

# On the Maximal Multiplicity of Block Sizes in a Random Set Partition

L. MUTAFCHIEV<sup>\*†</sup> AND M. SAVOV<sup>‡</sup>

## Abstract

We study the asymptotic behavior of the maximal multiplicity  $M_n = M_n(\sigma)$  of the block sizes in a set partition  $\sigma$  of  $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , assuming that  $\sigma$  is chosen uniformly at random from the set of all such partitions. It is known that, for large  $n$ , the blocks of a random set partition are typically of size  $W = W(n)$ , with  $We^W = n$ . We show that, over subsequences  $\{n_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  of the sequence of the natural numbers,  $M_{n_k}$ , appropriately normalized, converges weakly, as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , to  $\max\{Z_1, Z_2 - u\}$ , where  $Z_1$  and  $Z_2$  are independent copies of a standard normal random variable. The subsequences  $\{n_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ , where the weak convergence is observed, and the quantity  $u$  depend on the fractional part  $f_n$  of the function  $W(n)$ . In particular, we establish that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \min\{f_{n_k}, 1 - f_{n_k}\} \sqrt{n_k} / \log^{7/4} n_k = u \in [0, \infty) \cup \{\infty\}$ . The behavior of the largest multiplicity  $M_n$  is in a striking contrast to the similar statistic of integer partitions of  $n$ . A heuristic explanation of this phenomenon is also given.

**Key words:** set partition, block size, maximum multiplicity, saddle point method, limiting distribution

**Mathematics Subject classifications:** 05A18, 60C05, 60F05

## 1 Introduction

A partition  $\sigma$  of the set  $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  is a representation of  $[n]$  as a union of disjoint, non-empty subsets called blocks. A block has size  $j$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , if

---

<sup>\*</sup>American University in Bulgaria, 1 "Georgi Izmirliiev" Square, Blagoevgrad 2700, Bulgaria  
E-mail: Ljuben@aubg.edu

<sup>†</sup>Institute of Mathematics and Informatics, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, "Akad. Georgi Bonchev" bl. 8, Sofia 1113, Bulgaria

<sup>‡</sup>Institute of Mathematics and Informatics, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, "Akad. Georgi Bonchev" bl. 8, Sofia 1113, Bulgaria E-mail: mladensavov@math.bas.bg

it has cardinality  $j$ . A partition  $\sigma$  of  $[n]$  obviously defines the representation:

$$n = \sum_{j=1}^n j\mu(j), \quad (1)$$

where  $\mu(j) \geq 0$  denotes the multiplicity (frequency) of blocks of size  $j$ . The total number of set partitions of  $[n]$ ,  $B_n$ , is called  $n$ -th Bell number. It is well known that

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{B_n}{n!} x^n = e^{e^x - 1}, \quad (2)$$

where  $x$  is a formal (complex) variable and  $B_0 := 1$  (regarding that  $\emptyset$  has exactly one partition - the empty partition). Moreover, (2) implies the following formula for Bell numbers:

$$B_n = e^{-1} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{k^n}{k!}.$$

An asymptotic representation of the numbers  $B_n$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , was found first by Moser and Wyman [9]. We have

$$\frac{B_n}{n!} \sim \frac{e^{e^W - 1}}{W^n \sqrt{2\pi W(W+1)} e^W}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $W = W(n)$  is the unique positive root of the equation

$$We^W = n, \quad (3)$$

from which one can get

$$W(n) = \log n - \log \log n + O\left(\frac{\log \log n}{\log n}\right), \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4)$$

For more details, we refer the reader, e.g., to [3, Chapter 6] and [5, Chapter VIII.4].

Further, we introduce the uniform probability measure  $P$  on the set of all partitions of  $[n]$  assuming that the probability  $1/B_n$  is assigned to each  $n$ -set partition  $\sigma$ . In this way, each numerical characteristic of  $\sigma$  becomes a random variable (a statistic in the sense of the random generation of set partitions of  $[n]$ ). In the following, we will be interested in the asymptotic behavior of the maximal multiplicity of the block sizes defined by

$$M_n = M_n(\sigma) := \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \mu(j), \quad (5)$$

where the multiplicities  $\mu(j)$  were defined by (1). From one side, our study is motivated by the asymptotic results related to limiting distributions of several set partition statistics. On the other hand, we are interested in a comparison between the typical behavior of  $M_n$  for large  $n$  and that one of the similar

statistic for the integer partitions of  $n$  obtained in [10]. In the brief survey that we present below we summarize several important results on the asymptotic enumeration and the probabilistic study of set partitions.

Harper [8] was apparently the first who has studied set partitions using a probabilistic approach. As a matter of fact, he found an appropriate normalization for the total number of blocks  $Y_n$  in a random partition of  $[n]$  and showed that  $(\log n)Y_n/\sqrt{n} - \sqrt{n}$  converges weakly, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , to a standard normal random variable. Sachkov [14], [15] obtained a multidimensional local limit theorem for the multiplicities of blocks of sizes  $1, 2, \dots, k$  ( $k$  being fixed) and found that the largest block size is asymptotic to  $eW$  (see (3) and (4)) plus a doubly exponentially distributed random variable. De Laurentis and Pittel [4] proved that most of the blocks are likely to have sizes close to  $W$  ( $\sim \log n$ ), see (4), and the process counting those typical blocks converges - in terms of finite dimensional distributions - to the Brownian Bridge process. Another important statistic of random set partitions is the total number  $\tilde{Y}_n$  of distinct block sizes. Odlyzko and Richmond [12] showed that  $\tilde{Y}_n$  is asymptotic to  $eW \sim e \log n$  both in probability and in the mean, while Arratia and Tavaré [2] extended this result to the convergence of  $\tilde{Y}_n$  in  $r$ -th mean for every  $r \geq 1$ . In addition Goh and Schmutz [7] determined the limiting behavior of the probability that the random set partition has at least one block of every size less than the largest block size (a gap-free partition).

A unified approach to a broad class of random combinatorial structures problems was proposed by Arratia and Tavaré [2]. It covers also the case of random set partitions. For more details, we also refer the reader to the subsequent book [1] (see, in particular, its Chapters 3 and 7). Their approach is based on a possibility of interpreting the multiplicities of the blocks in a random partition of  $[n]$  as a specially constructed sequence of independent and Poisson distributed random variables  $\{V_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ , whose parameters are  $W^j/j!$ , conditioned on the event  $\{\sum_{j \geq 1} jV_j = n\}$ . Such conditioning has been also used to study many other combinatorial structures (e.g., permutations, mappings of a finite set into itself, integer partitions, etc.; see [1]). Among many other results, Arratia and Tavaré [2] obtained estimates for the total variation distance between proper segments of block size multiplicities and such segments from the sequence  $\{V_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ . In a subsequent study Pittel [13] confirmed some conjectures of Arratia and Tavaré [2], re-derived Sachkov's limiting distribution of the maximal block size and obtained a functional limit theorem for a continuous time process composed from block sizes of order

$$k(t) = \begin{cases} \lfloor W + \Phi^{-1}(t)W^{1/2} \rfloor & \text{if } t \in (0, 1/2), \\ \lceil W + \Phi^{-1}(t)W^{1/2} \rceil & \text{if } t \in (1/2, 1]. \end{cases}$$

( $\Phi(t)$  is the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal random variable). A weak convergence to the Brownian bridge process was established.

Our aim in this paper is to determine asymptotically, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , the distribution of the maximal multiplicity of block sizes  $M_n$ , defined by (5). To state our main result, we need to introduce some notations. With  $W = W(n)$  given

by (3) and (4), we set

$$d_n := \lfloor W(n) \rfloor, \quad (6)$$

$$f_n := W(n) - d_n \in (0, 1), \quad (7)$$

$$R_n := \frac{W^{d_n}}{d_n!}, \quad (8)$$

$$\vartheta_n := \min \{f_n, 1 - f_n\}. \quad (9)$$

Furthermore, let  $Z_1$  and  $Z_2$  denote two independent copies of the standard normal random variable.

We organize the paper as follows. Section 2 contains some auxiliary facts related to the generating functions that we need further. In Section 3 we prove the following limit theorem for  $M_n$ .

**Theorem 1.** *We have the following scenarios.*

(i) *If  $\vartheta_{n_k} = o\left(\frac{\log^{7/4} n_k}{\sqrt{n_k}}\right)$  over a subsequence  $\{n_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ , then  $\frac{M_{n_k} - R_{n_k}}{\sqrt{R_{n_k}}}$  converges weakly, as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , to  $\max \{Z_1, Z_2\}$ .*

(ii) *If  $\frac{\log^{7/4} n_k}{\sqrt{n_k}} = o(\vartheta_{n_k})$  over a subsequence  $\{n_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ , then  $\frac{M_{n_k} - R_{n_k}}{\sqrt{R_{n_k}}}$  converges weakly, as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , to  $Z_1$ .*

(iii) *If  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\right)^{1/4} \vartheta_{n_k} \frac{\sqrt{n_k}}{\log^{7/4} n_k} = u \in (0, \infty)$  over a subsequence  $\{n_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ , then  $\frac{M_{n_k} - R_{n_k}}{\sqrt{R_{n_k}}}$  converges weakly, as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , to  $\max \{Z_1, Z_2 - u\}$ .*

*In addition, all these three cases are possible.*

We believe that the following comments on the comparison between this result and the corresponding one for random integer partitions would be helpful.

