Abstract

Kingman’s House-of-Cards model is a simple and celebrated model to describe the evolution of population under the competition of selection and mutation. Letting mutation probabilities vary on generations makes the model more realistic and meaningful. This paper considers the condensation phenomenon and limit fitness distribution when Kingman’s House-of-Cards model is put into a random environment consisting of i.i.d. random mutation probabilities. It turns out that the random model is completely dominated by Kingman’s model in terms of condensation and fitness. Another random model where all mutation probabilities are equal to the same random variable is also discussed. The relation between the three models is subtle and shows how extra randomness perturbs Kingman’s model. The main tool for comparison analysis is the matrix representation of the three models which is discovered in this work and plays crucial roles.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Model 1: Kingman’s model

Kingman [3] simplifies the evolution in a population of infinite size and discrete generations as a consequence of the competition of two preponderant factors: selection and mutation. Let $M_1$ be the space of probability measures on $[0,1]$ endowed with the topology of weak convergence, denoted by $T$. Assume that the fitness values of individuals belong to $[0,1]$ (individuals with bigger values are fitter) and the $i$–th ($i \geq 0$) generation be described by a fitness distribution, i.e., a probability measure $\bar{P}_i \in M_1$. The update from $\bar{P}_i$ to $\bar{P}_{i+1}$ is determined by selection and mutation as follows:

$$\bar{P}_{i+1}(dx) = (1 - b) \frac{x\bar{P}_i(dx)}{\int_0^1 y\bar{P}_i(dy)} + bQ(dx), \quad i \geq 0,$$

where $\bar{P}_0, Q \in M_1$ and $b \in (0,1)$ are given as parameters, and $Q$ is interpreted as the mutant fitness distribution, whereas $b$ is the mutation probability at each generation. Kingman uses $\beta$ for the mutation probability, but here we use $b$ and will use $\beta$ later to denote a random variable for a random mutation probability. The symbol bar on top of a notation refers to Kingman’s model, as there will be other models to be introduced.

We make the convention that $\frac{x\delta_0(dx)}{\int_0^1 y\delta_0(dy)} = \delta_0(dx)$, where $\delta_0$ is Dirac measure on 0. For any $\mu \in M_1$, $a \in [0,1]$, denote $\mu(a) = \mu(\{a\})$, the mass on the single point $a$.

Biologically, at the $(i + 1)$-th generation, independently each new individual either gets mutated with probability $b$ with fitness value drawn from a common mutant distribution $Q$ (i.e., mutation), or gets a value drawn from the size-biased fitness distribution $\frac{x\bar{P}_i(dx)}{\int_0^1 y\bar{P}_i(dy)}$ (i.e., selection). Thus mutation destroys the biochemical “house of cards” built up by evolution and the selection pushes individuals towards fitter values.

For any $\mu \in M_1$, define

$$u_\mu := \sup\{x : \mu[x,1] > 0\}. \quad (2)$$

So $u_\mu$ is interpreted and will be referred to as the largest fitness value in a population of distribution $\mu$. Since $u_{\bar{P}_i} \geq u_Q$, we can always assume $u_{\bar{P}_0} \geq u_Q$, otherwise we take $\bar{P}_1$ as $\bar{P}_0$. For convenience, we write

$$h := u_{\bar{P}_0} \in [u_Q,1].$$

The above display is assumed to hold throughout this paper including other models (the initial measure $\bar{P}_0$ will be written differently though). It is straightforward to see that $u_{\bar{P}_n} = h$ for any $n \geq 0$.

Kingman [3] proves the convergence of $(\bar{P}_i)_{i \geq 0}$ given any $\bar{P}_0$ with $h = 1$. But it is easy generalized to any $h \in [u_Q,1]$ and a proof can be found in [2]. We denote the limit of $(\bar{P}_i)_{i \geq 0}$ by $\bar{P}^h_\ast$. Here $\ast$ refers to that the object is obtained in the limit, $h$ indicates that the limit depends on $\bar{P}_0$ only through $h$. In fact, $\bar{P}^h_\ast$ takes different forms in different scenarios depending on $h, b, Q$. Since the integration will be always over $[0,1]$, from now on, the symbol $\int$ will be taken to mean $\int_0^1$. We say that a sequence of probability measures $(\bar{P}_i)_{i \geq 0}$ converges strongly to a probability measure $\bar{P}$ if the total variation $\|\bar{P}_i - \bar{P}\|$ converges to 0.

Theorem 1. Case 1: $\int \frac{Q(dx)}{x/h} \geq b^{-1}$. For any $\bar{P}_0$ with $u_{\bar{P}_0} = h$, $(\bar{P}_i)_{i \geq 0}$ converges strongly to the same limit

$$\bar{P}^h_\ast(dx) = \frac{bs_bQ(dx)}{s_b - (1 - b)x},$$

with $s_b$, as a function of $b$, being the unique solution of

$$\int \frac{bs_bQ(dx)}{s_b - (1 - b)x} = 1. \quad (3)$$
Case 2: $\int \frac{Q(dx)}{1-x/h} < b^{-1}$. For any $\bar{P}_0$ with $u_{\bar{P}_0} = h$, $(\bar{P}_i)_{i \geq 0}$ converges weakly to the same limit

$$\bar{P}^h_i(dx) = \frac{bQ(dx)}{1-x/h} + \left(1 - \int \frac{bQ(dy)}{1-y/h}\right) \delta_h(dx).$$

Case 1 corresponds to mutation dominating selection, such as $b$ is big and/or $Q$ is “fitter than” $\bar{P}_0$. So the limit has no trace left over by $\bar{P}_0$. In Case 2, selection is more favored so that if $\bar{P}_0(h) = Q(h) = 0$ (implying that $u_{\bar{P}_0} = h$ and $\bar{P}_n(h) = 0$ for any $n \geq 0$), a certain amount of mass $\left(1 - \int \frac{bQ(dy)}{1-y/h}\right)$ travels to the extreme point $u_{\bar{P}_0} = h$.

Introduce

$$\bar{C}^h_i := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{Case 1,} \\ 1 - \int \frac{bQ(dy)}{1-y/h}, & \text{Case 2.} \end{cases}$$

and call $\bar{C}^h_i$ the size of condensate of $\bar{P}^h_i$ on $h$ in Kingman’s model.

**Definition 1.** We say that condensation occurs in Kingman’s model on $h$ if the condensate size $\bar{C}^h_i > 0$.

A dynamic model under the competition of two opposing forces is not new, see for instance a recent work [1] or [2], and references therein. Recently, the phenomenon of condensation has been studied a lot in the literature. Biaconi *et al* [12] argue that the phase transition of condensation phenomenon is very close to Bose-Einstein condensation where a large fraction of a dilute gas of bosons cooled to temperatures very close to absolute zero occupy the lowest quantum state. See also [13] for another model which can be mapped into the physics context. Dereich and Mörters [5] study the asymptotic shape of the traveling wave of the density function of fitness distribution in the condensation case in Kingman’s model, and the limit shape turns out to be of gamma distribution under some assumptions. A series of papers [6, 7, 8, 9, 10] are written later on to investigate the shape of traveling wave in other models where condensation appears and have proved that gamma distribution is universal. Park and Krug [11] adapt Kingman’s model to a finite population with unbounded fitness distribution and observe in a particular case emergence of Gaussian distribution as the wave travels to infinity.

Motivated by the recent development, this paper reconsiders Kingman’s model, but under the condition that the mutation probabilities are not all the same. We are interested in how the condensation phenomenon and limit fitness distribution, if they exit, get affected by varying environments, i.e., different mutation probabilities. To this purpose, we introduce several models in the next sections.

### 1.2 Model 2: General model

Kingman’s model is a simple model enabling us to understand the interplay between selection and mutation. The mutation distribution may persist over time, but the mutation probabilities are likely not to remain the same due to environmental change. A more general version of Kingman’s model, taking into account the variability of mutation probabilities is:

$$\bar{P}_{i+1}(dx) = (1 - b_{i+1}) \frac{x\bar{P}_i(dx) \int \bar{P}_i(dy)}{\int \bar{P}_i(dy)} + b_{i+1}Q(dx), i \geq 0. \quad (4)$$

where $\bar{P}_0, Q \in M_1$, and $b_i \in [0, 1), \forall i \geq 1$ is the deterministic mutation probability of the $i$-th generation. The $b_i$’s are not allowed to take value 1. This is because the starting measure $\bar{P}_0$ will otherwise not be relevant when studying the long term behavior of $\bar{P}_i$’s. We call the above model the general model and the resulting $(\bar{P}_i)_{i \geq 0}$ the general forward sequence.
1.3 The two random models

We are interested, in particular, in the case where mutation probabilities of all generations are i.i.d. random variables with expectation equal to \( b \), the mutation probability in Kingman’s model. That is to put Kingman’s model in a random environment formed by the random mutation probabilities. We would like to understand how the random perturbation affects the condensation phenomenon and fitness. To this purpose, we will also introduce another random model in which all mutation probabilities equal the same random variable whose expectation is equal to \( b \). Kingman’s model and the two random models will be compared in the end to shed light on the role played by the randomness of mutation probabilities.

1.3.1 Model 3: Random i-i-d model

Let \( \mathcal{E} \) be a probability measure on \([0, 1]\) and \( \beta \) a random variable of law \( \mathcal{E} \) satisfying \( \mathbb{E}[\beta] = b \) and \( \mathbb{P}(\beta = 0) \neq 1, \mathbb{P}(\beta = 1) = 0 \). Let \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})\) be a probability space and \((\beta_i)_{i \geq 0}\) be an i.i.d. sequence in the probability space such that \( \beta_i \neq \beta \). The random i-i-d model is defined by the following iteration:

\[
P_{i+1}(dx) = (1 - \beta_{i+1}) \int yP_i(dy) + \beta_{i+1}Q(dx), \quad i \geq 0,
\]

with \( P_0, Q \in M_1 \). The resulting \((P_i)_{i \geq 0}\) is called the i-i-d forward sequence. At each generation, the mutation probability is not any more a fixed deterministic value, but a random variable playing the role of random environment. Equivalently (5) can be written as

\[
P_{i+1}(dx) = \left( \prod_{l=0}^{i} \frac{1 - \beta_{l+1}}{yP_l(dy)} \right) x^{i+1}P_0(dx) + \sum_{j=1}^{i+1} \left( \prod_{l=j}^{i} \frac{1 - \beta_{l+1}}{yP_l(dy)} \right) \beta_j x^{i-j+1}Q(dx), \quad i \geq 0.
\]

Remark 1. In some cases, we allow \( P_0 \) to be a random probability measure, and we still call \((P_i)_{i \geq 0}\) an i-i-d forward sequence, which is generated by (5) under the condition that \((\beta_i)_{i \geq 0}\) is i.i.d and independent of \( P_0 \).

1.3.2 Model 4: Random o-f-a model

If the \( \beta_i \)'s in (5) are all replaced by the same random variable \( \beta \) with other assumptions unchanged, we call the model random o-f-a model, where o-f-a means “one for all”. The resulting sequence is denoted by \((\hat{P}_i)_{i \geq 0}\) under the name o-f-a forward sequence. Conditional on \( \beta \), the o-f-a model becomes simply Kingman’s model.

1.4 Convention

If we use \( GM(\hat{P}_0, Q, b_1, b_2, \cdots) \) to denote the general model, then

- Kingman’s model is \( GM(\bar{P}_0, Q, b, b, \cdots) \);
- Random i-i-d model is \( GM(P_0, Q, \beta_1, \beta_2, \cdots) \);
- Random o-f-a model is \( GM(\hat{P}_0, Q, \beta, \beta, \cdots) \).

So analysis made on the general model naturally carries over to the others. In particular, Kingman’s model is a special case of the other three models.

To avoid presenting a definition many times in different models, we shall just give one version (mostly in the general model) and then use the adjective “general” to denote the version in the general model, the adjective “i-i-d” or no adjective for random i-i-d model, the adjective “o-f-a” for random o-f-a model and “Kingman’s” for Kingman’s model.
From now on, we assume that $Q$ converges weakly to a limit $\nu$. We shall first consider the particular case $Q = \delta_0$. It can be easily deduced that

$$P_i(dx) = (1 - \beta_{i-1}) \frac{x^i P_0(dx)}{\int y^i P_0(dy)} + \beta_{i-1} \delta_0(dx),$$

which converges weakly to

$$(1 - \beta) \delta_0(dx) + \beta \delta_0(dx).$$

From now on, we assume that $Q \neq \delta_0$.

If the i-i-d forward sequence converges weakly to a limit $\nu$, then it must satisfy

$$\nu(dx) \overset{d}{=} (1 - \beta) \frac{x \nu(dx)}{\int y \nu(dy)} + \beta Q(dx), \text{ with } \beta \text{ independent of } \nu.$$  

We shall give a name to those $\nu$'s satisfying the above distributional equation.

**Definition 2** (Invariant measure). $\nu$ is an invariant (random) measure if it satisfies the relation in the above display.

**Remark 2.** It is straightforward to see that $u_\nu \geq u_Q$ almost surely.

The existence of an invariant measure can be proved by investigating the model in a backward way. Consider a finite backward sequence $(P^n_i)_{0 \leq i \leq n}$ as follows:

$$P^n_i = \delta_h, \quad P^n_i(dx) = (1 - \beta_{i+1}) \frac{x^i P^n_{i+1}(dx)}{\int y P^n_{i+1}(dy)} + \beta_{i+1} Q(dx), \quad \forall 0 \leq i \leq n - 1. \quad (7)$$

By Lemma 1 (section 2.2.1), conditional on $(\beta_k)_{k \geq 1}$, $P^n_i$ converges strongly to a limit denoted by $P_{t,h}$ as $n$ tends to infinity for any $i \geq 0$. By Remark 7 (section 2.2.1)

$$P_{i-1,h}(dx) = (1 - \beta_i) \frac{x P_{i-1,h}(dx)}{\int y P_{i-1,h}(dy)} + \beta_i Q(dx), \quad i \geq 1$$

and by Remark 9 (section 2.2.1), the process

$$(P_{0,h}, P_{1,h}, \cdots)$$

is stationary ergodic unconditionally. So $P_{0,h} \overset{d}{=} P_{t,h}$ is an invariant measure.

By Remark 7 again, $P_{0,h}(dx)$ can be decomposed as a linear combination of $\{\delta_h(dx), Q(dx), xQ(dx), x^2Q(dx), \cdots\}$:

$$P_{0,h}(dx) = C_{0,h} \delta_h(dx) + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \left( \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} \frac{1 - \beta_i}{\int y P_{i-1,h}(dy)} \right) \beta_{j+1} x^j Q(dx). \quad (8)$$
where
\[ C_{0,h} = 1 - \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left( \prod_{i=1}^{j} \frac{1 - \beta_i}{\int y P_{i,h}(dy)} \right) \beta_{j+1} m_j \in [0, 1]. \]

By Remark 6 (section 2.2.1),
\[ P_{0,h}((u_Q, h)) = 0. \]
Moreover due to Remark 9 (section 2.2.1),
\[ P(C_{0,h} = 0) = \{0, 1\}. \]

It turns out that \( P_{0,h} \) is the unique invariant measure with the largest fitness value \( h \) almost surely.

**Proposition 1.** If \( C_{0,h} = 0, \) a.s., then \( P_{0,h} \) is the unique invariant measure supported on \([0, u_Q]\); if \( C_{0,h} > 0, \) a.s., then \( P_{0,h} \) is the unique invariant measure with the largest fitness value equal to \( h \) almost surely.

