e^{\lambda z} U(dz)$$

where U denotes the potential of L . We then set, following [3],

$$U(dz) = e^{-\omega z} U^*(dz)$$

where U^* denotes the potential of the associated Lévy process L^* whose Laplace exponent is given by $\Psi^*(\lambda) = \Psi(\lambda + \omega)$. In particular, $(\Psi^*)'(0) = \Psi'(\omega^+) = \mathbb{E}[L_1^*] > 0$ by the convexity of Ψ . Note that $\mathbb{E}[L_1^*]$ is necessarily finite since we have assumed that Ψ is analytic in a neighborhood of ω . Inverting Formula (2.15), we obtain :

$$\begin{aligned} u(x) - R(x) &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}} (F(u(x-y)) - R(x-y)) e^{-\omega y} U^*(dy) \\ &= -e^{-\omega x} \int_0^{+\infty} \mathbb{E}_{-x} \left[(F(u(-L_t^*)) - R(-L_t^*)) e^{-\omega L_t^*} \right] dt. \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

Applying the renewal theorem [2, Chapter I, Theorem 21], we deduce that

$$- \int_0^{+\infty} \mathbb{E}_{-x} \left[(F(u(-L_t^*)) - R(-L_t^*)) e^{-\omega L_t^*} \right] dt \xrightarrow{x \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[L_1^*]} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\omega z} (F(u(z)) - R(z)) dz$$

which is finite from Lemma 11. It remains to check that this constant is not null. We shall proceed by contradiction. Let us assume that $\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\omega z} (F(u(z)) - R(z)) dz = 0$. Dividing (2.15) by $\lambda - \omega$ and letting $\lambda \uparrow \omega$, we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\omega x} x (F(u(x)) - R(x)) dx = \Psi'(\omega^-) \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\omega x} (u(x) - R(x)) dx$$

which implies that $\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\omega x} (u(x) - R(x)) dx$ is finite. As a consequence, we deduce by analytic continuation that the equality

$$\frac{1}{\Psi(\lambda)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\lambda x} (F(u(x)) - R(x)) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\lambda x} (u(x) - R(x)) dx$$

also holds for $\lambda \in (\omega, \omega + 2\varepsilon)$ with $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough. In particular, this implies that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{(\omega+\varepsilon)x} u(x) dx = \mathbb{E}[e^{(\omega+\varepsilon)\mathbf{M}}] < +\infty.$$

But, looking only at one path of the branching process X , we have $\mathbb{E}[e^{(\omega+\varepsilon)\mathbf{M}}] \geq \mathbb{E}[e^{(\omega+\varepsilon)S_\zeta}]$ where ζ denotes the extinction time of X , which is independent of S . Since from Lemma 6 the generating function of the offspring distribution satisfies

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} s^k p_k = s + F(1-s) = s + (1-s)^\beta \times L(1-s)$$

where L is a slowly varying function, we deduce from [5, Theorem 2] that the asymptotics of the tail of ζ is given by $\mathbb{P}(\zeta > t) \underset{t \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} t^{-\frac{1}{\beta-1}} L^*(t)$ for some slowly varying function L^* . As a consequence,

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{(\omega+\varepsilon)S_\zeta}] \geq \mathbb{E}[e^{(\omega+\varepsilon)L_\zeta}] = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{t\Psi(\omega+\varepsilon)} \mathbb{P}(\zeta \in dt) = +\infty$$

since $\Psi(\omega + \varepsilon) > 0$. This contradicts the finiteness of the $\omega + \varepsilon$ exponential moment of \mathbf{M} . \square

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 3

We now tackle the case when L no longer admits moments of order 2. In the following, we need to separate the two cases $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $\alpha \in (1, 2)$, as in the latter case, we will have to deal with an extra term since the expectation of L_1 is finite.