It is shown in [10] that the maximal part size multiplicity in a random integer partition of  $n$ , when appropriately normalized, converges weakly, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , to the maximum of an infinite sequence of independent and exponentially distributed random variables. Theorem 1 establishes completely different limiting behavior for  $M_n$ . The next heuristic explains this phenomenon.

We recall that the conditioning relation, given briefly above and stated in detail in [1, Chapter 2] holds in both cases of random set partitions of  $[n]$  and random integer partitions of  $n$ . So, in both cases the joint distribution of the multiplicities is transferred to the joint distribution of independent random variables  $\{V_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ , conditioned upon  $\{\sum_{j \geq 1} jV_j = n\}$ . For set partitions,  $V_j$  are Poisson distributed variables whose means are equal to  $\lambda_j = W^j/j!$  and tend to infinity as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . For integer partitions,  $V_j$  are geometrically distributed with parameters  $e^{-j\pi/\sqrt{6n}}$ . The last fact was first established by Fristedt [6]. These relationships explain the major difference in the multidimensional limit laws of the multiplicities of set partitions and integer partitions. In fact, Poisson distributions with growing parameters are well approximated by the normal law, which is shown in the set partition case by Sachkov [15, Chapter IV, Theorem 4.2], while the geometric distributions are asymptotically close to the exponential law confirmed for integer partitions by Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 in [6]. Hence,

the limiting distribution of the maximum multiplicity in set partitions is based on the normal distribution, while for integer partitions we observe the effect of the exponential distribution.

Furthermore, Theorem 1 shows that the limiting behavior of  $M_n$  depends on the random variable  $V_{d_n}$  and its two closest neighbors in the sequence  $\{V_j\}_{j \geq 1}$  at most. This property is based on the fact that, for different  $j$ 's, the variables  $V_j$  converge to the standard normal random variable under different normalization depending on their parameters  $\lambda_j$ . One can easily observe the fast growth of the ratios  $\lambda_{j+1}/\lambda_j$  for  $j \leq d_n - 1$  and their fast decrease for  $j \geq d_n + 1$ . This implies that the normalization of  $M_n$  must only depend on the maximum Poisson parameter and eventually on its neighbors in the sequence  $\{\lambda_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ , i.e., on  $\lambda_{d_n} = R_n$  given by (8) and possibly on  $\lambda_{d_n \pm 1}$ . The participation of the fractional part  $f_n$  of  $W$  in Theorem 1 is due to the application of the Stirling's formula to the parameter  $\lambda_{d_n}$ . In the case of integer partitions we observe a completely different phenomenon: the multiplicity of part  $j$  multiplied by its size  $j$  tends weakly to one and the same exponentially distributed random variable with the same normalization (equal to  $\sqrt{6n}/\pi$ ) for all  $j \geq 1$ ; see [6, Theorems 2.1 and 2.2]. Hence all parts of a random integer partition contribute to the limiting behavior of the maximal part size in a likely manner that depends only on the part size  $j$  itself.

In our proof we use the saddle point method. We encounter several technical difficulties in its application since the underlying integrand is of the form of a product  $f(x)g(x)$ . This case was discussed in detail by Odlyzko in his survey [11, p.1183]. Our integrand involves the set partition generating function, i.e., we have  $f(x) = e^{e^x - 1}$ . The second factor depends on an extra parameter  $m = m(n)$ , i.e.,  $g(x) = g(x; m)$ . The latter one remains bounded when  $x$  is near to the saddle point  $x = W$ . We establish an asymptotic of the general type as it is given in [11, formula (12.43), p. 1183]. Probabilistic and asymptotic analysis of  $g(x; m)|_{x=W}$  in turn yields the results of Theorem 1.

## 2 Preliminaries

We start with a generating function identity for the cumulative distribution function of the maximal block size multiplicity  $M_n$  defined by (5).

**Lemma 1.** *For any formal (complex) variable  $x$  and any  $m \geq 1$ , we have*

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{B_n}{n!} P(M_n \leq m) x^n = e^{e^x - 1} F_m(x),$$

where, by convention,  $B_0 = P(M_0 \leq 0) = 1$  and

$$\begin{aligned} F_m(x) &= \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \left( 1 - e^{-x^j/j!} \sum_{k>m} \left( \frac{x^j}{j!} \right)^k \frac{1}{k!} \right) \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \left( e^{-x^j/j!} \sum_{k=0}^m \left( \frac{x^j}{j!} \right)^k \frac{1}{k!} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

*Proof.* The proof is based on a general identity established in [15, Chapter III, formula (0.14)]. We set therein  $\Lambda_j = \{0, 1, \dots, m\}$  for all  $j \geq 1$  and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{B_n}{n!} P(M_n \leq m) x^n \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{k=0}^m \left( \frac{x^j}{j!} \right)^k \frac{1}{k!} \right) = \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \left( e^{x^j/j!} - \sum_{k>m} \left( \frac{x^j}{j!} \right)^k \frac{1}{k!} \right) \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} e^{x^j/j!} \left( 1 - e^{-x^j/j!} \sum_{k>m} \left( \frac{x^j}{j!} \right)^k \frac{1}{k!} \right) \\ &= e^{e^x-1} \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \left( 1 - e^{-x^j/j!} \sum_{k>m} \left( \frac{x^j}{j!} \right)^k \frac{1}{k!} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

Further, we apply the Cauchy coefficient formula to the generating function identity of Lemma 1 on the circle  $x = We^{i\theta}$ ,  $-\pi < \theta \leq \pi$  with  $W = W(n)$  determined by (3) and (4). Thus we obtain

$$\frac{B_n}{n!} P(M_n \leq m) = \frac{W^{-n}}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} e^{e^{We^{i\theta}}-1} F_m(We^{i\theta}) e^{-i\theta n} d\theta := J_n. \quad (11)$$

In the asymptotic analysis of the integral  $J_n$  we will use characteristic functions. Hence we need a more convenient representation of the second factor of the integrand in (11) (see also (10)). We recall that in the Introduction we defined the sequence of independent and Poisson distributed random variables  $\{V_j\}_{j \geq 1}$  with parameters

$$\lambda_j := \frac{W^j}{j!}. \quad (12)$$

Further on, we denote by  $\mathbb{P}$  the probability measure on the probability space, where the sequence  $\{V_j\}_{j \geq 1}$  is defined. The expectation with respect to the probability measure  $\mathbb{P}$  is denoted by  $\mathbb{E}$ . We also denote by  $\mathbb{I}_{\{A\}}$  the indicator of an event  $A$  from the same probability space.

**Lemma 2.** *We have that*

$$\begin{aligned} F_m(We^{i\theta})e^{-i\theta n} &= e^{e^W - e^{We^{i\theta}}} \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta j(V_j - \lambda_j)} \mathbb{I}_{\{V_j \leq m\}} \right] \\ &= e^{e^W - e^{We^{i\theta}}} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j(V_j - \lambda_j)} \mathbb{I}_{\{\cap_{j=1}^{\infty} \{V_j \leq m\}\}} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

*Proof.* The proof is relatively straightforward. It relies on the independence of  $\{V_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ , the fact that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta j V_j} \mathbb{I}_{\{V_j \leq m\}} \right] = e^{-\frac{W^j}{j!}} \sum_{k=0}^m e^{i\theta j k} \left( \frac{W^j}{j!} \right)^k \frac{1}{k!}, \quad \theta \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (14)$$

and the obvious identity

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j \lambda_j = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j \frac{W^j}{j!} = We^W = n. \quad (15)$$

Indeed, we have from (10) and (14) that

$$\begin{aligned} F_m(We^{i\theta})e^{-i\theta n} &= e^{-i\theta n} \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \left( e^{-e^{i\theta j} \frac{W^j}{j!}} \sum_{k=0}^m e^{i\theta j k} \left( \frac{W^j}{j!} \right)^k \frac{1}{k!} \right) \\ &= e^{-i\theta n} \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} e^{\frac{W^j}{j!} - e^{i\theta j} \frac{W^j}{j!}} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta j V_j} \mathbb{I}_{\{V_j \leq m\}} \right] \\ &= e^{e^W - e^{We^{i\theta}}} \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta j(V_j - \lambda_j)} \mathbb{I}_{\{V_j \leq m\}} \right] \\ &= e^{e^W - e^{We^{i\theta}}} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j(V_j - \lambda_j)} \mathbb{I}_{\{\cap_{j=1}^{\infty} \{V_j \leq m\}\}} \right], \end{aligned}$$

which confirms (13). We only note that, for fixed  $W$ ,  $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j(V_j - \lambda_j) < \infty$  almost surely since

$$\text{Var} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j(V_j - \lambda_j) \right) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^2 \lambda_j = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^2 \frac{W^j}{j!} < \infty.$$

□

We conclude this section with a decomposition of the integral in (11). We break the range of integration up as follows. First, we set

$$\delta_n := \frac{n^{\frac{1}{7}}}{\sqrt{n \log(n)}} \quad (16)$$

and

$$\gamma_n := \frac{1}{\log^{\frac{1}{5}} n}. \quad (17)$$

Then, we write  $(-\pi, \pi] = D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3$ , where  $D_1 = \{\theta : -\delta_n < \theta < \delta_n\}$ ,  $D_2 = \{\theta : \delta_n \leq |\theta| < \gamma_n\}$ ,  $D_3 = \{\theta : \gamma_n \leq |\theta| < \pi\}$  and

$$J_n = J_{n,1} + J_{n,2} + J_{n,3}, \quad (18)$$

where

$$J_{n,k} = \frac{W^{-n}}{2\pi} \int_{D_k} e^{We^{i\theta} - 1} F_m(We^{i\theta}) e^{-i\theta n} d\theta, \quad k = 1, 2, 3. \quad (19)$$

The asymptotic analysis of these three integrals will be given in the next section.