Denote \( P_{h} = P_{0,h} \) and \( C_{h} = C_{0,h} \). It turns out that any invariant measure \( \nu \) is a convex combination of \( \{ P_{h} : h \in [u_Q, 1]\} \).

**Proposition 2.** Any invariant measure \( \nu \) satisfies that
\[ \nu \overset{d}{=} P_{uQ}. \]

The convergence is proved as follows:

**Theorem 2.** For any \( P_{0} \) with \( h \in [u_Q, 1] \), the i-i-d forward sequence \((P_{i})_{i \geq 0}\) converges weakly to \( P_{h} \).

### 1.5.2 Condensation criterion in random i-i-d model

We shall define properly what condensation is in random i-i-d model. The same as in Kingman’s model, condensation means that if under the condition \( P_{0}(h) = Q(h) = 0 \) (implying that \( P_{n} \) has no mass on \( h \) but has the largest fitness value \( h \) for all \( n \) almost surely), the limit \( P_{h}^{n} \) however has non-zero mass on \( h \) almost surely.

Let us go back to equation (8). If \( h > u_Q \), \( P_{h}^{n}(h) = C_{h}^{n} \). If \( h = u_Q \) and \( Q(u_Q) = 0 \), then again \( P_{h}^{n}(h) = C_{h}^{n} \). If \( h = u_Q \) and \( Q(u_Q) > 0 \), by Proposition 3 (section 2.3.1), \( C_{h}^{n} = 0 \) a.s. So we can call \( C_{h}^{n} \) the size of condensate of \( P_{h}^{n} \) on \( h \) in random i-i-d model and the definition of condensation can be given as follows.

**Definition 3 (Condensation in random i-i-d model).** We say that condensation occurs in random i-i-d model on \( h \) if the condensate size \( C_{h}^{n} > 0 \) a.s..

The main result of this part is the following:

**Theorem 3.** 1. If \( h = u_Q \), then there is no condensation on \( u_Q \) if
\[ \mathbb{E}[\ln \frac{u_Q (1 - \beta)}{\int y P_{uQ}^{n}(dy)}] < 0. \]
2. If \( h > u_Q \), then there is no condensation on \( h \) if and only if
\[ \mathbb{E}[\ln \frac{h (1 - \beta)}{\int y P_{uQ}^{n}(dy)}] \leq 0. \]

**Remark 3.** 1. The value of \( \mathbb{E}[\ln \frac{(1 - \beta)}{\int y P_{uQ}^{n}(dy)}] \) does not depend on the joint law of \((P_{uQ}, \beta), \) see 2) of Proposition 3.
2. Only a sufficient condition is obtained for \( h = u_Q \). A necessary and sufficient condition will be given using matrix approach.

3. The criterion relies on \( P_*^{u_Q} \) which is however too obscure to be useful. To bypass this difficulty, we will again need help from matrix approach.

4. Let \( u_Q \leq h_1 < h_2 \). No condensation on \( \{ h_2 \} \) implies no condensation on \( \{ h_1 \} \). In other words, the bigger \( h \) is, the more likely the condensation is to occur. It makes sense since bigger \( h \) means fitter \( P_0 \) and relatively weaker \( Q \) (strong selection, weak mutation).

It is proved in Proposition 4 (section 2.3.4) that

\[
\mathbb{E}[\ln \frac{u_Q(1-\beta)}{\int y P_*^{u_Q}(dy)}] \leq 0.
\]

The fact that the equality cannot detect the occurrence of condensation when \( h = u_Q \) in Theorem 3 aligns with Kingman’s model. Assuming \( h = u_Q \), the following term in random i-i-d model

\[
\mathbb{E}[\ln \frac{u_Q(1-\beta)}{\int y P_*^{u_Q}(dy)}]
\]

becomes

\[
\ln \frac{u_Q(1-b)}{\int y P_*^{u_Q}(dy)}
\]

in Kingman’s model, which, by a simple calculation, equals 0 if and only if

\[
\int \frac{Q(dx)}{1-x/u_Q} \leq b^{-1}.
\]

But it covers both cases with and without condensation.

**Example 1.** We say \( Q \) is degenerate if it is supported on a single point. Consider the following case: \( Q \) is degenerate and supported on \( \{ c \} \) for some \( c \in (0, 1) \), and \( h \in (c, 1) \). Then \( P_*^h \) can be written as \( P_*^h = X\delta_c + (1-X)\delta_h \) where \( X \) is a random variable taking values in \( [0, 1] \). As \( P_*^h \) is invariant, we have

\[
X\delta_c + (1-X)\delta_h \overset{d}{=} (1-\beta)cX\delta_c + h(1-X)\delta_h \overset{cX}{=} b\delta_c,
\]

where \( \beta \) is independent of \( X \). The above display is equivalent to

\[
X \overset{d}{=} \frac{c + (h\beta - c)(1-X)}{c + (h-c)(1-X)}.
\]

What is the necessary and sufficient condition for the above equation to have a solution \( X \) with \( 0 \leq X < 1 \)? A priori, it is not straightforward to find out an answer. But it is the same as to say that there is condensation on \( h \). Applying Theorem 3, the condition is simply \( \mathbb{E}[\ln h(1-\beta)/c] > 0 \). Moreover uniqueness is guaranteed by Proposition 1.

**1.5.3 Condensation criterion using matrices**

We assume that \( Q \) is not degenerate as this case has been discussed in Example 1. As there will be functions defined also on \( \infty \), we shall consider the function value at \( \infty \) as obtained by continuity.

If the previous results mainly rely on the finite backward sequence given in (7), what remains to be presented benefits mostly from the random matrix representation of another finite backward sequence which starts with \( Q \) (see (33) in section 2.5.2).

Let \( W^n, L_1 \) be the i-i-d versions of respectively \( W^n, L_1 \) defined in section 2.5.1 and Remark 13 (section 2.5.3) using matrices. In section 2.5.1, \( U^*_n \) is introduced as a mapping from a set of special square matrices to the same set.
Theorem 4. 1. \( C_{uQ}^q \) admits a matrix representation

\[
C_{uQ}^q \overset{d}{=} (1 - \beta_1) \lim_{k \to \infty} \lim_{n \to \infty} u_Q^{-k} \frac{[U^n]_W}{[W^n]},
\]

where the convergence of \( u_Q^{-k} \frac{[U^n]_W}{[W^n]} \) holds conditionally on \((\beta_1)_i \geq 0\).

For \( h = u_Q \), there is no condensation on \( u_Q \) if and only if

\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \lim_{n \to \infty} u_Q^{-k} \frac{[U^n]_W}{[W^n]} = 0, \text{ a.s.}
\]

In particular, there is no condensation on \( u_Q \) if

\[
E[\ln (u_Q \Gamma_1 L_1)] < 0.
\]

2. If \( h > u_Q \), there is no condensation on \( h \) if and only if

\[
E[\ln (h \Gamma_1 L_1)] \leq 0.
\]

Remark 4. By Remark 11 (section 2.3.1) and b) of Corollary 5 (section 2.5.5),

\[
E[\ln \Gamma_1 L_1] = E[\ln \frac{1 - \beta}{\int y P_{uQ}^q(dy)}].
\]

So the theorem rewrites Theorem 3 and provides an additional result, i.e., a matrix representation for \( C_{uQ}^q \).

In fact, not only the condensation phenomenon can be studied using matrices, the limit \( P_{uQ}^q \) (see Corollary 5) enjoys also a matrix representation. Fitness comparison of the limit fitness distributions between the three models is possible, as shown in the next section.

1.5.4 Impact of randomness: comparison of three models

Theorem 4 provides a workable approach to study the condensate size and the occurrence of condensation using matrix representation. The value of \( E[\ln \Gamma_1 L_1] \) is crucial to the occurrence of condensation.

1). Estimation of \( E[\ln \Gamma_1 L_1] \)

Theorem 5. We have

\[
E[\ln \hat{\Gamma}_1 \hat{L}_1] \leq E[\ln \Gamma_1 L_1] \leq \ln \hat{\Gamma}_1 L_1
\]

where

\[
\ln \hat{\Gamma} \hat{L} = \ln \frac{1 - b}{\int y P_{uQ}^q(dy)} = \begin{cases} 
\ln \frac{1 - b}{\mu_q} < \ln \frac{1}{u_Q} & \text{if } \int \frac{Q(dx)}{1 - x/u_Q} > b^{-1}; \\
\ln \frac{1}{u_Q} & \text{if } \int \frac{Q(dx)}{1 - x/u_Q} \leq b^{-1}.
\end{cases}
\]

and

\[
\ln \hat{\Gamma}_1 \hat{L}_1 = \ln \frac{1 - \beta}{\int y P_{uQ}^q(dy)}.
\]

Remark 5. By Theorem 1, if \( \int \frac{Q(dx)}{1 - x/u_Q} \leq b^{-1} \), then \( \ln \hat{\Gamma} \hat{L} = -\ln u_Q \). For the same reason, if \( \int \frac{Q(dx)}{1 - x/u_Q} \leq \beta^{-1} \) almost surely, then \( \ln \hat{\Gamma}_1 \hat{L}_1 = -\ln u_Q \) almost surely. So by taking \( \beta \) and hence \( b \) small enough, the two inequalities in (9) become equalities.
The first inequality of (9) is not expected at all, because random o-f-a model does not have a “global” condensation phenomenon and hence the term \(\mathbb{E}[\ln \hat{\Gamma}_1 L_1]\) has no interpretation regarding a global condensation. The second inequality of (9) implies that Kingman’s model is more likely to have condensation than random i-i-d model for \(h > u_Q\), due to Theorem 4. It also applies to \(h = u_Q\) as shown in Theorem 6 below.

2). Kingman’s model vs random i-i-d model

**Theorem 6.** We have

1. \[ \mathbb{E}[\int y^k P_\ast^{u_Q} (dy)] < \int y^k \hat{P}_\ast^{u_Q} (dy), \quad \forall k = 1, 2, \ldots. \]

2. if \(C_\ast^{u_Q} > 0\), a.s., then \[ \mathbb{E}[C_\ast^{u_Q}] < \hat{C}_\ast^{u_Q}. \]

The above comparison shows that random i-i-d model is completely dominated by Kingman’s model in terms of condensation and fitness.

3). Random i-i-d model vs random o-f-a model

Random o-f-a model yields a limit distribution fitter than that in random i-i-d model in terms of the logarithm of the moment of order 1.

**Theorem 7.** The following inequality holds

\[ \mathbb{E}[\ln \int y P_\ast^{u_Q} (dy)] \leq \mathbb{E}[\ln \int y \hat{P}_\ast^{u_Q} (dy)]. \]

4). Kingman’s model vs random o-f-a model

It is more delicate between the two models. Kingman’s model has a smaller condensate size but for the moment of order 1 there is no simple relationship.

**Theorem 8.** It holds that

\[ \mathbb{E}[\hat{C}_\ast^{u_Q} (u_Q)] \geq \hat{C}_\ast^{u_Q} (u_Q). \]

But there is no one-way inequality between \(\mathbb{E}[\int y \hat{P}_\ast^{u_Q} (dy)]\) and \(\mathbb{E}[\int y P_\ast^{u_Q} (dy)]\).

(5). Summary and Complement

The results in Theorems 6, 7, 8 can be carried over to the case \(h > u_Q\) using approximation and weak convergence (for instance to approximate \(Q\) by \((1 - 1/k)Q + 1/k\delta_h\) as \(k \rightarrow \infty\)), except that only non-strict inequalities in Theorem 6 can be proved.

It turns out that random i-i-d model is completely dominated by Kingman’s model in terms of condensate size and moments of all orders of the limit fitness distribution. We conjecture that random i-i-d model is also dominated by random o-f-a model in the same sense, as supported by a different comparison in Theorem 7. The relationship between Kingman’s model and random o-f-a model is more subtle.

The comparison between the three models is worked out on different levels of preciseness. The relation between Kingman’s model and random i-i-d model is more clear than the others. The matrix representation is believed to be helpful for further and finer investigations.

After all, a natural question arises: will the relations between the three models revealed and conjectured be applicable to other more sophisticated models? We conjecture that putting similar models in an appropriate random environment will exhibit the same effects of extra randomness. That is to say that to some extent the main results obtained here have analogs in other models of selection and mutation. This universality remains to be verified.
1.6 Organization

The general model provides a framework for other three models. After introducing necessary notations to describe relations between measures in section 2.1, section 2.2 gives some results on the general model which will be useful throughout the paper. Section 2.3.1 describes the limit object of an i-i-d forward sequence, i.e., the invariant measure. Section 2.3.2 proves Proposition 1 for the uniqueness of invariant measures. Section 2.3.3 proves Proposition 2 on the convex structure of invariant measures and section 2.3.4 gives the criterion of condensation by proving Theorem 3. Finally, Theorem 2, the weak convergence of the i-i-d forward sequence starting with any probability measure, is proved in section 2.4.

The condensation criterion depends on the invariant measure on \([0, u_Q]\) which is obscure. Fortunately, the general model enjoys a matrix representation which can be transferred to the others. This matrix representation allows a description of the invariant measure by matrices and then explicit calculations are possible. Section 2.5.1 introduces necessary notations on matrices. Section 2.5.2 presents the matrix representation of a particular finite general backward sequence starting with \(Q\). Extending the finite sequence to be infinite yields a general backward sequence expressed using matrices, in section 2.5.3. This general backward sequence depends on the mutation probabilities in a way revealed in section 2.5.4. A corresponding i-i-d version is introduced in section 2.5.5, and Theorem 4 is proved which rewrites criterion of condensation by matrices. After all these preparations, section 3 is dedicated to the analysis and comparison of the three models. Concerning condensation phenomenon, section 3.1 proves Theorem 5 to give a lower bound from random o-f-a model and an upper bound from Kingman’s model for \(E[\ln \Gamma_1 L_1]\). The contribution of the key Lemma 11 is crucial. Sections 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 are dedicated to the comparison analysis of the three models and prove respectively Theorem 6, 7, 8.

2 Weak convergence and condensation criterion

2.1 Relations between measures

We introduce some notations to describe the relations between measures. For any \(\mu \in M_1\), let

\[
D_{\mu}(x) := \mu[0, x], \quad \forall x \in [0, 1]
\]

be the distribution function.

For any two (deterministic) measures \(\mu, \nu \in M_1\), we say \(\mu\) is stochastically dominated by \(\nu\), denoted by \(\mu \leq \nu\), if

\[
D_{\mu}(x) \geq D_{\nu}(x), \quad \forall x \in [0, 1].
\]

Similarly, for two real-valued random variables \(\xi, \eta\), we say \(\xi\) is stochastically dominated by \(\eta\), written as \(\xi \leq \eta\), if

\[
P(\xi \leq x) \geq P(\eta \leq x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}.
\]

We say \(\mu\) is a component of \(\nu\) on \([0, a)\), denoted by \(\mu \preceq_a \nu\), if

\[
\mu(A) \leq \nu(A), \quad \text{for any measurable set } A \subset [0, a).
\]

For random measures \(\mu, \nu \in M_1\), we write \(\mu \leq \nu\) (resp. \(\mu \preceq_a \nu\)) if there exists a couple \((u, v)\) with \(u, v \in M_1\) such that

\[
u \) a.s. and \(u \overset{d}{=} \mu, v \overset{d}{=} \nu.
\]
2.2 Some facts of general model

2.2.1 Finite and (infinite) general backward sequences

We call \((\tilde{P}_i^n)_{0 \leq i \leq n}\) a finite general backward sequence if it is defined as follows

\[
\tilde{P}_i^n(dx) = (1 - b_{i+1}) \frac{x \tilde{P}_{i+1}^n(dx)}{y \tilde{P}_{i+1}^n(dy)} + b_{i+1} Q(dx), \quad \forall 0 \leq i \leq n - 1.
\]

with any \(\tilde{P}_n^n \in M_1\). A sequence \((\tilde{P}_i)_{i \geq 0}\) is called (infinite) general backward sequence if

\[
\tilde{P}_i(dx) = (1 - b_{i+1}) \frac{x \tilde{P}_{i+1}(dx)}{y \tilde{P}_{i+1}(dy)} + b_{i+1} Q(dx), \quad \forall i \geq 0.
\]

The infinite sequence can be obtained from finite sequences.

