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Abstract. We consider Gaussian approximation in a variant of the classical Johnson–Mehl birth-growth model with random growth speed. Seeds appear randomly in $\mathbb{R}^d$ at random times and start growing instantaneously in all directions with a random speed. The location, birth time and growth speed of the seeds are given by a Poisson process. Under suitable conditions on the random growth speed and a weight function $h : \mathbb{R}^d \to [0, \infty)$, we provide sufficient conditions for a Gaussian convergence of the sum of the weights at the exposed points, which are those seeds in the model that are not covered at the time of their birth. Moreover, using recent results on stabilization regions, we provide non-asymptotic bounds on the distance between the normalized sum of weights and a standard Gaussian random variable in the Wasserstein and Kolmogorov metrics.

1. Introduction

In the spatial Johnson–Mehl growth model, seeds appear at random times $t_i, i \in \mathbb{N}$, at random locations $x_i, i \in \mathbb{N}$, in $\mathbb{R}^d$, according to a Poisson process $(x_i, t_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+$, where $\mathbb{R}_+ := [0, \infty)$. Once a seed is born, it begins to form a cell by growing radially in all directions at a constant speed $v > 0$, so that by time $t$ it occupies the ball of radius $vt$. The parts of the space claimed by the seeds form the so-called Johnson–Mehl tessellation, see [5] and [9].

The study of such birth-growth processes started with the work of Kolmogorov [7] in two dimensions to model crystal growth. Since then, this model has seen applications in various biological contexts. For a sampling of the different subsequent developments and applications, see [3, 5, 9] and references therein.

Variants of the classical spatial birth-growth model can be found, sometimes as a particular case of other models, in many subsequent papers. Among the others, we mention [10] and [1], where the birth-growth model appears as a particular case of a random sequential packing model, and [12], who consider a variant of the model with non-uniform deterministic growth patterns. The main tools rely on the concept of stabilization by considering regions where the appearance of new points influences the functional of interest.

In this paper, we consider a generalization of the Johnson–Mehl model by introducing random growth speed for the seeds. The addition of random and possibly unbounded speed gives rise to many interesting features in the model, most importantly, it introduces long
range interactions. Furthermore, the model with random speed is no longer stabilizing in the classical sense of [8] and [11], since distant points may influence the growth pattern if their speeds are sufficiently high. Even in the constant speed setting we substantially improve and extend limit theorems obtained in [3].

We consider a birth-growth model, determined by a Poisson process $\eta$ in $X = \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+$ with the product intensity measure $\mu = \lambda \otimes \theta \otimes \nu$, where $\lambda$ is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$, $\theta$ is a non-null locally finite measure on $\mathbb{R}_+$, and $\nu$ is a probability distribution on $\mathbb{R}_+$ with $\nu(\{0\}) < 1$. Each point $x$ of this point process $\eta$ has three components $(x, t_x, v_x)$, where $v_x \in \mathbb{R}_+$ denotes the random speed of a seed born at location $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and whose growth commences at time $t_x \in \mathbb{R}_+$. In a given point configuration, a point $x = (x, t_x, v_x)$ is said to be exposed if there are no other points $(y, t_y, v_y)$ in the configuration with $t_y < t_x$ and $\|x - y\| \leq v_y(t_x - t_y)$, where $\| \cdot \|$ denotes the Euclidean norm. It should be noted that, because of random speeds, it may happen that the cell grown from a non-exposed seed shades a subsequent seed which would be exposed otherwise. Also notice that the indicator function that a point $(x, t_x, v_x) \in \eta$ is exposed depends only on the point configuration in the region

$$L_{x,t_x} := \{(y, t_y, v_y) \in X : \|x - y\| \leq v_y(t_x - t_y)\}. \quad (1.1)$$

Namely, $x$ is exposed if and only if $\eta$ has no points (apart from $x$) in $L_{x,t_x}$.

Given a measurable weight function $h : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}_+$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, the main object of interest in this paper is the sum of $h$ over the exposed points in $\eta$. Our aim is to provide sufficient conditions for Gaussian convergence of such sums. A standard approach for proving Gaussian convergence for such statistics relies on stabilization theory [1, 6, 10, 12]. In the usual stabilization literature, one assumes that the so-called stabilization region is a ball around a given reference point. Note that the region $L_{x,t_x}$ is unbounded and it seems that it is not expressible as a ball around $x$ in some different metric.

The recent work [2] introduced a new notion of ‘region-stabilization’ which allows for more general regions than balls. We will utilize this notion to prove bounds on the Wasserstein and Kolmogorov distances, defined below, between a suitably normalized sum of weights and the standard Gaussian distribution. For real-valued random variables $X$ and $Y$, the Wasserstein distance between their distributions is given by

$$d_W(X, Y) := \sup_{f \in \text{Lip}_1} |\mathbf{E} f(X) - \mathbf{E} f(Y)|,$$

where $\text{Lip}_1$ denotes the class of all Lipschitz functions $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ with Lipschitz constant at most one. The Kolmogorov distance between the distributions is given by

$$d_K(X, Y) := \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbf{P} \{X \leq t\} - \mathbf{P} \{Y \leq t\}|.$$

The main challenge when working with random unbounded speed of growth is that there are possibly very long-range interactions between seeds. This makes the use of balls as stabilization regions vastly suboptimal and necessitates the use of regions of a more general shape. In particular, we only assume that the random growth speed in our model has finite moments up to order $6d$ (see assumption (C) in Section 2), and this allows for various heavy-tailed distributions for the speed.
The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we describe the model and state our main results. In Section 3, we prove a result providing necessary upper and lower bounds for the variance of our statistic of interest. Section 4 contains the proof of the Theorems.

## 2. Model and main results

Consider the space $X := \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, with the Borel $\sigma$-algebra $\mathcal{F}$. Let $\mu$ be the product measure $\mu := \lambda \otimes \theta \otimes \nu$, where $\lambda$ stands for the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$, $\theta$ is a non-null locally finite measure on $\mathbb{R}_+$, and $\nu$ is a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}_+$ with $\nu\{\{0\}\} < 1$, and let $\eta$ be a Poisson process in $X$ with intensity measure $\mu$. The points from $X$ are written as $x := (x, t_x, v_x)$, and each such point correspond to a seed born in position $x$ at time $t_x$, which then grows radially in all directions with speed $v_x$. For $x \in X$, the region

$$G_x = G_{x,t_x,v_x} := \{(y, t_y) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+ : t_y \geq t_x, \|y - x\| \leq v_x(t_y - t_x)\}$$

is the growth region of the seed $x$. Denote by $N$ the family of $\sigma$-finite simple counting measures $\mathcal{M}$ on $X$ equipped with the smallest $\sigma$-algebra $\mathcal{N}$ such that the maps $\mathcal{M} \mapsto \mathcal{M}(A)$ are measurable for all $A \in \mathcal{F}$. We write $x \in \mathcal{M}$ if $\mathcal{M}\{(x)\} > 0$. For $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{N}$, a point $x \in \mathcal{M}$ is said to be exposed in $\mathcal{M}$ if it does not belong to the growth region of any other point $y \in (\mathcal{M} - \delta_x)$, where $\delta_x$ denotes the Dirac measure at $x$. We note here that the property of being exposed is not influenced by the speed component of $x$.

The influence set $L_x = L_{x,t_x}$, $x \in X$, defined at (1.1), is exactly the set of points $y$ in $\mathcal{M}$ which were born before time $t_x$ and which at time $t_x$ occupy a region that covers the location $x$, thereby shading it. Clearly, the point $x$ is exposed in $\mathcal{M}$ if and only if $(\mathcal{M} - \delta_x)(L_x) = 0$, where $\delta_x$ is the Dirac measure at $x$ and 0 stands for the zero measure. We write $(y, t_y, v_y) \preceq (x, t_x)$ or $y \preceq x$ if $y \in L_{x,t_x}$ (recall that the speed component of $x$ is irrelevant in such a relation) and so $x$ is not an exposed point with respect to $\delta_y$.

For $x \in X$ and $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{N}$, denote

$$H_x(\mathcal{M}) = H_{x,t_x}(\mathcal{M}) := \mathbb{1}\{x \text{ is exposed in } \mathcal{M} + \delta_x\} = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{M}(L_{x,t_x}(x))=0}.$$ 

For a measurable function $h : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{N}$, let

$$F(\mathcal{M}) := \int_X h(x)H_x(\mathcal{M} - \delta_x)\mathcal{M}(dx) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{M}} h(x)H_x(\mathcal{M} - \delta_x)$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.1)

be the sum of the weights determined by $h$ at locations of the exposed points in the point configuration $\mathcal{M}$. For example, if $h$ is the indicator of a window $W \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, then $F$ is the total number of exposed points located in $W$. The main goal of this paper is to find sufficient conditions for a Gaussian convergence of $F$. For this we utilize the tools developed in [2]. The functional $F(\eta)$ is a region-stabilizing functional, in the sense of [2], and can be represented as $F(\mathcal{M}) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{M}} \xi(x, \mathcal{M})$, where the score function $\xi$ is given by

$$\xi(x, \mathcal{M}) := h(x)H_x(\mathcal{M} - \delta_x), \quad x \in \mathcal{M}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.2)

By Theorem 2.1 in [2], we can obtain ready-to-use bounds on the Wasserstein and Kolmogorov distances between $F$, suitably normalized, and a standard Gaussian random variable $N$ upon validating equation (2.1) and assumptions (A1)–(A3) therein. We consistently follow the notation of [2].
Now we are ready to state our main results. First, we list the necessary assumptions on our model. In the sequel, we will drop $\lambda$ in Lebesgue integrals and simply write $dx$ instead of $\lambda(dx)$.