### 3 Proof of Theorem 1

Before we state a key result for our investigations we introduce and recall some notation. For each  $n \geq 1$ , omitting where obvious the dependence on  $n$ , we consider a sequence of independently distributed random variables  $\{V_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ , where  $V_j$  is Poisson of parameter  $\lambda_j$ , see (12). Set

$$\bar{V}_n := \max_{j \geq 1} \{V_j\}.$$

Recall also the definitions of  $d_n$  and  $R_n$ ; see (6) and (8), respectively, and denote by  $\Phi$  the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal law. Then we have the following claim.

**Theorem 2.** *For any  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , we have*

$$\left| \mathbb{P}\left(\bar{V}_n \leq R_n - c\sqrt{R_n}\right) - \prod_{j=d_n-1; d_n; d_n+1} \mathbb{P}\left(V_j \leq R_n - c\sqrt{R_n}\right) \right| = o\left(e^{-\frac{n}{\log^{\frac{3}{2}}(n)}}\right), \quad (20)$$

and moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} & \prod_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} \mathbb{P}\left(V_j \leq R_n - c\sqrt{R_n}\right) \\ &= \Phi(-c) \prod_{j=d_n-1; d_n+1} \mathbb{P}\left(V_j \leq R_n - c\sqrt{R_n}\right) + o(1). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

The proof of Theorem 2 relies on several intermediate technical results.

**Lemma 3.** *We have*

$$R_n = \max_{j \geq 1} \{\lambda_j\} = \lambda_{d_n} > \max_{j \geq 1; j \neq d_n} \{\lambda_j\}. \quad (22)$$

Moreover, for any  $n$ , the sequence  $\{\lambda_j\}_{j \geq 1}$  strictly increases for  $j \leq d_n$  and decreases afterwards. Finally, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$R_n \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{n}{\log^{\frac{3}{2}}(n)}. \quad (23)$$



*Proof.* We notice that  $\frac{\lambda_{j+1}}{\lambda_j} = \frac{W}{j}$ , which since  $W = W(n)$  is transcendental, strictly exceeds 1 if  $j \leq d_n$  and is smaller than 1 if  $j \geq d_n + 1$ , see (6) for the definition of  $d_n$ . Thus, (22) and the claim that succeeds it follow. For the final claim we use the well-known Stirling asymptotic

$$n! \sim \sqrt{2\pi n}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} e^{-n} \quad (24)$$

to get

$$\begin{aligned} R_n &= \frac{W^{d_n}}{d_n!} \sim \left(\frac{W}{d_n}\right)^{d_n} \frac{e^{d_n}}{\sqrt{2\pi d_n}} = \left(1 + \frac{f_n}{d_n}\right)^{d_n} \frac{e^{d_n}}{\sqrt{2\pi d_n}} \\ &\sim \frac{e^W}{\sqrt{2\pi W}} = \frac{n}{\sqrt{2\pi W^{\frac{3}{2}}}} \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{n}{\log^{\frac{3}{2}}(n)}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $f_n$  is defined in (7), (3) was employed for the last identity and (4) for the very last asymptotic relation. This concludes the proof.  $\square$

Lemma 3 suggests that  $V_{d_n}$  plays important role for the overall behavior of  $\bar{V}_n$ . From now on we use  $\stackrel{d}{=}$  for identity in distribution between two random variables. Since it is a classical result that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{V_{d_n} - R_n}{\sqrt{R_n}} \stackrel{d}{=} Z_1 \quad (25)$$

we proceed to investigate whether and when the other Poisson random variables scale in the same fashion with  $R_n$ . We have the following preliminary result.

**Lemma 4.** *For any  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , we have that*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{R_n - \lambda_{d_n+1}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_n+1}}} - c \frac{\sqrt{R_n}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_n+1}}} &= \sqrt{R_n} \frac{1 - f_n}{W(n)} (1 + o(1)) - c + o(1), \\ \frac{R_n - \lambda_{d_n-1}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_n-1}}} - c \frac{\sqrt{R_n}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_n-1}}} &= \sqrt{R_n} \frac{f_n}{W(n)} (1 + o(1)) - c + o(1). \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Moreover, for any sequence  $\{j_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  such that  $j_n \notin \{d_n - 1, d_n, d_n + 1\}$ , we have that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{R_n - \lambda_{j_n}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{j_n}}} - c \frac{\sqrt{R_n}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{j_n}}} \right) = \infty. \quad (27)$$

*Proof.* Consider first  $\lambda_{d_n+1}$ . Note that

$$\lambda_{d_n+1} = \frac{W^{d_n+1}}{(d_n + 1)!} = R_n \frac{W}{d_n + 1} \quad (28)$$

and since  $d_n < W < d_n + 1$  then it follows that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda_{d_n+1}}{R_n} = 1. \quad (29)$$

We then have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{R_n - \lambda_{d_n+1}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_n+1}}} - c \frac{\sqrt{R_n}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_n+1}}} = R_n \frac{1 - \frac{W}{d_n+1}}{\sqrt{R_n \frac{W}{d_n+1}}} - c + o(1) \\
 & = \sqrt{R_n} \left( 1 - \frac{W}{d_n+1} \right) (1 + o(1)) - c + o(1) \\
 & = \sqrt{R_n} \frac{1 - f_n}{W} (1 + o(1)) - c + o(1).
 \end{aligned}$$

The second claim of (26) follows in the same fashion. Let  $j_n = d_n + 2$ . We demonstrate that (27) holds since

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{R_n - \lambda_{d_n+2}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_n+2}}} - c \frac{\sqrt{R_n}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_n+2}}} \right) \\
 & = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{R_n}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_n+2}}} \left( 1 - \frac{W^2}{(d_n+1)(d_n+2)} \right) - c \frac{\sqrt{(d_n+1)(d_n+2)}}{\sqrt{W^2}} \right) \\
 & = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{\sqrt{R_n}}{(d_n+1)(d_n+2)} ((d_n+1)(d_n+2) - W^2) \right) - c \\
 & = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{\sqrt{R_n}}{(d_n+1)(d_n+2)} (3d_n + 2 - 2d_n f_n - f_n^2) \right) - c \\
 & = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{\sqrt{R_n}}{W^2} ((3 - 2f_n)W(n) + 2 - f_n^2) \right) - c = \infty,
 \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (23) in the very last relationship. Let us next consider the case  $j_n = d_n - 2$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{R_n - \lambda_{d_n-2}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_n-2}}} - c \frac{\sqrt{R_n}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_n-2}}} \right) \\
 & = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{R_n}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_n-2}}} \left( 1 - \frac{(d_n-1)(d_n-2)}{W^2} \right) - c \frac{W}{\sqrt{(d_n-1)(d_n-2)}} \right) \\
 & = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{\sqrt{R_n}}{W^2} (W^2 - (d_n-1)(d_n-2)) \right) - c \\
 & = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{\sqrt{R_n}}{W^2} (3d_n + 2d_n f_n + f_n^2 - 2) \right) - c \\
 & = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{\sqrt{R_n}}{W^2} ((3 + 2f_n)W - 2 + f_n^2) \right) - c = \infty,
 \end{aligned}$$

where we have used again (23) in the very last relationship. Finally, consider  $\{j_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  such that  $j_n \notin \{d_n - 1, d_n, d_n + 1\}$  for all  $n$  big enough. Let first

$j_n \leq d_n - 2$ . Then since  $\lambda_{j_n} \leq \lambda_{d_n-2}$ , see Lemma 3, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{R_n - \lambda_{j_n}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{j_n}}} - c \frac{\sqrt{R_n}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{j_n}}} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{j_n}}} \left( R_n - \lambda_{j_n} - c\sqrt{R_n} \right) \\
 &\geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{j_n}}} \left( R_n - \lambda_{d_n-2} - c\sqrt{R_n} \right) \\
 &= \frac{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_n-2}}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{j_n}}} \left( \frac{R_n - \lambda_{d_n-2}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_n-2}}} - c \frac{\sqrt{R_n}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_n-2}}} \right) \\
 &\geq \left( \frac{R_n - \lambda_{d_n-2}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_n-2}}} - c \frac{\sqrt{R_n}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_n-2}}} \right).
 \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Then, we can get from the arguments above that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{R_n - \lambda_{j_n}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{j_n}}} - c \frac{\sqrt{R_n}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{j_n}}} = \infty.$$

The case  $j_n \geq d_n + 2$  is dealt with precisely as in (30) since  $\lambda_{j_n} \leq \lambda_{d_n+2}$  from Lemma 3. This concludes the claim.  $\square$

Lemma 4 suggests that the distribution of  $\bar{V}_n$  may turn out to depend at most on  $V_{d_n-1}, V_{d_n}, V_{d_n+1}$ . We start investigating this by recording the immediate formula

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \bar{V}_n \leq R_n - c\sqrt{R_n} \right) = \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P} \left( V_j \leq R_n - c\sqrt{R_n} \right), \tag{31}$$

which is valid for any  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ . We proceed to study the infinite product without the terms  $j \in \{d_n - 1, d_n, d_n + 1\}$ . We write, for any  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$H_n := R_n - c\sqrt{R_n}$$

and derive the following property of  $H_n$ .