3.1. The case $\alpha \in (0, 1]$. To simplify the notation, we set

$$\eta_\alpha(\lambda) = \begin{cases} \Gamma(1-\alpha) \ell_\alpha(1/\lambda) \lambda^{\alpha-1} & \text{if } \alpha \in (0, 1) \\ -\ell_1 \ln(\lambda) & \text{if } \alpha = 1 \end{cases}$$

so that from Assumption 2 and the Tauberian theorem (1.6), together with a direct calculation when $\alpha = 1$, we have

$$\frac{1 - \mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda S_e}]}{\lambda} \underset{\lambda \downarrow 0}{\sim} \frac{1 - \mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda L_e^+}]}{\lambda} \underset{\lambda \downarrow 0}{\sim} \eta_\alpha(\lambda). \quad (3.1)$$

3.1.1. A key lemma. The proof will rely on the following Lemma which will be used repeatedly in the sequel :

Lemma 12. *Let f be a positive and non-increasing function such that $\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} f(x) = 0$. Then*

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\eta_\alpha(\lambda)} \left(\mathcal{L}[f](\lambda) - \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} \mathbb{E}[1_{\{S_e < x\}} f(x - L_e)] dx \right) = 0.$$

Proof. Observe first that since $L_e \leq S_e$ a.s. and f is non-increasing, we have $f(x - L_e) \leq f(x - S_e)$ a.s. Applying the Fubini-Tonelli theorem to compute the convolution product, this implies that :

$$\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} \mathbb{E}[1_{\{S_e < x\}} f(x - L_e)] dx \leq \mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda S_e}] \mathcal{L}[f](\lambda).$$

As a consequence, for all $\lambda > 0$,

$$\mathcal{L}[f](\lambda) - \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} \mathbb{E} [1_{\{S_e < x\}} f(x - L_e)] dx \geq \left(1 - \mathbb{E} [e^{-\lambda S_e}]\right) \mathcal{L}[f](\lambda) \geq 0. \quad (3.2)$$

Conversely, using that $1_{\{S_e < x\}} - 1_{\{L_e < x\}} \leq 0$ a.s., we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} \mathbb{E} [1_{\{S_e < x\}} f(x - L_e)] dx \\ &= \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} \mathbb{E} [(1_{\{S_e < x\}} - 1_{\{L_e < x\}}) f(x - L_e)] dx + \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} \mathbb{E} [1_{\{L_e < x\}} f(x - L_e)] dx \\ &\geq f(0) \frac{\mathbb{E} [e^{-\lambda S_e}] - \mathbb{E} [e^{-\lambda L_e^+}]}{\lambda} + \mathbb{E} [e^{-\lambda L_e} 1_{\{L_e \geq 0\}}] \mathcal{L}[f](\lambda) + \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} \mathbb{E} [1_{\{L_e < 0\}} f(x - L_e)] dx. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the Fubini-Tonelli theorem and a change of variable in the last integral yields :

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} \mathbb{E} [1_{\{L_e < 0\}} f(x - L_e)] dx &= \mathbb{E} \left[1_{\{L_e < 0\}} \int_{-L_e}^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda z - \lambda L_e} f(z) dz \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}(L_e < 0) \mathcal{L}[f](\lambda) - \mathbb{E} \left[1_{\{L_e < 0\}} \int_0^{-L_e} e^{-\lambda z} f(z) dz \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging everything together, we thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\mathcal{L}[f](\lambda) - \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} \mathbb{E} [1_{\{S_e < x\}} f(x - L_e)] dx \right) \\ & \leq f(0) \frac{\mathbb{E} [e^{-\lambda L_e^+}] - \mathbb{E} [e^{-\lambda S_e}]}{\lambda} + \left(1 - \mathbb{E} [e^{-\lambda L_e^+}]\right) \mathcal{L}[f](\lambda) + \mathbb{E} \left[1_{\{L_e < 0\}} \int_0^{-L_e} e^{-\lambda z} f(z) dz \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Now, from (3.1), the first term on the right-hand side converges towards 0,

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\eta_\alpha(\lambda)} \frac{\mathbb{E} [e^{-\lambda L_e^+}] - \mathbb{E} [e^{-\lambda S_e}]}{\lambda} = 0$$

and as above, using a change of variable and the monotone convergence theorem,

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\eta_\alpha(\lambda)} \left(1 - \mathbb{E} [e^{-\lambda L_e^+}]\right) \mathcal{L}[f] = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\eta_\alpha(\lambda)} \frac{1 - \mathbb{E} [e^{-\lambda L_e^+}]}{\lambda} \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-z} f\left(\frac{z}{\lambda}\right) dz = 0.$$