(A) The weight function $h$ satisfies
\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \max\{h(x), h(x)^8\} \, dx < \infty.
\]

(B) For all $a > 0$,
\[
\int_0^\infty e^{-a \Lambda(t)} \theta(dt) < \infty,
\]
where
\[
\Lambda(t) := \omega_d \int_0^t (t - s)^d \theta(ds) \tag{2.3}
\]
and $\omega_d$ is the volume of the $d$-dimensional unit ball.

(C) First $6d$ moments of $\nu$ are finite, i.e., $\nu_k := \int_0^\infty v^k \nu(dv) < \infty$ for $k = 1, \ldots, 6d$.

Note that, the function $\Lambda(t)$ given at (2.3) is up to a constant, the measure of the influence set of any point $x \in X$ with time component $t_x = t$ (the measure of the influence set is constant with respect to the location and speed components), since the $\mu$-content of $L_{x,t_x}$ is given by
\[
\mu(L_{x,t_x}) = \int_0^\infty \int_0^{t_x} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbf{1}_{y \in B_{v_y}(t_x-t_y)}(x) \, dy \, \theta(dt_y) \nu(dv_y) = \int_0^\infty \nu(dv_y) \int_0^{t_x} \omega_d v_y^d(t_x-t_y)^d \theta(dt_y) = \nu_d \Lambda(t_x),
\]
where $B_r(x)$ denotes the closed $d$-dimensional ball of radius $r$ centered at $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. In particular, if $\theta$ is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}_+$, then $\Lambda(t) = \omega_d t^{d+1}/(d+1)$.

Define
\[
h^{(i)} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(x)^i \, dx, \quad i \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{2.4}
\]
and
\[
\tilde{M}_i := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{M}(x)^i \, dx, \quad i = 1, 2,
\]
where
\[
\tilde{M}(x) := \max\{h(x)^2, h(x)^4\}.
\]

The following theorem is our first main result.

**Theorem 2.1.** For $d \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\eta$ be a Poisson process on $X$ with intensity measure $\mu$ as above. Let the assumptions (A)–(C) be in force. Then for $F := F(\eta)$ as in (2.1),
\[
d_W\left(\frac{F - EF}{\sqrt{\text{Var} F}}, N\right) \leq C \left[ \frac{\tilde{M}_2^{1/2}}{\text{Var} F} + \frac{\tilde{M}_1}{(\text{Var} F)^{3/2}} \right],
\]
and
\[ d_K \left( \frac{F - EF}{\sqrt{\text{Var} F}}, N \right) \leq C \left[ \frac{\tilde{M}^{1/2}_2 + \tilde{M}^{1/2}_1}{\text{Var} F} + \frac{\tilde{M}_1}{(\text{Var} F)^{3/2}} + \frac{\tilde{M}^{5/4}_1 + \tilde{M}^{3/2}_1}{(\text{Var} F)^2} \right] \]
for a constant \( C > 0 \) which depends on \( d \), the first \( 6d \) moments of \( \nu \), and \( \theta \).

To derive a quantitative central limit theorem from Theorem 2.1, a lower bound on the variance is needed. The following proposition provides general lower and upper bounds on the variance, which is then specialized for the measure \( \theta \) on \( \mathbb{R}_+ \) given by the density
\[ \theta(dt) := t^\tau dt, \quad \tau \in (-1, \infty). \] (2.5)
In the following, for \( t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R} \), we write \( t_1 \wedge t_2 \) for \( \min\{t_1, t_2\} \).

**Proposition 2.2.** Let the assumptions (A)–(C) be in force. For \( \eta \) a Poisson process with intensity measure \( \mu \) as above and \( F = F(\eta) \) as in (2.1),
\[ \text{Var}(F) \geq \left[ \int_0^\infty w(t)\theta(dt) - 2\omega_d \nu_d \int_0^\infty \int_0^t (t - s)^d w(s)w(t)(ds)\theta(dt) \right] h^{(2)}(t) \] (2.6)
and
\[ \text{Var}(F) \leq \left[ 2 \int_0^\infty w(t)^{1/2}\theta(dt) + \omega_d^2 \nu_{2d} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \int_{[t_1 \wedge t_2]} (t_1 - s)^d(t_2 - s)^d w(t_1)^{1/2}w(t_2)^{1/2}\theta(ds)\theta^2(d(t_1, t_2)) \right] h^{(2)}, \] (2.7)
where
\[ w(t) := e^{-\nu_d \Lambda(t)} = \mathbb{E} [H_{0,t}(\eta)] \] (2.8)
and \( h^{(2)} \) is defined at (2.4). Moreover, if \( \theta \) is given by (2.5), then
\[ C_1 \mathbb{1}_{\tau \leq d - 1} \leq \frac{\text{Var}(F)}{\nu_d^{-(\tau + 1)/(d + \tau + 1)} h^{(2)}} \leq C_2 (1 + \nu_d \nu_{2d}^{-2}) \] (2.9)
for constants \( C_1, C_2 > 0 \), depending on the dimension \( d \) and \( \tau \).

We remark here that the variance lower bound in (2.9), we believe, continues to hold when \( \tau > d - 1 \). But our approximations in general do not allow us to extend beyond \( d - 1 \). In the case of a deterministic speed \( v \) and for \( h = \mathbb{1}_W \) being the indicator function of an observation window \( W \subset \mathbb{R}^d \), Proposition 2.2 provides an explicit condition on \( \theta \) ensuring that the variance scales like the volume of the observation window in the classical Johnson–Mehl growth model. The problem of finding such a condition, explicitly formulated in [4, page 754], arose in [3], where asymptotic normality for the number of exposed seeds in a region, as the volume of the region tends to infinity, is obtained under the assumption that the variance scales properly. This was by then only shown numerically for the case when \( \theta \) is the Lebesgue measure and \( d = 1, 2, 3, 4 \). Subsequent papers [10, 12] derived the variance scaling for the Lebesgue measure and some generalizations of it, but in a slightly different formulation of the model, in which seeds that do not appear in the observation window are automatically rejected and cannot influence the growth pattern in the region \( W \).
The bounds in Theorem 2.1 can be specified under two different scenarios. When considering a sequence of weight functions \((h_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\), under suitable conditions Theorem 2.1 provides a quantitative CLT for the corresponding functionals \((F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\). Keeping all other quantities fixed with respect to \(n\), let \((h_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) be a sequence of non-negative weight functions such that
\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \max\{h_n(x), h_n(x)^8\} \, dx \leq Ch_n^{(2)},
\] (2.10)
for some constant \(C\). In view of Proposition 2.2, this provides the following quantitative CLT for the functionals \((F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) corresponding to \((h_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\).

**Theorem 2.3.** For \(n \in \mathbb{N}\), let \(F_n\) be defined as in (2.1) with \(h = h_n\) for some \((h_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\), satisfying (2.10), and such that \(h_n^{(2)} \geq 1\) for all sufficiently large \(n\). Let the assumptions (A)–(C) be in force. If \(\theta\) and \(\nu\) satisfy
\[
\int_0^\infty w(t)\theta(dt) - 2\omega_d\nu_d \int_0^\infty \int_0^t (t-s)^d w(s)\theta(ds)\theta(dt) > 0,
\] (2.11)
where \(w(t)\) is given at (2.8), then there exists a constant \(C > 0\) such that
\[
\max\left\{d_W\left(\frac{F_n - E F_n}{\sqrt{\text{Var} F_n}}, N\right), d_K\left(\frac{F_n - E F_n}{\sqrt{\text{Var} F_n}}, N\right)\right\} \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{h_n^{(2)}}},
\]
for all \(n \in \mathbb{N}\), where \(h_n^{(2)}\) is defined as in (2.1). In particular, the condition (2.11) is satisfied for \(\theta\) given at (2.5) with \(\tau \in (-1, d - 1)\).

Note that the rate of convergence expressed in Theorem 2.3 is presumably optimal, as it has the same order as the inverse of square root of the variance. Let \(h_n = \mathbb{1}_{W_n}, n \in \mathbb{N}\), be indicator functions of a sequence of windows \((W_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) with \(\lambda(W_n) \to \infty\) as \(n \to \infty\). In this case (2.10) is trivially satisfied and Theorem 2.3 yields a CLT for the number of exposed seeds, with rate of convergence of order \(1/\sqrt{\lambda(W_n)}\). This extends the CLT for the number of exposed seeds from [3] in several directions: the model is generalized to random growth speed, there is no constraint of any kind on the shape of the growing windows, and a logarithmic factor is removed from the rate of convergence.

In a different scenario, when \(\theta\) has the power-law density (2.5) with \(\tau \in (-1, d - 1)\), it is possible to explicitly specify the dependence of the bound in Theorem 2.1 on the moments of \(\nu\), as stated in the following result.

**Theorem 2.4.** Let the assumptions (A) and (C) be in force. For \(\theta\) given at (2.5) with \(\tau \in (-1, d - 1)\), there exists a constant \(C > 0\) depending only on \(d\) and \(\tau\) such that
\[
d_W\left(\frac{F - E F}{\sqrt{\text{Var} F}}, N\right) \leq C \nu_d^{\frac{\tau+1}{2(d+\tau+1)}} \left[\left(1 + \nu_d \nu_d^{-\delta}\right)^{3/2} \tilde{M}_2^{1/2} h_n^{(2)} + \left(1 + \nu_d \nu_d^{-\delta}\right)^{1/2} \tilde{M}_1^{1/2}\right],
\]
and
\[
d_K\left(\frac{F - E F}{\sqrt{\text{Var} F}}, N\right) \leq C \nu_d^{\frac{\tau+1}{2(d+\tau+1)}} \left[\left(1 + \nu_d \nu_d^{-\delta}\right)^{3/2} \tilde{M}_2^{1/2} + \left(1 + \nu_d \nu_d^{-\delta}\right)^{1/2} \tilde{M}_1^{1/2}\right].
\]
is presumably optimal.

As an application of Theorem 2.4, we consider the case when the intensity of the underlying point process grows to infinity. The quantitative central limit theorem for this case is contained in the following result.