**Lemma 5.** *For any  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , there exists  $n(c)$  such that, for  $n \geq n(c)$ ,*

$$\min_{j \neq d_n-1, d_n, d_n+1} \frac{H_n}{\lambda_j} = \min \left\{ \frac{H_n}{\lambda_{d_n-2}}; \frac{H_n}{\lambda_{d_n+2}} \right\} > 1. \tag{32}$$

*Proof.* Indeed, identity (32) is always true as  $\lambda_j$  strictly increases for  $j \leq d_n$  and strictly decreases afterwards, see Lemma 3. For the inequality in (32) we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{H_n}{\lambda_{d_n+2}} &= \frac{R_n - c\sqrt{R_n}}{R_n \frac{W^2}{(d_n+1)(d_n+2)}} = \frac{1 - cR_n^{-1/2}}{\frac{W^2}{(d_n+1)(d_n+2)}} > 1 \\
 &\iff (d_n+1)(d_n+2)(1 - cR_n^{-1/2}) > W^2 \\
 &\iff (d_n^2 + 3d_n + 2)(1 - cR_n^{-1/2}) > d_n^2 + 2d_n + f_n^2 \\
 &\iff d_n^2 + 3d_n + 2 - cR_n^{-1/2}(d_n^2 + 3d_n + 2) > d_n^2 + 2d_n f_n + f_n^2 \\
 &\iff 3d_n - 2d_n f_n + 2 - cR_n^{-1/2}(d_n^2 + 3d_n + 2) > f_n^2,
 \end{aligned}$$

where each successive implication involves a rearrangement of the initial inequality and an application of  $W = f_n + d_n$  and of (23). The very last inequality is valid for all  $n$  large enough from (23) and  $d_n = \lfloor W \rfloor \sim \log(n)$ , see (4), and  $f_n \in (0, 1)$ . Similarly one can check that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{H_n}{\lambda_{d_n-2}} &= W^2 \frac{R_n - c\sqrt{R_n}}{R_n(d_n-1)(d_n-2)} > 1 \\ &\iff W^2(1 - cR_n^{-1/2}) > (d_n-1)(d_n-2) \\ &\iff (d_n^2 + 2f_nd_n + f_n^2)(1 - cR_n^{-1/2}) > d_n^2 - 3d_n + 2 \\ &\iff 2f_nd_n + 3d_n + f_n^2 - cR_n^{-1/2}(d_n^2 + 2f_nd_n + f_n^2) > 2. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of the claim.  $\square$

To simplify (31) we make some preliminary estimates regarding the terms in (31).

**Proposition 1.** *For any  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $H_n = R_n - c\sqrt{R_n}$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1; j \neq d_n-1, d_n, d_n+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(V_j > H_n) &= 0; \\ \sum_{j=1; j \neq d_n-1, d_n, d_n+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(V_j > H_n) &= o\left(e^{-\frac{n}{\log^6(n)}}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

*Proof.* We choose  $n(c)$  so that (32) is valid for any  $n \geq n(c)$ . Set  $u_j = 1 - \frac{\lambda_j}{H_n}$  and from (32), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{j \neq d_n-1, d_n, d_n+1} u_j &= 1 - \max \left\{ \frac{\lambda_{d_n-2}}{H_n}; \frac{\lambda_{d_n+2}}{H_n} \right\} \\ &= \min \left\{ 1 - \frac{\lambda_{d_n-2}}{H_n}; 1 - \frac{\lambda_{d_n+2}}{H_n} \right\} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

We study the two terms in the last identity above. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \frac{\lambda_{d_n+2}}{H_n} &= \frac{1 - \frac{c}{\sqrt{R_n}} - \frac{W^2}{(d_n+1)(d_n+2)}}{1 - \frac{c}{\sqrt{R_n}}} \\ &= 1 - \frac{W^2}{(d_n+1)(d_n+2)} + O\left(\frac{\log^{\frac{3}{4}}(n)}{n^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right) \\ &= \frac{3d_n - 2d_nf_n + 2 - f_n^2}{d_n^2} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{d_n}\right)\right) + O\left(\frac{\log^{\frac{3}{4}}(n)}{n^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right) \\ &= \frac{3 - 2f_n + o(1)}{d_n} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{d_n}\right)\right) + O\left(\frac{\log^{\frac{3}{4}}(n)}{n^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right) \\ &= \frac{3 - 2f_n}{W} + o\left(\frac{1}{\log(n)}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

where the second identity comes from (23). Similar calculations yield that

$$1 - \frac{\lambda_{d_n-2}}{H_n} = \frac{3 + 2f_n}{\log(n)} + o\left(\frac{1}{\log(n)}\right). \quad (35)$$

Henceforth, from (34) and (35), we conclude that for all  $n$  big enough

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{j \neq d_n-1, d_n, d_n+1} u_j &= 1 - \max\left\{\frac{\lambda_{d_n-2}}{H_n}; \frac{\lambda_{d_n+2}}{H_n}\right\} \\ &= \frac{3 - 2f_n}{\log(n)} + o\left(\frac{1}{\log(n)}\right) \geq \frac{1}{2\log(n)}. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Then from the Markov inequality with  $h = \frac{H_n}{\lambda_j} - 1 > 0$ ,  $a = \ln(1+h) = \ln\left(\frac{H_n}{\lambda_j}\right)$  and from (32) we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(V_j > H_n) &\leq \mathbb{E}[e^{aV_j}] e^{-aH_n} = e^{\lambda_j(e^a-1)-aH_n} = e^{\lambda_j h - H_n \ln(1+h)} \\ &= e^{(H_n - \lambda_j) - H_n \ln\left(\frac{H_n}{\lambda_j}\right)} = e^{H_n(u_j + \ln(1-u_j))} \leq e^{-CH_n u_j^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where in the last inequality we have used (36) and the obvious fact that  $\ln(1-x) + x \leq -Cx^2$ , for some  $C > 0$  small enough. However, again from (36) and (23),

$$\min_{j \neq d_n-1, d_n, d_n+1} u_j \geq \frac{1}{2\log(n)} \text{ and } H_n = R_n - c\sqrt{R_n} \geq \frac{n}{\log^2(n)}$$

for all  $n \geq n^* \geq n(c)$ . Therefore, for all  $n \geq n^* \geq n(c)$  we have from (37) that

$$\mathbb{P}(V_j > H_n) \leq e^{-\frac{C}{4} \frac{H_n}{\log^2(n)}} \leq e^{-\frac{C}{4} \frac{n}{\log^4(n)}}.$$

Let  $U_n := \lceil e^{\frac{C}{4} \frac{n}{\log^5(n)}} \rceil$ . Then, clearly

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1; j \neq d_n-1, d_n, d_n+1}^{U_n} \mathbb{P}(V_j > H_n) &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} U_n e^{-\frac{C}{4} \frac{n}{\log^4(n)}} = 0; \\ \sum_{j=1; j \neq d_n-1, d_n, d_n+1}^{U_n} \mathbb{P}(V_j > H_n) &\leq \lceil e^{\frac{C}{4} \frac{n}{\log^5(n)}} \rceil o\left(e^{-\frac{C}{4} \frac{n}{\log^4(n)}}\right) = o\left(e^{-\frac{C}{8} \frac{n}{\log^4(n)}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Let us consider now  $j > U_n$ . Since  $d_n \sim W \sim \log(n)$ , see (6) and (4), then  $U_n - d_n > 0$ . We use the Chebyshev's inequality to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(V_j > H_n) &\leq \frac{\lambda_j}{H_n} = \frac{R_n \prod_{k=d_n+1}^j \frac{W}{k}}{H_n} = \frac{\prod_{k=d_n+1}^j \frac{W}{k}}{1 - \frac{c}{R_n^{\frac{1}{2}}}} \\ &\leq \frac{\prod_{k=U_n}^j \frac{W}{k}}{1 - \frac{c}{R_n^{\frac{1}{2}}}} \leq \frac{W^{j-U_n}}{U_n^{j-U_n}} \sim \frac{W^{j-U_n}}{U_n^{j-U_n}}. \end{aligned}$$

Summing over  $j > U_n$ , we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j > U_n} \mathbb{P}(V_j > H_n) &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j > U_n} \frac{W^{j-U_n}}{U_n^{j-U_n}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{W}{U_n} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{W}{U_n}} = 0; \\ \sum_{j > U_n} \mathbb{P}(V_j > H_n) &\lesssim \frac{W}{U_n} = o\left(\log(n) e^{-\frac{c}{4} \frac{n}{\log^5(n)}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

since evidently  $\frac{W}{U_n} = o\left(\log(n) e^{-\frac{c}{4} \frac{n}{\log^5(n)}}\right)$ . This concludes the proof of the proposition.  $\square$

