Deviations for weak record numbers in simple random walks
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Abstract

Record numbers are important statistics in random walk models. Their deviation principles are unknown as far as we know. In this article, we provide the asymptotic probabilities of different kinds of deviations for the number of “weak records” (or “ladder points”) in one–dimensional symmetric simple random walks.
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1. Introduction

“Record”, according to the Oxford dictionary, can be referred as an extreme attainment, that is, the best (or worst) performance ever attested in a particular activity. The study of record statistics has become an integral part of diverse fields such as meteorology, hydrology, economics, sports, etc. In mathematics, record statistics in the setting of i.i.d random variables are well understood in many situations. For example, suppose a family of i.i.d random variables \( \{X_n, n \geq 0\} \) is a stochastic model for achievements in a sequence of activities. Let \( M_n = \max_{0 \leq i \leq n} X_i \), then \( M_n \) is the record at time \( n \) and the statistic

\[
K_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} 1\{X_i = M_n\}
\]

counts the number of the current record. Brands et al. [5] and the references therein studied the asymptotic behaviors of \( K_n \) as \( n \) tends to infinity, and Khmaladze et al. [22] discussed the number of the so–called \( \varepsilon \)–repetitions of the current record value.

In real applications, it is more reasonable that the series of \( X_n \) are correlated. In this case, we say that a record event happens at time \( k \), if \( X_k \) is larger than all previous values in the series. For example, Majumdar and Ziff [30] used random walks to model the time series of achievements in some particular activities and discussed the growth of record numbers and surviving ages. For more works using
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random walks to study the record phenomena, please refer to Godrèche et al. \[16\] and the references therein. Usually, the main goal in the theory of records is to answer the following questions (See Majumdar \[29\]):

(a) How many records occur up to step \( n \)?

(b) How long does a record survive?

(c) What is the age of the longest surviving record?

In this paper, we are interested in the asymptotic properties of record numbers in random walks as the number of steps tends to infinity, and aim to study the deviations between the record numbers and their asymptotic limits.

Now let us recall some important definitions. Let \( \{X_k, k \geq 1\} \) be a sequence of i.i.d. random variables.

\[ S_n = \{S_0, n \geq 0\} \]

denotes the general one-dimensional random walk on \( \mathbb{R} \), that is, \( S_0 = 0 \), and \( S_n = \sum_{k=1}^{n} X_k \) for \( n \geq 1 \), where \( X_k \)'s are i.i.d.

Define

\[ M_n = \max_{0 \leq m \leq n} S_m, \quad n \geq 1. \quad (1.1) \]

Let \( T_0 = 0 \),

\[ T_n = \inf\{m > T_{n-1}, S_m \geq M_{m-1}\} \text{ for } n \geq 1, \quad (1.2) \]

and define

\[ A_n = \sup\{k \geq 1, \quad T_k \leq n\} \quad (1.3) \]

for each \( n \geq 1 \), where \( \inf \emptyset := +\infty \) and \( \sup \emptyset := 0 \) by convention. Obviously, \( S_{T_k} \) is the maximum value among \( S_0, S_1, \ldots, S_{T_k} \) and \( \{A_n, n \geq 1\} \) is a counting process which records the numbers that \( S \) arrives at its maximum values. In this paper, we call \( A_n \) the weak record numbers up to time \( n \). Here, we use “weak” to emphasize that we not only consider the time when a new record appears, but also keep eyes on the time when the current record is repeated. We remark that our weak record numbers up to time \( n \) is also different from the “record numbers” studied in Katzenbeisser and Panny \[21\], Kirschenhofer and Prodinger \[23\], Pătănea \[32\], and the references therein, where they discussed the number of the events \( \{S_k = M_n\} \) (rather than \( \{S_k = M_k\} \)) that occur up to time \( n \).

In the field of random walks, \( A_n \) is also called the number of “weak ladder points” which is a footstone in the fluctuation theory of random walks. The fluctuation theory was set forth by Spitzer \[34\] and Feller \[11\], and has drawn much attention since then because of its wide applications and elaborated but fascinating theory. For more details, one can refer to Karlin and Taylor \[20\], Chapter 17. Omey and Teugels \[17\] proved that a normed version of the bivariate ladder process \( (T_n, S_{T_n})_n \) converges in law to the bivariate ladder process of a Lévy process \( X \) whenever the normed \( (S_n) \) converges in law to \( X \). As an immediate corollary, one can derive that a normed version of \( A_n \) (number of ladder points) of \( S \) converges in distribution to the local time at the supremum of \( X \). Chaumont and Doney \[7\] extended this result to a more general case, where it is proved that when a normed sequence of random walks \( S^{(n)} \) converges almost surely on the Skorokhod space towards a Lévy process \( X \), then a normed version of the counting processes of ladder points of \( S^{(n)} \) converges uniformly on compact sets in probability toward the local time at the supremum of
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X. Based on these results, one may further ask how about the deviations between the normed version of \( A_n \) and its limit. As far as we know, there is little literature to investigate such problems.

To state our problem more precisely, we suppose that \( \{S_n\} \) is a one-dimensional simple symmetric random walk on \( \mathbb{Z} \), that is, we assume that

\[
P(X_k = 1) = P(X_k = -1) = 1/2.
\]

In this case, we can show that as \( n \) tends to infinity,

\[
A_n/\sqrt{n} \to 2 \max_{0 \leq t \leq 1} B(t) =: 2B^*(1)
\]

in distribution, where \( \{B(t)\} \) is a standard Brownian motion (see Theorem 2.6 below). This result suggests that if we regard \( A_n \) as \( 2\sqrt{n}B^*(1) \), then we only ignore an insignificant probability. In this paper, we are interested in describing the above “insignificant” probability. Rigorously, we study the asymptotic probabilities of \( P(A_n \geq \sqrt{n}c_n) \) and \( P(A_n \leq \sqrt{n}/c_n) \), where \( c_n \) tends to \( \infty \) besides other constraints.

We will get the large deviations principle (LDP), moderate deviations principle (MDP) and small ball probabilities (SBP) for \( A_n \), respectively. For the general theory of LDP and MDP, please refer to Dembo and Zeitouni [10]. For a comprehensive bibliography on SBP, please refer to Lifshits [25].

Let \( Y_k = T_k - T_{k-1} \) for \( k \geq 1 \). The strong Markov property of random walks implies that \( Y_k \)'s are i.i.d, and

\[
A_n = \sup \left\{ k, \sum_{i=1}^{k} Y_i \leq n \right\}.
\]

Namely, \( \{A_n\}_{n \geq 1} \) is a discrete time renewal process with the inter-occurrence time sequence \( \{Y_n\} \). There are many results on the theory of deviations for renewal processes or renewal reward processes. See, for example, Serfozo [33], Glynn and Whitt [15], Jiang [19], Chi [9], Frolov et al. [13], Lefevere et al. [24], Borovkov and Mogulskii [4], Tsirelson [36], Logachov and Mogulskii [27], and the references therein. However, most of the above results need constraints on moments or moment generating functions for inter-occurrence times, which are not fulfilled by \( A_n \) in the symmetric simple random walk case.

We will adopt two different routes to deal with the problems we are concerned with. When we investigate the LDP and MDP for \( A_n \), we use the deviation theory for occupation time of Markov processes. To get the SBP for \( A_n \), we will follow the standard strategy to build the moment generating functions of \( A_n \) and estimate the tail probabilities. The latter is a hard point of this paper.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we summarize the main results of this paper. In Section 3, we prove the LDP and MDP for \( A_n \). In the rest of the paper, we devote to find the SBP for \( A_n \), where we build the moment generating function of \( A_n \) in Section 4, show the convergence of \( A_n \) in Section 5, and prove the result on the SBP in Section 6. The last section, Section 7, contains the technical proofs of two lemmas in Section 5. Without other statements, in the sequel, \( M, M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) ..... are unspecified positive finite constants which may not necessarily be the same in each occurrence.
2. Main results

Let $S = \{S_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be a simple symmetric random walk on $\mathbb{Z}$, and $A_n$ defined by (1.3) is the corresponding weak record numbers up to time $n$. For any $\lambda \leq 0$, define

$$M(\lambda) := \frac{1 + e^\lambda - \sqrt{1 - e^{2\lambda}}}{2},$$

and

$$\Lambda(\lambda) := \ln M(\lambda) = \ln\left(1 + e^\lambda - \sqrt{1 - e^{2\lambda}}\right) - \ln 2.$$

Then

$$G(\lambda) := \Lambda'(\lambda) = 1 - \frac{1}{2(1 + e^\lambda)} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{1 - e^{2\lambda}}}$$

is a continuous monotone function with $G(0) = +\infty$ and $G(-\infty) = 1$. Therefore, for any $x \in (1, +\infty)$, there exists a unique $\lambda \in [-\infty, 0)$ such that $G(\lambda) = x$. Denote this unique $\lambda$ by $G^{-1}(x)$. By direct computation, we get that for any $x \geq 0$,

$$\Lambda^*(x) = \sup_{\lambda \leq 0} \{x\lambda - \Lambda(\lambda)\} = \begin{cases} xG^{-1}(x) - \Lambda(G^{-1}(x)), & \text{if } x > 1; \\ \ln 2, & \text{if } x = 1; \\ +\infty, & \text{if } x < 1. \end{cases}$$

We first have the following large deviations principle (LDP) and moderate deviations principle (MDP) for $A_n$. 

**Theorem 2.1 (LDP)** For any $x > 0$,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \mathbb{P}(A_n \geq xn) = -x\Lambda^*(1/x). \quad (2.1)$$

**Theorem 2.2 (MDP)** If $(c_n)$ is a sequence of positive numbers such that $c_n \to \infty$ and $c_n = o(n^{1/2})$ as $n \to \infty$, then for any $x > 0$,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{c_n^2} \ln \mathbb{P}(A_n \geq x\sqrt{n}c_n) = -x^2/8. \quad (2.2)$$

From the MDP, we can get the following law of the iterated logarithm (LIL).

**Theorem 2.3 (LIL)**

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{A_n}{\sqrt{n \ln \ln n}} = \frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{2}}.$$

To state our results on the small ball probability (SBP), we introduce the following notation.

$$\mathcal{H} = \left\{ (c_n)_{n \geq 0} : c_n > 0, \lim_{n \to \infty} c_n = +\infty \text{ and } c_n^2 e^{4c_n^2} = o\left(\frac{n^{1/4}}{\ln n}\right) \text{ as } n \to \infty \right\}.$$

We have the following result on the small ball probability (SBP) for $A_n$.