Lemma 1. For any given \((b_i)_{i \geq 1}\), the sequence \((\tilde{P}_i^n)_{0 \leq i \leq n}\) with \(\tilde{P}_0^n = \delta_h\) satisfies that \(\tilde{P}_0^n \preceq_h \tilde{P}_{n+1}^n\) and thus \(\tilde{P}_n^n\) converges strongly to a limit denoted by \(\tilde{P}_{0,h}\).

Remark 6. Apparently, \(\tilde{P}_{0,h}\) is supported on \([0, u_Q] \cup \{h\}\) or \([0, u_Q]\) only.

Remark 7. Letting \(i\) tend to infinity, (11) becomes

\[
\tilde{P}_{i-1,h}(dx) = (1 - b_i) \frac{x \tilde{P}_{i,h}(dx)}{y \tilde{P}_{i,h}(dy)} + b_i Q(dx), \quad i \geq 1.
\]

By construction, there exists a function \(f_h : [0, 1)^N \to M_1\) such that

\[
\tilde{P}_{i,h} = f_h(b_{i+1}, b_{i+2}, \ldots).
\]

Notice that

\[
\tilde{P}_0^n(dx) = \left( \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{1 - b_{i+1}}{y \tilde{P}_i^n(dy)} \right) x^n \delta_h(dx) + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \left( \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} \frac{1 - b_i}{y \tilde{P}_i^n(dy)} \right) b_{j+1} x^j Q(dx).
\]

By letting \(n\) go to infinity,

\[
\tilde{P}_{0,h}(dx) = \tilde{C}_{0,h} \delta_h(dx) + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left( \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} \frac{1 - b_i}{y \tilde{P}_i^n(dy)} \right) b_{j+1} x^j Q(dx).
\]

where

\[
\tilde{C}_{0,h} := 1 - \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left( \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} \frac{1 - b_i}{y \tilde{P}_i^n(dy)} \right) b_{j+1} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \left( \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{1 - b_{i+1}}{y \tilde{P}_i^n(dy)} \right) h^n.
\]

If we define \(\tilde{C}_{i,h}\) for \((\tilde{P}_{i,h})_{i \geq 1}\), \(\forall i \geq 1\), the same as \(\tilde{C}_{0,h}\) for \((\tilde{P}_{i,h})_{i \geq 0}\), then

\[
\tilde{C}_{i,h} = \frac{h(1 - b_{i+1})}{y \tilde{P}_i(dy)} \tilde{C}_{i+1,h}, \quad i \geq 0.
\]

Remark 8. Consider the i-i-d version \((P_i^n)_{0 \leq i \leq n}\) of \((\tilde{P}_i^n)_{0 \leq i \leq n}\) introduced in (7). It holds that

\[
P_0^n \preceq_h P_{0,h}, \quad \forall n \geq 0; \quad P^n \preceq_h P_{0,h} \text{ conditional on } (\beta_i)_{i \geq 1}.
\]

Consider a forward sequence \((P_i)_{i \geq 0}\) with \(P_0 = \delta_h\). Then

\[
(P_0, P_1, \ldots, P_n) \equiv (P^n, P^n, \ldots, P^n)
\]

and consequently

\[
P^n \preceq_h P^{n+1}, \forall n \geq 0; \quad P^n \equiv P_{0,n}.
\]
Remark 9. Consider \((P_{i,h})_{i \geq 0}\), the i-i-d version of \((\tilde{P}_{i,h})_{i \geq 0}\). By (13), \((P_{i,h})_{i \geq 0}\) is stationary ergodic. By (16), \(\{C_{0,h} = 0\}\) belongs to the shift-invariant \(\sigma\)-algebra generated by \((P_{i,h})_{i \geq 0}\). So \[\mathbb{P}(\{C_{0,h} = 0\}) \in \{0,1\}.\]

Proof. First of all, \(\tilde{P}_n^i = \delta_h \leq_h \tilde{P}_{n+1}^i\). Assume for a given \(1 \leq i \leq n\), we have \(\tilde{P}_i^i \leq_h \tilde{P}_{i+1}^i\). By definition\[
\tilde{P}_{i-1}^n(dx) = (1 - b_i) x \tilde{P}_i^n(dx) + b_i Q(dx), \quad \tilde{P}_{i-1}^{n+1}(dx) = (1 - b_i) x \tilde{P}_{i+1}^{n+1}(dx) + b_i Q(dx).
\]
Since \(\tilde{P}_i^i \leq_h \tilde{P}_{i+1}^i\), we have
\[
\int y \tilde{P}_i^n(dy) \geq \int y \tilde{P}_{i+1}^{n+1}(dy)
\]
and thus
\[
\frac{x}{\int y \tilde{P}_i^n(dy)} \leq \frac{x}{\int y \tilde{P}_{i+1}^{n+1}(dy)}, \quad \forall x \in [0,1].
\]
Together with \(\tilde{P}_i^i \leq_h \tilde{P}_{i+1}^i\), we get \(\tilde{P}_{i-1}^n \leq_h \tilde{P}_{i+1}^{n+1}\). By induction, \(\tilde{P}_0^n \leq_h \tilde{P}_0^{n+1}\) for any \(n \geq 1\).

From now on, we denote
\[P^h = P_{0,h}, \quad C^n = C_{0,h}\]
and will use them interchangeably.

2.2.2 Comparisons of general forward sequences

Consider two general forward sequences \((\tilde{P}_i^i)_{i \geq 0}\), \((\tilde{P}_i^{i'})_{i \geq 0}\) corresponding respectively to \(((b_i)_{i \geq 1}, h, Q, \tilde{P}_0^i)\) and \(((b_i)_{i \geq 1}, h', Q', \tilde{P}_0^{i'})\) such that \(\tilde{P}_0^i \leq_h \tilde{P}_0^{i'}\). Let \(a = Q(h)\). Applying the same comparison approach in the proof of Lemma 1, the following result holds with proof omitted.

Lemma 2. In the above setting, we have:

a). For any \(i \geq 0\), \(P_i^i \leq_h \tilde{P}_i^i\) and hence \(\tilde{P}_i(h) \leq \tilde{P}_i^i(h)\);

b). The mass on \(h\) is as follows:

\[
\tilde{P}_{i+1}^i(h) = \left( \prod_{l=0}^{i} \frac{1 - b_{l+1}}{\int y \tilde{P}_l^i(dy)} \right) h^{i+1} \tilde{P}_0^i(h) + \sum_{j=1}^{i+1} \left( \prod_{l=j}^{i} \frac{1 - b_{l+1}}{\int y \tilde{P}_l^i(dy)} \right) b_j h^{i-j+1} a,
\]

and

\[
\tilde{P}_{i+1}(h) = \left( \prod_{l=0}^{i} \frac{1 - b_{l+1}}{\int y \tilde{P}_l(dy)} \right) h^{i+1} \tilde{P}_0^i(h) + \sum_{j=1}^{i+1} \left( \prod_{l=j}^{i} \frac{1 - b_{l+1}}{\int y \tilde{P}_l(dy)} \right) b_j h^{i-j+1} a,
\]

with

\[
\left( \prod_{l=0}^{i} \frac{1 - b_{l+1}}{\int y \tilde{P}_l^i(dy)} \right) \leq \left( \prod_{l=0}^{i} \frac{1 - b_{l+1}}{\int y \tilde{P}_l(dy)} \right), \quad \sum_{j=1}^{i+1} \left( \prod_{l=j}^{i} \frac{1 - b_{l+1}}{\int y \tilde{P}_l^i(dy)} \right) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{i+1} \left( \prod_{l=j}^{i} \frac{1 - b_{l+1}}{\int y \tilde{P}_l(dy)} \right).
\]

Similarly we have the following results.

Lemma 3. a). If general forward sequences \((\tilde{P}_i)_{i \geq 0}\), \((\tilde{P}_i^i)_{i \geq 0}\) correspond respectively to \(((b_i)_{i \geq 1}, h, Q, \tilde{P}_0)\) and \(((b_i)_{i \geq 1}, h', Q, \tilde{P}_0^i)\) such that \(h \leq h'\) and \(\tilde{P}_0^i \leq h\). Then for any \(i \geq 0\), \(\tilde{P}_i^i \leq_h \tilde{P}_i\).

b). If general forward sequences \((\tilde{P}_i)_{i \geq 0}\), \((\tilde{P}_i^i)_{i \geq 0}\) correspond respectively to \(((b_i)_{i \geq 1}, h, Q, \tilde{P}_0)\) and \(((b_i)_{i \geq 1}, h', Q', \tilde{P}_0^i)\) such that \(u_Q = h \leq u_{Q'} \leq h'\) and \(\tilde{P}_0^i \leq_h \tilde{P}_0\). Then for any \(i \geq 0\), \(\tilde{P}_i^i \leq_h \tilde{P}_i\).
2.3 Condensation criterion

2.3.1 Invariant measure and stationary process

Lemma 4. For any invariant measure $\nu$, there exists a unique i-i-d backward sequence $(P_i)_{i \geq 0} \in M_1^{b_0}$ which is stationary and $P_i \overset{d}{=} \nu$ with $\beta_i$ independent of $(P_j)_{j \geq 1}$, satisfying

$$P_i(dx) = (1 - \beta_{i+1}) \frac{xP_{i+1}(dx)}{\int yP_{i+1}(dy)} + \beta_{i+1}Q(dx), i \geq 0.$$  \hfill (20)

Proof. Using iteration (5), one-dimensional distribution determines the multi-dimensional distributions which are consistent by definition and then determines the distribution of the process $(P_i)_{i \geq 0} \in M_1^{b_0}$ using Kolmogorov’s extension theorem. \hfill \square

Remark 10. $P_{i, h}$, the i-i-d version of $\tilde{P}_{0, h}$, is apparently an invariant measure and $(P_{i, h})_{i \geq 0}$ is the corresponding i-i-d backward process.

Proposition 3. Let $\nu$ be an invariant measure such that $u_\nu = h, a.s.$ Let $(P_i)_{i \geq 0}$ be the i-i-d backward sequence with $P_0 \overset{d}{=} \nu$. Then we have

$$P_0(dx) = C_0 \delta_h(dx) + \beta_1 Q(dx) + \cdots + \beta_{j+1} \prod_{i=1}^{j} \frac{(1 - \beta_i)}{\int yP_i(dy)} x^j Q(dx) + \cdots, a.s..$$  \hfill (21)

where

$$C_0 := 1 - \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \beta_{j+1} \prod_{i=1}^{j} \frac{(1 - \beta_i)}{\int yP_i(dy)} m_j \in [0, 1]$$  

(see Remark 11 given later) such that

0). $\nu(h) \overset{d}{=} C_0$ if $Q(h) = 0$.

1). Define $C_i$ for $(P_j)_{j \geq 1}$ for any $i \geq 1$, the same as $C_0$ for $P_0$. Then

$$C_i \frac{h(1 - \beta_i)}{\int yP_i(dy)} = C_{i-1}, a.s..$$

The process $(C_i)_{i \geq 0}$ is stationary.

2). For any joint couple $(\beta, \nu)$, $E[\ln \frac{1 - \beta}{\int y(\nu(dy))}]$ exists and equals a value in $[-\infty, -\ln \int yQ(dy)]$ which does not depend on the joint law of $(\beta, \nu)$.

3). If $h > u_Q$ with $\nu(h) > 0, a.s.$ or $h = u_Q$ with $Q(u_Q) = 0$ and $\nu(u_Q) > 0, a.s.$, then

$$E[\frac{h(1 - \beta)}{\int y(\nu(dy))}] = 0.$$

4). If $h = u_Q$ and $Q(u_Q) > 0$, then

$$E[\ln \frac{u_Q(1 - \beta)}{\int y(\nu(dy))}] < 0 \text{ and } C_0 = 0, a.s..$$

5). If $h = u_Q$, then

$$E[\ln \frac{u_Q(1 - \beta)}{\int y(\nu(dy))}] \leq 0.$$
Proof. For any \( k \geq 1 \), the i-i-d backward sequence \((P_i)_{i \geq 1}\) satisfies that

\[
P_0(dx) = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \beta_{j+1} \prod_{i=1}^{j} \frac{(1 - \beta_i)}{yP_i(dy)} x^j Q(dx) + \left( \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{(1 - \beta_i)}{yP_i(dy)} \int y^k P_k(dy) \right) \frac{x^k P_k(dx)}{y^k P_k(dy)}.
\]

Since \( P_k \overset{d}{=} P_0 \) for any \( k \geq 1 \) and \( u_{P_0} = h \), a.s.,

\[
\frac{x^k P_k(dx)}{y^k P_k(dy)} \text{ converges weakly as } k \text{ tends to infinity to } \delta_h(dx).
\]

By integrating (22) on \([0, 1]\), the following two terms decrease on \( k \) and converge to \( C_0 \) conditionally on \((P_i)_{i \geq 0}\)

\[
\prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{(1 - \beta_i)}{yP_i(dy)} \int y^k P_k(dy) = 1 - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \beta_{j+1} \prod_{i=1}^{j} \frac{(1 - \beta_i)}{yP_i(dy)} m_j \rightarrow C_0. \tag{23}
\]

So conditionally on \((P_i)_{i \geq 0}\)

\[
P_0(dx) - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \beta_{j+1} \prod_{i=1}^{j} \frac{(1 - \beta_i)}{yP_i(dy)} x^j Q(dx)
\]

converges in \( k \) to a non-negative measure on \([0, h]\) which has mass \( C_0 \) and which unconditionally equals in distribution \( C_0 \delta_h \). Thus (21) holds.

0. This is due to the representation (21).

1. This is due to (20) and (21).

2. By (21), it is clear that \( Q \leq \nu \leq \delta_h \), a.s. Thus

\[
\ln \int yQ(dy) \leq \ln \int y\nu(dy) \leq \ln h < \infty, \text{ a.s.}
\]

In consequence

\[
E[\ln \frac{1 - \beta}{y \nu(dy)}] = E[\ln(1 - \beta) - \ln \int y\nu(dy)]
\]

\[
= E[\ln(1 - \beta)] - E[\ln \int y\nu(dy)] \in [-\infty, -\ln \int yQ(dy)].
\]

AppARENTLY the above display does not depend on the joint law of \((\beta, \nu)\).