As an important corollary we obtain that

**Corollary 1.** *For any  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , with  $H_n := R_n - c\sqrt{R_n}$*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{j=1, j \neq d_n-1, d_n, d_n+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(V_j \leq R_n - c\sqrt{R_n}\right) = 1$$

and even more

$$\prod_{j=1, j \neq d_n-1, d_n, d_n+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(V_j \leq R_n - c\sqrt{R_n}\right) = 1 - o\left(e^{-\frac{n}{\log^6(n)}}\right).$$

*Proof.* The proof is trivial using Proposition 1. First note that it additionally implies that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{j \geq 1; j \neq d_n-1, d_n, d_n+1} \mathbb{P}(V_j > H_n) = 0$$

and then note that the latter together with  $\log(1-x) = -x + o(x)$ , as  $x \rightarrow 0$ , triggers

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{j=1, j \neq d_n-1, d_n, d_n+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(V_j \leq R_n - c\sqrt{R_n}\right) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{\sum_{j=1, j \neq d_n-1, d_n, d_n+1}^{\infty} \log(1 - \mathbb{P}(V_j > H_n))} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-(1+o(1)) \sum_{j=1, j \neq d_n-1, d_n, d_n+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(V_j > H_n)} = 1 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\prod_{j=1, j \neq d_n-1, d_n, d_n+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(V_j \leq R_n - c\sqrt{R_n}\right) = e^{\sum_{j=1, j \neq d_n-1, d_n, d_n+1}^{\infty} \log(1 - \mathbb{P}(V_j > H_n))} \\ &= e^{-(1+o(1)) \sum_{j=1, j \neq d_n-1, d_n, d_n+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(V_j > H_n)} = 1 - o\left(e^{-\frac{n}{\log^6(n)}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

We now have all the ingredients for the proof of Theorem 2.

*Proof of Theorem 2.* For any  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , we have from (31), Corollary 1 and (25) that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bar{V}_n \leq R_n - c\sqrt{R_n}\right) = \left(\prod_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} \mathbb{P}\left(V_j \leq R_n - c\sqrt{R_n}\right)\right) \left(1 - o\left(e^{-\frac{n}{\log^6(n)}}\right)\right),$$

which proves (20). However, since  $(V_{d_n} - R_n)/\sqrt{R_n}$  converges in distribution to the standard normal law we immediately get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \prod_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} \mathbb{P}\left(V_j \leq R_n - c\sqrt{R_n}\right) \\ &= \Phi(-c)\mathbb{P}\left(V_{d_n-1} \leq R_n - c\sqrt{R_n}\right)\mathbb{P}\left(V_{d_n+1} \leq R_n - c\sqrt{R_n}\right) + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

which settles (21) and concludes the proof.  $\square$

Now we are ready to commence the proof of Theorem 1 for which we need a helpful claim. Let

$$b(W) := b(W(n)) = W(1+W)e^W = n(1+W) \stackrel{(4)}{\sim} n \log(n). \quad (38)$$

Then recalling the definition of  $M_n$  under the probability measure  $P$ , see (5), we have the following statement.

**Proposition 2.** *The following asymptotic relation holds for any  $c \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ :*

$$\frac{B_n}{n!} P\left(M_n \leq R_n - c\sqrt{R_n}\right) = \frac{e^{e^W-1} \prod_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} \mathbb{P}\left(V_j \leq R_n - c\sqrt{R_n}\right)}{\sqrt{2\pi} W^n \sqrt{b(W)}} (1 + o(1)). \quad (39)$$

*As a consequence*

$$P\left(M_n \leq R_n - c\sqrt{R_n}\right) = \prod_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} \mathbb{P}\left(V_j \leq R_n - c\sqrt{R_n}\right) + o(1). \quad (40)$$

We set  $m = \lfloor H_n \rfloor = \lfloor R_n - c\sqrt{R_n} \rfloor$  and use the decomposition (18) and (19) with  $k = 1$  to recall that

$$J_{1,n} = \frac{W^{-n}}{2\pi} \int_{-\delta_n}^{\delta_n} e^{e^{W e^{i\theta}} - 1} F_m(W e^{i\theta}) e^{-i\theta n} d\theta. \quad (41)$$

Then we have the following result.

**Lemma 6.** *We have that*

$$J_{1,n} = \frac{W^{-n} e^{e^W - 1}}{\sqrt{2\pi} \sqrt{b(W)}} \left( \prod_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} \mathbb{P}(V_j \leq m) + o(1) \right). \quad (42)$$

The proof of the lemma requires several intermediate results. The first provides a simplification of the infinite product of (13). Recall that  $d_n = \lfloor W \rfloor$ .

**Proposition 3.** *We have that*

$$\prod_{j=1, j \neq d_n, d_n-1, d_n+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta j(V_j - \lambda_j)} \mathbb{I}_{\{V_j \leq m\}} \right] = e^{\phi_n(\theta)} + K_{n,m}(\theta), \quad (43)$$

where

$$\phi_n(\theta) = e^{W e^{i\theta}} - e^W - \sum_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} \frac{W^j e^{i\theta j}}{j!} + \sum_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} \frac{W^j}{j!} - i\theta n + i\theta \sum_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} j\lambda_j \quad (44)$$

and

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} |K_{n,m}(\theta)| = o\left(e^{-\frac{n}{\log^6(n)}}\right) = o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{b(W)}}\right). \quad (45)$$

*Proof of Proposition 3.* From the independence of  $\{V_j\}_{j \geq 1}$  we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \prod_{j=1, j \neq d_n, d_n-1, d_n+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta j(V_j - \lambda_j)} \mathbb{I}_{\{V_j \leq m\}} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta \sum_{j=1, j \neq d_n, d_n-1, d_n+1}^{\infty} j(V_j - \lambda_j)} \mathbb{I}_{\{\cap_{j=1, j \neq d_n, d_n-1, d_n+1}^{\infty} \{V_j \leq m\}\}} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta \sum_{j=1, j \neq d_n, d_n-1, d_n+1}^{\infty} j(V_j - \lambda_j)} \right] - \\ & \quad - \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta \sum_{j=1, j \neq d_n, d_n-1, d_n+1}^{\infty} j(V_j - \lambda_j)} \mathbb{I}_{\{\cup_{j=1, j \neq d_n, d_n-1, d_n+1}^{\infty} \{V_j > m\}\}} \right] \\ &= \prod_{j=1, j \neq d_n, d_n-1, d_n+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta j(V_j - \lambda_j)} \right] + K_{n,m}(\theta). \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, from (33) and  $m = \lfloor H_n \rfloor$

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} |K_{n,m}(\theta)| &\leq \sum_{j=1, j \neq d_n-1, d_n, d_n+1} \mathbb{P}(V_j > m) \\ &= \sum_{j=1, j \neq d_n-1, d_n, d_n+1} \mathbb{P}(V_j > H_n) = o\left(e^{-\frac{n}{\log^6(n)}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

which with the help of (38) proves (45). Next, note that since

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j(V_j - \lambda_j)} \right] = \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{W^j}{j!}(1-e^{i\theta j})} e^{-i\theta j\lambda_j} = e^{-i\theta n} e^{W e^{i\theta}} - e^W,$$



where we have used (15), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & \prod_{j=1, j \neq d_n, d_n-1, d_n+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta j(V_j - \lambda_j)} \right] \\ &= e^{e^{W e^{i\theta}} - e^W - \sum_{j=d_n+1}^{d_n+1} \frac{W^j e^{i\theta j}}{j!} + \sum_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} \frac{W^j}{j!} - i\theta n + i\theta \sum_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} j\lambda_j} = e^{\phi_n(\theta)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain (43) and (44) and the proposition is therefore proved.  $\square$

Next, Proposition 3 allows with an application of (13) in (41) the following new representation of  $J_{1,n}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} J_{1,n} &= \frac{W^{-n} e^{e^W - 1}}{2\pi} \int_{-\delta_n}^{\delta_n} \prod_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta j(V_j - \lambda_j)} \mathbb{I}_{\{V_j \leq m\}} \right] \left( e^{\phi_n(\theta)} + o\left(e^{-\frac{n}{\log^6(n)}}\right) \right) d\theta \\ &= \frac{W^{-n} e^{e^W - 1}}{2\pi} \left( \int_{-\delta_n}^{\delta_n} \prod_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta j(V_j - \lambda_j)} \mathbb{I}_{\{V_j \leq m\}} \right] e^{\phi_n(\theta)} d\theta + o\left(e^{-\frac{n}{\log^6(n)}}\right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

We proceed to give some elementary properties for  $\phi_n$ .