**Theorem 2.4 (SBP)** If $(c_n^{1+\gamma}) \in \mathcal{H}$ for some $\gamma > 0$, then for any $x \geq 1$,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{\ln c_n} \ln \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{A_n}{x\sqrt{n}} \leq \frac{x\sqrt{n}}{c_n}\right) = -1.$$
Remark 2.1 It can be easily seen that: (1) if \( c_n = \delta \sqrt{\ln n} \vee 1 \) with \( \delta < 1/4 \), then \((c_n) \in \mathcal{H}\); (2) if \((c_n) \in \mathcal{H}\), then \((c_n/a) \in \mathcal{H}\) for any \( a \geq 1\);

Remark 2.2 If \( c_n \approx (\ln \ln n) \vee 1 \), then for any \( x > 0 \), \((c_n/x) \in \mathcal{H}\). In this case, the conclusion of Theorem 2.4 can be strengthened as

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{\ln c_n} \ln \mathbb{P} \left( A_n \leq \frac{x \sqrt{n}}{c_n} \right) = -1 \quad \text{for all } x > 0.
\]

As will be seen in the next section, the weak record process \( \{A_n\} \) can be transformed to the occupation time at 0 for a Markov chain. Through this transform, we can readily get the LDP and MDP for \( A_n \) based on the celebrated Cramér’s Theorem and the contributions of Chen [8] respectively. However, this transform cannot facilitate our work when we investigate the SBP for \( A_n \). Instead, we adopt the standard strategy to investigate \( A_n \) directly. As byproducts, we obtain the moment generating function of \( A_n \) and build the weak convergence theorem of \( A_n/\sqrt{n} \).

Theorem 2.5 For any \( \lambda > -\ln 2 \),

\[
L_{A_n}(\lambda) := \mathbb{E} \left( e^{-\lambda A_n} \right) = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left( e^{-\lambda} - 1 \right)^k R_{n,k},
\]

where

\[
R_{n,k} := \sum_{m=k}^{n} \left[ \sum_{t_1 + \cdots + t_k = m, 1 \leq t_1, \cdots, t_k} a_{t_1} a_{t_2} \cdots a_{t_k} \right]
\]

for each \( 1 \leq k \leq n \), and \( a_{2m} = a_{2m-1} := \sum_{k=m+1}^{\infty} \frac{(2k-3)!!}{2^k k!} \) for each \( m \geq 1 \).

Theorem 2.6 For any \( \lambda \in (-\infty, +\infty) \), we have

\[
\mathbb{E} \left( e^{-\lambda A_n/\sqrt{n}} \right) \to \mathbb{E} \left( e^{-\lambda (2B^*(1))} \right)
\]

as \( n \) tends to infinity. In addition, for any \( k \geq 1 \), we have

\[
\mathbb{E} \left( \frac{A_n^k}{n^{k/2}} \right) \to 2^k \mathbb{E} \left[ (B^*(1))^k \right]
\]

as \( n \) tends to infinity.

Remark 2.3 Theorem 2.6 shows that not only \( A_n/\sqrt{n} \) converges in distribution to \( 2B^*(1) \), but also the moments of \( A_n/\sqrt{n} \) converge to the corresponding ones of \( 2B^*(1) \).

The Beta function \( \beta(a,b) \) and the Gamma function \( \Gamma(c) \) will be used frequently in the sequel. Recall that

\[
\beta(a,b) := \int_{0}^{1} x^{a-1}(1-x)^{b-1}dx \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma(c) := \int_{0}^{\infty} x^{c-1}e^{-x}dx
\]

for \( a, b, c > 0 \). It is well known that
(1) \( \beta(a, b) = \frac{\Gamma(a)\Gamma(b)}{\Gamma(a+b)} \) for any \( a, b > 0 \);
(2) \( \Gamma(1) = 1, \Gamma(1/2) = \sqrt{\pi} \); and
(3) \( \Gamma(c) = (c-1)\Gamma(c-1) \) for \( c > 1 \).

For the convenience of reference, we remind that for each \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \),

\[
\mathbb{E} \left( e^{-2\lambda B^*(1)} \right) = \int_0^\infty e^{-2\lambda x} \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-x^2/2} dx \\
= 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-\lambda)^k \frac{2^{k/2}}{\Gamma((k+2)/2)} \\
= e^{2\lambda^2} \int_{2\lambda}^{\infty} \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-y^2/2} dy,
\]

which implies that

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ (2B^*(1))^k \right] = k! B_k, 
\]

and that for any \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \),

\[
\mathbb{E} \left( e^{-2\lambda B^*(1)} \right) \leq 2e^{2\lambda^2}.
\]

Here and in the rest of this paper, we always let

\[
B_k := \frac{2^{k/2}}{\Gamma((k+2)/2)}.
\]

3. LDP and MDP for \( A_n \)

In this section, we study the LDP and MDP for \( A_n \). We first introduce an important transform. Recall \( M_n, T_k \) and \( A_n \) as defined in (1.1), (1.2) and (1.3), respectively. Let \( \mathcal{S}_0 = 0 \) and \( \mathcal{S}_n := M_n - S_n \) for \( n \geq 1 \). Then \( \{ \mathcal{S}_n, n \geq 0 \} \) is a nonnegative homogeneous Markov chain with the transition probability matrix \( (p_{ij})_{i,j \geq 0} \), where

\[
p_{ij} = \begin{cases} 
1/2, & \text{if } j = i + 1, \ i \geq 0; \\
1/2, & \text{if } j = i - 1, \ i \geq 1; \\
1/2, & \text{if } j = i = 0; \\
0, & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]

Let \( L_0^0(\mathcal{S}) \) be the occupation time of \( \mathcal{S} \) at site 0 from time 1 and up to time \( n \), that is,

\[
L_0^0(\mathcal{S}) = 0, \ \text{and} \ L_n^0(\mathcal{S}) := \sum_{k=1}^{n} 1{\{\mathcal{S}_k = 0\}} \text{ for } n \geq 1.
\]

It is easy to see that

\[
A_n = L_n^0(\mathcal{S}).
\]

Let \( \overline{\tau}_1 := \inf \{ n > 0, \ \mathcal{S}_n = 0 \} \) and \( \overline{\tau}_{k+1} := \inf \{ n > \overline{\tau}_k, \ \mathcal{S}_n = 0 \} \) for \( k \geq 1 \). (3.1) suggests that

\[
A_n = \sup \{ k \geq 1, \ \overline{\tau}_k \leq n \}.
\]
The Markov property indicates that \( \tau_1 \) and \( \tau_{k+1} - \tau_k, \ k \geq 1 \) are i.i.d.

We next prove the LDP for \( A_n \) via (3.2) as follows.

**Proof of Theorem 2.1** Let \( \{Y_i, i \geq 1\} \) be a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with the same distribution as \( (\tau_1 | S_0 = 0) \). Then we have

\[
L_n^0(S) = \sup \left\{ k \geq 0, \sum_{i=1}^k Y_i \leq n \right\}.
\]

Therefore, for any \( 0 < x \leq 1 \),

\[
P \left( L_n^0(S) \geq \lceil xn \rceil \right) \leq P(A_n \geq xn) = P \left( L_n^0(S) \geq xn \right) \leq P \left( L_n^0(S) \geq \lfloor xn \rfloor \right),
\]

which implies that

\[
P \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor xn \rfloor} Y_i \leq n \right) \leq P(A_n \geq xn) \leq P \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\lceil xn \rceil} Y_i \leq n \right),
\]

where \( \lfloor a \rfloor \) and \( \lceil a \rceil \) denote the minimal integer no smaller than \( a \) and the maximal integer no larger than \( a \), respectively.

Next, let

\[
f_0(\lambda) = \mathbb{E} \left( e^{\lambda \tau} | S_0 = 0 \right) \quad \text{and} \quad f_1(\lambda) = \mathbb{E} \left( e^{\lambda \tau} | S_0 = 1 \right)
\]

for \( \lambda \leq 0 \). From the basic properties of Markov chains, we know that \( f_0(\lambda) \) and \( f_1(\lambda) \) are the minimal nonnegative solutions of the following equations:

\[
f_0(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2} e^{\lambda} + \frac{1}{2} e^{\lambda} f_1(\lambda),
\]

\[
f_1(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2} e^{\lambda} + \frac{1}{2} e^{\lambda} f_1^2(\lambda),
\]

from which we get that

\[
f_0(\lambda) = M(\lambda),
\]

which implies that \( \mathbb{E} (\tau | S_0 = 0) = +\infty \).

From the assumptions that \( S_0 = 0 \) and \( Y \overset{d}{=} \tau_1 \), we have that \( \mathbb{E}(e^{\lambda Y_k}) = M(\lambda) \) for \( \lambda < 0 \), and that \( \mathbb{E}(Y_k) = +\infty \). Applying the Cramér’s Theorem [10, P.27], we obtain that

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i \leq xn \right) = -\Lambda^*(x).
\]

The remainder is same as the proof of Theorem 2 in Gantert and Zeitouni [14]. So we omit the details. \( \square \)

To prove the MDP for \( A_n \), we recall that by the first entrance decomposition of Markov chains,

\[
\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P} \left( S_n = 0 | S_0 = 0 \right) s^n = \frac{1}{1 - f_0(\ln s)} = \frac{2}{1 - s + \sqrt{1 - s^2}}
\]
for any $s \in [0, 1)$. Therefore,
\[
\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(S_n = 0 | S_0 = 0) s^n \sim \sqrt{2}(1-s)^{-1/2}
\]
as $s$ tends to 1. By Tauberian’s Theorem [11], we know that
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n^{1/2}} \sum_{k=0}^{n} \mathbb{P}(S_k = 0 | S_0 = 0) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\Gamma(3/2)}.
\]

Proof of Theorem 2.2} Note that $A_n = \sum_{k=1}^{n} 1_{\{S_k=0\}}$. From (3.3), we know that
Case (1) of Theorem 2 in Chen [8] is fulfilled by the Markov chain $\{S\}$ with $f = 1_{\{0\}}$, $p = 1/2$ and $a_n = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{1(3/2)}$. Consequently,
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{c_n^2} \ln \mathbb{P}(A_n \geq x \sqrt{nc_n}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{c_n^2} \ln \mathbb{P}(A_n \geq x \sqrt{n/c_n^2} c_n^2)
\]
\[
= \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{c_n^2} \ln \mathbb{P}(A_n \geq x \frac{\Gamma(3/2)}{\sqrt{2}} a (n/c_n^2) c_n^2)
\]
\[
= -(1-p) \left( \frac{p \Gamma(3/2)}{\Gamma(p+1)\sqrt{2}} \right)^{(1-p)^{-1}}
\]
\[
= -\frac{x^2}{8},
\]
where we use the fact $p = 1/2$ in the last equality. \hfill \Box

Since Theorem 2.3 is a straightforward application of Theorem 3 in Chen [8] to our case, we leave its proof to the readers.