3. Since \( C_0 > 0 \) almost surely, using (23) we obtain that

\[
\left( \ln \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{(1 - \beta_i)}{yP_i(dy)} \int y^k P_k(dy) \right) /k = \left( \sum_{i=1}^{k} \ln \frac{h(1 - \beta_i)}{yP_i(dy)} + \ln \int y^k P_k(dy) \right) /k \overset{d}{\rightarrow} 0.
\]

Notice that \( \int \frac{y^k P_k(dy)}{h^k} \) converges weakly to \( \nu(u_Q) \). Thus

\[
\left( \sum_{i=1}^{k} \ln \frac{h(1 - \beta_i)}{yP_i(dy)} \right) /k \overset{a.s.}{\rightarrow} E[\ln \frac{h(1 - \beta_i)}{yP_i(dy)} | \mathcal{F}].
\]

By Lemma 4, \((P_i)_{i \geq 1}\) is a stationary process. Let \( \mathcal{F} \) be the shift-invariant \( \sigma \)-algebra generated by \((P_i)_{i \geq 1}\). By Birkoff’s ergodic theorem,

\[
\left( \sum_{i=1}^{k} \ln \frac{h(1 - \beta_i)}{yP_i(dy)} \right) /k \overset{a.s.}{\rightarrow} E[\ln \frac{h(1 - \beta_i)}{yP_i(dy)} | \mathcal{F}].
\]
The above two displays entail that

$$\mathbb{E}[\ln \frac{1 - \beta_1}{\int yP_i(dy)} | \mathcal{F}] = 0, \text{a.s.}$$

and then

$$\mathbb{E}[\ln \frac{1 - \beta_1}{\int yP_i(dy)}] = 0.$$

4). Let $a = Q(u_Q)$. Consider a forward sequence $(P_i)_{i \geq 0}$ with $P_0 \overset{d}{=} \nu$. Taking the expectation of the mass on $u_Q$ in (6), and conditional on the shift-invariant $\sigma$-algebra $\mathcal{F}$, we get for any $i \geq 0$

$$1 \geq \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\prod_{l=0}^{i} \frac{1 - \beta_{l+1}}{\int yP_l(dy)}\right) u_Q^{i+1} P_0(u_Q) | \mathcal{F}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{i+1} \left(\prod_{l=j}^{i} \frac{1 - \beta_{l+1}}{\int yP_l(dy)}\right) \beta_j | \mathcal{F}\right] u_Q^{i-j+1}

\geq ab \sum_{j=1}^{i+1} \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{l=j}^{i} \frac{u_Q(1 - \beta_{l+1})}{\int yP_l(dy)} | \mathcal{F}\right]

\geq ab \sum_{j=1}^{i+1} \exp \left(\sum_{l=j}^{i} \mathbb{E}[\ln \frac{u_Q(1 - \beta_{l+1})}{\int yP_l(dy)} | \mathcal{F}]\right) = ab \sum_{j=1}^{i+1} \exp \left((i - j + 1) \mathbb{E}[\ln \frac{u_Q(1 - \beta_1)}{\int yP_1(dy)} | \mathcal{F}]\right).

Letting $i$ tend to infinity, it must be that

$$\mathbb{E}[\ln \frac{u_Q(1 - \beta_1)}{\int yP_1(dy)} | \mathcal{F}] < 0, \text{a.s.}$$

So $\mathbb{E}[\ln \frac{u_Q(1 - \beta_1)}{\int yP_1(dy)}] = \mathbb{E}[\ln \frac{u_Q(1 - \beta_1)}{\int yP_1(dy)}] < 0$.

Now we show that $C_0 = 0$ a.s.. By 1), $\{C_0 > 0\}$ belongs to $\mathcal{F}$ the shift-invariant $\sigma$-algebra generated by $(P_i)_{i \geq 1}$. Note that $\nu(u_Q) > 0$, a.s.. Proceeding in the same way as for assertion 3), we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\ln C_0 | \mathcal{F}] = \lim_{k \to \infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{k} \ln \frac{u_Q(1 - \beta_i)}{\int yP_i(dy)} + \ln \frac{y^k P_k(dy)}{u_Q}\right]

\leq \lim_{k \to \infty} k \mathbb{E}[\ln \frac{u_Q(1 - \beta_1)}{\int yP_1(dy)} | \mathcal{F}] = -\infty, \text{a.s.}.$$

Then it must be that $C_0 = 0, \text{a.s.}$.

5. Assume that $\mathbb{E}[\ln \frac{u_Q(1 - \beta)}{\int yP_1(dy)}] > 0$. Then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$, such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\ln \frac{(u_Q - \varepsilon)(1 - \beta)}{\int yP_1(dy)}] > 0.$$

We consider again a forward sequence $(P_i)_{i \geq 0}$ with $P_0 \overset{d}{=} \nu$. Then $P_i \overset{d}{=} \nu, \forall i \geq 0$, and

$$P_i([u_Q - \varepsilon, u_Q]) \geq \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{(u_Q - \varepsilon)(1 - \beta_j)}{\int yP_j(dy)} P_0([u_Q - \varepsilon, u_Q]).$$

By (21), $Q \leq \nu$ a.s. and thus $P_i([u_Q - \varepsilon, u_Q]) > 0$ almost surely for any $i \geq 0$. Consequently

$$\frac{\ln P_i([u_Q - \varepsilon, u_Q])}{i} \geq \frac{\ln P_0([u_Q - \varepsilon, u_Q])}{i} + \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \left(\frac{\ln (u_Q - \varepsilon)(1 - \beta_j)}{\int yP_j(dy)}\right) / i. \quad (24)$$
The left side of the above display converges weakly to 0. The first term on the right side \( \ln P_0([u_Q - \varepsilon, u_Q]) \) tends to 0 as \( i \) goes to infinity. Then
\[
\sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \left( \ln \left( \frac{(u_Q - \varepsilon)(1 - \beta_j)}{yP_j(dy)} \right) \right) \rightarrow 0 \text{ a.s.}
\]
Therefore
\[
E[\ln \left( \frac{(u_Q - \varepsilon)(1 - \beta_{i+1})}{y\nu(dy)} \right)] = E[E[\ln \left( \frac{(u_Q - \varepsilon)(1 - \beta_{i+1})}{yP_0(dy)} \right) | \mathcal{F}]] \leq 0
\]
which is a contradiction. \( \square \)

**Remark 11.** For the particular i-i-d backward sequence \((P_i,h)_{i \geq 0}\), \( C_0 \) is actually \( C_{0,h} \). Generally, the notation \( C_0 \) does not tell which backward sequence is under consideration. In fact as shown by Lemma 4 and Proposition 1, all backward sequences described in Proposition 3 for a given \( h \) are the same, i.e., have the same distribution.

### 2.3.2 Largest fitness value \( h \) determines an invariant measure

**Proof of Proposition 1.** We shall consider only the case \( C_{0,h} = 0 \) a.s.. The case of \( C_{0,h} > 0 \), a.s. follows similarly. Notice that for any \( h > u_Q \), if \( C_{0,h} = 0 \) a.s., then \( P_{0,h} \) is an invariant measure on \([0, u_Q]\). It thus suffices to prove that for any invariant measure \( \nu \) on \([0, u_Q]\),
\[
E[\ln \left( u_Q - \varepsilon \right)(1 - \beta_{i+1}) \int yP_i(dy)] = 0.
\]
Assertion a) in Lemma 2 implies that
\[
P_i \leq u_Q \nu, \quad P'(u_Q) \geq \nu(u_Q).
\]  \( (26) \)
We consider three cases.

**case 1.** \( a = 0, C_{0,u_Q} = 0 \) a.s.: Since \( P'(u_Q) = C_{0,u_Q} = 0 \) a.s., by (26), \( \nu(u_Q) = 0 \) a.s.. Then we conclude that \( P' \not\leq \nu \).

**case 2.** \( a = 0, C_{0,u_Q} > 0 \), a.s.: Then by 3) of Proposition 3,
\[
E[\ln \left( u_Q \frac{1 - \beta_{i+1}}{yP_i(dy)} \right)] = 0.
\]
Assertion a) in Lemma 2 implies that
\[
E[\ln \left( \frac{u_Q(1 - \beta)}{y\nu(dy)} \right)] \geq E[\ln \left( \frac{u_Q(1 - \beta)}{yP_i(dy)} \right)] = 0.
\]
Assertion 5) of Proposition 3 entails that the inequality should be an equality. Then \( P' \not\leq \nu \).

**case 3.** \( a > 0 \): assertion 4) of Proposition 3 says that \( C_{0,u_Q} = 0 \) a.s. Thus the first term on the right-hand side of (18) in the i-i-d version converges weakly to 0. Therefore (19) entails that \( P'(u_Q) \leq \nu(u_Q) \). We conclude by (26) that \( P' \not\leq \nu \). \( \square \)
2.3.3 Convex decomposition of invariant measures

Lemma 5. Recall the definition of $u_\mu$ for $\mu \in M_1$. Then $u(\cdot)$ is a continuous (hence measurable) function on $(M_1, T)$.

Proof. Assume that a sequence $\{\mu_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ converges weakly to $\mu$. If $u_{\mu_n}$ does not converge to $u_\mu$, then by compactness there exists a subsequence $\{\mu_{nk}\}_{k \geq 1}$ such that $u_{\mu_{nk}}$ converges to a limit $a$ with $a < u_\mu$ or $a > u_\mu$. It suffices to find a contradiction in the first case, as the second case works similarly. Find a continuous function $\beta$, $\nu$ where $u$ converge to $\beta$, $\nu$ on $(a, \infty)$. Then $U_u u \in \mathcal{M}$. Then $U u \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\nu$ is a continuous function on $(a, \infty)$. If $U u \in \mathcal{M}$, it must be that $\beta \in \mathcal{M}$. We leave the proof of convergence to the end and consider the condensation first.

Proof of Proposition 2. For any invariant measure $\nu$, write

$$d\mu = (1 - \beta) \frac{x\nu(dx)}{\int y\nu(dy)} + \beta Q(dx)$$

where $\beta, \nu$ are independent. Then $\mu = d\mu$, and $u_\mu = u_\nu \geq u_Q$ almost surely. By Lemma 5, $u_\mu, u_\nu$ are random variables. Applying Theorem 5.3 in [4], there exist probability kernels $U(\cdot, \cdot), V(\cdot, \cdot)$ from $[0, 1]$ to $M_1$ such that almost surely

$$\mathbb{P}(\mu \in \cdot | u_\mu) = U(u_\mu, \cdot), \mathbb{P}(\nu \in \cdot | u_\nu) = V(u_\nu, \cdot)$$

Since $u_\mu = u_\nu$, a.s.,

$$U(u_\mu, \cdot) \overset{a.s.}{=} U(u_\nu, \cdot) \overset{a.s.}{=} \mathbb{P}(\mu \in \cdot | u_\mu) \overset{a.s.}{=} \mathbb{P}(\mu \in \cdot | u_\nu).$$

Then

$$U(u_\nu, dx) = (1 - \beta) \frac{xV(u_\nu, dx)}{\int yV(u_\nu, dy)} + \beta Q(dx), a.s..$$

Because $\mu = d\nu$,

$$U(u_\nu, \cdot) \overset{a.s.}{=} \mathbb{P}(\mu \in \cdot | u_\mu) \overset{d}{=} \mathbb{P}(\nu \in \cdot | u_\nu) \overset{a.s.}{=} V(u_\nu, \cdot), \quad u_{U(u_\nu, \cdot)} = u_{V(u_\nu, \cdot)} = u_\nu.$$

Therefore $U(u_\nu, \cdot), V(u_\nu, \cdot)$ are invariant measures almost surely, and by Proposition 1, it must be that $U(u_\nu, \cdot) = V(u_\nu, \cdot) = \mathbb{P}(P^u_{\nu} \in \cdot | u_\nu)$.

2.3.4 Condensation criterion

We leave the proof of convergence to the end and consider the condensation first.

Proposition 4. $\mathbb{E}[\ln \frac{h(1 - \beta)}{\int y P^u_{\nu}(dy)}] \leq 0$.

Proof. This result completes assertion 5) of Proposition 3 with the case $h > u_Q$. Let $(P_i)_{i \geq 0}$ be an i-i-d forward sequence with $P_0 = \delta_h$. By Remark 8, $P_i$ converges weakly to $P^h_{\nu}$, and $\mathbb{E}[\ln \frac{h(1 - \beta)}{\int y P^u_{\nu}(dy)}]$ converges increasingly to $\mathbb{E}[\ln \frac{h(1 - \beta)}{\int y P^u_{\nu}(dy)}]$.

Using (6)

$$\mathbb{E}[P_{i+1}(h)] = \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\prod_{l=0}^{i} \frac{1 - \beta_{i+1}}{\int y P^u_{\nu}(dy)}\right) h^{i+1}\right] \geq \exp \left(\sum_{l=0}^{i} \mathbb{E}\left[\ln \frac{h(1 - \beta_{i+1})}{\int y P^u_{\nu}(dy)}\right]\right).$$

Since $\mathbb{E}[P_{i+1}(h)] \leq 1$, it must be that $\mathbb{E}[\ln \frac{h(1 - \beta)}{\int y P^u_{\nu}(dy)}] \leq 0$. 

17
Proof of Theorem 3. The first assertion holds due to 3) of Proposition 3. We shall consider only the second one. If there is condensation, then \( P^{uQ}_* \neq P^h_* \). By 3) of Proposition 3 and a) of Lemma 3,

\[
\mathbb{E}[\ln \frac{h(1-\beta)}{yP^{uQ}_*(dy)}] > \mathbb{E}[\ln \frac{h(1-\beta)}{yP^h_*(dy)}] = 0.
\]

If there is no condensation, then \( P^h_* = P^{uQ}_* \). By Proposition 4,

\[
\mathbb{E}[\ln \frac{h(1-\beta)}{yP^{uQ}_*(dy)}] = \mathbb{E}[\ln \frac{h(1-\beta)}{yP^h_*(dy)}] \leq 0.
\]

\[
\square
\]

2.4 Weak convergence

We prove here Theorem 2 in difference cases.

1). \( P_0 = \delta_h \)

Proof of Theorem 2. It is shown in Remark 8. \( \square \)

Let \((P'_i)_{i \geq 0}\) be coupled as in Lemma 2 in the i-i-d version with \((P_i)_{i \geq 0}\) such that \( P'_0 = \delta_h \).

2). \( C_{0,h} = 0, a.s. \)

Proof of Theorem 2. We use the same comparison approach in case 1 and case 3 in the proof of Proposition 1. \( \square \)

3). \( C_{0,h} > 0, a.s. : P_0(h) > 0 \)

We shall use the following result taken from ([2], p.10), where only \( h = 1 \) is considered. But it is easily generalized to any \( h \).

Lemma 6. Let two deterministic measures \( \mu_1, \mu_2 \in M_1 \) such that \( u_{\mu_1} = u_{\mu_2} = h \) and \( \mu_1 \preceq_h \mu_2 \). If for some \( \varepsilon > 0 \) such that at some \( a \in (0, h) \), \( D_{\mu_1}(a) + \varepsilon \leq D_{\mu_2}(a) \), then

\[
\int y\mu_1(dy) \geq c(a, \varepsilon) \int y\mu_2(dy)
\]

where \( c(a, \varepsilon) = \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon(a-h)} > 1 \).