**Lemma 7.** *We have that*

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_n(0) &= \phi_n'(0) = 0, \\ \phi_n''(0) &= -b(W) + \sum_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} j^2 \frac{W^j}{j!} = -b(W) (1 + o(1)), \\ |\phi_n'''(\theta)| &\leq (W^3 + 3W^2 + W) e^W + \sum_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} j^2 \frac{W^j}{j!}, \\ &= W^3 e^W (1 + o(1)) = n \log^2(n) (1 + o(1)). \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Therefore, for  $|\theta| \leq \delta_n$  we have that

$$\phi_n(\theta) = -b(W) \frac{\theta^2}{2} (1 + o(1)) + o(1). \quad (48)$$

*Proof.* For the first derivative of  $\phi_n$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_n'(\theta) &= iW e^{i\theta} e^{W e^{i\theta}} - i \sum_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} j \frac{W^j}{j!} e^{i\theta j} - in + i \sum_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} j\lambda_j; \\ \phi_n'(0) &= iW e^W - i \sum_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} j \frac{W^j}{j!} - in + i \sum_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} j \frac{W^j}{j!} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the very last relation follows from (3). Also

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_n''(\theta) &= -W^2 e^{2i\theta} e^{W e^{i\theta}} - W e^{i\theta} e^{W e^{i\theta}} + \sum_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} j^2 \frac{W^j}{j!} e^{i\theta j}; \\ \phi_n''(0) &= -W^2 e^W - W e^W + \sum_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} j^2 \frac{W^j}{j!} \\ &= -b(W) + \sum_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} j^2 \frac{W^j}{j!},\end{aligned}$$

where the last identity holds since (38) is valid. In addition, note that since  $\max_{j \geq 1} \lambda_j = \max_{j \geq 1} \frac{W^j}{j!} = R_n$ , see (22), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} j^2 \frac{W^j}{j!} &\leq 3(d_n + 1)^2 R_n = 3 \log^2(n) \frac{n}{\sqrt{2\pi} \log^{3/2}(n)} (1 + o(1)) \\ &= \frac{3}{\sqrt{2\pi}} n \log^{\frac{1}{2}}(n) (1 + o(1)) = o(b(W)),\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from (23) and the very last relation is due to (38). The first two parts of (47) are therefore established. Taking third derivative we get that

$$\begin{aligned}|\phi_n'''(\theta)| &\leq (W^3 + 3W^2 + W) e^W + \sum_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} j^3 \frac{W^j}{j!} \\ &= W^3 e^W (1 + o(1)) + \sum_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} j^3 \frac{W^j}{j!}.\end{aligned}$$

However, using (23), (22) and (4) we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}W^3 e^W &= nW^2 = n \log^2(n) (1 + o(1)) \\ \sum_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} j^3 \frac{W^j}{j!} &\leq 3(d_n + 1)^3 R_n \\ &= 3 \log^3(n) \frac{n}{\log^{3/2}(n)} (1 + o(1)) \\ &= 3n \log^{3/2}(n) (1 + o(1)).\end{aligned}$$

This confirms the last part of (47). Relation (48) comes with the help of (47),

Taylor expansion of third order,  $|\theta| \leq \delta_n$ , see (16), and

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_n(\theta) &= -b(W) \frac{\theta^2}{2} (1 + o(1)) + O(\delta_n^3 n \log^2(n)) \\ &= -b(W) \frac{\theta^2}{2} (1 + o(1)) + O\left(\frac{n^{\frac{3}{2}}}{n^{\frac{3}{2}} \log^{\frac{3}{2}}(n)} n \log^2(n)\right) \\ &= -b(W) \frac{\theta^2}{2} (1 + o(1)) + o(1).\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the overall proof of Lemma 7.  $\square$

We are now ready to tackle Lemma 6.

*Proof of Lemma 6.* We write

$$\delta'_n = \frac{\log \log(n)}{\sqrt{n \log(n)}}.$$

Next for  $[\delta'_n, \delta_n]$  we get from the representation (46) and the asymptotic relation (48) that

$$\begin{aligned}& \left| \int_{|\theta| \in [\delta'_n, \delta_n]} \prod_{j=d_n, d_n-1, d_n+1} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta j(V_j - \lambda_j)} \mathbb{I}_{\{V_j \leq m\}} \right] e^{\phi_n(\theta)} d\theta \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{|\theta| \in [\delta'_n, \delta_n]} \prod_{j=d_n, d_n-1, d_n+1} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta j(V_j - \lambda_j)} \mathbb{I}_{\{V_j \leq m\}} \right] e^{-b(W) \frac{\theta^2}{2} (1+o(1)) + o(1)} d\theta \right| \\ &\leq \int_{|\theta| \in [\delta'_n, \delta_n]} e^{-b(W) \frac{\theta^2}{2} (1+o(1)) + o(1)} d\theta \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{b(W)}} \int_{|y| \in [\delta'_n \sqrt{b(W)}, \delta_n \sqrt{b(W)}]} e^{-\frac{y^2}{2} (1+o(1)) + o(1)} dy \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{b(W)}} \int_{|y| \geq \delta'_n \sqrt{b(W)}} e^{-\frac{y^2}{2} (1+o(1)) + o(1)} dy \\ &= \frac{o(1)}{\sqrt{b(W)}},\end{aligned}$$

because

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta'_n \sqrt{b(W)} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \log(n)}{\sqrt{n \log(n)}} \sqrt{n(1+W)} = \infty.$$

Therefore, we conclude from (46) combined with (38) and the fact that  $e^{-\frac{n}{\log^6(n)}}$  is of lower order than  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{b(W)}}$  that

$$J_{1,n} = \frac{W^{-n} e^{e^W - 1}}{2\pi} \left( \int_{-\delta'_n}^{\delta'_n} \prod_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta j(V_j - \lambda_j)} \mathbb{I}_{\{V_j \leq m\}} \right] e^{\phi_n(\theta)} d\theta + o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{b(W)}}\right) \right). \quad (49)$$

It remains to examine the integral term. Using (48) we arrive as above at the equivalent term

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{-\delta'_n}^{\delta'_n} \prod_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta_j(V_j-\lambda_j)} \mathbb{I}_{\{V_j \leq m\}} \right] e^{-b(W)\frac{\theta^2}{2}(1+o(1))+o(1)} d\theta \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{b(W)}} \int_{-\delta'_n\sqrt{b(W)}}^{\delta'_n\sqrt{b(W)}} \prod_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\frac{y}{\sqrt{b(W)}}j\sqrt{\lambda_j}\frac{(V_j-\lambda_j)}{\sqrt{\lambda_j}}} \mathbb{I}_{\{V_j \leq m\}} \right] e^{-\frac{y^2}{2}(1+o(1))+o(1)} dy. \end{aligned}$$

Now, from (4), (22) and (23), we have that with  $z_j(y) := \frac{y}{\sqrt{b(W)}}j\sqrt{\lambda_j}$ ,  $y \in [-\delta'_n\sqrt{b(W)}, \delta'_n\sqrt{b(W)}]$  the following bound is valid

$$|z_j(y)| \leq \delta'_n(d_n+1)\sqrt{R_n} \sim \frac{\log \log(n)}{\sqrt{n \log(n)}} \log^{1/4}(n)\sqrt{n} = o(1).$$

Henceforth,

$$\begin{aligned} & \prod_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{iz_j(y)\frac{(V_j-\lambda_j)}{\sqrt{\lambda_j}}} \mathbb{I}_{\{V_j \leq m\}} \right] \\ &= \prod_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} \left( \mathbb{P}(V_j \leq m) + \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( e^{iz_j(y)\frac{(V_j-\lambda_j)}{\sqrt{\lambda_j}}} - 1 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{V_j \leq m\}} \right] \right) \\ &= \prod_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} \mathbb{P}(V_j \leq m) + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

where the very last relation follows from

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( e^{iz_j(y)\frac{(V_j-\lambda_j)}{\sqrt{\lambda_j}}} - 1 \right) \mathbb{I}_{\{V_j \leq m\}} \right] \right| \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \min \left\{ 1, |z_j(y)| \left| \frac{V_j - \lambda_j}{\sqrt{\lambda_j}} \right| \right\} \right] = o(1),$$

because  $|z_j(y)| = o(1)$  uniformly for the specified range of  $y$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(V_j - \lambda_j)}{\sqrt{\lambda_j}} = Z_1$$

and the sequence  $\left\{ \frac{V_j - \lambda_j}{\sqrt{\lambda_j}} \right\}_{j \geq 1}$  is as a consequence tight. Therefore, we further

conclude using  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta'_n \sqrt{b(W)} = \infty$  that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{-\delta'_n}^{\delta'_n} \prod_{j=d_{n-1}}^{d_n+1} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta j(V_j - \lambda_j)} \mathbb{I}_{\{V_j \leq m\}} \right] e^{-b(W) \frac{\theta^2}{2} (1+o(1)) + o(1)} d\theta \\
 &= \frac{\prod_{j=d_{n-1}}^{d_n+1} \mathbb{P}(V_j \leq m)}{\sqrt{b(W)}} \int_{-\delta'_n \sqrt{b(W)}}^{\delta'_n \sqrt{b(W)}} e^{-\frac{y^2}{2} (1+o(1)) + o(1)} dy + o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{b(W)}}\right) \\
 &= \sqrt{2\pi} \frac{\prod_{j=d_{n-1}}^{d_n+1} \mathbb{P}(V_j \leq m)}{\sqrt{b(W)}} + o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{b(W)}}\right).
 \end{aligned}$$

This together with (49) proves (42) and Lemma 6 is completed.  $\square$

We recall that  $\gamma_n := \frac{1}{\log \frac{1}{5}(n)}$ , see (17), and consider

$$\begin{aligned}
 J_{2,n} &= \frac{W^{-n}}{2\pi} \int_{\pi \geq |\theta| \geq \gamma_n} e^{W e^{i\theta} - 1} F_m(W e^{i\theta}) e^{-i\theta n} d\theta \\
 &= \frac{W^{-n} e^{e^W - 1}}{2\pi} \int_{\pi \geq |\theta| \geq \gamma_n} \prod_{j=d_{n-1}}^{d_n+1} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta j(V_j - \lambda_j)} \mathbb{I}_{\{V_j \leq m\}} \right] e^{\phi_n(\theta)} d\theta \\
 &\quad + \frac{W^{-n} e^{e^W - 1}}{2\pi} o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{b(W)}}\right),
 \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

see (19) and recall the claims of Proposition 3 for the last identity. To investigate the integral term we discuss further  $\phi_n$ .

