

Asymptotic Analysis of Statistical Estimators related to MultiGraphex Processes under Misspecification

ZACHARIE NAULET¹, JUDITH ROUSSEAU^{2,*} and FRANÇOIS CARON^{2,†}

¹*Université Paris-Saclay, Laboratoire de mathématiques d'Orsay, 91405, Orsay, France.*

E-mail: zacharie.naulet@universite-paris-saclay.fr

²*University of Oxford, Department of Statistics, Oxford, UK.*

*E-mail: *judith.rousseau@stats.ox.ac.uk; †caron@stats.ox.ac.uk*

This article studies the asymptotic properties of Bayesian or frequentist estimators of a vector of parameters related to structural properties of sequences of graphs. The estimators studied originate from a particular class of graphex model introduced by Caron and Fox [13]. The analysis is however performed here under very weak assumptions on the underlying data generating process, which may be different from the model of [13] or from a graphex model. In particular, we consider generic sparse graph models, with unbounded degree, whose degree distribution satisfies some assumptions. We show that one can relate the limit of the estimator of one of the parameters to the sparsity constant of the true graph generating process. When taking a Bayesian approach, we also show that the posterior distribution is asymptotically normal. We discuss situations where classical random graphs models such as configuration models, sparse graphon models, edge exchangeable models or graphon processes satisfy our assumptions.

Keywords: Bayesian Nonparametrics; Networks; Random Graphs; Sparsity; Caron and Fox model; Inference; Maximum Likelihood Estimation; Bayesian Estimation; Misspecification

1. Introduction

The increasing availability of large graph-valued data has led to the development of a variety of statistical network models, capturing different features of real-world graphs, together with computational methods to estimate their parameters and, in some cases, the theoretical analysis of the statistical properties of these procedures. In this paper we are interested in the latter, i.e. the analysis of the statistical properties of inference procedures in networks, with a particular focus on the class of sparse multigraphs with unbounded average degree: that is graphs such that the number of edges grows sub-quadratically, but super-linearly, with the number of nodes.

Probabilistic sparse network models with unbounded average degree include sparse graphons [4, 1, 5, 6], models based on exchangeable random measures (also known as graphex or graphon processes) [13, 36, 8], some sparse configuration models [9], and edge-exchangeable graphs [17, 12, 38]. While these models can all capture sparsity, they exhibit very different structural properties. For instance, in sparse graphon models, the clustering coefficient, a measure of the transitivity of the graph, vanishes as the size of the graph increases. Additionally, the proportion of nodes with a given degree $j \geq 1$ goes to zero for any j . Other models, such as graphex models, can exhibit a very different behaviour, as shown by [15]. For some models within this class, the clustering coefficient converges to a strictly positive constant; moreover, the proportion of nodes of a given degree j tends to a constant $p_j > 0$, which behaves like a power-law for large j .

Most of the literature on statistical properties of estimators in sparse graphs with unbounded degrees has focused on the specific class of sparse graphon models, with a particular interest in sparse stochastic blockmodels [1, 2, 39, 7, 20, 25, 26]; see [21] for a recent survey on optimal procedures for (sparse) graphon estimation. Little work has been done besides sparse graphon models. Notable exceptions are the work of [37] which considers consistent estimators of the (generalised) graphon function, and [29] who propose a novel estimator for the power-law exponent in graphex-based models and analyse some of its properties. Both of these work consider the well-specified case, where the graphs are sampled from a graphex process.

[13] introduced and studied a specific model of sparse random multigraph based on exchangeable random measures. This model, which belongs to the class of multigraphex and has connections to sparse configuration models [9], is parameterized by three parameters $(\sigma, \tau, s) \in (-\infty, 1) \times (0, \infty)^2 =: \mathcal{S}$. Although simple, the model captures important properties of real-world graphs via its interpretable parameters. The parameter σ controls both the sparsity rate and the exponent of the asymptotic degree distribution, larger values corresponding to sparser graphs; the parameter τ tunes the exponential tilting of the degree distribution for finite graphs; the parameter s corresponds to an effective sample size of the graph. Additionally, [13] develops efficient algorithms to perform a Bayesian inference for this model.

The aim of this paper is to study the properties of Bayesian or frequentist methods of estimation of $\phi = (\sigma, \tau, s)$ based on the likelihood of the model of [13]. More precisely let $\hat{\phi}_t$ and $\Pi_t(\cdot)$ denote respectively the maximum likelihood estimator and the posterior distribution for some prior distribution $p(\cdot)$ over the parameter ϕ based on the observation of a graph of effective sample size t under this model. We study the existence and the convergence of the estimator $\hat{\phi}_t$ in [Theorem 1](#), as well as the asymptotic behaviour of the distribution $\Pi_t(\cdot)$ in [Theorems 2](#) and [3](#) as the size of the graph goes to infinity. In both cases, we do not assume that the true generating distribution of the graph belongs to the model of [13] nor do we even assume that it belongs to a multigraphex model. Our assumptions on the true data generating process are very weak.

In particular, we consider generic sparse graphs models satisfying, in probability or almost surely

$$D_t^* \sim CN_t^{\frac{2}{1+\alpha_0}}, \quad N_t \rightarrow \infty$$

for some sparsity constant $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1)$ and some $C > 0$, where D_t^* is twice the number of (multi)edges and N_t the number of nodes. We show that, under some additional assumptions on the observed degree distribution, one can relate the limit of the estimator of the sparsity parameter $\hat{\sigma}_t$ to the sparsity constant α_0 of the true graph generating process. When taking a Bayesian approach, we also show that the posterior distribution $\Pi_t(\cdot)$ is asymptotically normal with mean $\hat{\phi}_t$ and a variance which we characterize.