**Corollary 2.5.** Let the assumptions (A) and (C) be in force. For a weight function \(h\), consider \(F\) defined at (2.1) evaluated at the Poisson process \(\eta_s\) with intensity \(s\lambda \otimes \theta \otimes \nu\) for \(s > 0\) and \(\theta\) given at (2.5) with \(\tau \in (-1, d - 1)\). Then there exists a constant \(C > 0\) depending only on \(d\), \(\tau\) and \(\nu_d\) such that, for all \(s \geq 1\),

\[
d_W \left( \frac{F(\eta_s) - \mathbf{E}F(\eta_s)}{\sqrt{\mathbf{Var}F(\eta_s)}}, N \right) \leq C s^{-\frac{d}{2(\alpha + 1)}},
\]

and

\[
d_K \left( \frac{F(\eta_s) - \mathbf{E}F(\eta_s)}{\sqrt{\mathbf{Var}F(\eta_s)}}, N \right) \leq C s^{-\frac{d}{2(\alpha + 1)}} \left[ 1 + s^{-\frac{d}{2(\alpha + 1)}} \right].
\]

As is the case in Theorem 2.3, the rate obtained in Corollary 2.5 is presumably optimal.

### 3. Variance estimation

In this section, we estimate the mean and variance of the statistic \(F\), thus providing a proof of Proposition 2.2. First notice that by the Mecke formula and assumption (A), the mean of \(F\) is given by

\[
\mathbf{E}F(\eta) = \int_X h(x)\mathbf{E}H_x(\eta)\mu(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(x)dx \int_0^\infty w(t)\theta(dt) = h^{(1)} \int_0^\infty w(t)\theta(dt),
\]

where \(w(t)\) and \(h^{(1)}\) are defined at (2.8) and (2.4), respectively. We first prove the lower bounds on the variance. In many instances, we will use the simple inequality

\[
2ab \leq a^2 + b^2, \quad a, b \geq 0.
\]

Also notice that for \(x \in \mathbb{R}^d\),

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \lambda(B_{r_1}(0) \cap B_{r_2}(x))dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} 1_{y \in B_{r_1}(0)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} 1_{y \in B_{r_2}(x)} dxdy = \omega_d r_1^d r_2^d.
\]

The multivariate Mecke formula yields that

\[
\mathbf{Var}(F) = \int_X h(x)^2\mathbf{E}H_x(\eta)\mu(dx) - \left( \int_X h(x)\mathbf{E}H_x(\eta)\mu(dx) \right)^2
\]

\[
+ \int_D h(x)h(y)\mathbf{E}[H_x(\eta + \delta y)H_y(\eta + \delta y)]\mu^2(dx, dy),
\]

where \(h^{(2)}\) is defined at (2.4).
where the double integration is over the region $D \subset X$ where the points $x$ and $y$ are incomparable ($x \not\leq y$ and $y \not\leq x$), i.e.,

$$D := \{(x, y) : \|x - y\| > \max\{v_x(t_y - t_x), v_y(t_x - t_y)\}\}.$$ 

It is possible to get rid of the Dirac measures in the inner integral, since on $D$, the points are incomparable. Thus, using the translation invariance of $E H_x(\eta)$, we have

$$\operatorname{Var}(F) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(x)^2 dx \int_0^\infty w(t)\theta(dt) - I_0 + I_1,$$

(3.3)

where

$$I_0 := 2 \int_{X^2} 1_{y \leq x} h(x) h(y) w(t_x) w(t_y) \mu^2(d(x, y)),$$

and

$$I_1 := \int_D h(x) h(y) \left[ E[H_x(\eta)H_y(\eta)] - w(t_x) w(t_y) \right] \mu^2(d(x, y)).$$

**Proof of Proposition 2.2.** First notice that the term $I_1$ in (3.3) is non-negative, since

$$E[H_x(\eta)H_y(\eta)] = e^{-\mu(L_x \cup L_y)} \geq e^{-\mu(L_x)} e^{-\mu(L_y)} = w(t_x) w(t_y).$$

Furthermore, (3.1) yields that

$$I_0 \leq \int_X h(x)^2 w(t_x) \left[ \int_X 1_{y \leq x} w(t_y) \mu(dy) \right] \mu(dx) + \int_X h(y)^2 w(t_y) \left[ \int_X 1_{y \leq x} w(t_x) \mu(dx) \right] \mu(dy).$$

Since $y \leq x$ is equivalent to $\|y - x\| \leq v_y(t_x - t_y)$, the first summand on the right-hand side above can be simplified as

$$\int_X h(x)^2 w(t_x) \left[ \int_X 1_{y \leq x} w(t_y) \mu(dy) \right] \mu(dx)$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^\infty h(x)^2 w(t_x) dx \theta(dt_x) \int_0^\infty \int_0^{t_x} \omega_d v_y^d(t_x - t_y)^d w(t_y) \theta(dt_y) \nu(dy)$$

$$= \omega_d \nu_d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(x)^2 dx \int_0^\infty \int_0^t (t - s)^d w(s) w(t) \theta(ds) \theta(dt).$$

The second summand in the bound on $I_0$, upon interchanging integrals for the second step, turns into

$$\int_X h(y)^2 w(t_y) \left[ \int_X 1_{y \leq x} w(t_x) \mu(dx) \right] \mu(dy)$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_0^\infty h(y)^2 w(t_y) dy \theta(dt_y) \int_0^\infty \int_{t_y}^\infty \omega_d v_y^d(t_x - t_y)^d w(t_x) \theta(dt_x) \nu(dy)$$

$$= \omega_d \nu_d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(y)^2 dy \int_0^\infty \int_0^t (t - s)^d w(s) w(t) \theta(ds) \theta(dt).$$

Combining, by (3.3) we obtain (2.6).

To prove (2.7), note that by the Poincaré inequality,

$$\operatorname{Var}(F) \leq \int_X E |F(\eta + \delta_x) - F(\eta)|^2 \mu(dx).$$
Observe that
\[ |F(x + \delta_x) - F(x)| = h(x)H_x(\eta) - \sum_{y \in \mathcal{V}} h(y)H_y(\eta)\mathbb{1}_{y \geq x}. \]

Using that
\[ -\sum_{y \in \mathcal{V}} h(x)h(y)H_x(\eta)H_y(\eta)\mathbb{1}_{y \geq x} \leq 0, \]
in the first step, and the Mecke formula in the second step now yields
\[
\int_{\mathcal{X}} E |F(x + \delta_x) - F(x)|^2 \mu(dx)
\leq \int_{\mathcal{X}} E [h(x)^2H_x(\eta)] \mu(dx) + \int_{\mathcal{X}} E \left[ \sum_{y,z \in \mathcal{V}} 1_{y \geq x}1_{z \geq x}h(y)h(z)H_y(\eta)H_z(\eta) \right] \mu(dx)
= \int_{\mathcal{X}} h(x)^2w(t_x)\mu(dx) + \int_{\mathcal{X}^2} 1_{y \geq x}h(y)^2w(t_y)\mu^2(dx,dy)
\quad + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{D_x} h(y)h(z)e^{-\mu(L_y \cup L_z)}\mu^2(d(y,z))\mu(dx), \tag{3.4}
\]
where
\[ D_x = \{(y, z) \in \mathcal{X}^2 : y \geq x, z \geq x, y \nleq x, z \nleq y \}. \]

Using that \(xe^{-x/2} \leq 1\) for \(x \geq 0\), observe that
\[
\int_{\mathcal{X}^2} 1_{y \geq x}h(y)^2w(t_y)\mu^2(dx,dy) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} h(x)^2w(t_x)\mu(L_x)\mu(dx) \leq \int_{\mathcal{X}} h(x)^2w(t_x)^{1/2}\mu(dx). \tag{3.5}
\]

Next, using that \(\mu(L_y \cup L_z) \geq (\mu(L_y) + \mu(L_z))/2\) and that \(D_x \subseteq \{y, z \geq x\}\) for the first inequality, (3.1) for the second, we have
\[
\int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{D_x} h(y)h(z)e^{-\mu(L_y \cup L_z)}\mu^2(d(y,z))\mu(dx)
\leq \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}^2} 1_{y \geq x}h(y)h(z)w(t_y)^{1/2}w(t_z)^{1/2}\mu^2(d(y,z))\mu(dx)
\leq \int_{\mathcal{X}} w(t_y)^{1/2}w(t_z)^{1/2} \int_{\mathcal{X}^2} h^2(z) \left( \int_{\mathcal{X}} 1_{x \leq y,z} \mu(dx) \right) d(y,z)\theta^2(d(t_y,t_z)). \tag{3.6}
\]

By (3.2),
\[
\int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} 1_{x \leq y,z} \mu(dx)dy = \int_{0}^{t_x \wedge t_z} \int_{0}^{t_x} \theta(dt_x)\mu(dx)\int_{0}^{t_x} \lambda(B_{v_x(t_y-t_x)}(y) \cap B_{v_x(t_x-t_z)}(z))dy
= \omega^2_{d} \nu_{d} \int_{0}^{t_y \wedge t_z} (t_y - t_x)^d(t_z - t_x)^d\theta(dt_x).
\]

Plugging in (3.6), we obtain
\[
\int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{D_x} h(y)h(z)e^{-\mu(L_y \cup L_z)}\mu^2(d(y,z))\mu(dx)
\]
Plugging in, we have
\[ \Gamma \text{ is the Gamma function. In particular,} \]
Then
\[ \int_{0}^{t} (t-s)^d s \theta(ds) \theta^2(d(t_1, t_2)). \]
This in combination with (3.4) and (3.5) proves (2.7).