**Lemma 8.** *We have that*

$$\begin{aligned}
 \operatorname{Re} \phi_n(\theta) &= e^{W \cos(\theta)} \cos(W \sin(\theta)) - e^W + \sum_{j=d_{n-1}}^{d_n+1} \frac{W^j}{j!} (1 - \cos(\theta j)) \\
 &= \left( e^{W \cos(\theta)} - e^W \right) - e^{W \cos(\theta)} (1 - \cos(W \sin(\theta))) + \sum_{j=d_{n-1}}^{d_n+1} \frac{W^j}{j!} (1 - \cos(\theta j)).
 \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

*As a consequence the following estimate holds*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\pi \geq |\theta| \geq \gamma_n} \log(n) \frac{\operatorname{Re} \phi_n(\theta)}{n} \leq -C < 0. \tag{52}$$

*Proof of Lemma 8.* Relation (51) follows easily from (44). Since the second term in the last relation of (51) is non-positive and  $\cos(\gamma_n) \geq \cos(\theta)$ ,  $\gamma_n \leq |\theta| \leq \pi$ ,

we get that for all large  $n$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \operatorname{Re} \phi_n(\theta) &\leq \left( e^{W \cos(\gamma_n)} - e^W \right) + 6R_n = -e^W \left( 1 - e^{-W(1-\cos(\gamma_n))} \right) + 6R_n \\
 &\leq -e^W \left( 1 - e^{-W \frac{\gamma_n^2}{2}} \right) + 6R_n \\
 &= -e^W \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{W}{2 \log^{\frac{3}{2}}(n)}} \right) + 6R_n = -\frac{n}{W} \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{W}{2 \log^{\frac{3}{2}}(n)}} \right) + 6R_n \\
 &= -\frac{n}{W} (1 + o(1)) + 6R_n = \left( -\frac{n}{\log(n)} + \frac{n}{\sqrt{2\pi} \log^{\frac{3}{2}}(n)} \right) (1 + o(1)) \\
 &= -\frac{n}{\log(n)} \left( 1 - \frac{4}{\log^{\frac{1}{2}}(n)} \right) (1 + o(1)) \\
 &= -\frac{n}{\log(n)} (1 + o(1)),
 \end{aligned}$$

where in the first inequality we have used from (22) that

$$\sum_{j=d_n-1}^{d_n+1} \frac{W^j}{j!} (1 - \cos(\theta j)) \leq 6R_n,$$

in the second one that  $1 - \cos(x) \leq \frac{x^2}{2}$  and we have also invoked (3) and (23). This shows (52) and concludes the proof of the statement.  $\square$

Therefore with Lemma 8 we conclude that for all large  $n$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\left| \int_{\pi \geq |\theta| \geq \gamma_n} \prod_{j=d_n, d_n-1, d_n+1} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta j(V_j - \lambda_j)} \mathbb{I}_{\{V_j \leq m\}} \right] e^{\phi_n(\theta)} d\theta \right| \leq \int_{\pi \geq |\theta| \geq \gamma_n} e^{\operatorname{Re} \phi_n(\theta)} d\theta \\
 &\leq 2\pi \exp \left\{ -C \frac{n}{\log(n)} \right\} = o \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{b(W)}} \right),
 \end{aligned}$$

where the very last relation follows from (38). Henceforth, applying this in (50) we arrive at the following

**Lemma 9.** *We have that*

$$\begin{aligned}
 J_{2,n} &= \frac{W^{-n}}{2\pi} \int_{\pi \geq |\theta| \geq \gamma_n} e^{e^{W e^{i\theta}} - 1} F_m(W e^{i\theta}) e^{-i\theta n} d\theta \\
 &= \frac{W^{-n} e^{e^W - 1}}{2\pi} o \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{b(W)}} \right).
 \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

It remains to consider the region  $|\theta| \in [\delta_n, \gamma_n]$ , see (16) for  $\delta_n$  and (17) for

$\gamma_n$ . Recall from (19) that

$$\begin{aligned} J_{3,n} &= \frac{W^{-n}}{2\pi} \int_{|\theta| \in [\delta_n, \gamma_n]} e^{e^{W e^{i\theta}} - 1} F_m(W e^{i\theta}) e^{-i\theta n} d\theta \\ &= \frac{W^{-n} e^{e^W - 1}}{2\pi} \int_{|\theta| \in [\delta_n, \gamma_n]} \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta j (V_j - \lambda_j)} \mathbb{I}_{\{V_j \leq m\}} \right] d\theta, \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

where the latter follows from (13). This estimate hinges upon the following elementary bounds.

**Lemma 10.** *For any positive integer  $l < d_n - 1$ ,*

$$\left| \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta j (V_j - \lambda_j)} \mathbb{I}_{\{V_j \leq m\}} \right] \right| \leq e^{-\frac{W^l}{l!} (1 - \cos(\theta l))} + o\left(e^{-\frac{n}{\log^6(n)}}\right). \quad (55)$$

Moreover, for  $|\theta| \in [\delta_n, \gamma_n]$  we have that

$$\left| \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta j (V_j - \lambda_j)} \mathbb{I}_{\{V_j \leq m\}} \right] \right| = o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{b(W)}}\right). \quad (56)$$

*Proof.* From (33) it follows that, for any  $l < d_n - 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta j (V_j - \lambda_j)} \mathbb{I}_{\{V_j \leq m\}} \right] \right| \leq \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta l (V_l - \lambda_l)} \mathbb{I}_{\{V_l \leq m\}} \right] \right| \\ &= \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta l (V_l - \lambda_l)} \right] \right| + o\left(e^{-\frac{n}{\log^6(n)}}\right) \\ &= e^{-\frac{W^l}{l!} (1 - \cos(\theta l))} + o\left(e^{-\frac{n}{\log^6(n)}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

or the claim (55) follows. To derive (56) we set

$$\delta_n < \varphi_n := \frac{1}{\log^2(n)} < \gamma_n.$$

For  $|\theta| \in [\varphi_n, \gamma_n]$ , we apply (55) with  $l = 10$  to get

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta j (V_j - \lambda_j)} \mathbb{I}_{\{V_j \leq m\}} \right] \right| \leq e^{-\frac{W^{10}}{10!} (1 - \cos(10\theta))} + o\left(e^{-\frac{n}{\log^6(n)}}\right) \\ &\leq e^{-C100 \frac{W^{10}}{10!} \varphi_n^2} + o\left(e^{-\frac{n}{\log^6(n)}}\right) = e^{-C100 \frac{W^{10}}{10!} \frac{1}{\log^4(n)}} + o\left(e^{-\frac{n}{\log^6(n)}}\right) \\ &= o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{b(W)}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that  $1 - \cos(x) \geq Cx^2$  for all  $x$  small enough, the obvious convergence  $10\varphi_n \rightarrow 0$  and the fact that from (38) it follows that

$$e^{-C100 \frac{W^{10}}{10!} \frac{1}{\log^4(n)}} = o\left(e^{-\log^5(n)}\right) = o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{b(W)}}\right),$$

where  $b(W) \sim n \log(n)$ , see (38). Finally, it remains to consider the case  $|\theta| \in [\delta_n, \varphi_n]$ . In this case we set  $l_n := \lfloor aW \rfloor < d_n - 1$  for some  $a \in (0, 1)$ . Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\theta l_n| \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_n aW = a \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(n)}{\log^2(n)} = 0,$$

where in the first identity we have employed (4). Therefore, the bound above can be replicated with  $\delta_n$  for  $\varphi_n$  to derive

$$\left| \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta j(V_j - \lambda_j)} \mathbb{I}_{\{V_j \leq m\}} \right] \right| \leq e^{-Cl_n^2 \frac{W^{l_n}}{l_n!} \delta_n^2} + o\left(e^{-\frac{n}{\log^6(n)}}\right).$$

Now, as  $l_n \rightarrow \infty$ , from Stirling approximation, see (24), the asymptotic (4), and the expressions for  $\delta_n$  and  $l_n$  we get that

$$\begin{aligned} l_n^2 \frac{W^{l_n}}{l_n!} \delta_n^2 &= \frac{a^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left(\frac{W}{l_n}\right)^{l_n} W^{\frac{3}{2}} e^{l_n} \frac{n^{\frac{2}{7}}}{n \log(n)} (1 + o(1)) \\ &= \frac{a^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left(\frac{W}{l_n}\right)^{l_n} \frac{e^{l_n} \sqrt{\log(n)}}{n^{\frac{5}{7}}} (1 + o(1)) \\ &\geq \frac{e^{-1} a^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left(\frac{W}{l_n}\right)^{l_n} \frac{e^{a \log(n)} \sqrt{\log(n)}}{n^{\frac{5}{7}}} (1 + o(1)) \\ &\geq \frac{e^{-1} a^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left(\frac{1}{a}\right)^{l_n} \frac{\sqrt{\log(n)}}{n^{\frac{5}{7} - a}} (1 + o(1)) \\ &\geq \frac{e^{-1} a^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{\sqrt{\log(n)}}{n^{\frac{5}{7} - a}} (1 + o(1)). \end{aligned}$$

Choosing  $a = \frac{6}{7}$ , we get the following estimate with some  $C' > 0$ :

$$\left| \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[ e^{i\theta j(V_j - \lambda_j)} \mathbb{I}_{\{V_j \leq m\}} \right] \right| \leq e^{-C'n^{\frac{1}{7}} \sqrt{\log(n)}} + o\left(e^{-\frac{n}{\log^6(n)}}\right) = o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{b(W)}}\right).$$

This proves (56) and concludes the claim.  $\square$

From Lemma 10 and (56) we easily arrive at

$$J_{3,n} = \frac{W^{-n} e^{e^W - 1}}{2\pi} o\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{b(W)}}\right). \quad (57)$$

Now, we are ready to complete the proof of Theorem 2.