Proof of Theorem 2. For any \( \varepsilon > 0, a \in (0, h) \), let

\[
n_i = \#\{j : D_{P'_j}(a) + \varepsilon \leq D_{P_j}(a), 0 \leq j \leq i\}.
\]

By 4) of Proposition 3, \( Q(h) = 0 \). So (17) and (18) in the i-i-d setting become

\[
P'_{i+1}(h) = \left( \prod_{l=0}^{i} \frac{1-\beta_{l+1}}{yP'_l(dy)} \right) h^{i+1}, \quad P_{i+1}(h) = \left( \prod_{l=0}^{i} \frac{1-\beta_{l+1}}{yP_l(dy)} \right) h^{i+1} P_0(h).
\]

Then by Lemma 6,

\[
P'_{i+1}(h) \leq \frac{1}{c^{n_i}(a, \varepsilon)} P_{i+1}(h) \leq \frac{1}{c^{n_i}(a, \varepsilon)}.
\]

But \( P'_{i+1}(h) \) converges weakly to \( C_{0,h} \) which is non-zero almost surely. Then \( \lim_{i \to \infty} n_i < \infty \) a.s.. Since \( \varepsilon \) can be any small positive value, \( P_i \) converges weakly to \( P^h_* \). \( \square \)
4). \( C_{0,h} > 0, \text{a.s.:} \ P_0(h) = 0 \)

The idea is to use a tripling argument as in the proof of Theorem 5 in [2]. For any deterministic \( \mu \in M_1 \) and any \( a \in [0,1] \), define

\[
\mu^a := \mu_{[0,a)} + \mu([a,1])\delta_a.
\]

Particularly let \( a < h \) and triple \((P_i)_{i \geq 0}, (P'_i)_{i \geq 0}\) with a third forward sequence \((P''_i)_{i \geq 0}\) such that

1. The three sequences are defined on the same probability space \((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)\) and share the same \((\beta_i)_{i \geq 1}\).
2. \( P''_0 = P^a_0, \ P''_{i+1}(dx) = (1 - \beta_{i+1}) \int y P''_i(dy) + \beta_{i+1} Q^a(dx), i \geq 0. \)

Note that \( P^a_0(a) > 0 \). By part 3) of this section, \( P''_i \) converges weakly to a limit denoted also by \( P^a_* \) which satisfies that

\[
P^a_*(dx) \overset{d}{=} \left(1 - \beta\right) \int x P^a_*(dx) \frac{dx}{y P^a_*(dy)} + bQ^a(dx) \tag{27}
\]

where \( \beta \) is independent of \( P^a_* \). By Lemma 3, the tripling of three sequences yields that

\[
P'_i \preceq_h P_i \preceq_a P''_i \tag{28}
\]

and thus

\[
P^h_* \preceq_a P^a_*. \tag{29}
\]

**Lemma 7.** \( P^a_* \) converges weakly to \( P^h_* \) as \( a \) tends to \( h \).

**Proof.** For any \( 0 \leq c_1 < c_2 < 1 \), Lemma 3 entails that \( P^a_{c_2} \preceq_{c_1} P^a_{c_1} \). Thus \( P^a_* \) converges weakly to a limit distribution, denoted by \( P \). Apparently \( P \preceq_a P^a_* \) for any \( a < h \) and \( u_P = h \) a.s. Letting \( a \) tend to \( h \), the weak convergence of both sides in (27) yields that

\[
P(dx) \overset{d}{=} \left(1 - \beta\right) \int x P(dx) \frac{dx}{y P(dy)} + bQ(dx).
\]

where \( \beta \) is independent of \( P \). Thus \( P \) is an invariant measure with \( u_P = h \) almost surely. By Proposition 1, \( P \overset{d}{=} P^h_* \). \( \square \)

**Proof of Theorem 2.** For any \( f \in C[0,1] \), recall (28) and we have

\[
\mathbb{E}[\int f(x) P^a_*(dx)] = \lim_{i \to \infty} \mathbb{E}[\int f(x) P''_i(dx)] \leq \lim_{i \to \infty} \mathbb{E}[\int f(x) P'_i(dx)] \leq \lim_{i \to \infty} \mathbb{E}[\int f(x) P_i(dx)] = \mathbb{E}[\int f(x) P^h_*(dx)].
\]

We conclude using Lemma 7. \( \square \)

**2.5 Matrix analysis**

Recall that, in this section, we exclude that \( Q \) is degenerate, as this case has been discussed in Example 1.
2.5.1 Notations on matrices

Let $m_i := \int y^i Q(dy)$, $\forall i \geq 0$. For any $1 \leq j \leq n \leq \infty$ (except $j = n = \infty$), define

$$\tilde{W}^j_x := \begin{pmatrix} x & x^2 & x^3 & \cdots & x^{n-j+2} \\ \tilde{\Gamma} & m_1 & m_2 & \cdots & m_{n-j+1} \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & -\tilde{\Gamma}_{n-j+1} & m_1 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \ddots & \ddots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & -\tilde{\Gamma}_n & m_1 \end{pmatrix},$$

(30)

and

$$\tilde{W}^{j,n} := \int \tilde{W}^j_x Q(dx) = \begin{pmatrix} m_1 & m_2 & m_3 & \cdots & m_{n-j+2} \\ -\tilde{\Gamma} & m_1 & m_2 & \cdots & m_{n-j+1} \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & -\tilde{\Gamma}_{j+1} & m_1 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \ddots & \ddots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & -\tilde{\Gamma}_n & m_1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (31)$$

Let

$$\check{W}^n = \check{W}_x^n; \check{W}_x = \check{W}_x^1; \check{W}_x^{n+1} = (x); \check{W}_x^{m,n} = 1, \forall m > n + 1,$$

and

$$\check{W}^n = \check{W}_x^1; \check{W} = \check{W}_x^1; \check{W}_x^{n+1} = (m_i); \check{W}_x^{m,n} = 1, \forall m > n + 1.$$

For a matrix $M$ of shape $m \times n$, let $r_i(M)$ be the $i$-th row and $c_j(M)$ be the $j$-th column, for any $1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n$. If the matrix is like

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} m_{a_1} & m_{a_2} & \cdots & m_{a_{n-1}} & m_{a_n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \cdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \cdots & \cdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & m_{a_{n+m}} \end{pmatrix},$$

define, for any $k \geq 0$

$$U_k^r M := \begin{pmatrix} m_{a_1} & m_{a_2} & \cdots & m_{a_{n-1}} & m_{k+a_n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \cdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \cdots & \cdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & m_{a_{n+m}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here $U_k^r$ increases the indices of the first row by $k$, with $r$ referring to “row”, and $U$ to “upgrade”. Similarly define

$$U_k^c M := \begin{pmatrix} m_{a_1} & m_{a_2} & \cdots & m_{a_{n-1}} & m_{k+a_n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \cdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \cdots & \cdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & m_{k+a_{n+m}} \end{pmatrix},$$

which increases the indices of the last column by $k$, with $c$ referring to “column”.

In particular we write

$$U^r = U_1^r, U^c = U_1^c.$$

Let $| \cdot |$ denote the determinant operator for square matrices. Define

$$\tilde{L}_{i,n} := \frac{|\tilde{W}_x^{i+1,n}|}{|\tilde{W}_x^{i,n}|}, \forall 1 \leq i \leq n.$$
2.5.2 Matrix representation of a finite general backward sequence

Consider a finite general backward sequence as follows:

\[ \tilde{P}_n = Q; \quad \tilde{P}_i^n(x) = (1 - b_{i+1}) \frac{x \tilde{P}_i^n(dx)}{\int y \tilde{P}_i^n(dy)} + b_{i+1}Q(dx), \quad 0 \leq i \leq n - 1. \]  

(32)

The sequence differs from the one defined by (7) at \( \tilde{P}_n^n \). This particular choice will endow \( \tilde{P}_i^n, 0 \leq i \leq n \), with a matrix representation.

Lemma 8. For any \( 0 \leq i \leq n \),

\[ \frac{x \tilde{P}_i^n(dx)}{\int y \tilde{P}_n^n(dy)} = \frac{|\tilde{W}_i^{i+1,n}|}{|\tilde{W}_i^{i+1,n}|} Q(dx). \]  

(33)

Remark 12. In consequence,

\[ \frac{\int y^{k+1} \tilde{P}_i^n(dy)}{\int y \tilde{P}_n^n(dy)} = \frac{|U^r_k \tilde{W}_i^{i+1,n}|}{|\tilde{W}_i^{i+1,n}|} =: \tilde{G}_i^{n,k} = \frac{m_{k+1} + \tilde{\Gamma}_{i+1} \tilde{G}_i^{n+2,k+1}}{m_1 + \tilde{\Gamma}_{i+1}} \]  

(34)

where the last equality is obtained by developing \( |U^r_k \tilde{W}_i^{i+1,n}|, |\tilde{W}_i^{i+1,n}| \) on the first column. In particular, we define

\[ \tilde{G}_k^n := \frac{|U^r_k \tilde{W}_n^n|}{|\tilde{W}_n^n|}. \]

Note that

\[ \tilde{L}_{i,n} = \frac{|\tilde{W}_i^{i+1,n}|}{|\tilde{W}_i^{i,n}|} = \frac{|\tilde{W}_i^{i+1,n}|}{m_1 |\tilde{W}_i^{i+1,n}| + \tilde{\Gamma}_i |U^r \tilde{W}_i^{i+1,n}|} = \frac{1}{m_1 + \tilde{\Gamma}_i} \frac{1}{\tilde{G}_i^{n+1,1}}. \]  

(35)

By the above Lemma,

\[ \tilde{P}_i^n(dx) = (1 - b_{i+1}) \frac{|\tilde{W}_i^{i+2,n}|}{|\tilde{W}_i^{i+2,n}|} Q(dx) + b_{i+1}Q(dx) \]  

(36)

with the \( k \)-th moment

\[ \frac{\int y^k \tilde{P}_i^n(dy)}{\int y \tilde{P}_n^n(dy)} = (1 - b_{i+1}) \tilde{G}_i^{n,k} + b_{i+1}m_1 = b_{i+1}(\tilde{\Gamma}_{i+1} \tilde{G}_i^{n+2,k} + m_1) \]  

(37)

which equals

\[ \frac{b_{i+1}}{\tilde{L}_{i+1,n}} \quad \text{if } k = 1. \]  

(38)

If \( \tilde{\Gamma}_i = \infty \), we write

\[ \tilde{L}_{i,n} = 0, \quad \tilde{\Gamma}_i \tilde{L}_{i,n} = \frac{|\tilde{W}_i^{i+1,n}|}{|U^r \tilde{W}_i^{i+1,n}|} = \frac{1}{\tilde{G}_i^{n+1,1}}. \]  

(39)

Proof. Note that

\[ \frac{x \tilde{P}_i^{n-1}(dx)}{\int y \tilde{P}_n^{n-1}(dy)} = \frac{x \tilde{m}_1 + x^2 \tilde{\Gamma}_n}{m_1^2 + m_2 \tilde{\Gamma}_n} Q(dx) = \frac{|\tilde{W}_n^{n,n}|}{|\tilde{W}_n^{n,n}|} Q(dx). \]

Assume that for some \( 1 \leq i \leq n - 1 \),

\[ \frac{x \tilde{P}_i^n(dx)}{\int y \tilde{P}_n^n(dy)} = \frac{|\tilde{W}_i^{i+1,n}|}{|\tilde{W}_i^{i+1,n}|} Q(dx), \]
then
\[ P_{t-1}^n(dx) = (1 - b_i) \frac{|\tilde{W}_i^{i-1,n}|}{|W_i^{i+1,n}|} Q(dx) + b_i Q(dx). \]

Consequently
\[
\frac{x \hat{P}_{t-1}^n(dx)}{\int y \hat{P}_{t-1}^n(dy)} = \frac{(1 - b_i)x |\tilde{W}_i^{i+1,n}| + b_i x}{(1 - b_i) \int y |\tilde{W}_i^{i+1,n}| Q(dy) + b_i m_1} Q(dx)
\]
\[ = \frac{\Gamma_i x |\tilde{W}_i^{i+1,n}| + x |W_i^{i+1,n}|}{\Gamma_i (U^r W_i^{i+1,n}) + m_1 |W_i^{i+1,n}|} Q(dx) = \frac{|\tilde{W}_i^{i,n}|}{|W_i^{i,n}|} Q(dx). \]

We thus conclude by induction.

For \( 2 \leq i \leq n + 1 \), expanding \(|\tilde{W}_i^{i,n}|\) along the first row yields
\[
\frac{|\tilde{W}_i^{i,n}|}{|W_i^{i,n}|} = \frac{1}{|W_i^{i,n}|} \sum_{k=0}^{n-i+1} \left( \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} \tilde{\Gamma}_{i+j} \right) |\tilde{W}_i^{i+k+1,n}| x^{k+1}
\]
\[ = \sum_{k=0}^{n-i+1} \left( \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} \tilde{\Gamma}_{i+j} \tilde{L}_{i+k,n} \right) \tilde{L}_{i+k,n} x^{k+1} = \sum_{k=0}^{n-i+1} \tilde{\Phi}_{i,k,n} x^{k+1}. \]

where
\[
\tilde{\Phi}_{i,k,n} := \left( \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} \tilde{\Gamma}_{i+j} \tilde{L}_{i+j,n} \right) \tilde{L}_{i+k,n} m_{k+1}. \]

By (36) and (40)
\[
\hat{P}_{t-2}^n(dx) = (1 - b_{i-1}) \sum_{k=0}^{n-i+1} \tilde{\Phi}_{i,k,n} x^{k+1} Q(dx) + b_{i-1} Q(dx) \]

We expect that as \( n \to \infty \), \( \hat{P}_{t-2}^n \) converges as \( n \) goes to infinity with \( i - 2 \) fixed. Then we obtain a general backward sequence which enjoys a matrix representation.

### 2.5.3 Convergence of the finite general backward sequence

**Proposition 5.** For any \( i \geq 0, n \geq i \),
\[
0 < \tilde{G}_i^{n+1} < \tilde{G}_i^{n+1} < 1.
\]

Denote the limit of \( \tilde{G}_i^{n+1,1} \) by \( \tilde{G}_i^{i+1,1} \), and the limit of \( \tilde{G}_i^n \) by \( \tilde{G}_i^1 \).

**Proof.** If \( n = i \), \( 0 < \tilde{G}_i^{i+1,1} = \frac{m_2}{m_1} < \frac{m_2}{m_1} = \tilde{G}_i^{n+1} < 1 \). Consider \( n > i \). Since it holds regardless of the values of \( \{b_i\}_{i \geq 0} \), we shall prove the following
\[
0 < \tilde{G}_i^1 < \tilde{G}_i^{n+1} < 1, \forall n \geq 1.
\]

The above inequality is correct since it is exactly \( 0 < x_0^n < x_0^{n+1} < 1 \), using notations from Lemma 14 in the appendix.

**Remark 13.** Using (35) and (39), if \( \tilde{\Gamma}_i = \infty \), then \( \tilde{L}_{i,n} = 0 \); if \( \tilde{\Gamma}_i < \infty \), then \( \tilde{L}_{i,n} \) decreases strictly in \( n \geq i - 1 \). Define
\[
\tilde{L}_i := \lim_{n \to \infty} \tilde{L}_{i,n} = \frac{1}{m_1 + \tilde{\Gamma}_i \tilde{G}_i^{i+1,1}}.
\]
In both cases, $\tilde{\Gamma}_i\tilde{L}_{i,n}$ decreases strictly in $n$. Denote the limit of $\tilde{\Gamma}_i\tilde{L}_{i,n}$ by $\tilde{\Gamma}_i\tilde{L}_i$ such that

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_i\tilde{L}_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \tilde{\Gamma}_i = \infty; \\ \frac{\tilde{\Gamma}_{i+1}L_i}{m_i + \tilde{\Gamma}_{i+1}} & \text{if } \tilde{\Gamma}_i < \infty. \end{cases} \quad (44)$$

**Remark 14.** By Remark 13 and (44), if $\tilde{\Gamma}_{i+k} < \infty$, then $\tilde{\Phi}_{i,k,n}$ strictly decreases in $n$; otherwise $\tilde{\Phi}_{i,k,n} = 0$ for any $n$. Define

$$\tilde{\Phi}_{i,k} := \lim_{n \to \infty} \tilde{\Phi}_{i,k,n} = \left( \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} \tilde{\Gamma}_{i+j} \tilde{L}_{i+j} \right) \tilde{L}_{i+k} m_{k+1}.$$  

**Corollary 1.** For any $k \geq 1, i \geq 1$, $\tilde{G}_{i,k}^n$ increases strictly in $n$ and denote the limit by $\tilde{G}_{i,k}$ (if $i = 1$, denote the limit by $\tilde{G}_k$).