4. Moment generating function of $A_n$

From now on, we will focus on the proof of Theorem 2.4. In this section, we will build the moment generating function of $A_n$. We first introduce an auxiliary random variable as follows:
\[
\tau := \inf \{n > 0, S_{n-1} < S_n = 0\}.
\]
Then from the general theory of simple random walks, we have
\[
\phi(u) = \mathbb{E}(u^{\tau}) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{P}(\tau = 2n-1) u^{2n} = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \sqrt{1-u^2} \right)
\]
for $u \in [0, 1]$, where
\[
p_{2n-1} := \mathbb{P}(\tau_1 = 2n-1) = \frac{1}{2n-1} C_{2n-1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{2^{2n-1}}.
\]

Inspired by the fluctuation theory of the partial sums of i.i.d. random variables, we define
\[
L_n := \max \{0 \leq k \leq n, S_k = M_n\}, \quad n \geq 1.
\]
Intuitively, $L_n$ is the position of the last maximum among $\{S_0, S_1, \cdots, S_n\}$. It is easy to see that for $n \geq 1$,

$$A_n = \sum_{k=1}^{n} 1_{\{L_k = k\}}.$$ 

The main result of this section is as follows.

**Theorem 4.1** For any $(\lambda, \mu, t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times [0, 1]$, we have

$$H(\lambda, \mu, t) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left( e^{-\lambda A_n - \mu S_n} \right) t^n = \begin{cases} \infty, & \text{if } (\lambda, \mu, t) \notin D, \\ \frac{1 - \phi(t)}{G(\lambda, \mu, t)}, & \text{if } (\lambda, \mu, t) \in D. \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

where

$$D = \left\{ (\lambda, \mu, t) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times [0, 1] : \frac{1}{2} e^{\mu t} + \phi(t) < 1, \quad \frac{1}{2} e^{-\mu t} + \phi(t) < e^\lambda \right\},$$

and

$$G(\lambda, \mu, t) = \left[ 1 - e^{-\lambda \left( \frac{1}{2} e^{\mu t} + \phi(t) \right) } \right] \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{1}{2} e^{\mu t} + \phi(t) \right) \right].$$

**Proof.** Since $A_n = \sum_{k=1}^{n} 1_{\{L_k = k\}}$, and we have that $A_n = A_k$ when $L_n = k$. Hence,

$$\mathbb{E} \left( e^{-\lambda A_n - \mu S_n} \right) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \mathbb{E} \left( e^{-\lambda A_n - \mu S_n} 1_{\{L_n = k\}} \right) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \mathbb{E} \left( e^{-\lambda A_k - \mu S_k} 1_{\{L_k = k\}} e^{-\mu (S_n - S_k) 1_{\{S_m < S_k, k < m \leq n\}}} \right) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \psi(\lambda, \mu, k) \tilde{\psi}(\mu, n - k),$$

where

$$\psi(\lambda, \mu, k) := \mathbb{E} \left( e^{-\lambda A_k - \mu S_k} 1_{\{L_k = k\}} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\psi}(\mu, n - k) := \mathbb{E} \left( e^{-\mu S_k} 1_{\{L_k = 0\}} \right)$$

for any $k \geq 0$. Therefore,

$$H(\lambda, \mu, t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{n} \psi(\lambda, \mu, k) \tilde{\psi}(\mu, n - k) t^n = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \psi(\lambda, \mu, k) t^k \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\psi}(\mu, k) t^k. \quad (4.1)$$

Due to the right continuity of the simple random walks, we know that if $L_{n-1} = k < n - 1$ and $L_n = n$, then $A_n = A_k + 1$ and $S_n = S_k$. Therefore, for any $n \geq 2$,

$$\psi(\lambda, \mu, n) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E} \left( e^{-\lambda A_n - \mu S_n} 1_{\{L_{n-1} = k, L_n = n\}} \right) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \mathbb{E} \left( e^{-\lambda A_{n-1} - \mu S_{n-1}} 1_{\{L_{n-1} = k, L_n = n\}} \right) + \mathbb{E} \left( e^{-\lambda A_n - \mu S_n} 1_{\{L_{n-1} = n-1, L_n = n\}} \right) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} e^{-\lambda} \mathbb{E} \left( e^{-\lambda A_{n-1} - \mu S_{n-1}} 1_{\{L_{n-1} = k, O_{n,k}\}} \right) + \frac{1}{2} e^{-\lambda} \mathbb{E} \left( e^{-\lambda A_{n-1} - \mu S_{n-1}} 1_{\{L_{n-1} = n-1\}} \right), \quad (4.1)$$

for any $k \geq 0$. Therefore,

$$H(\lambda, \mu, t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{n} \psi(\lambda, \mu, k) \tilde{\psi}(\mu, n - k) t^n = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \psi(\lambda, \mu, k) t^k \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\psi}(\mu, k) t^k. \quad (4.1)$$

Due to the right continuity of the simple random walks, we know that if $L_{n-1} = k < n - 1$ and $L_n = n$, then $A_n = A_k + 1$ and $S_n = S_k$. Therefore, for any $n \geq 2$,
where
\[ O_{n,k} := \{ S_n = S_k; S_m - S_k < 0 \text{ for all } k < m < n \} \]
is independent of the event \( \{ L_k = k \} \). By the property of stationary independent increments for simple random walks, it is easy to see that
\[ \mathbb{P}(O_{n,k}) = \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau} = n - k). \]

Hence,
\[ \psi(\lambda, \mu, n) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} e^{-\lambda} \psi(\lambda, \mu, k) \mathbb{P}(O_{n,k}) + \frac{1}{2} e^{-\lambda - \mu} \psi(\lambda, \mu, n-1) \]
\[ = \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} e^{-\lambda} \psi(\lambda, \mu, k) \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau} = n - k) + \frac{1}{2} e^{-\lambda - \mu} \psi(\lambda, \mu, n-1), \]
which implies that
\[ \Psi(\lambda, \mu, t) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \psi(\lambda, \mu, k) t^k \]
\[ = 1 + \psi(\lambda, \mu, 1) t + \frac{1}{2} e^{-\lambda - \mu} \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \psi(\lambda, \mu, n-1) t^n \]
\[ + e^{-\lambda} \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \psi(\lambda, \mu, k) \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau} = n - k) t^n \]
\[ = 1 + \psi(\lambda, \mu, 1) t + \frac{1}{2} e^{-\lambda - \mu} (\Psi(\lambda, \mu, t) - 1) + e^{-\lambda} \Psi(\lambda, \mu, t) \phi(t). \]

Since \( \psi(\lambda, \mu, 1) = \frac{1}{2} e^{-\lambda - \mu} \), we have
\[ \Psi(\lambda, \mu, t) = 1 + \left( \frac{1}{2} e^{-\lambda - \mu} t + e^{-\lambda} \phi(t) \right) \Psi(\lambda, \mu, t). \]

Consequently,
\[ \Psi(\lambda, \mu, t) = \begin{cases} \infty, & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} e^{-\lambda - \mu} t + e^{-\lambda} \phi(t) \geq 1, \\ \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{-\lambda - \mu} t - e^{-\lambda} \phi(t)}, & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} e^{-\lambda - \mu} t + e^{-\lambda} \phi(t) < 1. \end{cases} \]

To get \( \tilde{\psi}(\mu, n) \), we use the equivalence principle in the fluctuation theory of random walks (see [20, P487]). For each \( n \geq 0 \), we have
\[ \tilde{\psi}(\mu, n) = \mathbb{E} \left( e^{-\mu S_n} 1_{\{ L_n = 0 \}} \right) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } n = 0, \\ \frac{1}{2} e^{\mu} \mathbb{E} \left( e^{-\mu S_{n-1}} 1_{\{ K_{n-1} = n-1 \}} \right), & \text{if } n \geq 1, \end{cases} \]
where
\[ K_n := \max \left\{ k, S_k = \min_{0 \leq m \leq n} S_m \right\}. \]
Note that $K_n = \max \left\{ k, -S_k = \max_{0 \leq m \leq n} (-S_m) \right\}$, and that $\{S\}$ is symmetric, we get that $\tilde{\psi}(\mu, n) = \frac{1}{2} e^{\mu} \psi(0, -\mu, n - 1)$ for every $n \geq 1$, and therefore,

$$
\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\psi}(\mu, k) t^k = 1 + \frac{1}{2} e^{\mu} t \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \psi(0, -\mu, n) t^k
$$

$$
= 1 + \frac{1}{2} e^{\mu} t \Psi(0, -\mu, t)
$$

$$
= \begin{cases} 
\infty, & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} e^{\mu} t + \phi(t) \geq 1, \\
\frac{1 - \phi(t)}{1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{\mu} t - \phi(t)}, & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} e^{\mu} t + \phi(t) < 1.
\end{cases}
$$

Summing up on both sides, we obtain (4.1). □

Based on (4.1), we are now ready to prove Theorem 2.5.

**Proof of Theorem 2.5.** From (4.1), one can get that for any $t \in [0, 1)$ and $e^\lambda > \frac{t}{2} + \phi(t)$,

$$
H(\lambda, 0, t) = \frac{1 - \phi(t)}{[1 - e^{-\lambda} (t/2 + \phi(t))] (1 - t/2 - \phi(t))} = \frac{1}{1-t} \frac{1}{1 + (1 - e^{-\lambda}) \overline{T}(t)},
$$

where

$$
\overline{T}(t) := \frac{\sqrt{1 - t^2} - 1 + t^2}{t(1-t)}.
$$

Using the Taylor’s expansion $\sqrt{1 - t^2} = 1 - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \tilde{p}_k t^{2k}$ for $t \in (-1, 1)$, where

$$
\tilde{p}_k := \frac{(2k - 3)!!}{2^k k!} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \tilde{p}_k = 1,
$$

we have that for $0 \leq t < 1$,

$$
\overline{T}(t) = \frac{t^2 - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \tilde{p}_k t^{2k}}{t(1-t)} = \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \tilde{p}_k \sum_{m=1}^{2k-2} t^m = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_m t^m,
$$

where $a_{2n-1} = a_{2n} = 1 - \sum_{k=1}^{n} \tilde{p}_k$ for each $n \geq 1$. By the fundamental result in mathematical analysis, when $t \in [0, \sqrt{2}/2)$ and $\lambda > -\ln 2$, we have

$$
e^\lambda > \frac{t}{2} + \phi(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \left( 1 - e^\lambda \right) \overline{T}(t) \right| < 1.
$$

Therefore, from the expansion

$$
\frac{1}{1-x} = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} x^k, \quad |x| < 1,
$$
we have that

\[
H(\lambda, 0, t) = \frac{1}{1-t} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k \left(1 - e^{-\lambda}\right)^k \left[ \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_m t^m \right] \left[ \sum_{t_1+\cdots+t_k=m} t_1 a_1 t_2 a_2 \cdots a_k \right] t^m
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{1-t} \left\{ 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left( e^{-\lambda} - 1 \right)^k \sum_{m=k}^{\infty} \left[ \sum_{t_1+\cdots+t_k=m} t_1 a_1 t_2 a_2 \cdots a_k \right] t^m \right\}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{1-t} \left\{ 1 + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \left( e^{-\lambda} - 1 \right)^k \sum_{t_1+\cdots+t_k=m} t_1 a_1 t_2 a_2 \cdots a_k \right\} t^m
\]

\[
= 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( 1 + \sum_{m=1}^{n} \left( e^{-\lambda} - 1 \right)^k \sum_{t_1+\cdots+t_k=m} t_1 a_1 t_2 a_2 \cdots a_k \right) t^n
\]

which implies the desired conclusion of Theorem 2.5.

