ASYMPTOTIC ANALYSIS OF THE ELEPHANT RANDOM WALK
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Abstract. In this work we study asymptotic properties of a long range memory random walk known as elephant random walk. First we prove recurrence and positive recurrence for the elephant random walk. Then, we establish the transience regime of the model. Finally, in the positive recurrent regime and under the Poisson Hypothesis, we establish the replica mean field limit for this random walk.

1. Introduction.

The asymptotic behavior of random walks with long range memory has been extensively studied over the last years. In particular, the so called elephant random walk (ERW) has raised a considerable interest in the last four years. The ERW was introduced by G. Schütz and S. Trimper [18] as an example of a non-Markovian process where it is possible to compute exactly the mean and the variance of the random walk and which exhibits a phase transition from diffusive to superdiffusive behaviour. Independently, [4] and [9] proved a strong law of large number and a central limit theorem for the ERW. Then, Bercu [6] obtained some refinements on the asymptotic behavior of the ERW. Indeed, most of the related work on limit theorems of random walks with memory can be subdivided into two categories: the study of limit theorems such as law of large numbers, central limit theorems and invariance principles, see for instance [4], [6], [8], [9], [10], [12] and references therein; and hypergeometric identities arising from this kind of processes, see [7].

In this paper we focus on the study of recurrence-transience properties for the elephant random walk as well as on the study of its replica mean field limit under the Poisson Hypothesis. The Poisson hypothesis is an assumption introduced by Kleinrock [14] to justify that some approximations to a given stochastic process become exact in the limit. In our context assuming the Poisson hypothesis amounts to asymptotic independence between replicas.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we define the model and state the main results of this work. In section 3 we establish the recurrence (respectively transience) property for the ERW. We also discuss the positive recurrence of our
model. Finally, in section 4, we establish the replica mean field limit for the ERW in the positive recurrent regime.

2. Definition of the ERW and main results

The ERW is defined as follows. The walk starts at $X_0 := 0$ at time $n = 0$. At each discrete time step the elephant moves one step to the right or to the left respectively, so

\[ X_{n+1} = X_n + \eta_{n+1} \]

where $\eta_{n+1} = \pm 1$ is a random variable. The memory consists of the set of random variables $\eta_n'$ at previous time steps which the elephant remembers as follows:

(D1) At time $n+1$ a number $n'$ from the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ is chosen according to a probability mass function $\phi_n$.

(D2) $\eta_{n+1}$ is determined stochastically by the rule

$\eta_{n+1} = \eta_n'$ with probability $p$ and $\eta_{n+1} = -\eta_n'$ with probability $1 - p$.

(D3) The elephant starting at $X_0$ moves to the right with probability $r$ and to the left with probability $1 - r$, i.e.,

$\eta_1 = 1$ with probability $r$ and $\eta_1 = -1$ with probability $1 - r$.

It is obvious from the definition that

\[ X_n = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \eta_k. \]

Let $P$ denotes the law of the ERW departing from the origin at time 0 and let $E$ denotes the corresponding expectation operator.

2.1. The uniform case. In this paper we focus on the case where $\phi_n(i) = \frac{1}{n}$ which we call the uniform case. A simple computation yields

\[ P[\eta_{n+1} = \eta|\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_n] = \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} [1 + (2p - 1) \eta_k \eta] \text{ for } n \geq 1, \]

where $\eta = \pm 1$. For $n = 0$ we get in accordance with rule (D3)

\[ P[\eta_1 = \eta] = \frac{1}{2} [1 + (2r - 1) \eta] \]

and

\[ E[\eta_1] = 2r - 1. \]
The conditional expectation of the increment $\eta_{n+1}$ given its previous history is given by

\begin{equation}
E[\eta_{n+1}|\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_n] = (2p - 1)\frac{X_n}{n} \quad \text{for } n \geq 2.
\end{equation}

A straightforward computation using equations (2.3) and (2.4) gives

\begin{equation}
P[X_{n+1} = x+y|X_n = x] = \begin{cases} 
exy(2p-1)+n & \text{if } n \geq 1 
4n^2 & \text{if } n = 0 
1 \delta_1(y) + (1-r)\delta_{-1}(y) & \text{if } n \geq 1 
\end{cases}
\end{equation}

where $y \in \{-1, 1\}$ and $\delta_n(.)$ is the Dirac measure centred on some fixed point $n$. Therefore, $\pi_n(x,x+y) = P[X_{n+1} = x+y|X_n = x]$ with $y \in \{-1, 1\}$ defines a non-homogeneous one-step transition kernel on $\mathbb{Z}$.