*Proof of Theorem 2.* Clearly,  $J_n = J_{1,n} + J_{2,n} + J_{3,n}$ , see (11), (41), (50) and (54). However, the asymptotic relations (42), (53) and (57) yield immediately (39) for any  $c \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ . Applying (39) with  $c = -\infty$  we get that other than the product term the rest in (39) is the asymptotic behavior of  $B_n/n!$ . This deduces (40).  $\square$

Now we are in a position to prove Theorem 1.

*Proof of Theorem 1.* From (40) of Proposition 2 and (21) of Theorem 2 we deduce that for any  $c \in \mathbb{R}$

$$P\left(M_n \leq R_n - c\sqrt{R_n}\right) = \Phi(-c) \prod_{j=d_n-1; d_n+1} \mathbb{P}\left(V_j \leq R_n - c\sqrt{R_n}\right) + o(1). \quad (58)$$

Let us investigate the asymptotic of the other two terms in (58). Consider  $j = d_n + 1$  and note that

$$T_n := \frac{(V_{d_n+1} - \lambda_{d_n+1})}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_n+1}}} \rightarrow Z_1.$$

Therefore, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(V_{d_n+1} \leq R_n - c\sqrt{R_n}\right) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{V_{d_n+1} - \lambda_{d_n+1}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_n+1}}} \leq \frac{R_n - \lambda_{d_n+1}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_n+1}}} - c\frac{\sqrt{R_n}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_n+1}}}\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(T_n \leq \frac{R_n - \lambda_{d_n+1}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_n+1}}} - c\frac{\sqrt{R_n}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_n+1}}}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

Since  $T_n \rightarrow Z_1$  it suffices to understand the behavior of

$$\frac{R_n - \lambda_{d_n+1}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_n+1}}} - c\frac{\sqrt{R_n}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_n+1}}}.$$

Feeding (23) into (26) and applying (29) we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{R_n - \lambda_{d_n+1}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_n+1}}} - c\frac{\sqrt{R_n}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_n+1}}}\right) &= \sqrt{R_n} \frac{1 - f_n}{\log(n)} (1 + o(1)) - c + o(1) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\log^{\frac{1}{4}}(n)} (1 - f_n) (1 + o(1)) - c + o(1). \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

Until the end we will work over subsequences but for clarity we will preserve the notation, e.g.  $d_n + 1$  instead of  $d_{n_k} + 1$  etc. Considering (60) we see from

(59) that for any  $u \in [0, \infty]$  over a subsequence

$$\begin{aligned}
 \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( V_{d_{n+1}} \leq R_n - c\sqrt{R_n} \right) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( T_n \leq \frac{R_n - \lambda_{d_{n+1}}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_{n+1}}}} - c \frac{\sqrt{R_n}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_{n+1}}}} \right) \\
 &= \Phi(u - c) \\
 \iff \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{R_n - \lambda_{d_{n+1}}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_{n+1}}}} - c \frac{\sqrt{R_n}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_{n+1}}}} \right) &= u - c \\
 \iff \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\log^{\frac{7}{4}}(n)} (1 - f_n) &= u.
 \end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

In the same vein we derive for any  $u \in [0, \infty]$  over a subsequence that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left( \frac{R_n - \lambda_{d_{n-1}}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_{n-1}}}} - c \frac{\sqrt{R_n}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{d_{n-1}}}} \right) &= \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\log^{\frac{7}{4}}(n)} f_n (1 + o(1)) - c + o(1) \\
 \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( V_{d_{n-1}} \leq R_n - c\sqrt{R_n} \right) &= \Phi(u - c) \\
 \iff \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\log^{\frac{7}{4}}(n)} f_n &= u.
 \end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

From (58),(61) and (62) we then conclude the second item (ii) of Theorem 1 over subsequences for which

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \min \{f_n, 1 - f_n\} \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\log^{\frac{7}{4}}(n)} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \vartheta_n \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\log^{\frac{7}{4}}(n)} = \infty.$$

However, since (61) and (62) cannot hold simultaneously over a subsequence for finite values of  $u$  we deduce the other two items of Theorem 1. It remains to confirm that all items of Theorem 1 are possible. Clearly, the second one is attainable since  $W$  grows logarithmically and fills the intervals between integers in a denser and denser way. Therefore, for a subsequence  $\{n_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  such that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |\vartheta_{n_k} - 1/2| = 0$  we have that item (ii) of Theorem 1 can materialize. Next, one ought to understand how well  $W$  is approximated by integers. This may be a difficult task in general. We will see that over a subsequence the last limit in (61) may fail. For this purpose we consider  $W$ . Clearly,

$$x_m = me^m, m \geq 1,$$

are such that

$$W(x_m) = m.$$

Then for any  $n \in (x_m, x_{m+1})$  we have that

$$f_n = W(n) - \lfloor W(n) \rfloor = W(n) - W(x_m) = 1 - W(x_{m+1}) + W(n)$$

or

$$1 - f_n = W(x_{m+1}) - W(n) = \int_n^{x_{m+1}} W'(y)dy.$$

From (3) valid for any  $x > 0$  it follows that  $W'(x) \sim x^{-1}$ , as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , and therefore setting  $n_m = \lfloor x_{m+1} \rfloor$  and  $v_m = x_{m+1} - n_m$  we have as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , that

$$1 - f_{n_m} = W(x_{m+1}) - W(n_m) = \int_{n_m}^{x_{m+1}} W'(y)dy \sim \log\left(\frac{x_{m+1}}{n_m}\right) \sim \frac{v_m}{n_m}.$$

This fed back into the final term in (61) over the subsequence  $n_m$  yields that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sqrt{n_m}}{\log^{\frac{7}{4}}(n_m)} (1 - f_{n_m}) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{v_m}{\sqrt{n_m} \log^{\frac{7}{4}}(n_m)} = 0.$$

This concludes the proof of the theorem. □

## References

- [1] R. Arratia, A. D. Barbour and S. Tavaré. *Logarithmic Combinatorial Structures: a Probabilistic Approach*, Europ. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2003.
- [2] R. Arratia and S. Tavaré. Independent process approximations for random combinatorial structures. *Adv. Math.* 104(1994), 90-154.
- [3] N. G. De Bruijn. *Asymptotic Methods in Analysis*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1958.
- [4] J. M. De Laurentis and B. Pittel. Counting subsets of the random partitions and the "Brownian Bridge" process. *Stochastic Processes Appl.* **15** (1983), 155-167.
- [5] P. Flajolet and R. Sedgewick. *Analytic Combinatorics*, Cambr. Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2009.
- [6] B. Fristedt. The structure of random partitions of large integers. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **337** (1993), 703-735.
- [7] W. M. Y. Goh and E. Schmutz. Gap free set partitions. *Random Str. Alg.* **3**(1992), 9-18.
- [8] L. H. Harper. Stirling behavior is asymptotically normal. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **38** (1967), 410-414.
- [9] L. Moser and M. Wyman. An asymptotic for the Bell numbers. *Trans. Roy. Soc. Canada* **49** (1955), 49-55.
- [10] L. Mutafchiev. On the maximal multiplicity of parts in a random integer partition. *Ramanujan J.* **9** (2005), 305-316.

- [11] A. M. Odlyzko. Asymptotic enumeration methods. *In: Handbook of Combinatorics, Vol. II (R. Graham, M. Grötschel and L. Lovász, Eds.)*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1995.
- [12] A. Odlyzko and L. B. Richmond. On the number of distinct block sizes in partitions of a set. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **38** (1985), 170-181.
- [13] B. Pittel. Random set partitions: asymptotics of subset counts. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 79(1997), 326-359.
- [14] V. N. Sachkov. Random partitions of sets. *Theory Probab. Appl.* **19** (1974), 184-190.
- [15] V. N. Sachkov. *Probabilistic Methods in Combinatorial Analysis (in Russian)*, Nauka, Moscow, 1978; *English translation: Vol.56 of Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1984.