5. Convergence of \( A_n \)

In this section, we prove the convergence of \( A_n \) to \( 2B^*(1) \) by moment generating functions. To this end, we need the following two lemmas which estimate the bounds of \( R_{n,k} \) as defined in (2.4).

**Lemma 5.1** We have

\[
R_{n,1} \leq 2\sqrt{n}, \quad R_{n,2} \leq \pi(n - 2)
\]

for any \( n \geq 1 \). Furthermore, when \( n \geq k \geq 3 \), we have

\[
R_{n,k} \leq \frac{\pi^{k/2}}{\Gamma((k+2)/2)} \left[ (n - 1)^{k/2} - (k - 1)^{k/2} \right].
\]

**Lemma 5.2** There exists \( M > 0 \) such that for any sufficiently large \( n \),

\[
\left| R_{n,k} - n^{k/2} B_k \right| \leq M \sqrt{\frac{c_n}{n^{1/4}}} n^{k/2} B_k
\]

holds for all \( 1 \leq k \leq c_n \) whenever \( c_n / n^{1/4} \to 0 \). Moreover, for any \( k \geq 1 \),

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{R_{n,k}}{n^{k/2}} = B_k.
\]

The proofs of these two lemmas will be postponed to Section 7.

Next, define

\[
h_{n,m}(\lambda) := \sum_{k=m}^{n} k(k-1) \cdots (k+1-m) \left( e^{-\lambda} - 1 \right)^{k-m} e^{-m\lambda} R_{n,k}
\]
for \( n > m \geq 1 \). Obviously, we have
\[
h'_{n,m}(\lambda) = -mh_{n,m}(\lambda) - h_{n,m+1}(\lambda),
\tag{5.3}
\]
and
\[
h'_{n,n}(\lambda) = -nh_{n,n}(\lambda).
\tag{5.4}
\]

**Lemma 5.3** For any \( n \geq k \geq 1 \), we have
\[
\frac{d^k L_{A_n}(\lambda)}{d\lambda^k} = (-1)^k \sum_{m=1}^{k} d_m^{(k,n)} h_{n,m}(\lambda),
\tag{5.5}
\]
where
\[
d_m^{(k,n)} = \frac{1}{(m-1)!} \sum_{i=1}^{m} i^{k-1} \binom{m-1}{i-1} (-1)^{m-i}
\tag{5.6}
\]
for \( 1 < m < k \), and \( d_1^{(k,n)} = d_k^{(k,n)} = 1 \). If \( k > n \), then we have
\[
\frac{d^k L_{A_n}(\lambda)}{d\lambda^k} = (-1)^k \sum_{m=1}^{n} d_m^{(k,n)} h_{n,m}(\lambda),
\tag{5.7}
\]
where \( d_m^{(k,n)} \) satisfies \(5.6\) for \( 1 < m \leq n \), and \( d_1^{(k,n)} = 1 \).

**Proof.** We first verify by induction that \(5.5\) holds. First, it is easy to see that when \( k = 1 \),
\[
\frac{dL_{A_n}(\lambda)}{d\lambda} = -h_{n,1}.
\]
Suppose that \(5.5\) holds for \( k = r < n \). Then applying \(5.3\) to get that
\[
\frac{d^{r+1} L_{A_n}(\lambda)}{d\lambda^{r+1}} = (-1)^r \frac{d}{d\lambda} \left[ \sum_{m=1}^{r} d_m^{(r,n)} h_{n,m}(\lambda) \right]
= (-1)^{r+1} \left[ d_r^{(r,n)} h_{n,r+1}(\lambda) + \sum_{m=2}^{r} \left( md_m^{(r,n)} + d_m^{(r,m)} \right) h_{n,m}(\lambda) + d_1^{(r,n)} h_{n,1}(\lambda) \right],
\]
which implies that \(5.5\) holds for all \( 1 \leq k \leq n \), and
\[
d_k^{(k,n)} = d_{k-1}^{(k-1,n)}, \quad d_1^{(k,n)} = d_1^{(k-1,n)};
\tag{5.8}
\]
\[
d_m^{(k,n)} = md_m^{(k-1,n)} + d_m^{(k-1,m)}, \quad 1 < m < k.
\tag{5.9}
\]
To verify \(5.6\), note that \( d_1^{(1,n)} = 1 \) and hence \(5.6\) holds for \( k = 1 \). Suppose that \(5.6\) holds for \( k = r < n \), that is, for each \( 1 < m < r \),
\[
d_m^{(r,n)} = \frac{1}{(m-1)!} \sum_{i=1}^{m} i^{r-1} \binom{m-1}{i-1} (-1)^{m-i},
\tag{5.10}
\]

and \( d_1^{(r,n)} = d_r^{(r,n)} = 1 \). Then when \( k = r + 1 \), by (5.8), it is easy to see that
\[
d_{r+1,n}^{(r+1,n)} = 1.
\]

By (5.9) and (5.10), we have that for \( 1 < m < r + 1 \),
\[
d_{m+1,n}^{(m+1,n)} = md_m^{(m,n)} + d_{m-1}^{(m,n)}
= \frac{1}{(m-1)!} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i^{r-1} (-1)^{m-i} \left[ mC_m^{i-1} - (m-1)C_m^{i-2} \right] + m^r
= \frac{1}{(m-1)!} \sum_{i=1}^{m} i^r (-1)^{m-i} C_m^{i-1},
\]
which implies that (5.6) holds for all \( 1 \leq k \leq n \).

Similarly, when \( k > n \), we can also verify the desired result. \(\square\)

The following theorem gives the formulas for \( A_n \)’s moments.

**Theorem 5.1** For any \( k \geq 1 \), we have
\[
E \left[ (A_n)^k \right] = \sum_{m=1}^{k \wedge n} R_{n,m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} i^k C_m^i (-1)^{m-i}.
\]

Furthermore, we have
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{E \left[ (A_n)^k \right]}{n^{k/2}} = B_k \sum_{i=1}^{k} i^k C_k^i (-1)^{k-i}.
\]

**Proof.** Lemma 5.3 yields that
\[
E \left[ (A_n)^k \right] = \sum_{m=1}^{k \wedge n} d_m^{(k,n)} h_{n,m}(0).
\]

Since \( h_{n,m}(0) = m! R_{n,m} \), substituting (5.6) into (5.11) yields that
\[
E \left[ (A_n)^k \right] = \sum_{m=1}^{k} \left[ \frac{1}{(m-1)!} \sum_{i=1}^{m} i^{k-1} C_m^{i-1} (-1)^{m-i} \right] m! R_{n,m}
= \sum_{m=1}^{k} R_{n,m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} i^{k-1} (-1)^{m-i}
= \sum_{m=1}^{k} R_{n,m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} C_m^i (-1)^{m-i}.
\]

The first conclusion has been proved. Furthermore, the second conclusion follows from Lemma 5.2 and (5.12). \(\square\)

Now we are at the position to prove Theorem 2.6.
Proof of Theorem 2.6. For any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, (2.3) and Lemma 5.1 imply that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a sufficiently large $m > 0$, such that for any $n \geq 1$,

$$
\left| \mathbb{E}\left( e^{-\lambda A_n/\sqrt{n}}\right) - \sum_{k=1}^{m} \left( e^{-\lambda/\sqrt{n}} - 1 \right)^k R_{n,k} - 1 \right| \leq \varepsilon.
$$

Applying Lemma 5.2 to let $n \to \infty$ first and then $\varepsilon \to 0$, we have that

$$
\mathbb{E}\left( e^{-\lambda A_n/\sqrt{n}}\right) \to 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-\lambda)^k B_k.
$$

Together with (2.6), we can get the first result. To prove the convergence of moments, we use the combinatorial equality (see Aigner [1, P.97], for example)

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{k} C_i^k (-1)^{k-i} = k!
$$

together with Theorem 5.1 to get that

$$
\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{E}\left[ (A_n)^k \right] / n^{k/2} = k! B_k = \mathbb{E}\left[ (2B^* (1))^k \right],
$$

as desired. \[\square\]

6. Small ball probabilities

To get the small ball probabilities, we need the following lemma on the Laplace transform of $A_n$.