Finally, to show that the last term on the right-hand side of (3.3) also converges towards 0, let us take $\varepsilon > 0$. By assumption on f , there exists A_ε such that $f(x) \leq \varepsilon$ for any $x \geq A_\varepsilon$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[1_{\{L_e < 0\}} \int_0^{-L_e} e^{-\lambda z} f(z) dz \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{A_\varepsilon} e^{-\lambda z} f(z) 1_{\{L_e < 0\}} 1_{\{z < -L_e\}} dz + \varepsilon \int_{A_\varepsilon}^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda z} 1_{\{L_e < 0\}} 1_{\{z < -L_e\}} dz \right] \\ & \leq A_\varepsilon f(0) + \varepsilon \int_{A_\varepsilon}^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda z} \mathbb{P}(L_e < -z) dz \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq A_\varepsilon f(0) + \varepsilon C_\alpha \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda z} \mathbb{P}(L_e > z) dz$$

where the last inequality follows from Assumption (1.4), by taking A_ε large enough. As a consequence, we deduce that

$$\limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\eta_\alpha(\lambda)} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\{L_e < 0\}} \int_0^{-L_e} e^{-\lambda z} u(z) dz \right] \leq \varepsilon C_\alpha$$

which proves Lemma 12. \square

3.1.2. *Proof of Theorem 3 when $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.* Let us take the Laplace transform of the integral equation (1.7) satisfied by u . We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}[u](\lambda) - \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{1}_{\{S_e < x\}} u(x - L_e)] dx \\ = \frac{1 - \mathbb{E} [e^{-\lambda S_e}]}{\lambda} - \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{1}_{\{S_e < x\}} F(u(x - L_e))] dx. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

Applying Lemma 12 with $f = u$, we deduce thanks to (3.1) that

$$\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{1}_{\{S_e < x\}} F(u(x - L_e))] dx \underset{\lambda \rightarrow 0}{\sim} \eta_\alpha(\lambda).$$

Applying next Lemma 12 with $f = F \circ u$, we obtain

$$\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} F(u(x)) dx \underset{\lambda \rightarrow 0}{\sim} \eta_\alpha(\lambda).$$

As a consequence, when $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we conclude from the Tauberian theorem (1.6), since $F \circ u$ is decreasing, that

$$F(u(x)) \underset{x \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} \ell_\alpha(x) x^{-\alpha}.$$

Finally, from Lemma 6, since $u(x) \xrightarrow{x \rightarrow +\infty} 0$, this implies that

$$u(x) \underset{x \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{\beta - 1}{c_\beta \Gamma(2 - \beta)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \ell_\alpha^{\frac{1}{\beta}}(x) x^{-\frac{\alpha}{\beta}}$$

which is the announced asymptotics. When $\alpha = 1$, we obtain, using the integrated version of Karamata's Tauberian theorem [4, Theorem 1.7.1]

$$\int_0^x F(u(z)) dz \underset{x \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} \ell_1 \ln(x) \quad (3.5)$$

but we unfortunately cannot differentiate this equivalence as such. We shall end the proof of this case after dealing with the situation $\alpha \in (1, 2)$. \square

3.2. The case $\alpha \in (1, 2)$. The main difference with the previous case is that the expectations of $L_{\mathbf{e}}$ and $S_{\mathbf{e}}$ are now finite. As a consequence, Assumption 2 and the Tauberian theorem (1.6) yields the asymptotics

$$\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} x \mathbb{P}(S_{\mathbf{e}} \geq x) dx = \frac{1 - \mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda S_{\mathbf{e}}}] - \lambda \mathbb{E}[S_{\mathbf{e}} e^{-\lambda S_{\mathbf{e}}}]}{\lambda^2} \underset{\lambda \downarrow 0}{\sim} \Gamma(2 - \alpha) \ell_{\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \right) \lambda^{\alpha-2} \quad (3.6)$$

and likewise for $L_{\mathbf{e}}$. We proceed as before and start by a result similar to Lemma 12.

3.2.1. A key lemma.

Lemma 13. *Let f be a positive, differentiable and non-increasing function such that*

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\ell_{\alpha}(1/\lambda)} \lambda^{2-\alpha} \mathcal{L}[f](\lambda) = 0. \quad (3.7)$$

We write xf for the function $x \rightarrow xf(x)$. Then

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\ell_{\alpha}(1/\lambda)} \lambda^{2-\alpha} \left(\mathcal{L}[xf](\lambda) - \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} x \mathbb{E}[1_{\{S_{\mathbf{e}} < x\}} f(x - L_{\mathbf{e}})] dx \right) = 0.$$