**Proof.** The case $k = 1$ has been proved by Proposition 5. We consider here general $k$. Let $i \geq 2$. It is equivalent to prove the strict monotonicity for $\tilde{G}_{i-1,k}^n$ on $n$. For any $l \geq 0$, if $\tilde{\Phi}_{i,l,n} > 0$, then by Remark 14

$$\tilde{\Phi}_{i,l,n} > \tilde{\Phi}_{i,l,n+1} > 0.$$  

In view of (40), $\tilde{P}_{i-\frac{m}{2}}^n([0,x])$ is a convex combination of $\{\frac{x^lQ(dx)}{m_l}; l \geq 0\}$, such that the mass on $\frac{x^lQ(dx)}{m_l}$ is $(1 - b_{i-1})\tilde{\Phi}_{i,l,n}$ which decreases strictly in $n$ if $l \geq 1$ and $\tilde{\Gamma}_{i+l} < \infty$. When $l = 1$, the mass is on $Q(dx)$ which equals $b_{i-1}$ and which does not depend on $n$. Simply speaking, changing from $n$ to $n + 1$, the mass on $\frac{x^lQ(dx)}{m_l}$ for any $1 \leq l \leq n-i+1$, if non-zero, decreases strictly, and the lost mass will be moved to a new measure $\frac{x^{n-i+2}Q(dx)}{m_{n-i+2}}$.

Note that for any $0 \leq l \leq n-i+1$, by Hölder’s inequality,

$$\frac{\int y^{k+1}Q(dy) dy}{\int y y^{l}Q(dy)} = \frac{m_{l+k+1}}{m_{l+1}} < \frac{m_{n-i+3+k}}{m_{n-i+3}} = \frac{\int y^{k+1}y^{n-i+2}Q(dy)}{\int y y^{l}Q(dy)}$$

and

$$\frac{\int y^{k+1}Q(dy)}{m_l} < \frac{\int y^{k+1}y^{n-i+2}Q(dy)}{m_{n-i+2}}, \quad \frac{\int y y^{l}Q(dy)}{m_l} < \frac{\int y y^{n-i+2}Q(dy)}{m_{n-i+2}}.$$  

By Lemma 13 in the appendix, it follows that

$$\frac{\int y^{k+1}\tilde{P}_{i-\frac{m}{2}}^{n}(dy)}{\int y\tilde{P}_{i-\frac{m}{2}}^{n}(dy)}$$

is strictly increasing in $n$. We can conclude by using (34). \hfill $\square$

**Remark 15.** For any $i \geq 1, k \geq 1$, by (34)

$$\tilde{G}_{i,k} = \frac{m_{k+1} + \tilde{\Gamma}_{i} \tilde{G}_{i+1,k+1}}{m_i + \tilde{\Gamma}_{i}}. \quad (45)$$

Now we can let $n$ tend to infinity in (42) and obtain a limit.

**Proposition 6.** a). For $i \geq 2$, define

$$\tilde{P}_{i-2,n}(dx) := (1 - b_{i-1}) \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\Phi}_{i,k} \frac{x^{k+1}}{m_{k+1}} Q(dx) + \tilde{K}_{i,*} \delta_{u_0}(dx) \right) + b_{i-1} Q(dx) \quad (46)$$
where
\[ \tilde{K}_{i,*} := 1 - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \hat{K}_{i,k} \in [0, 1). \]

The probability measure \( \tilde{P}_{i,*} \) converges weakly to \( \tilde{P}_{i-2,*} \) and the convergence is strong if and only if \( \tilde{K}_{i,*} = 0 \). Moreover
\[ \tilde{K}_{i,*} = (1 - b_i)u_Q \tilde{\Gamma}_i \tilde{L}_i \tilde{K}_{i+1,*}. \]  
(47)
b). For any \( i \geq 0 \), \( (\tilde{P}_{i,*})_{i \geq 0} \) is a general backward sequence:
\[ \tilde{P}_{i,*}(dx) = (1 - b_{i+1}) \frac{\tilde{P}_{i+1,*}(dx)}{y \tilde{P}_{i,*}(dy)} + b_{i+1}Q(dx). \]  
(48)
Moreover
\[ b_{i+1} = \tilde{L}_{i+1} \int y \tilde{P}_{i,*}(dy), \text{ i.e., } \frac{1 - b_{i+1}}{y \tilde{P}_{i,*}(dy)} = \tilde{\Gamma}_{i+1} \tilde{L}_{i+1}. \]

Proof. The proposition is a direct consequence of (38), (42) and Remark 14. \( \square \)

Remark 16. When \( Q(u_Q) = 0 \), for any \( i \geq 0 \),
\[ \tilde{C}_{i,*} := (1 - b_{i+1}) \tilde{K}_{i+2,*} = \tilde{P}_{i,*}(u_Q) = \lim_{j \to \infty} \frac{u_Q^{-j}}{j} \int y^j \tilde{P}_{i,*}(dy) \]
\[ = \lim_{j \to \infty} \frac{u_Q^{-j}}{j} (1 - b_{i+1}) \tilde{G}_{i+2,j} + u_Q^{-j} b_{i+1} m_{j+1} \]
\[ = (1 - b_{i+1}) \lim_{j \to \infty} \frac{u_Q^{-j}}{j} \tilde{G}_{i+2,j} \]
\[ = (1 - b_{i+1}) \lim_{j \to \infty} \frac{u_Q^{-j}}{j} \tilde{G}_{i+2,j}. \]

As a byproduct
\[ \tilde{K}_{i+2,*} = \lim_{j \to \infty} u_Q^{-j} \tilde{G}_{i+2,j}. \]

Remark 17. It is natural to ask if \( (\tilde{P}_{i,*})_{i \geq 0} \) and \( (\tilde{P}_{i,u_Q})_{i \geq 0} \) are the same sequence given the same \( (b_i)_{i \geq 0}, Q \). This question remains open. But \( (\tilde{P}_{i,*})_{i \geq 0} \) and \( (\tilde{P}_{i,u_Q})_{i \geq 0} \) do have the same distribution, since they are i-i-d backward sequences with the same largest fitness value \( u_Q \) almost surely, as to be shown in Corollary 5 later.

2.5.4 Dependence of the limit on mutation probabilities

Next we show how \( (\tilde{P}_{i,*})_{i \geq 1} \) depends on the mutation probabilities \( (b_i)_{i \geq 1} \).

Lemma 9. If \( \tilde{\Gamma}_i < \infty \), then
\[ \frac{1}{m_1 + \tilde{\Gamma}_i} < \tilde{L}_i < \frac{1}{m_1 (1 + \tilde{\Gamma}_i)} \]
and consequently \( m_1 < \tilde{G}_{i+1,1} < 1 \).

Proof. Let \( i = 1 \). Notice that by (55) in the appendix,
\[ 1 < \frac{1}{\tilde{G}^n_{2,1}} < \frac{1}{m_1}, \forall n \geq 1. \]

So by (35) we obtain
\[ \frac{1}{m_1 + \tilde{\Gamma}_1} < \tilde{L}_{1,n} < \frac{1}{m_1 (1 + \tilde{\Gamma}_1)}. \]  
(49)
By Remark 13, \( \tilde{L}_{1,n} \) decreases strictly to \( \tilde{L}_1 \). So \( \tilde{L}_1 < \frac{1}{m_1(1+\Gamma_1)} \). Moreover using again (35) and (55)

\[
\tilde{L}_1 = \frac{1}{m_1 + \Gamma_1 \frac{m_2 + m_3}{m_1 + \Gamma_2} \lim_{n \to \infty} |\tilde{W}^2,n|/|\tilde{W}^3,n|} \geq \frac{1}{m_1 + \Gamma_1 \frac{m_2 + m_3}{m_1 + \Gamma_2} > \frac{1}{m_1 + \Gamma_1}} \]

\( \square \)

**Proposition 7.** For any \( 1 \leq j < i \),

\[
\frac{\partial^2 \ln |\tilde{W}^n|}{\partial b_j \partial b_j} > 0, \forall n \geq i; \quad \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\partial^2 \ln |\tilde{W}^n|}{\partial b_j \partial b_j} > 0.
\]

**Proof.** Observe that

\[
\frac{\partial^2 \ln |\tilde{W}^n|}{\partial b_j \partial b_j} = -\frac{1}{b_j^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial b_j} \left( \frac{\partial |\tilde{W}^n|}{\partial b_j} \right) = -\frac{1}{b_j^2} \tilde{L}_1^{-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial b_j} (1 - |\tilde{W}^{-1,i,n}|/|\tilde{W}^n|) = \tilde{L}_1^{-1} \frac{1}{b_j^2} |\tilde{W}^{-1,i,n}| \frac{\partial}{\partial b_j} (|\tilde{W}^{-1,i,n}|/|\tilde{W}^n|)
\]

\[
= \tilde{L}_1^{-1} \frac{1}{b_j^2} |\tilde{W}^{-1,i,n}| \frac{\partial}{\partial b_j} \left( |\tilde{W}^{-1,i,n}| - |\tilde{W}^{-1,j+1,n}| \right) = \frac{1}{1 - b_j^2} \left( |\tilde{W}^{-1,i,n}| - |\tilde{W}^{-1,j+1,n}| \right) \left( |\tilde{W}^{-1,i,n}| - |\tilde{W}^{-1,j+1,n}| \right)
\]

By Remark 13, we can conclude \( \frac{\partial^2 \ln |\tilde{W}^n|}{\partial b_j \partial b_j} > 0 \). Letting \( n \to \infty \) we get the following using the same arguments

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\partial^2 \ln |\tilde{W}^n|}{\partial b_j \partial b_j} = \frac{1}{1 - b_j^2} \left( |\tilde{W}^{-1,i,n}| - |\tilde{W}^{-1,j+1,n}| \right) \left( |\tilde{W}^{-1,i,n}| - |\tilde{W}^{-1,j+1,n}| \right)
\]

\( \square \)

**Corollary 2.** For any \( i \geq 1 \), \( \tilde{L}_i \) are strictly decreasing in \( b_i \) and strictly increasing in \( b_j \), \( \forall j > i \). The same result holds for \( \tilde{L}_{i,n} \).

**Proof.** We shall only consider \( \tilde{L}_1 \). The strict monotonicity in \( b_1 \) stems from (44). Take \( j > 1 \) and assume \( \tilde{L}_1 < \infty \) (i.e., \( b_1 \in (0,1) \))

\[
\frac{\partial \tilde{L}_1}{\partial b_j} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\partial \tilde{L}_{1,n}}{\partial b_j} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{|\tilde{W}^2,n|}{|\tilde{W}^n|} \left( \frac{\partial |\tilde{W}^2,n|}{\partial b_j} / |\tilde{W}^2,n| - \frac{\partial |\tilde{W}^n|}{\partial b_j} / |\tilde{W}^n| \right)
\]

When \( b_1 = 1 \), we have

\[
\frac{\partial |\tilde{W}^n|}{\partial b_j} / |\tilde{W}^n| = \frac{\partial |\tilde{W}^2,n|}{\partial b_j} / |\tilde{W}^2,n|.
\]
If \( b_1 = c \in (0, 1) \), then by Proposition 7
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \left( \frac{\partial |\tilde{W}^{2,n}|}{\partial b_j} / |\tilde{W}^{2,n}| - \frac{\partial |\tilde{W}^n|}{\partial b_j} / |\tilde{W}^n| \right) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \int_c^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial b_1} \left( \frac{\partial |\tilde{W}^n|}{\partial b_j} / |\tilde{W}^n| \right) db_1 = \lim_{n \to \infty} \int_c^1 \frac{\partial^2 \ln |\tilde{W}^n|}{\partial b_1 \partial b_j} db_1 > 0.
\]

If \( \tilde{\Gamma}_1 = \infty \) (i.e., \( b_1 = 0 \)), then
\[
\frac{\partial (\tilde{\Gamma}_1 \tilde{L}_1)}{\partial b_j} \rightarrow \tilde{\Gamma}_1 \tilde{L}_1 \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \lim_{n \to \infty} \int_c^1 \frac{\partial^2 \ln |\tilde{W}^n|}{\partial b_1 \partial b_j} db_1 = \tilde{\Gamma}_1 \tilde{L}_1 \lim_{n \to \infty} \int_0^1 \frac{\partial^2 \ln |\tilde{W}^n|}{\partial b_1 \partial b_j} db_1 > 0.
\]

\[\text{Corollary 3. For any } k > 1, \text{ both } \tilde{G}_k^n \text{ and } \tilde{G}_k \text{ strictly decrease in } b_j, \forall j \geq 1.\]

\[\text{Proof. We shall prove only for } \tilde{G}_k. \text{ It is the same as to show that } \tilde{G}_{k+1,k} \text{ strictly decreases in } b_m, m \geq k + 1. \text{ Take } \frac{|\tilde{W}^n|}{|\tilde{W}^n|} \text{ and develop the top } |\tilde{W}^n| \text{ on the first } k \text{ elements of the first row. Letting } n \text{ go to infinity, we obtain}\]
\[1 = \left( \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} \tilde{\Gamma}_{1+j} \tilde{L}_{1+j} \right) \tilde{G}_{k+1,k} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \tilde{\Phi}_{1,i}. \quad (50)\]

Taking derivative on \( b_m \) on both sides, and using Corollary 2, the derivative of \( \tilde{G}_{k+1,k} \) on \( b_m \) is strictly negative.

\[\text{Corollary 4. The first term on the right side of (50):}\]
\[\left( \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} \tilde{\Gamma}_{1+j} \tilde{L}_{1+j} \right) \tilde{G}_{k+1,k}\]
\[\text{is strictly decreasing in every } b_m, \forall m \geq 1.\]

\[\text{Proof. By Corollary 2 and Corollary 3, the result holds for } b_m, \forall m \geq k + 1. \text{ For } m = k, \text{ by Corollary 2,}\]
\[\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \tilde{\Phi}_{1,i}\]
\[\text{is strictly increasing in } b_k. \text{ So by (50), the result holds for } b_k. \text{ It implies that } \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} \tilde{\Gamma}_{1+j} \tilde{L}_{1+j} \text{ is strictly decreasing in } b_k, \text{ since } \tilde{G}_{k+1,k} \text{ does not contain } b_k. \text{ Similarly, } \prod_{j=0}^{m-1} \tilde{\Gamma}_{1+j} \tilde{L}_{1+j} \text{ is strictly decreasing in } b_m \text{ for any } 1 \leq m < k. \text{ Since } \prod_{j=m}^{k-1} \tilde{\Gamma}_{1+j} \tilde{L}_{1+j} \text{ does not contain } b_m, \text{ we deduce that}\]
\[\prod_{j=0}^{k-1} \tilde{\Gamma}_{1+j} \tilde{L}_{1+j} = \prod_{j=0}^{m-1} \tilde{\Gamma}_{1+j} \tilde{L}_{1+j} \times \prod_{j=m}^{k-1} \tilde{\Gamma}_{1+j} \tilde{L}_{1+j}\]
\[\text{is strictly decreasing in } b_m. \text{ We conclude that the result holds for } 1 \leq m < k. \quad \Box\]

\[\text{Remark 18. Like } \hat{P}_0^n \text{ in (42), } \hat{P}_{0,*} \text{ in (51) is a convex combination of }\]
\[\{ \delta_{u_0}, Q(dx), \frac{xQ(dx)}{m_1}, \frac{x^2Q(dx)}{m_2}, \ldots \}.\]

\[\text{By (50),}\]
\[(1-b_1)(\prod_{j=0}^{k-1} \tilde{\Gamma}_{1+j} \tilde{L}_{1+j}) \tilde{G}_{k+1,k}\]

is the mass supported on \(\{\delta_{u_Q} \cdot \frac{z^{k+1}Q(dx)}{m_{k+1}}, \frac{z^{k+2}Q(dx)}{m_{k+2}}, \ldots\}\) which is strictly decreasing in every \(b_m, m \geq 1\). Consequently, \(P_{0,x}([x,1])\) for any given \(x \in (0,u_Q)\) is also strictly decreasing. This fact confirms the intuition that the bigger mutation probability is, the smaller the population fitness is.