2.2. The generator. Let $\mathcal{F}_b(\mathbb{Z})$ denote the collection of all bounded measurable functions $f: \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{R}$. The generator at time $n$ is the linear operator $\mathcal{L}_n : \mathcal{F}_b(\mathbb{Z}) \to \mathcal{F}_b(\mathbb{Z})$ defined by

\begin{equation}
(\mathcal{L}_nf)(x) := \sum_{y \in \{-1, 1\}} (f(y) - f(x)) \pi_n(x,y)
\end{equation}

for any $f \in \mathcal{F}_b(\mathbb{Z})$.

From now on we refer to any $f \in \mathcal{F}_b(\mathbb{Z})$ as a test function. The following lemma is crucial in what follows. Its proof follows from a simple computation and so is omitted.

**Lemma 2.1.** Let $(X_n)_{n \geq 0}$ be the ERW with full memory. Then, for any $n \geq 1$ and for any test function $f$ its generator takes the form

\[ \mathcal{L}_nf(x) = \frac{x(2p-1) + n}{2n}(f(x+1) - f(x)) + \frac{x(1-2p) + n}{2n}(f(x-1) - f(x)). \]

Having determined the exact expression of the generator of the ERW we can now calculate its value for specific test functions. This will be the subject of the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.2.** Let $(X_n)_{n \geq 0}$ be the ERW with full memory. Then, for any $n \geq 1$ we have

\[ \mathcal{L}_n|x| = \begin{cases} 
\frac{2p-1}{n}|x| & x \neq 0 
1 & x = 0.
\end{cases} \]

**Proof.** We only give the proof for $x \neq 0$. Let $h(x) = |x|$. Then observe that for any $x \neq 0$ and $y \in \{-1, 1\}$ we have $|x+y| - |x| = y|x|$. Therefore, for any $x \neq 0$
we have
\[
\mathcal{L}_n h(x) = \frac{1}{2n} \left( (x(2p - 1) + n)x|x| + (x(1 - 2p) + n)\frac{x}{|x|} \right)
\]
\[= \left( \frac{2p - 1}{n} \right) h(x).
\]

3. Recurrence and Transience

Now we present the main result of this section which establishes the recurrence and transience regimes of the ERW. The main obstacle in the study of the properties of recurrence and transience of the elephant random walk comes from the fact that this random walk is temporal inhomogeneous. We remark that the property of being recurrent or transient for this specific random walk is determined exclusively by the value of \( p \).

**Theorem 3.1.** Let \((X_n)_{n \geq 0}\) be the ERW with full memory. Then, if \( p \leq 3/4 \) the ERW is recurrent.

**Proof.** We begin by assuming that \( p < 3/4 \). The critical case \( p = 3/4 \) will be discussed afterwards. We will prove that the event

\[
\limsup_{n \to +\infty} X_n = -\infty, \quad \liminf_{n \to +\infty} X_n = +\infty
\]
occurs a.s.