Proof. Observe first that using the monotony of f and the decomposition $x = x - S_{\mathbf{e}} + S_{\mathbf{e}}$, we have

$$\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} x \mathbb{E}[1_{\{S_{\mathbf{e}} < x\}} f(x - L_{\mathbf{e}})] dx \leq \mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda S_{\mathbf{e}}}] \mathcal{L}[xf](\lambda) + \mathbb{E}[S_{\mathbf{e}} e^{-\lambda S_{\mathbf{e}}}] \mathcal{L}[f](\lambda). \quad (3.8)$$

This yields the lower bound

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\ell_{\alpha}(1/\lambda)} \lambda^{2-\alpha} \left(\mathcal{L}[xf](\lambda) - \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} x \mathbb{E}[1_{\{S_{\mathbf{e}} < x\}} f(x - L_{\mathbf{e}})] dx \right) \\ \geq - \liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\ell_{\alpha}(1/\lambda)} \lambda^{2-\alpha} \mathbb{E}[S_{\mathbf{e}} e^{-\lambda S_{\mathbf{e}}}] \mathcal{L}[f](\lambda) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

since $\mathbb{E}[S_{\mathbf{e}}] < +\infty$. On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} x \mathbb{E}[1_{\{S_{\mathbf{e}} < x\}} f(x - L_{\mathbf{e}})] dx \\ \geq f(0) \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} x (\mathbb{P}(L_{\mathbf{e}} \geq x) - \mathbb{P}(S_{\mathbf{e}} \geq x)) dx + \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} x \mathbb{E}[1_{\{L_{\mathbf{e}} < x\}} f(x - L_{\mathbf{e}})] dx \end{aligned}$$

and we need to study the last term. First, we write the bound, using again the decomposition $x = x - L_{\mathbf{e}} + L_{\mathbf{e}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} x \mathbb{E}[1_{\{L_{\mathbf{e}} < x\}} f(x - L_{\mathbf{e}})] dx \\ \geq \mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda L_{\mathbf{e}}} 1_{\{L_{\mathbf{e}} \geq 0\}}] \mathcal{L}[xf](\lambda) + \mathbb{E}[L_{\mathbf{e}} e^{-\lambda L_{\mathbf{e}}} 1_{\{L_{\mathbf{e}} \geq 0\}}] \mathcal{L}[f](\lambda) + \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} x \mathbb{E}[1_{\{L_{\mathbf{e}} < 0\}} f(x - L_{\mathbf{e}})] dx. \end{aligned}$$

Then, after a change of variable, the last term is seen to be greater than

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} x \mathbb{E}[1_{\{L_{\mathbf{e}} < 0\}} f(x - L_{\mathbf{e}})] dx \\ = \mathbb{E} \left[1_{\{L_{\mathbf{e}} < 0\}} \int_{-L_{\mathbf{e}}}^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda(z+L_{\mathbf{e}})} (z + L_{\mathbf{e}}) f(z) dz \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\geq \mathbb{E} \left[1_{\{L_{\mathbf{e}} < 0\}} \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda z} (z + L_{\mathbf{e}}) f(z) dz \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[1_{\{L_{\mathbf{e}} < 0\}} \int_0^{-L_{\mathbf{e}}} e^{-\lambda z} (z + L_{\mathbf{e}}) f(z) dz \right].$$

Plugging everything together, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}[xf](\lambda) &- \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} x \mathbb{E} [1_{\{L_{\mathbf{e}} < x\}} f(x - L_{\mathbf{e}})] dx \\ &\leq f(0) \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} x (\mathbb{P}(S_{\mathbf{e}} \geq x) - \mathbb{P}(L_{\mathbf{e}} \geq x)) dx + \left(1 - \mathbb{E} [e^{-\lambda L_{\mathbf{e}}^+}]\right) \mathcal{L}[xf](\lambda) \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} [L_{\mathbf{e}} e^{-\lambda L_{\mathbf{e}}^+}] \mathcal{L}[f](\lambda) + \mathbb{E} \left[1_{\{L_{\mathbf{e}} < 0\}} \int_0^{-L_{\mathbf{e}}} e^{-\lambda z} z f(z) dz \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