Now we move on to prove (2.9). We first prove the lower bound. Fix \( \tau \in (-1, d - 1] \).
Then
\[ \Lambda(t) = \omega_d \int_{0}^{t} (t-s)^d s \theta(ds) = \omega_d t^{d+\tau+1} B(d+1, \tau+1) = B \omega_d t^{d+\tau+1}, \]
where \( B := B(d+1, \tau+1) \) is a value of the Beta function. Hence, \( w(t) = \exp\{-B \omega_d \nu_d t^{d+\tau+1}\} \).
Plugging in, we have
\[
\frac{\text{Var}(F)}{h^{(2)}} \geq \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-B \omega_d \nu_d t^{d+\tau+1}} \theta(dt) - 2 \omega_d \nu_d \int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{t} (t-s)^d e^{-B \omega_d \nu_d (s^{d+\tau+1}+t^{d+\tau+1})} \theta(ds) \theta(dt) \\
= \left( \frac{1}{B \omega_d \nu_d} \right) \left[ \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-t^{d+\tau+1}} t^{\tau} dt - 2 \int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{t} (t-s)^d e^{-s^{d+\tau+1}+t^{d+\tau+1}} t^{\tau} s^{\tau} ds dt \right]. \tag{3.7}
\]
The lower bound in (2.9) will follow if we show that
\[ C_{d, \tau} := \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-t^{d+\tau+1}} t^{\tau} dt - 2 \int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{t} (t-s)^d e^{-s^{d+\tau+1}+t^{d+\tau+1}} t^{\tau} s^{\tau} ds dt > 0. \]
Writing \( s = tu \) for some \( u \in [0, 1] \),
\[
2 \int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{t} (t-s)^d e^{-s^{d+\tau+1}+t^{d+\tau+1}} t^{\tau} s^{\tau} ds dt \leq 2 \int_{0}^{\infty} t^{d+2\tau+1} \int_{0}^{1} (1-u)^d u^{\tau} e^{-u^{d+\tau+1}+u^{d+\tau+1}} \nu_d u dudt < 2 \int_{0}^{\infty} t^{d+2\tau+1} e^{-t^{d+\tau+1}} dt.
\]
By substituting \( t^{d+\tau+1} = z \), it is easy to check that for any \( \rho > -1 \),
\[
\int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-t^{\rho+1}} t^{\rho} dt = \frac{1}{\rho + 1} \Gamma \left( \frac{\rho + 1}{d + \tau + 1} \right),
\]
where \( \Gamma \) is the Gamma function. In particular,
\[
\int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-t^{d+\tau+1}} t^{\tau} dt = \frac{1}{d + \tau + 1} \Gamma \left( \frac{\tau + 1}{d + \tau + 1} \right) = \frac{1}{\tau + 1} \Gamma \left( \frac{\tau + 1}{d + \tau + 1} \right)
\]
and
\[
\int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-t^{d+\tau+1}} t^{d+2\tau+1} dt = \frac{1}{d + \tau + 1} \Gamma \left( 1 + \frac{\tau + 1}{d + \tau + 1} \right).
\]
Thus, since \( \tau \in (-1, d - 1] \),
\[ C_{d, \tau} > \Gamma \left( 1 + \frac{\tau + 1}{d + \tau + 1} \right) \left[ \frac{1}{\tau + 1} - \frac{2}{d + \tau + 1} \right] \geq 0. \]
By (3.7), we obtain
\[
\left( \nu_d \right)^{\frac{\tau+1}{\tau+1}} \frac{\text{Var}(F)}{h^{(2)}} \geq \left( \frac{1}{B \omega_d} \right)^{\frac{\tau+1}{\tau+1}} C_{d, \tau} > 0,
\]
proving the lower bound in (2.9).

Next, we prove the upper bound in (2.9). For \( \theta \) as in (2.5), arguing as above, we have
\[
\int_0^\infty w(t)^{1/2} \theta(dt) = \int_0^\infty e^{-B \omega_d \nu_d t^{d+\tau+1/2}} \theta(dt) = \left( \frac{2}{B \omega_d \nu_d} \right)^{\frac{\tau+1}{\tau+1}} \frac{1}{\tau + 1} \Gamma \left( 1 + \frac{\tau + 1}{d + \tau + 1} \right).
\]

Finally, substituting \( s' = \nu_d^{\frac{1}{1+d}} s \) and similar substitutions for \( t_1 \) and \( t_2 \), it is straightforward to see that
\[
\nu_2 \Delta h^{(2)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^{t_1\wedge t_2} (t_1 - s)^d (t_2 - s)^d w(t_1)^{1/2} w(t_2)^{1/2} \theta(ds) \theta^2(d(t_1, t_2)) \leq C \nu_2 \nu_d^{-2} \nu_d^{\frac{\tau+1}{\tau+1}},
\]
for some constant \( C \) depending only on \( d \) and \( \tau \). The upper bound in (2.9) now follows from the above two inequalities and (2.7).

\[\square\]

4. Proofs of the Theorems

In this section, we derive our main results from Theorem 2.1 in [2]. While we do not restate the theorem here and refer the reader to Section 2 in [2], it is important to note that the Poisson process considered in [2, Theorem 2.1] has the intensity measure \( s \mathbb{Q} \) obtained by scaling parameter a fixed measure \( \mathbb{Q} \) on \( \mathbb{X} \). Nonetheless, the main result is non-asymptotic and while in the current paper, we consider a Poisson process with fixed intensity measure \( \mu \) (without a scaling parameter), we can still use [2, Theorem 2.1] with \( s = 1 \) and the measure \( \mathbb{Q} \) replaced by \( \mu \). While still following the notations from [2], we will drop the subscript \( s \) for ease of notation.

Recall that for \( \mathcal{M} \in \mathbb{N} \), the score function \( \xi(x, \mathcal{M}) \) is defined at (2.2). It is straightforward to check that if \( \xi(x, \mathcal{M}_1) = \xi(x, \mathcal{M}_2) \) for some \( \mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2 \in \mathbb{N} \) with \( \mathcal{M}_1 \leq \mathcal{M}_2 \) (meaning that \( \mathcal{M}_2 - \mathcal{M}_1 \) is a nonnegative measure) and \( x \in \mathcal{M}_1 \), then \( \xi(x, \mathcal{M}_1) = \xi(x, \mathcal{M}') \) for all \( \mathcal{M}' \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( \mathcal{M}_1 \leq \mathcal{M}' \leq \mathcal{M}_2 \), so that equation (2.1) in [2] hold. Next we check assumptions (A1)-(A3).

For \( \mathcal{M} \in \mathbb{N} \), define the stabilization region
\[
R(x, \mathcal{M} + \delta_x) := \begin{cases} L_{x,t_x} & \text{if } x \text{ is exposed in } \mathcal{M} - \delta_x, \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}
\]

It is not hard to see that \( R \) is monotonically decreasing in the second argument and that it satisfies assumption (A1) in [2], that is,
\[
\xi(x, \mathcal{M} + \delta_x) = \xi\left( x, (\mathcal{M} + \delta_x)_{R(x, \mathcal{M} + \delta_x)} \right), \quad x \in \mathbb{X}, \mathcal{M} \in \mathbb{N}.
\]

Let \( \eta \) be as in Theorem 2.1. For any \( p \in (0, 1) \), for all \( \mathcal{M} \in \mathbb{N} \) with \( \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{X}) \leq 7 \), we have
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \xi(x, \eta + \delta_x + \mathcal{M})^{4+p} \right] \leq h(x)^{4+p} w(t),
\]
confirming assumption (A2) in [2] with \( M_p(x) := h(x) \), where we recall that \( w(t) \) is defined at (2.8). For definiteness, we take \( p = 1 \), and recall that
\[
\widetilde{M}(x) = \widetilde{M}(x) := \max\{M_1(x)^2, M_1(x)^4\} = \max\{h(x)^2, h(x)^4\}.
\]
Finally, notice that
\[
P\{y \in R(x, \eta + \delta_x)\} = 1_{y \leq x} e^{-\mu(L_{x,t})} = 1_{y \leq x} w(t_x),
\]
so that assumption (A3) in [2] is satisfied with
\[
r(x, y) := \begin{cases} 
\nu_d \Lambda(t_x), & \text{if } y \leq x, \\
\infty, & \text{if } y \not\leq x.
\end{cases}
\]
Now that we have checked all the necessary conditions, we can invoke Theorem 2.1 in [2]. Let \( \zeta := \frac{p}{40 + 10p} = 1/50 \) and
\[
g(y) := \int_X e^{-\zeta r(x,y)} \mu(dx),
\]
\[
G(y) := \widetilde{M}(y)(1 + g(y)^5), \quad y \in X.
\]
For \( x_1, x_2 \in X \), denote
\[
q(x, y) := \int_X P\{\{x, y\} \subseteq R(z, \eta + \delta_z)\} \mu(dz) = \int_{x \leq z, y \leq z} w(t_z) \mu(dz).
\]
For \( \alpha > 0 \), let
\[
f_\alpha(y) := f_{\alpha}^{(1)}(y) + f_{\alpha}^{(2)}(y) + f_{\alpha}^{(3)}(y), \quad y \in X,
\]
where for \( y \in X \),
\[
f_{\alpha}^{(1)}(y) := \int_X G(x) e^{-\alpha r(x,y)} \mu(dx) = \int_{y \leq x} G(x) w(t_x)^\alpha \mu(dx),
\]
\[
f_{\alpha}^{(2)}(y) := \int_X G(x) e^{-\alpha r(y,x)} \mu(dx) = \int_{x \leq y} G(x) w(t_y)^\alpha \mu(dx),
\]
\[
f_{\alpha}^{(3)}(y) := \int_X G(x) q(x, y)^\alpha \mu(dx).
\]
Finally, let
\[
\kappa(x) := P\{\xi(x, \eta + \delta_x) \neq 0\} = 1_{(h(x) \neq 0)} w(t_x), \quad x \in X.
\]
For an integrable function \( f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \), denote \( \mu f := \int_X f(x) \mu(dx) \). With \( \beta := \frac{p}{32 + 4p} = 1/36 \), [2, Theorem 2.1] yields that \( F = F(\eta) \) satisfies
\[
d_W\left( \frac{F - EF}{\sqrt{\text{Var } F}}, N \right) \leq C \left[ \sqrt{\frac{\mu_f^2}{\text{Var } F} + \frac{\mu((\kappa + g)^{2\beta} G)}{(\text{Var } F)^{3/2}}} \right],
\]
and
\[
d_K\left( \frac{F - EF}{\sqrt{\text{Var } F}}, N \right) \leq C \left[ \sqrt{\frac{\mu_f^2}{\text{Var } F} + \frac{\sqrt{\mu_f^2} + \sqrt{\mu_f 2\beta}}{\text{Var } F} + \frac{\sqrt{\mu((\kappa + g)^{2\beta} G)}}{\text{Var } F}} \right].
\]
\[ + \frac{\mu((\kappa + g)^{2\beta}G)}{(\Var F)^{3/2}} + \left( \frac{\mu((\kappa + g)^{2\beta}G)}{\Var F} \right)^{5/4} + \left( \frac{\mu((\kappa + g)^{2\beta}G)}{\Var F} \right)^{3/2} \], \quad (4.6)\]

where \( N \) is a standard normal random variable and \( C \in (0, \infty) \) is a constant.