In [6] (see also [10]) the author proved that

\[
\limsup_{n \to +\infty} \frac{X_n}{\sqrt{2n \ln \ln n}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3 - 4p}}
\]

Therefore,

\[
\frac{X_n}{\sqrt{2n \ln \ln n}} \geq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3 - 4p}}
\]

for infinitely many \( n \). Since \( \sqrt{2n \ln \ln n} \) diverges, it follows that for any \( M > 0 \) there exist infinitely many \( n \) such that

\[
X_n \geq M.
\]

In this way we may conclude that

\[
\limsup_{n \to +\infty} X_n = +\infty \text{ a.s.}
\]

In the same work it is proved that

\[
\liminf_{n \to +\infty} \frac{X_n}{\sqrt{2n \ln \ln n}} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3 - 4p}}.
\]
It follows immediately that \( \lim \inf_{n \to +\infty} X_n = -\infty \) a.s. Then, the event defined in (3.1) has probability one as claimed. In other words the random walk is recurrent for \( p < 3/4 \). The proof that the random walk is recurrent for the critical case \( p = 3/4 \) is entirely analogous since for \( p = 3/4 \) we have that

\[
(3.7) \quad \limsup_{n \to +\infty} \frac{X_n}{\sqrt{2n \ln n \ln \ln n}} = 1
\]

and

\[
(3.8) \quad \liminf_{n \to +\infty} \frac{X_n}{\sqrt{2n \ln n \ln \ln n}} = -1.
\]

For a proof of (3.7) and (3.8) see [6] and [10]. □

Now we proceed to show that for \( p < 1/2 \) the ERW is actually positive recurrent. In order to do so we need to introduce some notation. For \( m \geq 1 \), let \( E^m_x(.) := E^m_x[.|X_m = x] \). Finally for any stopping time \( \tau \) and any discrete-time stochastic process \((Z_k)_{k \geq 0}\) define

\[
(3.9) \quad \tau^n := \min \{ n, \tau, \inf \{k \geq 0 : Z_k \geq n \} \}.
\]

**Theorem 3.2.** Let \((X_n)_{n \geq 0}\) be the ERW with full memory and let \( \tau_0 := \inf \{n : X_n = 0\} \). If \( p < 1/2, m \geq 1 \) and \( x \neq 0 \), then

\[
E^m_x[\tau_0] \leq \frac{1}{2(1-2p)}|x| + 1
\]

and the ERW with full memory is positive recurrent.

**Proof.** Let \( f(x) = |x| \). In lemma 2.2 we proved that

\[
(3.10) \quad L_n f(x) = \frac{(2p-1)}{n}|x|.
\]

for any \( x \neq 0 \).

Now let \( Z_n = (n + m + 1) f(X_n) \) and set \( \tau := \tau_0 \) in equation 3.9.

If \( \mathcal{F}_t = \sigma (\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_t) \), it follows from the discrete Dynkin’s formula and equation 3.10 that, for any \( x \neq 0 \),

\[
E^m_x[Z_{\tau_0}^{n}] = E^m_x[Z_0] + E^m_x \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{\tau_0} (E^m_x[Z_i/\mathcal{F}_{i-1}] - Z_{i-1}) \right] \\
\leq |x| + 2(2p-1)E^m_x \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{\tau_0} |X_i| \right].
\]
Observe that \( Z_{\tau_0^n} \geq 0 \) and that \( |X_i| \geq 1 \) for \( i < \tau_0^n \) in the sum above. Therefore, 
\[
\mathbb{E}_x[m]\left[\tau_0^n\right] \leq \frac{1}{2(1-2p)}|x| + 1.
\]

It follows from Fatou’s lemma applied to the inequality above that 
\[
\mathbb{E}_x[m](\tau_0^n) = \mathbb{E}_x[m]\left(\lim_{n \to +\infty} \tau_0^n\right) 
\leq \liminf_{n \to +\infty} \mathbb{E}_x[m](\tau_0^n) 
\leq \frac{1}{2(1-2p)}|x| + 1.
\]

This finishes the proof.

We finish this section by establishing the transient regime for the ERW.