### 2.5.5 The i-i-d backward sequence by matrices

The results in Proposition 6 can be transferred to random i-i-d model smoothly. Due to its importance, we state it explicitly, together with some more details related to the randomness.

**Corollary 5.** a) For \(i \geq 2\), let

\[P_{i-2,*}(dx) = (1-b_{i-1}) \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \Phi_{i,k} \frac{x^{k+1}Q(dx)}{m_{k+1}} + K_{i,*} \delta_{u_Q}(dx) \right) + b_{i-1}Q(dx)\]  

(51)

where

\[K_{i,*} := 1 - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \Phi_{i,k} \in [0,1).\]

Then conditional on \((\beta_i)_{i \geq 1}\), \(P_{i-2}^n\) converges weakly to \(P_{i-2,*}\) and the convergence is strong if and only if \(K_{i,*} = 0\). Moreover

\[K_{i,*} = (1-\beta_i)u_Q \Gamma_i L_i K_{i+1,*}.\]  

(52)

b) \((P_{i,*})_{i \geq 0}\) is a backward process with \(P_{0,*} \overset{d}{=} P_{\ast,u_Q}\) such that for any \(i \geq 0\)

\[P_{i,*}(dx) = (1-\beta_{i+1}) \frac{xP_{i+1,*}(dx)}{yP_{i+1,*}(dy)} + \beta_{i+1}Q(dx).\]  

(53)

Moreover

\[\beta_{i+1} = L_{i+1} \int yP_{i,*}(dy), \ i.e., \ \frac{1-\beta_{i+1}}{\int yP_{i,*}(dy)} = \Gamma_{i+1} L_{i+1}; \ \mathbb{P}(K_{i,*} = 0) \in \{0,1\}.\]

**Proof.** We shall only prove that \(\mathbb{P}(K_{i,*} = 0) \in \{0,1\}\). Since (52) implies that

\[\{K_{i,*} = 0\} = \{K_{i+1,*} = 0\}\]

for any \(i \geq 0\), we have that \(\mathbb{P}(K_{i,*} = 0) \in \{0,1\}\) as \((P_{i,*})_{i \geq 0}\) is stationary ergodic by that fact that \((P_{i,u_Q})_{i \geq 0}\) is stationary ergodic and that \((P_{i,*})_{i \geq 0} \overset{d}{=} (P_{i,u_Q})_{i \geq 0}\).

**Proof of Theorem 4.** One needs only to explain the matrix representation of \(C_{\ast,u_Q}\). By Proposition 1 and Proposition 3

\[C_{\ast,u_Q} \overset{d}{=} C_{0,*}.\]

Recall that

\[G_{1,k}^n = \frac{|U_k^W W^n|}{|W^n|} \overset{d}{=} \frac{|U_k^W W^{2,n+1}|}{|W^{2,n+1}|}; \ \lim_{n \to \infty} G_{1,k}^n = G_{1,k} \overset{d}{=} G_{2,k}.\]

Then we apply Remark 16.
3 Condensation and fitness comparison

3.1 Estimation of $\mathbb{E}[\ln \Gamma_1 L_1]$

Define

$$\tilde{R}_n := \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i}{|\tilde{W}_n|}, n \geq 1.$$ 

Lemma 10. $\frac{\mathbb{E}[\ln \tilde{R}_n]}{n}$ converges to $\mathbb{E}[\ln \Gamma_1 L_1]$.

Proof. Note that

$$\mathbb{E}[\ln(R_n)] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \ln \left( \frac{1}{n_1} \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{\Gamma_i |\tilde{W}_{i+1,n}|}{|\tilde{W}_{i,n}|} \right) \right] = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}[\ln(\Gamma_1 L_{i,n-i+1})] - \ln n_1.$$

Then we apply Remark 13. \qed

Proposition 8. $\ln \tilde{R}_n$ is strictly decreasing and strictly concave down in each $b_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$.

Proof. By Lemma 16 in the appendix,

$$\frac{\partial \ln \tilde{R}_n}{\partial b_i} = -\left(1/\Gamma_i - \frac{d|\tilde{W}_n|}{d\Gamma_i}/|\tilde{W}_n|\right)b_i < 0,$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 \ln \tilde{R}_n}{\partial b_i^2} = \frac{1}{b_i^2} \left(1/\Gamma_i - \frac{d|\tilde{W}_n|}{d\Gamma_i}/|\tilde{W}_n|\right) \frac{(2b_i - 1/\Gamma_i - \frac{d|\tilde{W}_n|}{d\Gamma_i}/|\tilde{W}_n|)}{< 0}.$$ \qed

Lemma 11. Let $f(x_1, \cdots, x_n) : [0, 1]^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a $C^2$ function with $\sum_{i \neq j} f_{x_ix_j} \leq 0$. Let $(\xi_1, \cdots, \xi_n)$ be a vector of $n$ exchangeable random variables in $[0, 1]$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\xi_1, \cdots, \xi_n)] \geq \mathbb{E}[f(\xi_1, \cdots, \xi_1)].$$

Proof. Since the vector is exchangeable, we can directly take a symmetric $f$ and prove the inequality under $f_{x_1x_2} \leq 0$. For any $a > b \in [0, 1]$,

$$f(\underbrace{a, \cdots, a}_n) + f(\underbrace{b, \cdots, b}_n) - f(\underbrace{a, b, \cdots, b}_{n-1}) - f(\underbrace{b, a, \cdots, a}_{n-1})$$

$$= \int_b^a (f_{x_1}(x_1, a, \cdots, a) - f_{x_1}(x_1, b, \cdots, b))dx_1$$

$$= \sum_{i=2}^n \int_b^a (f_{x_1}(x_1, b, \cdots, b, a, \cdots, a) - f_{x_1}(x_1, b, \cdots, b, a, \cdots, a))dx_1$$

$$= \sum_{i=2}^n \int_b^a f_{x_1x_i}(x_1, b, \cdots, b, x_i, a, \cdots, a)dx_1$$

$$= \sum_{i=2}^n \int_b^a f_{x_1x_2}(x_1, x_2, b, \cdots, b, a, \cdots, a)dx_1 dx_2 \leq 0$$
Now for any $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_i, \xi_{i+1}, \xi_{i+2}, \ldots, \xi_n)]$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[f(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_i, \xi_{i+1}, \xi_{i+2}, \ldots, \xi_n) + f(\xi_{i+1}, \ldots, \xi_{i+1}, \xi_{i+2}, \ldots, \xi_n)]$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[f(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_{i+1}, \xi_{i+2}, \ldots, \xi_n) + f(\xi_{i+1}, \ldots, \xi_{i+1}, \xi_{i+2}, \ldots, \xi_n)]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[f(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_i, \xi_{i+2}, \ldots, \xi_n)].$$

By letting $i$ travel from 1 to $n - 1$, we prove the lemma.

**Proof of Theorem 5.** Lemma 10 and Proposition 8 together entail the second inequality of (9). For any $1 \leq j < i \leq n$, due to Proposition 7,

$$\frac{\partial^2 \ln \tilde{R}_n}{\partial b_j \partial b_j} = -\frac{\partial^2 \ln |\tilde{W}_n|}{\partial b_j \partial b_j} < 0.$$

Together with Lemma 11, the first inequality of (9) holds.

For the rest, the expressions of $\tilde{\Gamma}, \hat{\Gamma}$ are due to Theorem 1. A simple calculation based on Theorem 1 yields the second equality of (10).

**Remark 19.** It can be shown that applying Lemma 11 directly on $\ln \tilde{\Gamma}_1 \tilde{L}_1$ or $\ln \tilde{\Gamma}_1 \tilde{L}_{1,n}$ does not work. So we have to introduce $\tilde{R}_n$ for technical purpose. The same situation will occur in the proof of Theorem 7.

### 3.2 Kingman’s model vs random i-i-d model

**Lemma 12.** For any $k, n$, $\tilde{G}_n^k$ is strictly concave down in every $\Gamma_i$ (resp. $b_i$), $1 \leq i \leq n$. The same convexity holds for $\tilde{G}_k$. In consequence, $\tilde{C}_0, \ast$ is increasing (resp. decreasing) and concave down in every $\tilde{\Gamma}_i$ (resp. $\tilde{b}_i$), $i \geq 2$.

**Proof.** We shall consider first $\tilde{\Gamma}_i$. Let

$$f(\tilde{\Gamma}_i) = |U_i \tilde{W}_n|, g(\tilde{\Gamma}_i) = |\hat{W}_n|.$$

So $\tilde{G}_n^k = \frac{f}{g}$. Let $f', f'', g', g''$ be derivatives with respect to $\tilde{\Gamma}_i$. Then

$$\frac{dG_n^k}{d\tilde{\Gamma}_i} = \frac{f' g - f g'}{g^2} > 0$$

where the inequality is due to Corollary 3. Note that

$$\frac{g'}{g} = \prod_{j=1}^i \tilde{\Gamma}_j \tilde{L}_{j,n} > 0.$$

Since $f'' = g'' = 0$,

$$\frac{d^2 \tilde{G}_n^k}{d(\tilde{\Gamma}_i)^2} = \frac{f'' g - f g''}{g^2} - \frac{2g' f' g - f g'}{g^2} = -\frac{2g' f' g - f g'}{g^2} < 0.$$

Thus the part for $\tilde{\Gamma}_i$ is proved.
Notice that
\[ \frac{d^2 \tilde{\Gamma}_i}{db_i} = -\frac{1}{b_i^2} \quad \frac{d^2 \tilde{\Gamma}_i}{d(b_i)^2} = \frac{2}{b_i^3}. \]
Then
\[ d\tilde{G}_n^\beta / d\beta = \frac{f'g - fg'}{g^2} - \frac{1}{b_i^2} < 0 \]
and
\[ d^2 \tilde{G}_n^\beta / d(b_i)^2 = \frac{\frac{-1}{b_i^2} d^2 \tilde{G}_n^\beta}{d(\tilde{\Gamma}_i)^2} + \frac{2}{b_i^3} d\tilde{G}_n^\beta / d\tilde{\Gamma}_i \]
\[ = \frac{2(f'g - fg')}{g^2b_i^4} (b_i - b'_i) = \frac{2 d\tilde{G}_n^\beta}{b_i^3} (b_i - b'_i) < 0, \]
where the inequality is due to Lemma 16 in the appendix. The part for $b_i$ is proved.

The strict convexity of $\tilde{G}_k$ follows by letting $n$ go to infinity and using again Corollary 3, Lemma 16. For the conclusion on $\tilde{C}_{0,*}$, we refer to Remark 16. \qed

**Proof of Theorem 6.** There are two results to prove.

1. If we write $\tilde{W} = \tilde{W}(b_1, b_2, \cdots)$, then $W = \tilde{W}[b_i = \beta_i, i \geq 1] = \tilde{W}(\beta_1, \beta_2, \cdots)$. By (37), Corollary 1 and Lemma 12
\[ \int y^k P_n^\alpha (dy) = (1 - b)E[G_k] + bm_k \]
\[ < (1 - b)E[\tilde{G}_k | b_i = \beta_i, i \geq 2] + bm_k \]
\[ = (1 - b) \lim_{n \to \infty} E[\tilde{G}_n^\beta | b_i = \beta_i, i \geq 2 \leq n] + bm_k \]
\[ \leq (1 - b) \lim_{n \to \infty} E[\tilde{G}_n^\beta] + bm_k \]
\[ = \int y^k d\tilde{P}_n^\alpha. \]

2. Note that $C_{0,*} \equal{} C_{0,*}$. Since $C_{0,*} > 0$ a.s., we have $Q(u_Q) = 0$ by 4) of Proposition 3. By (52) and Remark 16, we have
\[ E[C_{0,*}] = (1 - b)E[K_{1,*}] = (1 - b)u_Q E[\Gamma_1 L_1 K_{2,*}]. \]
Note that
\[ \tilde{\Gamma}_1 L_1 = \frac{1 - b_1}{b_1 m_1 + (1 - b_1)\tilde{G}_{2,1}} \]
and by Lemma 9
\[ \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{\Gamma}_1 L_1}{\partial b_1^2} = \frac{2m_1(m_1 - \tilde{G}_{2,1})}{(b_1 m_1 + (1 - b_1)\tilde{G}_{2,1})^3} < 0. \]
By Remark 16 again
\[ E[C_{0,*}] = (1 - b)E[K_{1,*}] < (1 - b)E[\tilde{K}_{1,*} | b_i = b_i, i \geq 2] \]
\[ = (1 - b) \lim_{j \to \infty} u_Q^{-j} E[\tilde{G}_j | b_i = b_i] \]
\[ \leq (1 - b) \lim_{j \to \infty} u_Q^{-j} E[\tilde{G}_j | b_i = b_i, i \leq n] \]
\[ = (1 - b)\tilde{K}_{1,*} = \tilde{C}_{0,*} = \tilde{C}_{0,*}^\alpha \]
where the second inequality is due to Lemma 12. \qed
3.3 Random i-i-d model vs random o-f-a model

Proof of Theorem 7. By (37),
\[ \mathbb{E}[\ln \int yP_{\ast}^{u_Q}(dy)] = \mathbb{E}[\ln \frac{\beta_1}{L_1}]. \]

Note that
\[ \mathbb{E}[\ln(|W^n| \prod_{i=1}^{n} \beta_i)] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}\left(\ln\left(\frac{1}{m_1} \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \beta_i \frac{|W_i|}{|W_{i+1}|}\right)\right)] = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}[\ln \frac{\beta_1}{L_{1,n-i+1}}] - \ln m_1. \]

Using the same trick in proving the first inequality of (9), we get
\[ \mathbb{E}[\ln \frac{\beta_1}{L_1}] = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[\ln(|W^n| \prod_{i=1}^{n} \beta_i)]}{n} \leq \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[\ln(|\hat{W}^n| \prod_{i=1}^{n} \beta_i)]}{n} = \mathbb{E}[\ln \int y\hat{P}_{\ast}^{u_Q}(dy)]. \]

3.4 Kingman’s model vs random o-f-a model

Proof of Theorem 8. The condensate size \( \hat{C}_{\ast}^{u_Q} \) in Kingman’s model is a convex up function of \( b \), so \( \mathbb{E}[\hat{C}_{\ast}^{u_Q}(u_Q)] \geq \mathbb{E}[\hat{C}_{\ast}^{u_Q}(u_Q)]. \)

To show that there is no one-way inequality between \( \mathbb{E}[\int y\hat{P}_{\ast}^{u_Q}(dy)] \) and \( \mathbb{E}[\int y\tilde{P}_{\ast}^{u_Q}(dy)] \), we give a concrete example. Let \( Q(dx) = dx \) be the uniform probability measure on \( [0,1] \). By (10)
\[ \int y\tilde{P}_{\ast}^{u_Q}(dy) = s_b, \forall b \in (0,1) \]
which satisfies equation
\[ \int \frac{bs_b dx}{s_b - (1 - b)x} = 1. \]

We show that \( \frac{d^2 s_b}{db^2} \) takes strictly positive and negative values for different \( b \)'s.