Lemma 6.1 If $(c_n) \in \mathcal{H}$, then as $n \to \infty$,

$$
c_n \mathbb{E}\left( e^{-\frac{c_n}{\sqrt{n}} A_n}\right) \to \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}.
$$

Proof. From the assumption on $c_n$, we know that $c_n^2 \leq \ln n$ for sufficiently large $n$. Let $k_n$ be a positive integer such that $k_n \sim e^{2\pi c_n^2 / \ln n}$. Let

$$
B_n := \sum_{i=k_n+1}^{[n/2]} \left( e^{-\frac{c_n}{\sqrt{n}}} - 1 \right)^{2i} R_{n,2i} \vee \sum_{i=k_n+1}^{[n/2]} e^{-\frac{c_n}{\sqrt{n}}} - 1 \left|^{2i+1} R_{n,2i+1}. \right.
$$

Note that from Lemma 5.1 we get that

$$
R_{n,i} \leq (n\pi)^{i/2} / \Gamma\left( i + \frac{3}{2} \right) \leq \begin{cases} (n\pi)^{i/2} / k! & \text{if } i = 2k, \\ 2(n\pi)^{i/2} / k! & \text{if } i = 2k + 1. \end{cases}
$$

Therefore,

$$
\sum_{i=k_n+1}^{[n/2]} \left( e^{-\frac{c_n}{\sqrt{n}}} - 1 \right)^{2i} R_{n,2i} \leq \sum_{i=k_n+1}^{[n/2]} \frac{\pi^i (c_n)^{2i}}{i!} \leq \sum_{i=k_n+1}^{[n/2]} \frac{\pi^i (c_n)^{2i}}{i!} \leq \frac{(\pi c_n^2)^{k_n}}{k_n!} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{\pi c_n^2}{k_n+1} \right)^i.
$$
Together with the Stirling’s Lemma [18, P57], we can get that for sufficiently large $n$,
\[
\sum_{i=k_n+1}^{[n/2]} \left( e^{-\frac{c_n d}{\sqrt{n}}} - 1 \right)^{2i} R_{n,2i} \leq \frac{(\pi c_n^2)^{k_n}}{\sqrt{2\pi k_n} (k_n/e)^{k_n}} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\pi c_n^2}{k_n+1}} \leq \frac{1}{n}.
\]
Similarly, we have that for sufficiently large $n$,
\[
\sum_{i=k_n+1}^{[n/2]} \left| e^{-\frac{c_n d}{\sqrt{n}}} - 1 \right|^{2i+1} R_{n,2i+1} \leq \frac{1}{n}.
\]
Hence, from Theorem 2.5 it follows that
\[
\left| \mathbb{E} \left( e^{-\frac{c_n d}{\sqrt{n}} A_n} \right) - \sum_{i=0}^{2k_n+1} \left( e^{-\frac{c_n d}{\sqrt{n}}} - 1 \right)^i R_{n,i} \right| \leq B_n \leq \frac{1}{n},
\]
where, for convenience, define $R_{n,0} = 1$. Obviously, the same but easier discussion can lead to that
\[
\left| \sum_{i=2k_n+2}^{\infty} \left[ \sqrt{n} \left( e^{-\frac{c_n d}{\sqrt{n}}} - 1 \right) \right]^i B_i \right| \leq \frac{1}{n}
\]
for sufficiently large $n$. Since $k_n \leq M \ln n$ for a constant $M$, we can get from Lemma 5.2, 2.6 and 2.8 that
\[
\left| \sum_{i=0}^{2k_n+1} \left( e^{-\frac{c_n d}{\sqrt{n}}} - 1 \right)^i R_{n,i} - \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left[ \sqrt{n} \left( e^{-\frac{c_n d}{\sqrt{n}}} - 1 \right) \right]^i B_i \right|
\leq M \sqrt{\frac{k_n}{n^{1/4}}} \sum_{i=1}^{2k_n+1} \left[ \sqrt{n} \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{c_n d}{\sqrt{n}}} \right) \right]^i B_i + \sum_{i=2k_n+2}^{\infty} \left[ \sqrt{n} \left( e^{-\frac{c_n d}{\sqrt{n}}} - 1 \right) \right]^i B_i
\leq M \sqrt{\frac{k_n}{n^{1/4}}} \mathbb{E} \left( e^{2\sqrt{n} \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{c_n d}{\sqrt{n}}} \right)} B^*(1) \right) + \frac{1}{n} \leq M \sqrt{\frac{k_n}{n^{1/4}}} \mathbb{E} \left( e^{2c_n B^*(1)} \right) + \frac{1}{n}
\leq M \sqrt{\frac{k_n}{n^{1/4}}} e^{2c_n} + \frac{1}{n} \leq M \sqrt{\frac{\ln n}{n^{1/4}}} e^{2c_n^2}.
\]
Consequently,
\[
c_n \mathbb{E} \left( e^{-\frac{c_n d}{\sqrt{n}} A_n} \right) = c_n \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left[ \sqrt{n} \left( e^{-\frac{c_n d}{\sqrt{n}}} - 1 \right) \right]^i B_i + O \left( \sqrt{\frac{\ln n}{n^{1/4}}} e^{2c_n^2} \right)
= c_n \mathbb{E} \left( e^{2\sqrt{n} \left( e^{-\frac{c_n d}{\sqrt{n}}} - 1 \right) B^*(1)} \right) + O \left( \sqrt{\frac{\ln n}{n^{1/4}}} e^{2c_n^2} \right).
\]
Let $d_n := \sqrt{n} \left( 1 - e^{-c_n / \sqrt{n}} \right)$. Obviously we have $d_n / c_n \to 1$ as $n$ tends to infinity. By
\[
c_n \mathbb{E} \left( e^{-2d_n B^*(1)} \right) = c_n \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-2d_n x} \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-x^2/2} \, dx = \frac{2c_n e^{2d_n^2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{2d_n}^{\infty} e^{-x^2/2} \, dx
\]
together with the fact that
\[
\int_{x}^{\infty} e^{-x^2/2} \, dx \sim \frac{1}{x} e^{-x^2/2}
\]
for sufficiently large \(x\), we get that as \(n \to \infty\),
\[
c_n \mathbb{E} \left( e^{2\sqrt{n} \left( e^{c_n \sqrt{n}} - 1 \right) B^*(1)} \right) \to \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}. \tag{6.2}
\]
Then the desired result follows from (6.2) together with the assumptions on \(c_n\). \(\square\)

We can next prove Theorem 2.4 using Lemma 6.1.

**Proof of Theorem 2.4.** Note that if \((c_n^{1+\gamma}) \in \mathcal{H}\), then for any given \(x \geq 1\), we have \((c_n/x)^{1+\gamma} \in \mathcal{H}\) and \(\ln(c_n)/\ln(c_n/\lambda) \to 1\) as \(n \to \infty\). It is sufficient to prove Theorem 2.4 in the case of \(x = 1\). From Lemma 6.1, it is easy to see that
\[
\mathbb{P} \left( A_n \leq \sqrt{\frac{n}{c_n}} \right) = \mathbb{P} \left( e^{-\frac{b_n A_n}{c_n}} \geq e^{-1} \right) \leq e^{\mathbb{E} \left( e^{-\frac{b_n A_n}{c_n}} \right)} \leq M \frac{b_n}{c_n}.
\]
Therefore, by the assumption that \(c_n/n^\epsilon \to 0\) for any \(\epsilon > 0\), we get that
\[
\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{\ln c_n} \ln \mathbb{P} \left( A_n \leq \sqrt{\frac{n}{c_n}} \right) \leq -1.
\]
On the other hand, for any \(\gamma > \epsilon > 0\), define \(b_n = c_n^{1+\epsilon}\). Then from
\[
\mathbb{E} \left( e^{-\frac{b_n A_n}{c_n}} \right) \leq \mathbb{P} \left( e^{-\frac{b_n A_n}{c_n}} \geq e^{-b_n/c_n} \right) + e^{-b_n/c_n}
\]
and
\[
\mathbb{P} \left( A_n \leq \sqrt{\frac{n}{c_n}} \right) = \mathbb{P} \left( e^{-\frac{b_n A_n}{c_n}} \geq e^{-b_n/c_n} \right),
\]
we get that
\[
\mathbb{P} \left( A_n \leq \sqrt{\frac{n}{c_n}} \right) \geq \mathbb{E} \left( e^{-\frac{b_n A_n}{c_n}} \right) - e^{-b_n/c_n}.
\]
Note that (6.1) and (6.2) imply
\[
\mathbb{P} \left( A_n \leq \sqrt{\frac{n}{c_n}} \right) \geq \frac{M}{b_n} - \frac{Me^{2b_n^2}}{\sqrt{n^{1/4}/\ln n}} - e^{-b_n/c_n}
\]
\[
= \frac{M}{c_n^{1+\epsilon}} - \frac{Mb_n e^{2b_n^2}}{c_n^{1+\epsilon} \sqrt{n^{1/4}/\ln n}} - e^{-c_n^\epsilon},
\]
which yields that
\[
\liminf_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{\ln c_n} \ln \mathbb{P} \left( A_n \leq \sqrt{\frac{n}{c_n}} \right) \geq -\left(1 + \epsilon \right).
\]
Letting \(\epsilon \to 0\), we get that
\[
\liminf_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{\ln c_n} \ln \mathbb{P} \left( A_n \leq \sqrt{\frac{n}{c_n}} \right) \geq -1.
\]
The proof is completed. \(\square\)
7. Proofs of Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 5.2

In this section, we present the technical proofs of Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 5.2. Let us first recall some basic results which will be used in the following proofs.

If \( f(x) \) is a convex \( C^2 \)-function, then

\[
\int_{x-1/2}^{x+1/2} f(t) dt \geq f(x). \tag{7.1}
\]

Since the function \( f(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{u^2 - x^2}} \) is convex for \(-u < x < u\), we have for each \( n \geq 1 \),

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t\sqrt{n+1-i}}} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(n+1)^2 - (\frac{n}{2} - i)^2}} \leq 2 \int_{0}^{1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx = \pi. \tag{7.2}
\]

Furthermore, due to the fact that for any \( m \geq 1/2 \), \( f(x) = x^{-1/2}(a-x)^m \) is decreasing for \( x \in (0,a) \), we have that for any \( v \geq n \),

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{(v-i)^m}{\sqrt{t}} \leq \int_{0}^{n} \frac{(v-x)^m}{\sqrt{x}} dx \leq v^{m+1/2} \int_{0}^{n/v} \frac{(1-x)^m}{\sqrt{x}} dx. \tag{7.3}
\]

**Lemma 7.1** For any \( 0 \leq m \leq k-1 \) and \( 1 \leq c \leq n \) satisfying \( n \geq kc \), we have

\[
\sum_{1 \leq t_i < i \leq 1} \prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_i}} \left[ \sum_{c \leq i=m+n} \prod_{j=m+1}^{k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_j}} \right] \leq \frac{(n\pi)^{k/2}}{n!^{k/2}} \left( \frac{4ck}{\pi n} \right)^{m/2}. \tag{7.4}
\]

**Proof.** For any \( m \leq k-3 \), it follows from (7.2) that

\[
I(k, m, n) := \sum_{c \leq m+n} \prod_{j=m+1}^{k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_j}}
\]

is not larger than

\[
\sum_{t_{m+1}=1}^{n-\sum_{i=1}^{m} t_i} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_{m+1}}} \sum_{t_{m+2}=1}^{n-\sum_{i=1}^{m} t_i} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_{m+2}}} \cdots \sum_{t_{k-1}=1}^{n-\sum_{i=1}^{k-2} t_i} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_{k-1}}} \left( \sqrt{n-\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} t_i} \right)^{m/2} \]

\[
= \pi \sum_{t_{m+1}=1}^{n-\sum_{i=1}^{m} t_i} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_{m+1}}} \sum_{t_{m+2}=1}^{n-\sum_{i=1}^{m} t_i} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_{m+2}}} \cdots \sum_{t_{k-1}=1}^{n-\sum_{i=1}^{k-2} t_i} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_{k-2}}} \left( \sqrt{n-\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} t_i} \right)^{m/2} \]

\[
\leq 2\pi \sum_{t_{m+1}=1}^{n-\sum_{i=1}^{m} t_i} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_{m+1}}} \cdots \sum_{t_{k-3}=1}^{n-\sum_{i=1}^{k-4} t_i} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_{k-3}}} \left( \sqrt{n-\sum_{i=1}^{k-3} t_i} \right)^{k/2}.
\]

\[
\leq 8\pi \sqrt{\pi n} \left( \frac{4ck}{\pi n} \right)^{m/2}. \tag{7.4}
\]
Similarly, we can show that (7.6) also holds for all \( m < k \).