In the rest of this section, we estimate the summands on the right-hand side of the above two bounds. We start with a simple lemma.

**Lemma 4.1.** For all \( a \geq 0 \) and \( b > 0 \),

\[ Q(a, b) := \int_0^\infty t^a e^{-b\Lambda(t)} \theta(dt) < \infty. \quad (4.7) \]

**Proof.** Assume that \( \theta([0, c]) > 0 \) for some \( c > 0 \), since otherwise the result holds trivially. Also, it suffices to show the finiteness of the integral over \([2c, \infty)\), as

\[ \int_0^{2c} t^a e^{-b\Lambda(t)} \theta(dt) \leq (2c)^a \int_0^{2c} e^{-b\Lambda(t)} \theta(dt) < \infty \]

by (B). The inequality \( x^{a/d}e^{-x/2} \leq C \) for some constant \( C > 0 \) yields that

\[ \int_{2c}^\infty t^a e^{-b\Lambda(t)} \theta(dt) \leq \frac{C}{b^a/d} \int_{2c}^\infty \frac{t^a}{\Lambda(t)^{a/d}} e^{-b\Lambda(t)^{2/2}} \theta(dt). \]

For \( t \geq 2c \),

\[ \Lambda(t) = \int_0^t (t - s)^d \theta(ds) \geq \int_0^{t/2} (t - s)^d \theta(ds) \geq (t/2)^d \theta([0, t/2]) \geq 2^{-d} t^d \theta([0, c]). \]

Thus,

\[ \int_{2c}^\infty t^a e^{-b\Lambda(t)} \theta(dt) \leq \frac{C 2^a}{(b^a \theta([0, c]))^{a/d}} \int_{2c}^\infty e^{-b\Lambda(t)^{2/2}} \theta(dt) < \infty \]

by assumption (B), yielding the result. \( \square \)

To compute the bounds in (4.5) and (4.6), we need to bound \( \mu f_{2\beta} \) and \( \mu f_{\beta}^2 \), with \( \beta = 1/36 \). Nonetheless, we provide bounds on \( \mu f_\alpha \) and \( \mu f_\alpha^2 \) for any \( \alpha > 0 \). By Jensen’s inequality, it suffices to bound \( \mu f_\alpha^{(i)} \) and \( \mu f_\alpha^{(i)} \) for \( i = 1, 2, 3 \). This is the objective of the following three lemmas.

Notice that for \( g \) defined at (4.1) and \( Q \) defined at (4.7), we have

\[ g(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbf{1}_{y \leq x} w(t_x)^{\xi} \mu(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbf{1}_{x \in B_{vy}(tx-t_y)} w(t_x)^{\xi} dx \theta(dt_x) \]

\[ = \omega_d v_y^d \int_{t_y}^{\infty} (t_x - t_y)^d w(t_x)^{\xi} \theta(dt_x) \leq \omega_d v_y^d \int_0^{\infty} t_x^d w(t_x)^{\xi} \theta(dt_x) = \omega_d v_y^d Q(d, \zeta v_d). \]

Therefore, with \( Q_1 = Q_1(\nu_d) := Q(d, \zeta v_d)^5 \), the function \( G \) defined at (4.2) satisfies

\[ G(y) = \widetilde{M}(y) (1 + g(y)^5) \leq \omega_d^5 \widetilde{M}(y)(1 + Q_1 v_y^5d). \quad (4.8) \]
Lemma 4.2. For any $\alpha > 0$ and $f_\alpha^{(1)}$ defined at (4.4),
\[
\int_X f_\alpha^{(1)}(y) \mu(dy) \leq C_1 \bar{M}_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_X f_\alpha^{(1)}(y)^2 \mu(dy) \leq C_2 \bar{M}_2,
\]
where
\[
C_1 = \frac{\omega_\alpha^5}{\alpha} Q(0, \alpha \nu_d/2)(1 + Q_1 \nu_{5d}),
\]
and
\[
C_2 = \omega_\alpha^{12} Q(d, \alpha \nu_d/2)^2 Q(0, \alpha \nu_d)(1 + Q_1 \nu_{5d})^2 \nu_{2d}.
\]

Proof. Using $xe^{-x/2} \leq 1$ for $x \geq 0$ in the final step, we can write
\[
\int_X f_\alpha^{(1)}(y) \mu(dy) \leq \int_X \int_{y \leq x} G(x) w(t_x)^\alpha \mu(dx) \mu(dy)
= \omega_\alpha^5 \nu_d \int_X \Lambda(t_x) \bar{M}(x) \left(1 + Q_1 \nu_{5d}\right) w(t_x)^\alpha \mu(dx)
= \omega_\alpha^5 (1 + Q_1 \nu_{5d}) \bar{M}_1 \int_0^\infty \nu_d \Lambda(t_x) w(t_x)^\alpha \theta(dt_x)
\leq \omega_\alpha^5 Q(0, \alpha \nu_d/2)(1 + Q_1 \nu_{5d}) \bar{M}_1.
\]

For the second assertion, changing the order of the integrals in the second step and using (4.8) for the final step, we get
\[
\int_X f_\alpha^{(1)}(y)^2 \mu(dy) = \int_X \int_{y \leq x_1} \int_{y \leq x_2} G(x_1) w(t_{x_1})^\alpha G(x_2) w(t_{x_2})^\alpha \mu(dx_1) \mu(dx_2) \mu(dy)
= \int_X \int_X \left( \int_{y \leq x_1, y \leq x_2} \mu(dy) \right) G(x_1) G(x_2) (w(t_{x_1}) w(t_{x_2}))^\alpha \mu(dx_1) \mu(dx_2)
= \int_X \int_X \mu(L_{x_1,t_{x_1}} \cap L_{x_2,t_{x_2}}) G(x_1) G(x_2) w(t_{x_1}) w(t_{x_2})^\alpha \mu(dx_1) \mu(dx_2)
\leq \omega_\alpha^{10} (1 + Q_1 \nu_{5d})^2 \int_{R_+^2} \mu(L_{x_1,t_{x_1}} \cap L_{x_2,t_{x_2}}) \bar{M}(x_1) \bar{M}(x_2)
\times (w(t_{x_1}) w(t_{x_2}))^\alpha d(x_1, x_2) \theta^2(d(t_{x_1}, t_{x_2})).
\]

By (3.2), for any $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+$,
\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mu(L_{0,t_1} \cap L_{x,t_2}) dx = \int_0^{t_1 \wedge t_2} \theta(ds) \int_0^\infty \nu dv \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \lambda(B_{v(t_1-s)}(0) \cap B_{v(t_2-s)}(x)) dx
= \omega_\alpha^2 \int_0^\infty v^2 \nu dv \int_0^{t_1 \wedge t_2} (t_1 - s)^d (t_2 - s)^d \theta(ds)
= \omega_\alpha^2 \nu_{2d} \int_0^{t_1 \wedge t_2} (t_1 - s)^d (t_2 - s)^d \theta(ds).
\]

From (4.9), using (3.1) for the first inequality and the above equality in the second step, we obtain
\[
\int_X f_\alpha^{(1)}(y)^2 \mu(dy)
\]
where in the penultimate step, we have used the fact that $w$ is a decreasing function.

**Lemma 4.3.** For any $\alpha > 0$ and $f_\alpha^{(2)}$ defined at (4.4),

$$\int_X f_\alpha^{(2)}(y) \mu(dy) \leq C_1 \tilde{M}_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_X f_\alpha^{(2)}(y)^2 \mu(dy) \leq C_2 \tilde{M}_2$$

for

$$C_1 = \omega_d^{\alpha} Q(0, \alpha \nu_d / 2) Q(d, \alpha \nu_d / 2) (\nu_d + Q_1 \nu_{6d}),$$

and

$$C_2 = \omega_d^{\alpha} Q(0, \alpha \nu_d / 3) Q(2d, \alpha \nu_d / 3) (\nu_d + Q_1 \nu_{6d})^2.$$

**Proof.** By the definition of $f_\alpha^{(2)}$,

$$\int_X f_\alpha^{(2)}(y) \mu(dy) \leq \omega_d^{\alpha} \int_X \left( \int_{x \leq y} w(t_y)^{\alpha} \mu(dx) \right) \tilde{M}(x)(1 + Q_1 v_x^5) \mu(dx)$$

$$= \omega_d^{\alpha} \tilde{M}_1 \int_0^\infty \int_x \int_{x \leq y} w(t_y)^{\alpha} (t_y - t_x)^d \theta(dt_y) \theta(dt_x) \int_0^\infty v_x^5 (1 + Q_1 v_x^5) \nu(dv_x)$$

$$\leq \omega_d^{\alpha} (\nu_d + Q_1 \nu_{6d}) \tilde{M}_1 \int_0^\infty w(t_x)^{\alpha/2} \theta(dt_x) \int_0^\infty t_y^d w(t_y)^{\alpha/2} \theta(dt_y)$$

$$\leq \omega_d^{\alpha} Q(0, \alpha \nu_d / 2) Q(d, \alpha \nu_d / 2) (\nu_d + Q_1 \nu_{6d}) \tilde{M}_1,$$

where in the penultimate step, we have used that $w$ is decreasing. This proves the first assertion.