Multiplying both sides by $\lambda^{2-\alpha}/\ell_{\alpha}(1/\lambda)$ and letting $\lambda \downarrow 0$, we deduce that the limits of the first and third terms on the right-hand side are null thanks to (3.6), (3.7) and the fact that $\mathbb{E}[|L_{\mathbf{e}}|] < +\infty$. For the second term, observe that since f is non-increasing, integrating by parts the second Laplace transform,

$$\mathcal{L}[f](\lambda) - \lambda \mathcal{L}[xf](\lambda) = - \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} x f'(x) dx \geq 0$$

hence, still from (3.7),

$$\limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\ell_{\alpha}(1/\lambda)} \lambda^{3-\alpha} \mathcal{L}[xf](\lambda) \leq \limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\ell_{\alpha}(1/\lambda)} \lambda^{2-\alpha} \mathcal{L}[f](\lambda) = 0$$

which is also null. To compute the limit of the last term, let us take as before $\varepsilon > 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\lambda^{2-\alpha}}{\ell_{\alpha}(1/\lambda)} \mathbb{E} \left[1_{\{L_{\mathbf{e}} < 0\}} \int_0^{-L_{\mathbf{e}}} e^{-\lambda z} z f(z) dz \right] \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda^{2-\alpha}}{\ell_{\alpha}(1/\lambda)} \mathbb{E} \left[1_{\{L_{\mathbf{e}} < 0\}} \int_0^{A_{\varepsilon}} 1_{\{z < -L_{\mathbf{e}}\}} e^{-\lambda z} z f(z) dz \right] + \varepsilon \frac{\lambda^{2-\alpha}}{\ell_{\alpha}(1/\lambda)} \mathbb{E} \left[1_{\{L_{\mathbf{e}} < 0\}} \int_{A_{\varepsilon}}^{+\infty} 1_{\{z < -L_{\mathbf{e}}\}} e^{-\lambda z} z dz \right] \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda^{2-\alpha}}{\ell_{\alpha}(1/\lambda)} A_{\varepsilon}^2 f(0) + \varepsilon \frac{\lambda^{2-\alpha}}{\ell_{\alpha}(1/\lambda)} \int_{A_{\varepsilon}}^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda z} z \mathbb{P}(L_{\mathbf{e}} < -z) dz \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda^{2-\alpha}}{\ell_{\alpha}(1/\lambda)} A_{\varepsilon}^2 f(0) + \varepsilon C_{\alpha} \frac{\lambda^{2-\alpha}}{\ell_{\alpha}(1/\lambda)} \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda z} z \mathbb{P}(L_{\mathbf{e}} > z) dz \xrightarrow{\lambda \downarrow 0} \varepsilon C_{\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

where we used Assumption 2 in the last inequality, and the asymptotics (3.6) to compute the limits. This concludes the proof of Lemma 13. \square

3.2.2. *Proof of Theorem 3 when $\alpha \in (1, 2)$.* Multiplying Equation (1.7) by x and taking the Laplace transform, we deduce that :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}[xu](\lambda) &- \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} x \mathbb{E} [1_{\{S_{\mathbf{e}} < x\}} u(x - L_{\mathbf{e}})] dx \\ &= \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} x \mathbb{P}(S_{\mathbf{e}} \geq x) dx - \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} x \mathbb{E} [1_{\{S_{\mathbf{e}} < x\}} F(u(x - L_{\mathbf{e}}))] dx. \end{aligned}$$

Assume for the time being that u and $F \circ u$ satisfy assumption (3.7). Applying Lemma 13 with $f = u$, we deduce that

$$\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} x \mathbb{E} [1_{\{S_e < x\}} F(u(x - L_e))] dx \underset{\lambda \rightarrow 0}{\sim} \Gamma(2 - \alpha) \lambda^{\alpha-2} \ell_\alpha(1/\lambda)$$

and, then, applying again Lemma 13 this time with $F \circ u$,

$$\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} x F(u(x)) dx \underset{\lambda \rightarrow 0}{\sim} \Gamma(2 - \alpha) \lambda^{\alpha-2} \ell_\alpha(1/\lambda).$$

Finally, integrating by parts and applying the Tauberian theorem (1.6), we thus deduce that

$$\int_0^x z F(u(z)) dz \underset{x \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} \frac{1}{2 - \alpha} x^{2-\alpha} \ell_\alpha(x)$$

and Theorem 3 follows from the monotone density theorem and Lemma 6.