Consequently, we use (7.3) recursively to get that

\[
I(k, m, n) \leq 2\pi \left[ \prod_{i=2}^{k-3} \Delta_i \right] \sum_{t_{m+1} = 1}^{n - \sum_{i=1}^{m} t_i} \frac{(n - 2 - \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} t_i)^{(k-3)/2}}{\sqrt{t_{m+1}}},
\]

where \( \Delta_i = \beta \left( \frac{1}{2}, \frac{k-m-i}{2} \right) \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq k - m - 3 \). By direct computation, we have that

\[
2\pi \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{k-3} \Delta_i \right] \leq 2\pi \frac{\Gamma(1/2)^{k-m-3}\Gamma(3/2)}{\Gamma((k-m)/2)} = \frac{\pi^{(k-m)/2}}{\Gamma((k-m)/2)}.
\]

(7.5)

Consequently,

\[
\sum_{c \leq m+1, \ldots, t_{k-1} \leq n} \prod_{j=m+1}^{k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_j}} \leq \frac{\pi^{(k-m)/2}}{\Gamma((k-m)/2)} \left( n - \sum_{i=1}^{m} t_i \right)^{(k-m)/2-1}. \tag{7.6}
\]

Similarly, we can show that (7.6) also holds for \( k - 2 \leq m < k \), and hence it holds for all \( m < k \).

Applying (7.6) to the lefthand side of (7.4), we obtain that

\[
\sum_{1 \leq t_i < c} \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_i}} \left[ \sum_{c \leq t_{m+1}, \ldots, t_{k-1} \leq n} \prod_{j=m+1}^{k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_j}} \right] \leq \frac{\pi^{(k-m)/2}}{\Gamma((k-m)/2)} \sum_{1 \leq t_i < c} \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_i}} \left( n - \sum_{i=1}^{m} t_i \right)^{(k-m)/2-1}.
\]

By using (7.3) recursively again, we have that

\[
\sum_{1 \leq t_i < c} \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_i}} \left[ \sum_{c \leq t_{m+1}, \ldots, t_{k-1} \leq n} \prod_{j=m+1}^{k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_j}} \right] \leq \frac{\pi^{(k-m)/2}}{\Gamma((k-m)/2)} \sum_{t_1=1}^{c} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_1}} \cdots \sum_{t_{m-1}=1}^{c} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_{m-1}}} \left( n - \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} t_i \right)^{(k-m-1)/2} \left( \frac{2(\alpha / n)^{1/2}}{\Gamma((k-m)/2)} \right)^{m/2} \cdot
\]

\[
\leq \cdots \leq \frac{\pi^{(k-m)/2}}{\Gamma((k-m)/2)} \frac{(4c)^{m/2}}{\Gamma((k-m)/2)} \frac{1}{n^{k/2-1}}
\]

\[
= \frac{n^{k/2-1} \pi^{k/2}}{\Gamma(k/2)} \frac{(4c)^{m/2}}{\Gamma((k-m)/2)} \Gamma(k/2) \Gamma((k-m)/2).
\]

(7.7)
Lemma 7.2 For all positive integers $k, r$ with $kr \leq n$, we have
\[
\sum_{t_1 + \cdots + t_k = n} \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_i}} \geq \sum_{t_1 = r}^{n_{1,k}} \sum_{t_2 = r}^{n_{2,k} - t_1} \cdots \sum_{t_{k-1} = r}^{n_{k-1,k} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} t_i} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\left( n - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} t_i \right) \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} t_i}} \left\{ 1 - 2 \sqrt{\frac{r}{n}} \left( \left( 1 + \frac{k - 2}{n} \right)^{\frac{k-3}{2}} + 2k \right) - 2 \sqrt{\frac{k - 1 + r}{n}} \right\}.
\]

Proof. Direct computations show that Lemma 7.2 holds for $k = 1, 2$. In the following, we prove the lemma in the case of $k \geq 3$. Note that
\[
\sum_{t_1 + \cdots + t_k = n} \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_i}} \geq \sum_{t_1 = r}^{n_{1,k}} \sum_{t_2 = r}^{n_{2,k} - t_1} \cdots \sum_{t_{k-1} = r}^{n_{k-1,k} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} t_i} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\left( n - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} t_i \right) \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} t_i}} \left\{ 1 - 2 \sqrt{\frac{r}{n}} \left( \left( 1 + \frac{k - 2}{n} \right)^{\frac{k-3}{2}} + 2k \right) - 2 \sqrt{\frac{k - 1 + r}{n}} \right\}.
\]

where $n_{i,k} = n - (k - i)r$. Since $1/\sqrt{t_i}$ is decreasing in $i$, and
\[
\sqrt{n - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} t_i} \leq \sqrt{n + k - 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} t_i} \leq \sqrt{n + k - 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} x_i}
\]
for $x_i \in [k_i, k_i + 1]$, where $k_i$ is a nonnegative integer and $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} k_i < n$, we have that for $k \geq 3$,
\[
\sum_{t_1 + \cdots + t_k = n} \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_i}} \geq \int_{r}^{n_{1,k}} \cdots \int_{r}^{n_{k-1,k} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} t_i} \int_{r/n}^{1 - \frac{(k-1)r}{n}} \int_{r/n}^{1 - \frac{x_{k-1}}{n} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} x_i} \frac{dt_1 dt_2 \cdots dt_{k-1}}{\sqrt{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} t_i \left( n + k - 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} t_i \right)}}.
\]

Observe that
\[
\int_{r/n}^{1 - \frac{x_{k-1}}{n}} \frac{dx_{k-1}}{\sqrt{x_{k-1} \left( 1 + \frac{k - 1}{n} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} x_i \right)}} = \beta \left( \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \right) - T_2(k - 2, n) - T_3(k - 2, n),
\]

From the fact that
\[
\sqrt{2n - 1} \leq \frac{\Gamma(n)}{\Gamma(n - \frac{1}{2})} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{(2n - 2)!!}{(2n - 3)!!} \leq \frac{2\sqrt{n - 1}}{\sqrt{\pi}},
\]
we can get by induction that for all $k > m$,
\[
\frac{\Gamma(k/2)}{\Gamma((k - m)/2)} \leq k^{m/2}.
\]

Applying this inequality to \((7.7)\) immediately induces \((7.4)\). \(\square\)
where
\[
T_2(k, n) := \int_0^{r/n} \frac{dx_{k-1}}{\sqrt{x_{k-1} \left(1 + \frac{k-1}{n} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} x_i\right)}}
\]
\[
T_3(k, n) := \int_{1-\frac{k-1}{n} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} x_i}^{1-\frac{k-2}{n} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} x_i} \frac{dx_{k-1}}{\sqrt{x_{k-1} \left(1 + \frac{k-1}{n} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} x_i\right)}}
\]

Therefore,
\[
\sum_{\substack{l_1, \ldots, l_k = n \atop r \leq l_1, \ldots, l_k}} \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{l_i}} \geq n^{k/2-1}(I_1(k, n) - I_2(k, n) - I_3(k, n)), \quad (7.8)
\]

where
\[
I_1(k, n) := \beta \left(\frac{1, 1}{2, 2}\right) \int_{r/n}^{1-\frac{(k-1)r}{n}} dx_1 \cdots \int_{r/n}^{1-\frac{2x_1}{n} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-3} x_i} dx_{k-2}, \quad (7.9)
\]
\[
I_2(k, n) := \int_{r/n}^{1-\frac{(k-1)r}{n}} dx_1 \cdots \int_{r/n}^{1-\frac{2x_1}{n} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-3} x_i} dx_{k-2} \frac{T_2(k, n) dx_{k-2}}{\prod_{i=1}^{k-2} x_i}, \quad (7.10)
\]
\[
I_3(k, n) := \int_{r/n}^{1-\frac{(k-1)r}{n}} dx_1 \cdots \int_{r/n}^{1-\frac{2x_1}{n} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-3} x_i} dx_{k-2} \frac{T_3(k, n) dx_{k-2}}{\prod_{i=1}^{k-2} x_i}. \quad (7.11)
\]

It is easy to see that
\[
T_2(k, n) \leq \frac{2\sqrt{r/n}}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{k-1}{n} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} x_i}} \leq \frac{2\sqrt{r/n}}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{k-2}{n} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} x_i}}.
\]

Hence
\[
I_2(k, n) \leq 2 \sqrt{\frac{r}{n}} \int_0^{1+\frac{k-2}{n}} dx_1 \cdots \int_0^{1+\frac{k-2}{n} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-3} x_i} \frac{dx_{k-2}}{\prod_{i=1}^{k-2} x_i \left(1 + \frac{k-2}{n} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} x_i\right)}
\]
\[
= 2 \sqrt{\frac{r}{n}} \left(1 + \frac{k-2}{n}\right)^{(k-3)/2} \int_0^1 dx_1 \cdots \int_0^{1-\frac{k-3}{2} x_i} \frac{dx_{k-2}}{\prod_{i=1}^{k-2} x_i \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} x_i\right)}
\]
\[
= 2 \sqrt{\frac{r}{n}} \left(1 + \frac{k-2}{n}\right)^{(k-3)/2} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \beta \left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{k-i}{2}\right).
\]
Since
\[
I_3(k, n) \leq 2\sqrt{\frac{(r + k - 1)/n}{1 - \frac{r}{n} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} x_i}},
\]
we have that
\[
I_3(k, n) \leq \int_0^{1 - \frac{r}{n}} dx_1 \cdots \int_0^{1 - \frac{r}{n}} dx_k \frac{2\sqrt{r + k - 1} dx_{k-2}}{n \prod_{i=1}^{k-2} x_i \left(1 - \frac{r}{n} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} x_i\right)}
\]
\[= 2\sqrt{\frac{k - 1 + r}{n}} \left(1 - \frac{r}{n}\right)^{(k-3)/2} \prod_{i=1}^{k-2} \beta \left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{k - i}{2}\right).
\]