For the second assertion, using (4.8) in the third step and (3.1) in the final step, we have

$$\int_X f_\alpha^{(2)}(y)^2 \mu(dy) = \int_X w(t_y)^{\alpha} \left( \int_{x \leq y} G(x_1) \mu(dx_1) \int_{x_2 \leq y} G(x_2) \mu(dx_2) \right) \mu(dy)$$
Noticing that

and, arguing similarly as for

we have

For fixed \( x_1, t_{x_2} \) and \( v_{x_2} \), we have

and, arguing similarly as for \( \mu(f^{(2)}_\alpha) \) above, (4.10) yields that

Before proceeding to bound the integrals of \( f^{(3)} \), notice that, since \( \theta \) is a non-null measure,

\[
Q_{2,\alpha} = Q_{2,\alpha}(\nu_d) := \int_0^\infty t^{d-1} e^{-\frac{\alpha \nu_{d}^2}{4} \Lambda (t)} \, dt = \int_0^\infty t^{d-1} e^{-\frac{\alpha \nu_{d}^2}{4} \int_0^t (t-s)^2 \theta (ds)} \, dt \\
\leq \int_0^\infty t^{d-1} e^{-\frac{\alpha \nu_{d}^2}{4} \int_0^{t/2} (t/2)^2 \theta (ds)} \, dt = \int_0^\infty t^{d-1} e^{-\frac{\alpha \nu_{d}^2}{4} \theta ([0,t/2])) (t/2)^2} \, dt < \infty .
\]
Lemma 4.4. For any $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $f^{(3)}_\alpha$ defined at (4.4),
\[
\int_X f^{(3)}_\alpha(y) \mu(dy) \leq C_1 \tilde{M}_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_X f^{(3)}_\alpha(y)^2 \mu(dy) \leq C_2 \tilde{M}_2,
\]
where
\[
C_1 = C Q(0, \alpha \nu_d/3)^2(\nu_d + Q_1 \nu_6) \{Q_{2,\alpha} + \nu_d Q(2d, \alpha \nu_d/3)\},
\]
\[
C_2 = C Q(0, \alpha \nu_d/3)^3 \times \left[Q_{2,\alpha}^2 \nu_d(1 + Q_1 \nu_6)^2 + (\nu_d + Q_1 \nu_6)^2 + Q(2d, \alpha \nu_d/3)^2 \nu_2d(\nu_d + Q_1 \nu_6)^2\right],
\]
and $C$ is a positive constant that depends only on $d$.

Proof. With $q$ defined at (4.3), noticing that $x, y \preceq z$ implies
\[
|x - y| \leq |x - z| + |y - z| \leq t_z(v_x + v_y),
\]
we can write
\[
q(x, y) \leq e^{-\nu_d \Lambda(r_0)} \int_{r_0}^\infty \lambda(B_{v_x(t_z - t_x)}(0) \cap B_{v_y(t_z - t_y)}(y - x)) e^{-\nu_d \Lambda(t_x - \Lambda(r_0))} \theta(dt_z),
\]
where
\[
r_0 = r_0(x, y) := \frac{|x - y|}{v_x + v_y} \vee t_x \vee t_y.
\]
Therefore,
\[
q(x, y)^\alpha \leq e^{-\alpha \nu_d \Lambda(r_0)} \left(1 + \int_{r_0}^\infty \lambda(B_{v_x(t_z - t_x)}(0) \cap B_{v_y(t_z - t_y)}(y - x)) e^{-\nu_d \Lambda(t_z - \Lambda(r_0))} \theta(dt_z)\right)
\]
\[
\leq e^{-\alpha \nu_d \Lambda(r_0)} + \int_{r_0}^\infty \lambda(B_{v_x(t_z - t_x)}(0) \cap B_{v_y(t_z - t_y)}(y - x)) e^{-\nu_d \Lambda(t_z)} \theta(dt_z).
\]
(4.11)

Then, with $f^{(3)}_\alpha$ defined at (4.4),
\[
\int_X f^{(3)}_\alpha(y) \mu(dy) \leq \int_{X^2} G(x) e^{-\alpha \nu_d \Lambda(r_0)} \mu^2(dy, y))
\]
\[
+ \int_{X^2} G(x) \int_{r_0}^\infty \lambda(B_{v_x(t_z - t_x)}(0) \cap B_{v_y(t_z - t_y)}(y - x)) e^{-\alpha \nu_d \Lambda(t_z)} \theta(dt_z) \mu^2(dy, y)).
\]
(4.12)

Since $\Lambda$ is increasing,
\[
\exp\{-\alpha \nu_d \Lambda(r_0(x, y))\} \leq \exp\left\{-\frac{\alpha \nu_d}{3} \left[\Lambda\left(\frac{|x - y|}{v_x + v_y}\right) + \Lambda(t_x) + \Lambda(t_y)\right]\right\},
\]
(4.13)
and by a change of variable and passing to polar coordinates, we obtain
\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\alpha \nu_d \Lambda(\frac{|x|}{v_x + v_y})} dx \leq d \omega_d(v_x + v_y)^d \int_0^\infty \rho^{d-1} e^{-\alpha \nu_d \Lambda(\rho)} d\rho = d \omega_d(v_x + v_y)^d Q_{2,\alpha}.
\]
(4.14)
Thus, using (4.8), (4.13) and (4.14), we can bound the first summand on the right-hand side of (4.12) as
\[
\begin{align*}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(x) e^{-\alpha \nu d \Lambda(r_0)} \mu^2(d(x, y)) \\
\leq \omega_d^5 \int_0^\infty w(t_x)^{\alpha/3} dt_x \int_0^\infty w(t_y)^{\alpha/3} dt_y \\
\times \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{M}(x) dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (1 + Q_1 v_5^d) \frac{|x - y|}{v_x + v_y}^{\alpha/3} dy \nu^2(d(v_x, v_y)) \\
\leq d\omega_d^6 Q(0, \alpha \nu d/3)^2 Q_{2, \alpha} \tilde{M}_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (1 + Q_1 v_5^d) (v_x + v_y)^d \nu^2(d(v_x, v_y)) \\
\leq d^2 \omega_d^6 Q(0, \alpha \nu d/3)^2 Q_{2, \alpha} (\nu_d + Q_1 \nu_d) \tilde{M}_1,
\end{align*}
\]

where for the final step, we have used Jensen’s inequality and the fact that $\nu_d \nu_5 d \leq \nu_0 d$, which is a consequence of positive association, since $v^d$ and $v_5^d$ are both increasing functions of $v$. Arguing similarly for the second summand in (4.12), using (4.8) in the first and (3.2) in the second step, we obtain
\[
\begin{align*}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(x) \int_{r_0}^{\infty} \lambda(B_{v_y(t_x - t_y)}(0) \cap B_{v_y(t_x - t_y)}(y - x)) e^{-\alpha \nu d \Lambda(t_x)} \theta(t_x) \mu^2(d(x, y)) \\
\leq \omega_d^5 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{M}(x) dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (1 + Q_1 v_5^d) \int_{t_x \vee t_y}^\infty w(t_z)^{\alpha/3} dt_z \\
\times \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \lambda(B_{v_y(t_x - t_y)}(0) \cap B_{v_y(t_x - t_y)}(y)) dy \right) \theta(t_z) \nu^2(d(t_x, t_y)) \nu^2(d(v_x, v_y)) \\
\leq \omega_d^7 \tilde{M}_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (1 + Q_1 v_5^d) v_x^d v_y^d \nu^2(d(v_x, v_y)) \\
\times \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nu_d^2 w(t_z)^{\alpha/3} w(t_x)^{\alpha/3} w(t_y)^{\alpha/3} \theta^3(d(t_z, t_x, t_y)) \right) \\
\leq \omega_d^7 Q(0, \alpha \nu d/3)^2 Q(2d, \alpha \nu d/3) \nu_d (\nu_d + Q_1 \nu_d) \tilde{M}_1.
\end{align*}
\]

This concludes the proof of the first assertion.