**Theorem 3.3.** Let \((X_n)_{n \geq 0}\) be the ERW with full memory. Then, if \( p > 3/4 \) the ERW is transient.

**Proof.** In [6] it was proved that if \( p > 3/4 \), then the sequence \((M_n)\) defined by \( M_n = a_n X_n \) is a martingale with respect to the natural filtration. Here \((a_n)\) is a sequence such that \( \lim_{n \to +\infty} n^{2p-1} a_n = \Gamma(2p) \). Then, there exists \( N \) such that for any \( n \geq N \), we have \( (3.11) \)
\[
\frac{X_n^2}{n} \geq C n^{4p-3} M_n^2
\]
for some positive constant \( C \). Since \( p > 3/4 \), \( n^{4p-3} \) diverges. In order to prove transience it only remains to show that \( M_n^2 \) is bounded away from zero for values of \( n \) large enough. Since \( M_n \) converges a.s. to a finite random variable \( M \) ([6], [4]), it suffices to have \( M \neq 0 \). We know from ([6]) that \( M_n \) may be written as \( M_n = \sum_{k=1}^n a_k \epsilon_k \) where \( \epsilon_k = \eta_k - (2p-1)X_{k-1}/(k-1) \). That \( M \neq 0 \) a.s follows from the irreducibility of the process and the fact that its drift function is of the form \( \mu_n(x) = \mathbb{E}(X_{n+1} - X_n|X_n = x) = (2p-1)\frac{x}{n} \). In other words, the process has a drift pushing it away from the origin.

\[\square\]

4. **Replica Mean Field Limit for the Recurrent Case.**

We now turn our attention to the study, in more detail, of the recurrent regime. We focus in obtaining the Replica Mean Field (RMF) limit of the ERW, which allows us to give an estimate of the expectation of the process at stationarity.

Recently Baccelli and Taillefumer (see [3]) used RMF limits to describe the stationary state of a system with a finite number of neurons. We refer the interested reader to the works [2], [5], [17] and [19] for related and relevant works.
The main idea hidden behind the RMF approach is to describe the moments of the invariant measure in terms of basic structural elements of the process. In the case of the ERW the structural element is the probability \( p \) of copying the past.

The results presented in the current section as well as the techniques used to obtain them follow closely the work in [3]. Indeed, we refer the interested reader to [3] and references therein for a detailed and comprehensive explanation of the RMF approach.

Now we define the finite Replica Mean Field system consisting of \( M \) identical copies of an elephant random walk

\[
X_n := (X_{n_i})_{i=1}^M \quad \text{after} \quad n = \sum_{i=1}^M n_i \quad \text{total jumps},
\]

where \( n_i \) is the number of jumps given by the \( i \)-th elephant, \( M > 1 \) and \( i \in \{1, \ldots, M\} \).

If \( \eta^i_k \) denotes the \( k \)-th jump given by the \( i \)-th elephant where \( k \in \{1, \ldots, n_i\} \) and \( i \in \{1, \ldots, M\} \), then we have

\[
X_{n_i}^i = \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \eta^i_k \quad \text{with} \quad X_{0}^i = 0.
\]

Now we define the generator of the \( M \)-finite Replica Mean Field model. In analogy to the elephant random walk we consider an ERW with a non-homogeneous one-step transition kernel. The generator of the finite \( M \)-RMF process \( X_{n+1} \) in any test function \( f : \mathbb{R}^M \to \mathbb{R} \) and \( x \in \mathbb{R}^M_+ \) takes the form

\[
(4.1) \quad \mathcal{L}_n f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^M \xi_i \sum_{j=1}^M \psi^i(j) \sum_{k=1}^{n_j} \phi^i_{n_j}(k) \sum_{y \in \{-1,1\}} p^{i,j}(y) \left[ f(x + ye_i) - f(x) \right],
\]

where \( n = \sum_{i=1}^M n_i \), \( x = (x_1, \ldots, x_M) \) and \( \{e_1, \ldots, e_M\} \) is the canonical basis of \( \mathbb{R}^M \).

Here \( \xi_i \) is the probability that the \( i \)-th elephant will be chosen to be the next one to make a step, \( \psi^i(j) \) is the probability to choose the \( j \)-th elephant to determine how the \( i \)-th will move and \( \phi^i_{n_j}(k) \) denotes the probability to choose the \( k \)-th step, \( k \leq n_j \), of the \( j \)-th elephant. Finally, \( p^{i,j}(y) \) is the probability that the \( i \)-th elephant decides to give one step to the right or to the left (depending on wether \( y = 1 \) or \( y = -1 \)) according to rule \((D_2)\) applied to the \( j \)-th elephant.