To estimate \(I_1(k, n)\), we define
\[
\hat{I}_1(m, n) := \int_{r/n}^{1 - \frac{(k-1)r}{n}} dx_1 \cdots \int_{r/n}^{1 - \frac{(k-1)r}{n}} dx_k \frac{2\sqrt{r + k - 1} dx_{k-2}}{n \prod_{i=1}^{k-2} x_i \left(1 - \frac{r}{n} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} x_i\right)}
\]
for all integer \(1 \leq m \leq k - 2\). Note that
\[
I_1(k, n) = \beta \left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right) \hat{I}_1(k - 2, n).
\]

For each \(m \geq 2\),
\[
\hat{I}_1(m, n) = \int_{r/n}^{1 - \frac{(k-1)r}{n}} dx_1 \cdots \int_{r/n}^{1 - \frac{(k-m)r}{n}} dx_{m-1}
\]
\[\cdot \left[ \int_0^{1 - \frac{(k-m)r}{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} x_i - \int_{r/n}^{1 - \frac{(k-m)r}{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} x_i \right] \frac{2\sqrt{r + k - 1} dx_{m-2}}{n \prod_{i=1}^{m-2} x_i \left(1 - \frac{r}{n} - \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} x_i\right)} \frac{k-m-2}{k-2} \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} x_i \right] \frac{2\sqrt{r + k - 1} dx_{m-2}}{n \prod_{i=1}^{m-2} x_i \left(1 - \frac{r}{n} - \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} x_i\right)} \frac{k-m-2}{k-2} \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} x_i \right]
\]
\[\geq \beta \left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{k - m}{2}\right) \hat{I}_1(m - 1, n) - \tilde{I}_1(m - 1, n) + \beta \left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{k - j}{2}\right),
\]
where
\[
\tilde{I}_1(m - 1, n) = 2\sqrt{\frac{r}{n}} \int_0^{1 - \frac{(k-m)r}{n}} dx_1 \cdots \int_0^{1 - \frac{(k-m)r}{n}} dx_k \frac{2\sqrt{r + k - 1} dx_{m-2}}{n \prod_{i=1}^{m-2} x_i \left(1 - \frac{r}{n} - \sum_{i=1}^{m-2} x_i\right)} \frac{k-m-2}{k-2} \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} x_i \right]
\]
\[= 2\sqrt{\frac{r}{n}} \left(1 - \frac{(k-m)r}{n}\right)^{(k-3)/2} \prod_{j=1}^{m} \beta \left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{k - j}{2}\right).
\]

(7.12)
Therefore, \( (7.12) \) yields that
\[
\tilde{I}_1(k-2, n) \geq \prod_{i=2}^{k-2} \beta \left( \frac{1}{2}, \frac{k-i}{2} \right) \tilde{I}_1(1, n) - \tilde{I}_1(k-3, n) - \beta \left( \frac{1}{2}, 1 \right) \tilde{I}_1(k-4, n)
\]
\[- \beta \left( \frac{1}{2}, 1 \right) \beta \left( \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2} \right) \tilde{I}_1(k-5, n) - \cdots - \prod_{i=3}^{k-2} \beta \left( \frac{1}{2}, \frac{k-i}{2} \right) \tilde{I}_1(1, n).\]

Moreover, by using \( (7.13) \) we get that \( \tilde{I}_1(k-2, n) \) is larger than
\[
\prod_{i=2}^{k-2} \beta \left( \frac{1}{2}, \frac{k-i}{2} \right) \tilde{I}_1(1, n) - 2 \sqrt{\frac{r}{n}} \prod_{i=1}^{k-2} \beta \left( \frac{1}{2}, \frac{k-i}{2} \right) \sum_{j=2}^{k-2} \left( 1 - \frac{(k-j)r}{n} \right) \frac{k-3}{2}.\]

In addition,
\[
\tilde{I}_1(1, n) = \int_{\frac{1}{r/n}}^{1} \left( 1 - \frac{(k-1)r}{n} - x \right) \frac{k-1-2}{\sqrt{x}} dx 
\geq \beta \left( \frac{1}{2}, \frac{k-1}{2} \right) - 2 \sqrt{\frac{r}{n}} \left( 1 - \frac{(k-1)r}{n} \right)^{\frac{k-3}{2}}.\]

We get that
\[
\tilde{I}_1(k-2, n) \geq \prod_{i=1}^{k-2} \beta \left( \frac{1}{2}, \frac{k-i}{2} \right) \left[ 1 - 2 \sqrt{\frac{r}{n}} \sum_{j=2}^{k-2} \left( 1 - \frac{(k-j)r}{n} \right)^{\frac{k-3}{2}} \right] 
- 2 \sqrt{\frac{r}{n}} \left( 1 - \frac{(k-1)r}{n} \right)^{\frac{k-3}{2}} \prod_{i=2}^{k-2} \beta \left( \frac{1}{2}, \frac{k-i}{2} \right).\]

Summing up, we obtain that for \( k \geq 3 \) satisfying \( kr \leq n \),
\[
\sum_{1+t_1+\cdots+t_k=n, \ t_\leq i_{1,\ldots,i_k}} \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_k}} \geq n^{k/2-1} \left( \beta \left( \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \right) \tilde{I}_1(k, n) - I_2(k, n) - I_3(k, n) \right) 
\geq \frac{(n\pi)^{k/2}}{n^{\Gamma(k/2)}} \left\{ 1 - 2 \sqrt{\frac{r}{n}} \left( 1 + \frac{k-2}{n} \right)^{\frac{k-3}{2}} - 2 \sqrt{\frac{k-1+r}{n}} \left( 1 - \frac{r}{n} \right)^{\frac{k-3}{2}} 
- 2 \sqrt{\frac{r}{n}} \sum_{j=2}^{k-2} \left( 1 - \frac{(k-j)r}{n} \right)^{\frac{k-3}{2}} + \left( 1 - \frac{(k-1)r}{n} \right)^{\frac{k-3}{2}} \beta \left( \frac{1}{2}, \frac{k-1}{2} \right)^{-1} \right\},\]

where we use the fact that
\[
\frac{\pi^{k/2}}{\Gamma(k/2)} = \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} \beta \left( \frac{1}{2}, \frac{k-j}{2} \right).\]

Note that for all \( k \geq 2 \),
\[
\beta \left( \frac{1}{2}, \frac{k-1}{2} \right)^{-1} \leq \sqrt{k}.\]
We obtain that
\[
\sum_{t_1, \ldots, t_k = n}^{k} \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_i}} \geq \frac{(n\pi)^{k/2}}{n\Gamma(k/2)} \left\{ 1 - 2\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{n}} \left( \left( 1 + \frac{k - 2}{n} \right)^{k/2} + 2k \right) - 2\sqrt{\frac{k - 1 + r}{n}} \right\},
\]
which is the desired conclusion of Lemma 7.2.

Recall that for each \( m \geq 1 \),
\[
a_{2m} = a_{2m-1} = \sum_{k=m+1}^{\infty} \frac{(2k - 3)!!}{2^k k!}.
\]
From
\[
\frac{(2k - 3)!! (2k - 2)!!}{(2k - 2)!! 2^k k!} \leq \frac{1}{(2k - 1)^{3/2}}
\]
and (7.1), we have that for all \( n \geq 1 \),
\[
a_{2n} \leq \int_{n+1/2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2x - 1)^{3/2}} \, dx = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}}.
\]
Together with the fact that \( a_{2m-1} = a_{2m} \) for all \( m \geq 1 \), we get that for all \( m \geq 1 \),
\[
a_m \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}. \tag{7.14}
\]

Now we present the proofs of Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2.

**Proof of Lemma 5.1** From (7.6) and (7.2), we can readily get that
\[
R_{n,1} \leq 2\sqrt{n}, \quad R_{n,2} \leq \pi(n - 2).
\]
For the case of \( n \geq k \geq 3 \), (7.6) and (7.14) yield that
\[
R_{n,k} = \sum_{m=k}^{n} \sum_{t_1, \ldots, t_k = m}^{t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \ldots \leq t_k} a_{t_1} a_{t_2} \cdots a_{t_k} \leq \frac{\pi^{k/2}}{\Gamma(k/2)} \sum_{m=k}^{n} (m - 2)^{k/2-1}
\leq \frac{\pi^{k/2}}{\Gamma((k + 2)/2)} \left[ (n - 1)^{k/2} - (k - 1)^{k/2} \right].
\]
The proof is completed.