Next we prove the second assertion. For ease of notation, we will drop obvious subscripts and write $y = (y, s, v)$, $x_1 = (x_1, t_1, u_1)$ and $x_2 = (x_2, t_2, u_2)$. Using (4.11), write
\[
\begin{align*}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( f_{\alpha}^{(3)}(y)^2 \mu(y) \right) = & \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} G(x_1) G(x_2) q(x_1, y) q(x_2, y) \mu^3(d(x_1, x_2, y)) \\
\leq & \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} G(x_1) G(x_2) (J_1 + 2J_2 + J_3) \mu^3(d(x_1, x_2, y)), \quad (4.15)
\end{align*}
\]

with
\[
J_1 = J_1(x_1, x_2, y) := \exp \left\{ -\alpha \nu d \left[ \Lambda(r_0(x_1, y)) + \Lambda(r_0(x_2, y)) \right] \right\},
\]
\[ J_2 = J_2(x_1, x_2, y) := e^{-\alpha_d \Lambda(r_0(x_1, y))} \int_{s \vee t_2}^{\infty} \lambda(B_{u_2(r-t_2)}(0) \cap B_{v(r-s)}(y - x_2)) e^{-\alpha_d \Lambda(r)} \theta(dr), \]

\[ J_3 = J_3(x_1, x_2, y) := \int_{s \vee t_2}^{\infty} \lambda(B_{u_2(r-t_2)}(0) \cap B_{v(r-s)}(y - x_2)) e^{-\alpha_d \Lambda(r)} \theta(dr) \times \int_{s \vee t_1}^{\infty} \lambda(B_{u_1(r-t_1)}(0) \cap B_{v(r-s)}(y - x_1)) e^{-\alpha_d \Lambda(r)} \theta(dr). \]

By (4.14),

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp \{ - \frac{\alpha d}{3} \left[ \Lambda \left( \frac{|y|}{u_1 + v} \right) + \Lambda \left( \frac{|x - y|}{u_2 + v} \right) \right] \} \, dx dy \\
\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp \{ - \frac{\alpha d}{3} \Lambda \left( \frac{|y|}{u_1 + v} \right) \} \, dy \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp \{ - \frac{\alpha d}{3} \Lambda \left( \frac{|x|}{u_2 + v} \right) \} \, dx \\
\leq d^2 \omega_1^2 (u_1 + v)^d (u_2 + v)^d Q_{2, \alpha}^2.
\]

Hence, using (4.8) and (4.13) for the first step and the inequality (3.1) for the second one, we have

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(x_1) G(x_2) J_1 \, \mu^3(dx_1, x_2, y) \\
\leq \omega_1^4 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{M}(x_1) \tilde{M}(x_2) \, dx_1 \, dx_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\frac{\alpha d}{3} \left[ \Lambda(t_1) + \Lambda(t_2) + 2 \Lambda(s) \right]} \theta^3 \, (d(t_1, t_2, s)) \\
\times \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + Q_1 u_1^5) (1 + Q_1 u_2^5) e^{-\frac{\alpha d}{3} \left[ \Lambda \left( \frac{|x_1 - y|}{u_1 + v} \right) + \Lambda \left( \frac{|x_2 - y|}{u_2 + v} \right) \right]} \, dy \nu^3 \, (d(u_1, u_2, v)) \\
\leq d^2 \omega_1^{12} Q_{2, \alpha}^2 Q(0, \alpha d/3)^3 \tilde{M}_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (u_1 + v)^d (u_2 + v)^d (1 + Q_1 u_1^5) (1 + Q_1 u_2^5) \nu^3 \, (d(u_1, u_2, v)) \\
\leq c_1 Q_{2, \alpha}^2 Q(0, \alpha d/3)^3 [\nu_2(1 + Q_1 \nu_5)^2 + (\nu_2 + Q_1 \nu_6)^2] \tilde{M}_2
\]

for some constant \( c_1 \) depending only on \( d \), where we have used monotonicity of \( Q \) in the penultimate step and Jensen’s inequality along with positive association for the final step.

Next, we bound the second summand in (4.15). Using (3.2) in the second step, monotonicity of \( \Lambda \) and (4.13) in the third step and (4.14) in the final one, we have

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} J_2(x_1, x_2, y) \, dx_2 \, dy \\
= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\alpha_d \Lambda(r_0(x_1, y))} \, dy \int_{s \vee t_2}^{\infty} \lambda(B_{u_2(r-t_2)}(0) \cap B_{v(r-s)}(y - x_2)) \, dx_2 \, e^{-\alpha_d \Lambda(r)} \theta(dr) \\
= \omega_1^2 u_2^d v^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\alpha_d \Lambda(r_0(x_1, y))} \, dy \int_{s \vee t_2}^{\infty} (r - t_2)^d (r - s)^d e^{-\alpha_d \Lambda(r)} \theta(dr) \\
\leq \omega_1^2 u_2^d v^d \exp \left\{ -\frac{\alpha d}{3} \left[ \Lambda(t_1) + \Lambda(t_2) + 2 \Lambda(s) \right] \right\} \\
\times \int_{0}^{\infty} r^{2d} e^{-\alpha_d \Lambda(r)^3/3} \theta(dr) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp \left\{ -\frac{\alpha d}{3} \Lambda \left( \frac{|x_1 - y|}{u_1 + v} \right) \right\} \, dy
\]
Thus,

\[
\begin{align*}
20 \text{C.BHATTACHARJEE, I.MOLCHANOV, AND R.TURIN} \\
\text{Arguing as above, } \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(x_1)G(x_2) J_2(x_1, x_2, y) \mu^3(d(x_1, x_2, y)) \\
\leq \omega_d^{10} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \bar{M}(x_1)^2 dx_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + Q_1 u_1^{5d})(1 + Q_1 u_2^{5d}) \\
\times \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} J_2(x_1, x_2, y)dx_2 dy \right) \theta^3(d(t_1, t_2, s)) \nu^3(d(u_1, u_2, s)) \\
\leq \omega_d^{13} Q_{2, \alpha}Q(2d, \alpha \nu_d/3) \bar{M} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\alpha \nu_d \Lambda(t_1) + \Lambda(t_2) + 2 \Lambda(s)} \theta^3(d(t_1, t_2, s)) \\
\times \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nu^3(d(u_1 + v)^d(1 + Q_1 u_1^{5d})(u_2^d + Q_1 u_2^{6d})\nu^3(d(u_1, u_2, v)) \\
\leq c_2 Q_{2, \alpha}Q(2d, \alpha \nu_d/3)Q(0, \alpha \nu_d/3) \left[ \nu_d + Q_1 \nu_{6d} \right]^2 + \nu_2d(\nu_d + Q_1 \nu_{6d})(1 + Q_1 \nu_{5d}) \bar{M} \\
\text{for some constant } c_2 \text{ depending only on } d. \text{ Finally, we bound the third summand in (4.15). Arguing as above, }
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} J_3(x_1, x_2, y)dx_2 dy \\
= \int_{s \sqrt{t_1}}^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \lambda(B_{u_1}(\rho-t_1) \cap B_{\nu}(\rho-s)(y-x_1))dy e^{-\alpha \nu_d \Lambda(\rho)} \theta(d\rho) \\
\times \int_{s \sqrt{t_2}}^\infty \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \lambda(B_{u_2}(\rho-t_2)(y-x_2))dx_2 \right) e^{-\alpha \nu_d \Lambda(\rho)} \theta(d\rho) \\
= \omega_d^4 u_1^d u_2^d v^2 \int_{s \sqrt{t_2}}^\infty (\rho-t_1)^d(\rho-s)^d e^{-\alpha \nu_d \Lambda(\rho)} \theta(d\rho) \int_{s \sqrt{t_2}}^\infty (r-t_1)^d(r-s)^d e^{-\alpha \nu_d \Lambda(\rho)} \theta(d\rho) \\
\leq \omega_d^4 u_1^d u_2^d v^2 \int_{s \sqrt{t_2}}^\infty r^d e^{-\alpha \nu_d \Lambda(r)/3} \theta(dr) \\
\leq \omega_d^4 Q(2d, \alpha \nu_d/3)^2 u_1^d u_2^d v^2 \exp \left\{ -\alpha \nu_d \left[ \Lambda(t_1) + \Lambda(t_2) + 2 \Lambda(s) \right] \right\}.
\end{align*}
\]

Thus,

\[
\begin{align*}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} G(x_1)G(x_2) J_3(x_1, x_2, y) \mu^3(d(x_1, x_2, y)) \\
\leq \omega_d^{10} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \bar{M}(x_1)^2 dx_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + Q_1 u_1^{5d})(1 + Q_1 u_2^{5d}) \\
\times \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} J_3(x_1, x_2, y)dx_2 dy \right) \theta^3(d(t_1, t_2, s)) \nu^3(d(u_1, u_2, v)) \\
\leq \omega_d^{14} Q(2d, \alpha \nu_d/3)^2 \bar{M} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + Q_1 u_1^{5d})(1 + Q_1 u_2^{5d}) u_1^d u_2^d v^2 \nu^3(d(u_1, u_2, v))
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\times \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^4} e^{-\frac{\alpha v_d}{3}[\Lambda(t_1) + \Lambda(t_2) + 2\Lambda(s)]} g^3(d(t_1, t_2, s))
\]
\[
\leq \omega_d^{14} Q(2d, \alpha v_d/3)^2 Q(0, \alpha v_d/3)^3 v_{2d}(v_d + Q_1 \nu_{2d})^2 \tilde{M}_2.
\]
Combining the bound for the summands on the right-hand side of (4.15) and noticing by (3.1) that
\[
Q_{2, 1}(2d, \alpha v_d/3) \left[ v_d(v_d + Q_1 \nu_{2d})^2 + v_{2d}(v_d + Q_1 \nu_{2d})(1 + Q_1 \nu_{2d}) \right]
\]
\[
\leq Q_{2, 1}(2d, \alpha v_d/3) \left[ \sqrt{v_{2d}(v_d + Q_1 \nu_{2d})^2} + v_{2d}(v_d + Q_1 \nu_{2d})(1 + Q_1 \nu_{2d}) \right]
\]
\[
\leq Q_{2, 1}(2d, \alpha v_d/3)[v_{2d}(1 + Q_1 \nu_{2d})^2 + (v_d + Q_1 \nu_{2d})^2] + Q(2d, \alpha v_d/3)^2 v_{2d}(v_d + Q_1 \nu_{2d})^2
\]
yields the desired conclusion. \qed

To compute the bounds in (4.5) and (4.6), we now only need to bound \(\mu((\kappa + g)^{2\beta} G)\).

**Lemma 4.5.** For \(\alpha \in (0, 1]\),
\[
\mu((\kappa + g)^{\alpha} G) \leq \omega_d^{5+\alpha} (C_1 + C_2 + C_3) \tilde{M}_1,
\]
where
\[
C_1 = Q(0, \alpha v_d)(1 + Q_1 \nu_{2d}) ,
\]
\[
C_2 = v_{\alpha d} Q(0, \alpha \zeta v_d/2) Q(d, \zeta v_d/2)^{\alpha},
\]
and \(C_3 = v_{(5+\alpha)d} Q(0, (5 + \alpha)\zeta v_d/2) Q(d, \zeta v_d/2)^{5+\alpha}\).