In this section we consider the following setting.

i) The elephant that will move next is chosen uniformly, i.e. \( \xi(i) = \frac{1}{M} \).

ii) If \( j \) is the next elephant that will move, then the elephant whose path will determine the next move of \( j \) is chosen uniformly among the remaining elephants, i.e. \( \psi^i(j) = \frac{1}{M-1} \) for any \( j \neq i \).

iii) The process does not loose any of its memory. The step of the elephant selected in item (ii) is chosen uniformly among all the previous steps \( k \leq n_j \), i.e. \( \phi^i_{n_j}(k) = \frac{1}{n_j} \).

iv) The \( i \)-th elephant copies the step given in the past by the \( j \)-th elephant with probability \( p \).
In order to avoid trivial degeneracies at the beginning of the process and in the counting of the steps, we make the following assumptions.

a) Assume that elephant $i$ has been chosen to be the next one to move. When we choose the replica $j$ that will determine the next move of the $i$-th elephant, if it happens to choose an elephant $j$ that is on the other side of the origin with respect to the $i$-th elephant, then the $i$-th elephant will not move and we continue the process by choosing another elephant to be the next to move. In other words, the $j$-th elephant will determine how the $i$-th elephant will move if $x \tilde{x} \geq 0$

where $x$ and $\tilde{x}$ are the actual positions of the $i$-th and $j$-th elephant respectively.

b) In order to avoid choosing an elephant that has not moved yet to be the one that will determine the next step of any other elephant we may assume, without lose of generality, that at the beginning of the process all elephants make an initial jump from their starting position $0$, to $-1$ or $1$, with equal probability $\frac{1}{2}$.

Having established the interaction dynamic between the replicas, we can now determine the generator of the finite $M$-Replica Mean Field model. This is the subject of the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.1.** Let $(X_n)_{n \geq 0}$ be the $M$-Replica Mean Field Model. Then

1. If $x_i x_j \geq 0$ for all $1 \leq i \neq j \leq M$, the generator takes the form

$$
\mathcal{L}_n f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{M} \sum_{y \in \{-1, 1\}} \frac{\pi_{n_j}^i(x_j, x_j + y)}{M(M-1)} [f(x + ye_i) - f(x)],
$$

where

$$
\pi_{n_j}^i(x_j, x_j + y) = \frac{x_j y(2p-1) + n_j}{2n_j}
$$

and $y \in \{-1, 1\}$.

2. If $x_i x_j < 0$ for any $1 \leq i \neq j \leq M$, the generator takes the form

$$
\mathcal{L}_n f(x) = 0.
$$

3. In other cases, the generator takes the form

$$
\mathcal{L}_n f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{M} \sum_{y \in \{-1, 1\}} 1_{\{x_i x_j \geq 0\}} \frac{\pi_{n_j}^i(x_j, x_j + y)}{M(M-1)} [f(x + ye_i) - f(x)]
$$

where $y \in \{-1, 1\}$.
Proof. Assume, without loss of generality, that $x_i, x_j \geq 0$ for all $1 \leq i \neq j \leq M$. Since we are dealing with the uniform case, it follows from Lemma 2.1 that

\begin{equation}
\mathcal{L}_n f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \psi^j(j) \sum_{y \in \{-1,1\}} \frac{x_j y(2p - 1) + n_j}{2n_j} [f(x + ye_i) - f(x)].
\end{equation}

The proof follows from the fact that $\xi_i = \frac{1}{M}$ and that $\psi^j(j) = \frac{1}{M} - \frac{1}{M}$ for any $j \neq i$. □

Lemma 4.2. Let $(X_n)_{n \geq 0}$ be the $M$-Replica Mean Field Model. Then, if $p \leq 3/4$ the $M$-Replica Mean Field Model is recurrent.