**Proof of Lemma 5.2** It is sufficient to prove (5.1).

Recall that from Stirling's formula, we have, as \( n \to \infty \),
\[
a_n \sim \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi n}} \left[ 1 + O\left( \frac{1}{n} \right) \right]. \tag{7.15}
\]
To get (5.1), we will verify the lower bound and the upper bound respectively.
To prove the lower bound, note that (7.15) implies that there exist constants \( r \) and \( M \) with \( r > M \), such that for all \( n \geq r \),
\[
\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi n}} \left[ 1 - \frac{M}{n} \right] \leq a_n. \tag{7.16}
\]
Given \((c_n)\) such that \( c_n \to \infty \) and \( c_n = o(n^{1/4}) \). Let \( m_n = c_n^{3} \sqrt{n} \). Then \( c_n^{4}/m_n \to 0 \) and \( m_n/n \to 0 \). For all positive integer \( k \leq c_n, m \geq m_n \), we have
\[
\sum_{t_1 + \cdots + t_k = m} \prod_{l=1}^{k} a_{t_l} \geq \sum_{t_1 = n^{1/4}}^{n} \cdots \sum_{t_{k-1} = n^{1/4}}^{n} \prod_{l=1}^{k} a_{t_l},
\]
where \( n_{t_k} = m - (k-1)n^{1/4} \). From (7.16), it follows that there exist constants \( r \) and \( M \) with \( r > M \), such that for all \( n \geq r^{4} \),
\[
\sum_{t_1 + \cdots + t_k = m} \prod_{l=1}^{k} a_{t_l} \geq M_{n,k} \sum_{t_1 = n^{1/4}}^{n} \cdots \sum_{t_{k-1} = n^{1/4}}^{n} \sqrt{\frac{1}{m - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} t_i} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} t_i},
\]
where
\[
M_{n,k} = \left( \frac{2}{\pi} \right)^{k/2} \left( 1 - \frac{M}{n^{1/4}} \right)^k.
\]
From Lemma 7.2 we have that
\[
\sum_{t_1 + \cdots + t_k = m} \prod_{l=1}^{k} a_{t_l} \geq m_{n,k} \frac{(m \pi)^k}{m \Gamma(k/2)} \left\{ 1 - 2 \sqrt{\frac{k - 1 + n^{1/4}}{m}} \right\} - 2 \sqrt{\frac{n^{1/4}}{m}} \left( \frac{k - 2}{m} \right)^{k/2} + 2k \right\}.
\]
Therefore, the elementary inequality \( \lim_{n \to \infty} (1 + \frac{1}{n})^n = e \) and the conditions on \( k, m \) and \( c_n \) imply that there exists a constant \( M_0 > 0 \), such that for sufficiently large \( n \) and all \( k \leq c_n, m \geq m_n \),
\[
\sum_{t_1 + \cdots + t_k = m} \prod_{l=1}^{k} a_{t_l} \geq (1 - \frac{M}{n^{1/4}})^{c_n} \frac{2^{k/2}}{\Gamma(k/2)} \left( 1 - 2M_0 c_n \sqrt{\frac{n^{1/4}}{m}} \right) m^{k/2 - 1}
\]
\[
\geq m^{k/2 - 1} \frac{2^{k/2}}{\Gamma(k/2)} \left( 1 - \frac{M}{n^{1/4}} \right) m \left( \frac{2 \sqrt{\frac{n^{1/4}}{m}}}{M_0} \right)
\]
\[
\geq m^{k/2 - 1} \frac{2^{k/2}}{\Gamma(k/2)} \left( 1 - \frac{(c_n + n^{1/8}) M_1}{n^{1/4}} \right). \tag{7.17}
\]
Note that
\[
R_{n,k} = \sum_{m=k}^{n} \sum_{t_1 + \cdots + t_k = m} \prod_{l=1}^{k} a_{t_l} \geq \sum_{m=m_n}^{n} \sum_{t_1 + \cdots + t_k = m} \prod_{l=1}^{k} a_{t_l},
\]
It follows from (7.17) that for each $2 \leq k \leq c_n$,
\[
R_{n,k} \geq \sum_{m=m_n}^{n} m^{k/2-1} \frac{2^{k/2}}{\Gamma(k/2)} \left( 1 - \frac{(c_n + n^{1/8})M_1}{n^{1/4}} \right) \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=m_n}^{n} \frac{(m/n)^{k/2-1}}{n^{k/2-1}} \right)
\]
\[
\geq \frac{(2n)^{k/2}}{k\Gamma(k/2)/2} \left( 1 - \frac{(c_n + n^{1/8})M_1}{n^{1/4}} \right) \frac{1}{(m_n-1)/n} \int_{(m_n-1)/n}^{1} x^{k/2-1} \, dx
\]
\[
\geq \frac{(2n)^{k/2}}{k\Gamma(k/2)/2} \left( 1 - \frac{(c_n + n^{1/8})M_1}{n^{1/4}} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{(m_n/n)^{k/2}}{n^{k/2}} \right).
\]

Due to the assumptions on $m_n$, we have that for sufficiently large $n$, there exists a constant $M > 0$, such that for each $2 \leq k \leq c_n$,
\[
R_{n,k} \geq \frac{(2n)^{k/2}}{k\Gamma(k/2)/2} \left( 1 - \frac{(c_n + n^{1/8})M_1}{n^{1/4}} \right) \geq \frac{(2n)^{k/2}}{k\Gamma(k/2)/2} \left( 1 - M \sqrt{\frac{c_n}{n^{1/4}}} \right). (7.18)
\]

In the case of $k = 1$, from (7.17), we have that
\[
R_{n,1} \geq \frac{2n}{\sqrt{n}} \left( 1 - \frac{(c_n + n^{1/8})M_1}{n^{1/4}} \right) \int_{m_n/n}^{1} x^{-1/2} \, dx
\]
\[
\geq 2 \frac{2n}{\sqrt{n}} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{n} - \sqrt{\frac{m_n}{n}} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{(c_n + n^{1/8})M_1}{n^{1/4}} \right)
\]
\[
\geq 2 \frac{2n}{\sqrt{n}} \left( 1 - \frac{(c_n + n^{1/8})M_1}{n^{1/4}} \right) \geq 2 \frac{2n}{\sqrt{n}} \left( 1 - M \sqrt{\frac{c_n}{n^{1/4}}} \right).
\]

We get the desired lower bound.

To verify the upper bound, for any $k \leq c_n$ and $m \geq m_n$, let $C_0 = \emptyset$, $C_r := \{(i_1, \ldots, i_r) : 1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_r \leq k\}$ and $S_{i_1, \ldots, i_r} := \{1, 2, \cdots, k\} \setminus \{i_1, \ldots, i_r\}$ for all $r \geq 1$. Observe that
\[
\sum_{t_1 + \cdots + t_k = m} \prod_{l=1}^{k} a_{t_l} = \sum_{r=0}^{k-1} \sum_{t_{j_1} + \cdots + t_{j_{k-r}} \leq n^{1/4}} \prod_{l=1}^{k} a_{t_{j_l}} \sum_{n^{1/4} \leq t_{j_1} + \cdots + t_{j_{k-r}}} \prod_{l=1}^{k} a_{t_{j_l}},
\]
where on the lefthand side we omit the condition $t_1 + t_2 + \cdots + t_k = m$ for brevity. By the symmetry of the multiplier $\prod_{l=1}^{k} a_{t_l}$ on the indices $t_l$, and noting that there are $C_k^r$ elements in $C_r$, we have that
\[
\sum_{t_1 + \cdots + t_k = m} \prod_{l=1}^{k} a_{t_l} = \sum_{r=0}^{k-1} C_k^r \sum_{1 \leq t_{r+1} + \cdots + t_k \leq n^{1/4}} \prod_{l=1}^{k-r} a_{t_{r+l}},
\]
From Lemma 7.1 we get that
\[ a_n \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi n}} \left[ 1 + \frac{M}{n} \right]. \] (7.19)

We have that
\[
\sum_{t_1 + \cdots + t_k = m} \prod_{l=1}^{k} a_t \leq \sum_{r=0}^{k-1} C_k^r \tilde{M}_{r,k} \sum_{1 \leq t_1, \ldots, t_r \leq n^{1/4}} \prod_{l=1}^{r} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_l}} \sum_{n^{1/4} < t_{r+1}, \ldots, t_k = m} \prod_{l=r+1}^{k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_l}}.
\]

where
\[ \tilde{M}_{r,k} := \left( \frac{2}{\pi} \right)^{k/2} \left( 1 + \frac{M}{n^{1/4}} \right)^{k-r} (1 + M)^r. \]

From Lemma 7.1 we get that
\[
\sum_{t_1 + \cdots + t_k = m} \prod_{l=1}^{k} a_t \leq \sum_{r=0}^{k-1} C_k^r \tilde{M}_{r,k} \frac{(m \pi)^{k/2}}{m \Gamma(k/2)} \left( \frac{4n^{1/4}k}{\pi m} \right)^{r/2}
\[
\leq \frac{(2m)^{k/2}}{m \Gamma(k/2)} \left( 1 + \frac{M}{n^{1/4}} + (1 + M) \sqrt{\frac{4n^{1/4}k}{\pi m}} \right)^k
\]
\[
\leq \frac{(2m)^{k/2}}{m \Gamma(k/2)} \left( 1 + \frac{M}{n^{1/4}} + (1 + M) \sqrt{\frac{4n^{1/4}c_n}{\pi m_0}} \right)^{c_n}.
\]

Since \( c_n = o(n^{1/4}) \) and \( n^{1/4}c_n/m_n = c_n/n^{1/4} \to 0 \), there exists a constant \( M \), such that for sufficiently large \( n \) and all \( k \leq c_n, m \geq m_n \),
\[
\sum_{t_1 + \cdots + t_k = m} \prod_{l=1}^{k} a_t \leq \frac{(2m)^{k/2}}{m \Gamma(k/2)} \left( 1 + \frac{c_n M}{n^{1/4}} + M \sqrt{\frac{c_n}{n^{1/4}}} \right)
\]
\[
\leq \frac{(2m)^{k/2}}{m \Gamma(k/2)} \left( 1 + M \sqrt{\frac{c_n}{n^{1/4}}} \right). \] (7.20)

Note that
\[
R_{n,k} = \sum_{m=m_n}^{n} \sum_{t_1 + \cdots + t_k = m} \prod_{l=1}^{k} a_t + \sum_{m=k}^{m_n-1} \sum_{t_1 + \cdots + t_k = m} \prod_{l=1}^{k} a_t. \] (7.21)

(7.20) and the similar arguments to (7.18) imply
\[
\sum_{m=m_n}^{n} \sum_{t_1 + \cdots + t_k = m} \prod_{l=1}^{k} a_t \leq \frac{(2n)^{k/2}}{k \Gamma(k/2)/2} \left( 1 + M \sqrt{\frac{c_n}{n^{1/4}}} \right). \] (7.22)

In addition, (7.19) yields that
\[
\sum_{m=k}^{m_n-1} \sum_{t_1 + \cdots + t_k = m} \prod_{l=1}^{k} a_t \leq \sum_{m=k}^{m_n-1} \left( 1 + M \right)^k \left( \frac{2}{\pi} \right)^k \sum_{t_1 + \cdots + t_k = m} \prod_{l=1}^{k} \frac{1}{t_l}.\]
Together with Lemma 7.1, we get that
\[
\sum_{m=k}^{m_n-1} \sum_{t_1 \cdots t_k=m} \prod_{l=1}^{k} a_{t_l} \leq \sum_{m=k}^{m_n-1} \left(1 + M \right)^k \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^k \left(\frac{m \pi}{m \Gamma(k/2)}\right)^{k/2} \leq \frac{(2n)^k}{k \Gamma(k/2)/2} \left(\frac{m_n(1 + M)^2}{n}\right)^{k/2} \leq \frac{(2n)^k}{k \Gamma(k/2)/2} \frac{M c_n}{n^{1/4}} \tag{7.23}
\]
for all \(k \leq m_n\). Combining (7.21) with (7.22) and (7.23), we obtain that there exists a constant \(M\), such that for sufficiently large \(n\) and all \(k \leq c_n\),
\[
R_{n,k} \leq \frac{(2n)^{k/2}}{k \Gamma(k/2)/2} \left(1 + M \sqrt{\frac{c_n}{n^{1/4}}}\right),
\]
which is the desired upper bound. \(\square\)

Acknowledgements

This research is partially sponsored by Natural Science Foundation of China (11671145), Natural Science Foundation of Shanghai (16ZR1409700), and the program of China Scholarships Council (No.201806145024).

References


Probabilities of deviations for record numbers