It remains thus to check that

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{\lambda^{2-\alpha}}{\ell_\alpha(1/\lambda)} \mathcal{L}[F \circ u](\lambda) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{\lambda^{2-\alpha}}{\ell_\alpha(1/\lambda)} \mathcal{L}[u](\lambda) = 0.$$

The first limit is a consequence of the fact that $F \circ u$ is integrable. Indeed, starting from (3.4), in which both sides are positive thanks to (3.2), and recalling that $F \circ u$ is decreasing, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1 - \mathbb{E} [e^{-\lambda S_e}]}{\lambda} &\geq \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} \mathbb{E} [1_{\{S_e < x\}} F(u(x - L_e))] dx \\ &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[1_{\{L_e \geq 0\}} \int_{S_e}^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} F(u(x)) dx \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}(L_e \geq 0, S_e < 1) \int_1^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} F(u(x)) dx \end{aligned}$$

which implies from the monotone convergence theorem that

$$\mathbb{P}(L_e \geq 0, S_e < 1) \int_1^{+\infty} F(u(x)) dx \leq \mathbb{E}[S_e] < \infty.$$

The second limit, for u , is more involved. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that $\frac{1-\varepsilon}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{\beta} > 1$. We shall prove by iteration that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a constant C_n such that

$$\forall x > 0, \quad u(x) \leq C_n x^{-\min(\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{\beta^k}, \frac{\alpha}{\beta} - \varepsilon, 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{\beta^n})}. \quad (3.11)$$

The two first terms in the minimum will appear naturally during the iterative step of the proof, the constant ε being there to compensate for the slowly varying function ℓ_α . On the contrary, the last term is technical and has been added to ensure that the bound remains integrable near 0.

Let us start with the base case $n = 1$. Using that $F \circ u$ is decreasing and a change of variable, we have

$$F\left(u\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)\right) \int_0^1 e^{-z} dz \leq \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-z} F\left(u\left(\frac{z}{\lambda}\right)\right) dz \leq \lambda \int_0^{+\infty} F(u(x)) dx.$$

Setting $\lambda = 1/x$ and applying Lemma 6, we deduce that there exists a constant C_1 such that

$$u(x) \leq C_1 x^{-\frac{1}{\beta}} \leq C_1 x^{-\min(\frac{1}{\beta}, \frac{\alpha}{\beta} - \varepsilon, 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{\beta})}, \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow +\infty.$$

We now proceed to the induction step. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and assume that (3.11) is satisfied. Since $F \circ u$ is decreasing, we have :

$$\mathbb{P}(L_{\mathbf{e}} > 0)F(u(x)) \leq \mathbb{E} [1_{\{L_{\mathbf{e}} > 0\}}F(u(x - L_{\mathbf{e}}))] \leq \mathbb{E} [1_{\{S_{\mathbf{e}} < x\}}F(u(x - L_{\mathbf{e}}))] + \mathbb{P}(S_{\mathbf{e}} \geq x)F(1).$$

Multiplying this inequality by x and taking the Laplace transform, we obtain from Equation (1.7) :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(L_{\mathbf{e}} > 0) \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} x F(u(x)) dx &\leq \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} x (\mathbb{E} [1_{\{S_{\mathbf{e}} < x\}} u(x - L_{\mathbf{e}})] - u(x)) dx \\ &\quad + (1 + F(1)) \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} x \mathbb{P}(S_{\mathbf{e}} \geq x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Using (3.8) with $f = u$ yields

$$\mathbb{P}(L_{\mathbf{e}} > 0) \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} x F(u(x)) dx \leq \mathbb{E} [S_{\mathbf{e}} e^{-\lambda S_{\mathbf{e}}}] \mathcal{L}[u](\lambda) + (1 + F(1)) \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} x \mathbb{P}(S_{\mathbf{e}} \geq x) dx.$$

Then, using a change of variable and the recurrence assumption,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(L_{\mathbf{e}} > 0)F\left(u\left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)\right) \int_0^1 e^{-z} z dz &\leq C_n \mathbb{E}[S_{\mathbf{e}}] \lambda \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-z} \left(\frac{z}{\lambda}\right)^{-\min\left(\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{\beta^k}, \frac{\alpha}{\beta} - \varepsilon, 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{\beta^n}\right)} dz \\ &\quad + \lambda^2 (1 + F(1)) \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} x \mathbb{P}(S_{\mathbf{e}} \geq x) dx \end{aligned}$$

i.e., there exists a constant \tilde{C}_n such that for λ small enough,

$$u^\beta \left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right) \leq \tilde{C}_n \left(\lambda^{1 + \min\left(\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{\beta^k}, \frac{\alpha}{\beta} - \varepsilon, 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{\beta^n}\right)} + \lambda^\alpha \ell_\alpha \left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right) \right).$$

As before, setting $\lambda = 1/x$, we conclude that for x large enough

$$u(x) \leq \left(2\tilde{C}_n\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \left(x^{-\frac{1}{\beta} - \frac{1}{\beta} \min\left(\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{\beta^k}, \frac{\alpha}{\beta} - \varepsilon, 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{\beta^n}\right)} + x^{-\frac{\alpha}{\beta} + \varepsilon} \right).$$

We now assume that $x \geq 1$ and separate the different cases.