We omit its proof since it follows as in the one elephant case studied in Theorem 3.1.

Once we have determined the generator for the finite RMF model, we will establish a Foster-Lyapunov drift condition which is appropriate to show ergodicity for the model.

Proposition 4.1. Assume that $p < 1/2$ and let $H(x) = e^{\sum_{i=1}^{M} |x_i|}$. There exist strictly positive constants $c$ and $d$ and a compact set $R^M$ such that

\[ \mathcal{L}_n H(x) \leq -cH(x) + dI_{R^M}. \]

Proof. It follows from the previous lemma that

\[
\mathcal{L}_n H(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i} \sum_{y \in \{-1,1\}} \frac{1_{\{x_i, x_j \geq 0\}}}{M(M - 1)} [e^{x_i + y - |x_i|} - 1] H(x)
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i} \sum_{y \in \{-1,1\}} \frac{1_{\{x_i, x_j \geq 0\}}}{M(M - 1)} [e^{y|x_i|} - 1] H(x)
\]

\[
+ \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i} 1_{\{x_i = 0\}} \frac{1}{M(M - 1)} [e - 1] H(x)
\]

\[
= I + II,
\]

where

\[
I = \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i} 1_{\{x_i, x_j \geq 0\}} \left( \frac{x_j (2p - 1)(e^{x_i} - e^{-x_i})}{2n_j M(M - 1)} + e^1 + e^{-1} - 2 \right) \right] H(x)
\]

\[
II = \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i} 1_{\{x_i, x_j \geq 0\}} \left( \frac{x_j (2p - 1)(e^{x_i} - e^{-x_i})}{2n_j M(M - 1)} + e^1 + e^{-1} - 2 \right) \right] H(x)
\]
and
\[ II = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{M} 1_{\{x_i=0\}} \frac{1}{M(M-1)} [e - 1] H(x) \leq (e - 1) H(x). \]

Now note that
\[ I = \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{M} 1_{\{x_i \neq 0, x_i, x_j \geq 0\}} \left( |x_j| \left(\frac{2(p-1)(e^1 - e^{-1})}{2n_j M(M-1)} + \frac{e^1 + e^{-1} - 2}{2 M(M-1)}\right) \right) \right] H(x) \leq \left[ \frac{(2p-1)(e^1 - e^{-1})}{2M(M-1)n} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{M} 1_{\{x_i \neq 0, x_i, x_j \geq 0\}} |x_j| + \frac{e^1 + e^{-1} - 2}{2} \right] H(x). \]

Here we have used that \((2p-1)\frac{1}{n_j} \leq \frac{2p-1}{n}\) since \(p < 1/2\) and \(n_j \leq n\). Observe that for \(c > 0\),
\[ R^M_c := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^M : \left(\frac{(q-p)(e^1 - e^{-1})}{2Mn} \right) \sum_{j=1}^{M} |x_j| \leq \frac{e^1 + e^{-1} - 2}{2} + (e - 1) + c \right\}, \]
is a compact set. Outside \(R^M_c\) we have \(\mathcal{L}_n H(x) \leq -cH(x)\). On the other hand, it follows from the compactness of \(R^M_c\) that there exists a strictly positive constant \(d\) which may depends on \(c\) such that \(\mathcal{L}_n H(x) \leq -cH(x) + d\) on \(R^M_c\). In other words, there exist \(c, d > 0\) and a compact set \(R^M_c\) such that
\[ \mathcal{L}_n H(x) \leq -cH(x) + d1_{R^M_c}. \]

\[ \square \]

Now we can establish the ergodicity of the \(M\)-Replica Mean Field Model. From Lemma 4.2 we have that the process is recurrent. Then, proceeding almost in the same way as in the proof of Theorem 3.2 for the model with just one elephant, but this time using the Foster-Lyapunov drift inequality obtained in the last proposition we can show that the \(M\)-Replica Mean Field Model is actually positive recurrent on the set \(R^M_c\) (see also [15]). Furthermore, by construction the \(M\)-Replica Mean Field Model in non-explosive and the set \(R^K_c\) is a regeneration set. In this way we obtain the ergodicity of the RMF Markov chain.