**Proof.** Define the function
\[
\psi(t) := \int_t^\infty (s - t)^d e^{-\zeta v_d(s)} \theta(ds),
\]
so that \(g(x) = \omega_d v_x^d \psi(t_x)\) and
\[
G(x) \leq \omega_d^5 \tilde{M}(x) \left( 1 + v_x^{5d} \psi(t_x)^5 \right).
\]
By subadditivity, it suffices to separately bound
\[
\int_X \kappa^\alpha(x) G(x) \mu(dx) \quad \text{and} \quad \int_X g(x)^\alpha G(x) \mu(dx).
\]
First, observe by (4.8) that
\[
\int_X \kappa^\alpha(x) G(x) \mu(dx) \leq \omega_d^5 \int_X \tilde{M}(x)(1 + Q_1 \nu_{2d}) e^{-\alpha v_d \Lambda(t_x)} dx \theta(dt_x) \nu(dv_x)
\]
\[
= \omega_d^5 Q(0, \alpha v_d)(1 + Q_1 \nu_{2d}) \tilde{M}_1 = \omega_d^5 C_1 \tilde{M}_1.
\]
For the second integral, write
\[
\int g(x)^\alpha G(x) \mu(dx) \leq \omega_d^{5+\alpha} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{M}(x) dx \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \psi(t_x)^\alpha v_x^{\alpha d} (1 + \psi(t_x)^5 v_x^{5d}) \nu(dv_x) \theta(dt_x)
\]
\[
= \omega_d^{5+\alpha} \tilde{M}_1 \left[ \nu_{\alpha d} \int_0^\infty \psi(t)^\alpha \theta(dt) + \nu_{(5+\alpha)d} \int_0^\infty \psi(t)^{5+\alpha} \theta(dt) \right].
\]
Note that, for any \( a > 0 \),
\[
\int_0^\infty \psi(t)^a \theta(dt) = \int_0^\infty \left( \int_t^\infty (s-t)^d e^{-\zeta \nu_d \Lambda(s)} \theta(ds) \right)^a \theta(dt)
\leq \int_0^\infty e^{-a \zeta \nu_d \Lambda(t)/2} \theta(dt) \left( \int_0^\infty s^d e^{-\zeta \nu_d \Lambda(s)/2} \theta(ds) \right)^a
= Q(0, a \zeta /2) Q(0, \zeta /2)^a,
\]
where we have used the monotonicity of \( \Lambda \) in the second step. Hence,
\[
\int g(x)^a G(x) \mu(dx) \leq \omega_d^{5+a} (C_2 + C_3) \tilde{M}_1.
\]
Combining with the above bound yields the result. \( \square \)

**Proofs of Theorems 2.1 and 2.3:** Theorem 2.1 follows from (4.5) and (4.6) upon using Lemmas 4.1–4.5 and including the factors involving moments of the speed into the constants.

The assertion in Theorem 2.3 follows by combining Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 2.2. \( \square \)

**Proof of Theorem 2.4.** Let \( \theta \) be given at (2.5). Then, as in the proof of Proposition 2.2,
\[
\Lambda(t) = B \omega_d t^{d+\tau+1},
\]
where \( B := B(d+1, \tau+1) \). By its definition (4.7), for \( a \geq 0 \) and \( b > 0 \),
\[
Q(a, b) = \int_0^\infty t^a e^{-a \omega_d B t^{d+\tau+1}} dt = \frac{(b \omega_d B)^{-\frac{a+b+1}{d+\tau+1}}}{d+\tau+1} \Gamma \left( \frac{a+\tau+1}{d+\tau+1} \right) = C_1(a, \tau) b^{-\frac{a+b+1}{d+\tau+1}},
\]
where
\[
C_1(a, \tau) := \frac{(\omega_d B)^{-\frac{a+b+1}{d+\tau+1}}}{d+\tau+1} \Gamma \left( \frac{a+\tau+1}{d+\tau+1} \right).
\]
Then
\[
Q_1 := Q(d, \zeta \nu_d)^5 = C_1(d, \tau) \zeta^{-5} \nu_d^{-5}.
\]
Similarly,
\[
Q_{2, \alpha} := \frac{1}{d+\tau+1} \Gamma \left( \frac{d}{d+\tau+1} \right) (\alpha B \omega_d \nu_d/3)^{-\frac{d}{d+\tau+1}} = C_2(\alpha, \tau) \nu_d^{-\frac{d}{d+\tau+1}},
\]
where
\[
C_2(\alpha, \tau) := \frac{1}{d+\tau+1} \Gamma \left( \frac{d}{d+\tau+1} \right) (\alpha B \omega_d/3)^{-\frac{d}{d+\tau+1}}.
\]
Recall the parameters \( p = 1, \beta = 1/36 \) and \( \zeta = 1/50 \). Lemmas 4.2–4.5 in combination with the above estimates along with the inequality \( \nu_a \nu_b a \leq \nu_a b \) for any \( 0 < a < 6d \) yield that there exists a constant \( C \) depending only on \( d \) and \( \tau \) such that
\[
\int_X f_{2, \beta}^{(1)}(y) \mu(dy) \leq C \nu_d^{-\frac{d}{d+\tau+1}} \left( 1 + \nu_{5d} \nu_d^{-5} \right) \tilde{M}_1 \leq C \nu_d^{-\frac{d}{d+\tau+1}} \left( 1 + \nu_{6d} \nu_d^{-6} \right) \tilde{M}_1,
\]
\[
\int_X f_{\beta}^{(1)}(y)^2 \mu(dy) \leq C \nu_d^{-\frac{d}{d+\tau+1}} \nu_{2d} \nu_d^{-2} \left( 1 + \nu_{5d} \nu_d^{-5} \right)^2 \tilde{M}_2.
\]
\[
\leq C \nu_d^{-\frac{r+1}{d+1}} \nu_{6d} \nu_d^{-6} \left(1 + \nu_{6d} \nu_d^{-6}\right)^2 \tilde{M}_2,
\]
\[
\int_X f^{(2)}_{2\beta}(y) \mu(dy) \leq C \nu_d^{-\frac{r+1}{d+1}} \left(1 + \nu_{6d} \nu_d^{-6}\right) \tilde{M}_1,
\]
\[
\int_X f^{(2)}_\beta(y)^2 \mu(dy) \leq C \nu_d^{-\frac{r+1}{d+1}} \left(1 + \nu_{6d} \nu_d^{-6}\right)^2 \tilde{M}_2,
\]
\[
\int_X f^{(3)}_{2\beta}(y) \mu(dy) \leq C \nu_d^{-\frac{r+1}{d+1}} \left(1 + \nu_{6d} \nu_d^{-6}\right) \tilde{M}_1,
\]
\[
\int_X f^{(3)}_\beta(y)^2 \mu(dy) \leq C \nu_d^{-\frac{r+1}{d+1}} \left[\nu_{2d} \nu_d^{-2}(1 + \nu_{6d} \nu_d^{-5})^2 + \left(1 + \nu_{6d} \nu_d^{-6}\right)^2 + \nu_{2d} \nu_d^{-2}(1 + \nu_{6d} \nu_d^{-6})^2\right]
\leq C \nu_d^{-\frac{r+1}{d+1}} \left(1 + \nu_{6d} \nu_d^{-6}\right)^3 \tilde{M}_2.
\]
Finally, since \(2\beta < 1\),
\[
\mu((\kappa + g)^{2\beta}G) \leq C \left(\nu_d^{\frac{r+1}{d+1}} \left(1 + \nu_{5d} \nu_d^{-5}\right) + \nu_{2\beta d} \nu_d^{-\frac{r+1}{d+1} - 2\beta} + \nu_{(5+2\beta)d} \nu_d^{-\frac{r+1}{d+1} - 5 - 2\beta}\right) \tilde{M}_1
\leq C \nu_d^{-\frac{r+1}{d+1}} \left(1 + \nu_{6d} \nu_d^{-6}\right) \tilde{M}_1,
\]
where \(C\) is a constant depending only on \(d\) and \(\tau\). Plugging the above estimates in (4.5) and (4.6) and using Proposition 2.2 to lower bound the variance yield the desired bounds. \(\square\)

**Proof of Corollary 2.5:** Define the Poisson process \(\eta^{(s)}\) with intensity measure \(\mu^{(s)} = \lambda \otimes \theta \otimes \nu^{(s)}\), where \(\nu^{(s)}(A) = \nu(s^{-1/d} A)\) for all Borel sets \(A\). It is straightforward to see that the set of locations of exposed points of \(\eta_s\) has the same distribution as of those of \(\eta^{(s)}\), multiplied by \(s^{-1/d}\), i.e.,
\[
\{x : x \in \eta_s \text{ is exposed}\} = d s^{-1/d} \{x : x \in \eta^{(s)} \text{ is exposed}\}
\]
with \(=_{d}\) denoting equality in distribution. Hence, the functional \(F(\eta_s)\) has the same distribution as \(F_s(\eta^{(s)})\), where \(F_s\) is defined as in (2.1) for the weight function \(h_s(x) = h(s^{-1/d} x)\). It is easy to check that for \(k \in \mathbb{N}\), the \(k\)-th moment of \(\nu^{(s)}\) is given by \(\nu^{(s)}_k = s^{k/d} \nu_k\), and the quantities constructed from \(h_s\) become \(\tilde{M}^{(s)}_i = s \tilde{M}_i\), \(i = 1, 2\), and \(h^{(2)}_s = sh^{(2)}\). The result now follows directly from Theorem 2.4. \(\square\)
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