(1) On the one hand, if the minimum equals $\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{\beta^k}$, we have

$$u(x) \leq \left(2\tilde{C}_n\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \left(x^{-\sum_{k=1}^{n+1} \frac{1}{\beta^k}} + x^{-\frac{\alpha}{\beta} + \varepsilon} \right) \leq C_{n+1} x^{-\min\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n+1} \frac{1}{\beta^k}, \frac{\alpha}{\beta} - \varepsilon, 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{\beta^{n+1}}\right)}.$$

(2) On the other hand, if the minimum equals $\frac{\alpha}{\beta} - \varepsilon$, we obtain

$$u(x) \leq \left(2\tilde{C}_n\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \left(x^{-\frac{1-\varepsilon}{\beta} - \frac{\alpha}{\beta^2}} + x^{-\frac{\alpha}{\beta} + \varepsilon} \right) \leq C_{n+1} x^{-\frac{\alpha}{\beta} + \varepsilon} \leq C_{n+1} x^{-\min\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n+1} \frac{1}{\beta^k}, \frac{\alpha}{\beta} - \varepsilon, 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{\beta^{n+1}}\right)}$$

since ε has been chosen small enough such that $1 - \varepsilon + \alpha/\beta > \alpha$.

(3) Finally, if the minimum equals $1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{\beta^n}$,

$$u(x) \leq \tilde{C}_{n+1} \left(x^{-\frac{2}{\beta} + \frac{\varepsilon}{\beta^{n+1}}} + x^{-\frac{\alpha}{\beta} + \varepsilon} \right) \leq C_{n+1} x^{-\min\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n+1} \frac{1}{\beta^k}, \frac{\alpha}{\beta} - \varepsilon, 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{\beta^{n+1}}\right)}$$

since $2/\beta > 1$.

This proves Formula (3.11). To conclude, note that $\sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{\beta^k} = \frac{1}{\beta-1} > 1$ which implies that the sum may be removed from the minimum for n large enough. As a consequence, we conclude from the Tauberian theorem that

$$\limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\ell_\alpha(1/\lambda)} \lambda^{2-\alpha} \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} u(x) dx \leq C_n \limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\ell_\alpha(1/\lambda)} \lambda^{2-\alpha} \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} x^{-\min(\frac{\alpha}{\beta}-\varepsilon, 1-\frac{\varepsilon}{\beta^n})} dx = 0$$

since $1 - \alpha + \frac{\alpha}{\beta} > \varepsilon$ and by taking n large enough $2 - \alpha > \frac{\varepsilon}{\beta^n}$. \square

3.3. Back to the case $\alpha = 1$. It remains to finish the proof of the case $\alpha = 1$. We first check that the conclusion of Lemma 13 remains valid when we replace the condition (3.7) by

$$\lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \lambda^{1-\delta} \mathcal{L}[f](\lambda) = 0 \quad (3.12)$$

for some $\delta > 0$. Indeed, since integrating by parts, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[S_e e^{-\lambda S_e}] = \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} \mathbb{P}(S_e \geq x) dx - \lambda \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} x \mathbb{P}(S_e \geq x) dx \underset{\lambda \downarrow 0}{\sim} -\ell_1 \ln(\lambda)$$

the lower bound (3.9) of Lemma 13 remains valid. Then, going back to the upper bound (3.10), we deduce similarly that the first and third terms on the right-hand side go to 0. For the second term, we have

$$1 - \mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda L_e^+}] = \lambda \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} \mathbb{P}(L_e^+ \geq x) dx \underset{\lambda \downarrow 0}{\sim} -\ell_1 \lambda \ln(\lambda)$$

hence

$$\limsup_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \lambda^2 \ln(\lambda) \mathcal{L}[xf](\lambda) \leq \limsup_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \lambda \ln(\lambda) \mathcal{L}[f](\lambda) = 0$$