Since the ergodicity of the process has been established, we can now proceed to describe its stationary measure. For that purpose, let \(E^M\) denotes the expectation operator induced by the stationary measure for the finite \(M\)-Replica Mean Field model. For any \(u > 0\) set
\[ \Lambda^{M,i}(u) := E^M [e^{uX_i}]. \]
Below we present the main result about the Replica Mean Field limit.

**Theorem 4.1.** If \( p < 1/2 \), then

\[
\lim_{M \to \infty} \mathbb{E}^M \left[ \frac{X_{n_i}}{n_i} \right] = 0
\]

for any \( 1 \leq i \leq M \).

**Proof.** By uniformity, it suffices to show the result for \( i = 1 \). For any \( u > 0 \), let \( V_u(x) = e^{ux} \). We have

\[
\mathcal{L}_n[V_u](x) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{M} \sum_{y \in \{-1, 1\}} 1\{x, x_j, x+y \geq 0\} \frac{\pi^{ij}_n(x_j, x+y)}{M(M-1)} [V_u(x+y) - V_u(x)]
\]

\[
= \sum_{j=2}^{M} \sum_{y \in \{-1, 1\}} 1\{x, x_j, x+y \geq 0\} \frac{yx_n_j(2p-1) + n_j}{2n_j M(M-1)} [e^{uy} - 1] e^{ux_j}.
\]

Since we are working in the stationary regime we have \( \mathbb{E}^M[\mathcal{L}_n[V_u]] = 0 \). Thus, taking expectation in the last equation above with respect to \( \mathbb{E}^M \) we get

\[
0 = (2p - 1) \left[ e^u - e^{-u} \right] \sum_{j=2}^{M} \mathbb{E}^M[Y_j e^{ux_j}] + (e^u + e^{-u} - 2)(M-1) \mathbb{E}^M[e^{ux_1}],
\]

where \( Y_i := \frac{X_i}{n_i} \). Since \( \Lambda^{M,1}(u) = \mathbb{E}^M[V_{u}^k] \), we can safely write

\[
(4.3) \quad 0 = (2p - 1) \left[ e^u - e^{-u} \right] \sum_{j=2}^{M} \mathbb{E}^M[Y_j e^{ux_j}] + (e^u + e^{-u} - 2)(M-1) \Lambda^{M,1}(u).
\]

Under the Poisson assumption hypothesis we have asymptotic independence between replicas. Then, for any \( j \neq 1 \) we have

\[
\lim_{M \to \infty} \mathbb{E}^M[Y_j e^{ux_j}] = \lim_{M \to \infty} \mathbb{E}^M[Y_j] \mathbb{E}^M[e^{ux_j}] = \beta \Lambda,
\]

where

\[
\beta := \lim_{M \to \infty} \mathbb{E}^M[Y_i] \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda := \lim_{M \to \infty} \Lambda^{M,1}[e^{ux_i}].
\]

Passing to the limit when \( M \to \infty \) in (4.3) leads to

\[
0 = (2p - 1) \left[ e^u - e^{-u} \right] \beta \Lambda + (e^u + e^{-u} - 2) \Lambda
\]

where \( u > 0 \). Since \( \Lambda \geq 1 \), we can write

\[
0 = (2p - 1) \left[ e^u - e^{-u} \right] \beta + (e^u + e^{-u} - 2)
\]

or equivalently

\[
\beta = \frac{e^u + e^{-u} - 2}{e^u - e^{-u}}.
\]
However the left hand side does not depend on $u$ and then, by passing to the limit when $u$ goes to 0 from the right we obtain
\[
\beta = \lim_{u \to 0} \frac{e^u + e^{-u} - 2}{e^u - e^{-u}} = 0.
\]
Therefore
\[
\lim_{M \to \infty} E_M^M \left[ \frac{X_{i_n}}{n_t} \right] = 0.
\]
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