The equation can be written as
\[ \int \frac{b dx}{1 - tx} = 1 \]
with \( t = \frac{1-b}{s_b} \in (0,1) \) strictly decreasing in \( b \). Then
\[ b = -\frac{t}{\ln(1-t)}, s_b = \frac{1}{t} + \frac{1}{\ln(1-t)}. \]

So
\[ \frac{ds_b}{db} = \frac{ds_b}{dt} \frac{dt}{db}, \quad \frac{ds_b}{dt} = -\frac{(1-t)\ln^2(1-t) + t^2}{-(1-t)t \ln(1-t) - t^3} = \frac{m(t)}{n(t)} \]
with \( m(t) \) the numerator and \( n(t) \) the denominator. Then
\[ \frac{d^2 s_b^2}{db^2} = \frac{d(ds_b/\bar{c})}{dt} \frac{db}{dt} = \frac{m'(t)n(t) - m(t)n'(t)}{n^2(t)} \frac{db}{dt} \]
where
\[ m'(t)n(t) - m(t)n'(t) \]
\[ = -2t(1-t)^2 \ln^3(1-t) + (4t^2 + 3t^3) \ln^2(1-t) - t^3(2 + t) \ln(1-t) \]
\[ = 5t^6 + O(t^7), \quad t \to 0. \]

But \( m'(0.5)n(0.5) - m(0.5)n'(0.5) = -4.184810^{-4} < 0 \). Together with \( n(t)^2 > 0, \frac{db}{dt} < 0, \forall t \in (0,1) \), we can conclude. \( \square \)
4 Appendix

4.1 Appendix A

Lemma 13. Let \( n \geq 2 \). Let \( a_1, \ldots, a_n, b_1, \ldots, b_n \) all be strictly positive numbers, such that
\[
\frac{a_i}{b_i} < \frac{a_n}{b_n}, \quad a_i < a_n, \quad b_i < b_n, \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq n - 1.
\]
Let \( c_1, \ldots, c_n, c'_1, \ldots, c'_n \) be positive numbers such that
\[
c_i \geq c'_i, \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq n - 1; \quad c_n < c'_n; \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c'_i > 0.
\]
Then
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i a_i < \sum_{i=1}^{n} c'_i a_i.
\]
Proof. Without loss of generality, assume \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i = 1 \). Define
\[
A = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i a_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} c_i a_i + (1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i) a_n, \quad B = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i b_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} c_i b_i + (1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i) b_n.
\]
and
\[
f(c_1, \ldots, c_{n-1}) = \frac{A}{B}, \quad c_i \geq 0, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} c_i \in (0, 1).
\]
It suffices to show that for any \( 1 \leq i \leq n - 1 \)
\[
\frac{\partial f}{\partial c_i} < 0, \quad c_i \in (0, 1).
\]
It works similarly and we shall consider only \( i = 1 \). We have
\[
\frac{\partial f}{\partial c_1} = -\frac{(a_n - a_1)B - (b_n - b_1)A}{B^2}.
\]
Note that
\[
\frac{a_n - a_1}{b_n - b_1} > \frac{a_n}{b_n} > \frac{a_i}{b_i}, \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq n - 1.
\]
That implies
\[
(b_n - b_1)A < (a_n - a_1)B
\]
which entails \( \frac{\partial f}{\partial c_1} < 0 \). \( \square \)

4.2 Appendix B

Lemma 14. Let \( X^n = (x_0^n, \ldots, x_n^n) \) be the unique solution of the equation
\[
X^n \tilde{W}^n = r_1 U^r \tilde{W}^n = (m_2, m_3, \ldots, m_{n+1}, m_{n+2}). \quad (54)
\]
Then \( 0 < x_0^n < x_0^{n+1} < 1 \) for any \( n \geq 1 \).
Proof. Note that by Hölder’s inequality
\[
x_0^n = \frac{|U^r \tilde{W}^n|}{|\tilde{W}^n|} = \tilde{G}_1^n \in (0, 1).
\]
For any \( n \geq 1 \), we are going to construct \( X^{n+1} \) from \( X^n \) and compare \( x_0^n, x_0^{n+1} \). The main argument is still Hölder’s inequality:
Define \( M \) of type \((*)\) if the following holds:

\[
\frac{m_{n+2}}{m_{n+3}} < \frac{m_{n+1}}{m_{n+2}} < \cdots < \frac{m_1}{m_2} < \frac{1}{m_1}.
\]

(55)

Note that

\[
x_0^n m_{n+1} + \cdots + x_n^n m_1 = m_{n+2}.
\]

Using (55), we get

\[
x_0^n m_{n+2} + \cdots + x_n^n m_2 = m_{n+3}.
\]

For \( \varepsilon \geq 0 \), let \( x_0^n, \varepsilon = x_0^n + \varepsilon \). Let \( C^n \) be the matrix of \( \hat{W}^n \) with the last column removed. Then there exists a unique vector \( X^{n, \varepsilon} = (x_0^{n, \varepsilon}, \ldots, x_n^{n, \varepsilon}) \) such that

\[
X^{n, \varepsilon} C^n = (m_2, m_3, \ldots, m_{n+1}).
\]

It is clear that if \( \Gamma_i = \infty \), \( x_i^{n, \varepsilon} = 0 \), and otherwise \( x_i^{n, \varepsilon} \) is continuous and strictly increasing on \( \varepsilon \). Let

\[
A_\varepsilon = \tilde{\Gamma}_{n+1}^{-1}(x_0^{n, \varepsilon} m_{n+1} + \cdots + x_n^{n, \varepsilon} m_1 - m_{n+2})(\equiv 0, \text{ if } \tilde{\Gamma}_{n+1} = \infty).
\]

Then

\[
x_0^{n, \varepsilon} m_{n+1} + \cdots + x_n^{n, \varepsilon} m_1 - \tilde{\Gamma}_{n+1} A_\varepsilon = m_{n+2}.
\]

If \( A_\varepsilon \not\equiv 0 \), then \( A_\varepsilon \) is continuous and strictly increasing on \( \varepsilon \) with \( A_0 = 0 \). Therefore there exists a unique \( \varepsilon > 0 \) such that

\[
x_0^{n, \varepsilon} m_{n+2} + \cdots + x_n^{n, \varepsilon} m_2 + A_\varepsilon m_1 = m_{n+3}.
\]

Then \( X^{n+1} = (x_0^{n, \varepsilon}, \ldots, x_n^{n, \varepsilon}, A_\varepsilon) \) satisfies

\[
X^{n+1} \hat{W}^{n+1} = (m_2, m_3, \ldots, m_{n+3}).
\]

So we have proved that \( 0 < x_0^n < x_0^{n+1} < 1 \). \( \square \)

4.3 Appendix C

**Definition 4.** Assume \( M \) is a matrix of size \( n \times n \). For any \( 1 \leq i \leq j \leq n \), let \( M(i, j) \) be the square matrix with \( M_{i,i}, M_{i,j}, M_{j,i}, M_{j,j} \) as the \( 4 \) corner elements. We say \( M \) is of type \((*)\) if the following holds: \( M_{i,j} > 0 \) if \( i \leq j \); \( M_{i,j} < 0 \) if \( i = 1 + j \); \( M_{i,j} = 0 \) if \( i > 1 + j \).

Define

\[
\mathcal{E}_k^n := \{e = (e_1, \ldots, e_k) : 1 = e_1 < e_2 < \cdots < e_k = n+1\}, \quad \forall 2 \leq k \leq n+1
\]

and

\[
\mathcal{E}^n := \cup_{2 \leq k \leq n+1} \mathcal{E}_k^n.
\]

Define

\[
d(M) := M_{1,n} \prod_{i=2}^{n} |M_{i,i-1}|; \quad d_M(e) := \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} d(M(e_i, e_{i+1} - 1)), \quad \forall e \in \mathcal{E}_k.
\]

Let \( s_n \) be the set of permutations of \( \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \).

**Lemma 15.** For any matrix \( M \) of type \((*)\) and of size \( n \times n \),

\[
|M| = \sum_{k=2}^{n+1} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_k} d_M(e).
\]

(56)
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Proof. By decomposing $|M|$ along the last row, we can prove it by induction. \hfill \Box

Remark 20. Leibniz formula says that $|M| = \sum_{\sigma \in s_n} \text{sgn}(\sigma) \prod_{i=1}^n M_{i, \sigma}$. It is easy to see that the set $\{ \sigma : \sigma \in s_n, \prod_{i=1}^n M_{i, \sigma} \neq 0 \}$ is in one-to-one correspondence to $\mathcal{E}^n$ and $\text{sgn}(\sigma) = 1$ for any $\sigma$ in the set. If we use $\sigma^e$ to denote the corresponding element in $s_n$ of an $e \in \mathcal{E}_k$,\[
\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} d(M(e_i, e_{i+1} - 1)) = \prod_{i=1}^n M_{i, \sigma^e} > 0.
\]
In other words, (56) is another writing of Leibniz formula.

Corollary 6. $|M(1, i)||M(i + 1, n)| = \sum_{k=2}^{n+1} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}_k, i+1 \in e} d_M(e)$.

Lemma 16. For any $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $\tilde{\Gamma}_i \in (0, \infty)$,\[
\frac{d\tilde{W}^n}{d\tilde{\Gamma}_i} / |\tilde{W}^n| \in (b_i, \frac{1}{\tilde{\Gamma}_i}); \quad \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{d\tilde{W}^n}{d\tilde{\Gamma}_i} / |\tilde{W}^n| \in (b_i, \frac{1}{\tilde{\Gamma}_i}).
\]
Proof. Notice that\[
|\tilde{W}^n| = \tilde{\Gamma}_i \frac{d\tilde{W}^n}{d\tilde{\Gamma}_i} + \left| \begin{array}{cc}
\tilde{W}^1, i-1 & 0 \\
0 & \tilde{W}^i, i+1, n
\end{array} \right| = \tilde{\Gamma}_i \frac{d\tilde{W}^n}{d\tilde{\Gamma}_i} + |\tilde{W}^{i-1}||\tilde{W}^{i+1, n}|.
\]
Dividing both sides by $|\tilde{W}^n|$ yields\[
1 = \tilde{\Gamma}_i \frac{d|\tilde{W}^n|}{d\tilde{\Gamma}_i} + |\tilde{W}^{i-1}||\tilde{W}^{i+1, n}| / |\tilde{W}^n|
\]
and hence\[
\frac{d|\tilde{W}^n|}{d\tilde{\Gamma}_i} / |\tilde{W}^n| = \tilde{\Gamma}_i^{-1}(1 - |\tilde{W}^{i-1}||\tilde{W}^{i+1, n}| / |\tilde{W}^n|) < \tilde{\Gamma}_i^{-1}
\]
and\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{d|\tilde{W}^n|}{d\tilde{\Gamma}_i} / |\tilde{W}^n| = \lim_{n \to \infty} \tilde{\Gamma}_i^{-1}(1 - |\tilde{W}^{i-1}||\tilde{W}^{i+1, n}| / |\tilde{W}^n|) = \tilde{\Gamma}_i^{-1}(1 - \prod_{j=1}^i \tilde{L}_j) < \tilde{\Gamma}_i^{-1}.
\]
(57)
To prove the strict lower bounds, we just need to show that\[
|\tilde{W}^{i-1}||\tilde{W}^{i+1, n}| / \frac{d|\tilde{W}^n|}{d\tilde{\Gamma}_i} < 1
\]
and\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} |\tilde{W}^{i-1}||\tilde{W}^{i+1, n}| / \frac{d|\tilde{W}^n|}{d\tilde{\Gamma}_i} = \tilde{\Gamma}_i(1 - \tilde{\Gamma}_i^{-1} \prod_{j=1}^i \tilde{L}_j)^{-1} - \tilde{\Gamma}_i < 1.
\]
(58)
Let $M$ be the matrix which is obtained by deleting the $i + 1$-th row and $i$-th column of $\tilde{W}^n$. Then\[
|M| = \frac{d|\tilde{W}^n|}{d\tilde{\Gamma}_i}.
\]
Denote $A = \{ e \in \mathcal{E}^{n+1} : i + 1 \in e \}$ and $t(e)$ such that $e_{t(e)} = i + 1$ for any $e \in A$. Corollary 6 tells that\[
|\tilde{W}^{i-1}||\tilde{W}^{i+1, n}| = \sum_{e \in A} d_{\tilde{W}^n}(e).
\]
Denote\[
A' = \{ e' \in \mathcal{E}^n : e \in A, s.t., e'_i = e_i, i \leq t(e) - 1; e'_i = e_{i+1} - 1, i \geq t(e) \}.
\]
There is a clear one-to-one correspondence between $A$ and $B$. Moreover

\[
\frac{d|\tilde{W}^n|}{dt_i} = |M| = \sum_{e' \in A'} d_M(e').
\]

Consequently

\[
|\tilde{W}^{i-1}| |\tilde{W}^{i+1,n}| / \frac{d|\tilde{W}^n|}{dt_i} = \frac{\sum_{e \in A} d_{\tilde{W}^n}(e)}{\sum_{e' \in A'} d_M(e')}, \quad (59)
\]

Let $e \in A \cap \mathcal{E}_k^{n+1}$ and $e'$ its corresponding element in $A'$. Then

\[
d_{\tilde{W}^n}(e) = \prod_{j=1, j \notin \{t(e)-1,t(e)\}}^{k-1} d(\tilde{W}^n(e_j, e_{j+1}) - 1))d(\tilde{W}^n(e_{t(e)} - 1, e_{i}))d(\tilde{W}^n(i + 1, e_{t(e)+1} - 1))
\]

and

\[
d_M(e') = \prod_{j=1, j \notin \{t(e)-1,t(e)\}}^{k-1} d(\tilde{W}^n(e_j, e_{j+1}) - 1))d(\tilde{W}^n(e_{t(e)} - 1, e_{i}))d(\tilde{W}^n(i + 1, e_{t(e)+1} - 1)).
\]

By Hölder's inequality,

\[m_i - e_{i-1} + 1)m_{i+1} - e_{i-1} - 1 < m_{i+1} - e_{i-1} - 1
\]

and then

\[
\frac{d_{\tilde{W}^n}(e)}{d_M(e')} < 1. \quad (60)
\]

So the first half of the lemma is proved. Let

\[c = \sup_{1 \leq j \leq i} \frac{m_j m_1}{m_j + 1}
\]

Then $c \in (0, 1)$. Denote

\[D = \{e \in \mathcal{E}^{n+1} : i + 1, i + 2 \in e\}
\]

and

\[D' = \{e' \in \mathcal{E}^n : \exists e \in D, s.t., e_i = e', \text{ if } i \leq t(e) - 1; e_i = e_{i+1} - 1, \text{ if } i \geq t(e)\}.
\]

Similarly as in (58), one can obtain that

\[
\frac{\sum_{e \in D} d_{\tilde{W}^n}(e)}{\sum_{e' \in D'} d_M(e')} = \frac{|\tilde{W}^{i-1}| m_1 |\tilde{W}^{i+2,n}|}{|U \cdot \tilde{W}^{i-1}| |\tilde{W}^{i+2,n}|} \leq c < 1
\]

and

\[
\frac{\sum_{e \in D} d_{\tilde{W}^n}(e)}{\sum_{e \in A} d_{\tilde{W}^n}(e)} = \frac{m_1 |\tilde{W}^{i+2,n}|}{|\tilde{W}^{i+1,n}|} \rightarrow m_1 L_{i+1} \in (0, 1), n \rightarrow \infty.
\]

Finally the inequality in (58) holds using also (59), (60).
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