thanks to (3.12). Finally, the last term on the right-hand side of (3.10) becomes :

$$\lambda \mathbb{E} \left[1_{\{L_e < 0\}} \int_0^{-L_e} e^{-\lambda z} z f(z) dz \right] \leq \lambda A_\varepsilon^2 f(0) + \varepsilon C_\alpha \lambda \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda z} z \mathbb{P}(L_e > z) dz \xrightarrow{\lambda \downarrow 0} \varepsilon C_\alpha \ell_1$$

which proves that the conclusion of Lemma 13 is still valid when $\alpha = 1$, provided the stronger assumption (3.12). Now, assuming that u and $F \circ u$ satisfy assumption (3.12), we deduce as above that

$$\int_0^x z F(u(z)) dz \underset{x \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} \ell_1 x$$

and the announced result follows from the monotone density theorem. It remains thus to check that

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \lambda^{1-\delta} \mathcal{L}[F \circ u](\lambda) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \lambda^{1-\delta} \mathcal{L}[u](\lambda) = 0.$$

The first asymptotics is an immediate consequence of the bound

$$\frac{1 - \mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda S_e}]}{\lambda} \geq \mathbb{P}(L_e \geq 0, S_e < 1) \int_1^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} F(u(x)) dx.$$

For the second one, observe that since $F \circ u$ is decreasing, we deduce from Formula (3.5) and Lemma 6, that there exists a constant K such that for $x > 0$,

$$u(x) \leq K(\ln(x))^{1/\beta} x^{-\frac{1}{\beta}}.$$

As a consequence the Tauberian theorem (1.6) yields

$$\limsup_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \lambda^{1-\delta} \mathcal{L}[u](\lambda) \leq \lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \lambda^{1-\delta} K \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\lambda x} (\ln(x))^{1/\beta} x^{-\frac{1}{\beta}} dx = 0$$

since $\frac{1}{\beta} > \delta$. □

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Liu and Q. Tang. Heavy tails of a Lévy process and its maximum over a random time interval. *Sci. China Math.* **54** (2011), no. 9, 1875–1884.
- [2] J. Bertoin. *Lévy Processes*. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics 121. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1996.
- [3] J. Bertoin and R. A. Doney. Cramér’s estimate for Lévy processes. *Statist. Probab. Lett.* **21** (1994), no. 5, 363–365.
- [4] N. H. Bingham, C. M. Goldie and. J L. Teugels. Regular variation. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, **27**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989.
- [5] K. A. Borovkov. A method of proving limit theorems for branching processes. *Theory Prob. Appl.* **33** (1989), 105–113.
- [6] J. Fleischman and S. Sawyer. Maximum geographic range of a mutant allele considered as a subtype of a Brownian branching random field. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **76** (1979), no. 2, 872–875.
- [7] F. Küh and R. L. Schilling. Maximal inequalities and some applications. *Probab. Surv.* **20** (2023), 382–485.
- [8] H. Hou, Y. Jiang, Y.-X. Ren and R. Song. Tail probability of maximal displacement in critical branching Lévy process with stable branching. *Bernoulli* **31** (2025), no. 1, 630–648.
- [9] A.E. Kyprianou. *Fluctuations of Lévy processes with applications. Introductory lectures*. Second edition. Universitext. Springer, Heidelberg, 2014.
- [10] S. P. Lalley and Y. Shao. Maximal displacement of critical branching symmetric stable processes. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* **52** (2016), no. 3, 1161–1177.
- [11] C. Profeta. Extreme values of critical and subcritical branching stable processes with positive jumps. *ALEA Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat.* **19** (2022), no. 2, 1421–1433.
- [12] C. Profeta. Maximal displacement of spectrally negative branching Lévy processes. *Bernoulli* **30** (2024), no. 2, 961–982.
- [13] V. Vigon. Simplifiez vos Lévy en titillant la factorisation de Wiener-Hopf, INSA de Rouen, 2002.
- [14] E. Willekens. On the supremum of an infinitely divisible process. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, **26** (1987), no. 1, 173–175.

UNIVERSITÉ PARIS-SACLAY, CNRS, UNIV EVRY, LABORATOIRE DE MATHÉMATIQUES ET MODÉLISATION D’EVRY, 91037, EVRY-COURCOURONNES, FRANCE. *Email* : christophe.profeta@univ-evry.fr