We then investigate situations where classical random graphs models such as *configuration models*, *sparse graphon models*, or *edge exchangeable models* may or may not generate sequence of graphs for which $\hat{\phi}_t$ and $\Pi_t(\cdot)$ do concentrate. Of special interest, we study the case where the true data generating process is a multigraphex process, possibly different from [13]’s model. This section has interests in its own right since we provide some theoretical results on the asymptotic behaviour of the degrees in this class of multigraphex, complementing the results of [15].

In [Section 2](#) we describe the model which is used to make inference and we present the results on the limiting behaviour of the maximum likelihood estimator and of the posterior distribution, in the well and mis-specified cases. In [Section 3](#), we discuss the applicability of our results to various classes of probabilistic sparse graphs or multigraphs and in [Section 4](#) we study in details the case where the true data generating process is a general multigraphex process, showing that the results of [Section 2](#) apply

under mild assumptions. Additionally, we derive the sparsity properties and power-law properties of multigraphex process. The main proofs are given in [Section 5](#).

Notations. Throughout the document, $(\mathcal{G}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ denotes a deterministic or random family of multigraphs, without vertices of degree zero, indexed by a size parameter $t \geq 0$. We note $\mathcal{G}_t = (\mathcal{V}_t, \mathcal{E}_t)$, where $\mathcal{V}_t \subset \mathbb{N}$ is the vertex set, and $\mathcal{E}_t = \{(i, j, \tilde{n}_{i,j}), \text{ for } i \leq j \in \mathcal{V}_t\}$ denotes the edge set, composed of the number of multiedges $\tilde{n}_{i,j}$ between nodes i and j in the vertex set. By convention, assume $\tilde{n}_{j,i} = \tilde{n}_{i,j}$. The size parameter may correspond to the number of nodes or edges or of some other quantity related to these numbers.

For any $i \in \mathcal{V}_t$, let $D_{t,i} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}_t} \tilde{n}_{i,j} \geq 1$ denote the degree of node i , so that $D_t^* = \sum_{i=1}^{N_t} D_{t,i}$ is twice the number of multiedges (up to the number of self edges). Denote also $N_{t,j} = \sum_{i=1}^{N_t} \mathbf{1}_{D_{t,i}=j}$, the number of nodes with degree j . Observe that $\sum_{j \geq 1} N_{t,j} = N_t$ and $\sum_{j \geq 1} j N_{t,j} = D_t^*$.

Throughout the paper $a_n \sim b_n$ means that a_n/b_n converges to 1, $a_n = o(b_n)$ means that a_n/b_n converges to 0, and $a_n = O(b_n)$ means that a_n/b_n is bounded. We also use the notation $a_n \lesssim b_n$ to denote $a_n = O(b_n)$. We say that $a_n \asymp b_n$ if there exist constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that $c_1 a_n \leq b_n \leq c_2 a_n$. Also for any B subset of \mathcal{X} B^c denotes the complementary of B in \mathcal{X} ; in particular, if the set refers to a function f whose domain is $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, then B^c denotes the complementary set of B in \mathcal{X} .

2. Main results

In this section, we derive our main results on the maximum likelihood estimator and the posterior distribution. We consider a given deterministic family of multigraphs $(\mathcal{G}_t)_{t \geq 0}$.

In this section we are studying the statistical properties of either the maximum likelihood or the Bayesian approach associated to the particular multigraphex process proposed by [\[13\]](#), without assuming that the true data generating process belongs to the model of [\[13\]](#).

In order to make explicit the likelihood, we briefly summarize the model of [\[13\]](#). This model is a special example of the class of multigraphex models, which are presented in more details in [Section 4](#). Let M be a unit rate Poisson process: $M := \{(\vartheta_i, \theta_i) : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ on \mathbb{R}_+^2 . In the model, the observations consist of a subset of an infinite symmetric array $(\tilde{n}_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2}$ of multi-edges whose conditional distribution given M is given by

$$\tilde{n}_{i,j} | M \sim \begin{cases} \text{Poisson}(2\bar{\rho}^{-1}(\vartheta_i)\bar{\rho}^{-1}(\vartheta_j)) & \text{if } i < j, \\ \text{Poisson}(\bar{\rho}^{-1}(\vartheta_i)^2) & \text{if } i = j, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where $\bar{\rho}^{-1}(y) := \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^* : \bar{\rho}(x) \leq y\}$ denotes the generalized inverse of the tail Lévy intensity of a generalized gamma process [\[11\]](#):

$$\bar{\rho}(x) = \int_x^\infty \rho(w)dw, \quad \rho(w) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\sigma)} w^{-1-\sigma} e^{-\tau w}, \quad (\sigma, \tau) \in (-\infty, 1) \times \mathbb{R}_+^*. \quad (2)$$

The form [Equation \(1\)](#) of the conditional distribution of the multi-edges is a special case of multigraphon, defined in particular in [\[9, Definition 4\]](#). In [Section 4](#) we study the behaviour of the multigraphex for more general forms of multigraphons.

The infinite array $(\tilde{n}_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2}$ can be seen as the adjacency matrix of an infinite multigraph \mathcal{G} . A projective sequence of (almost-surely) finite multigraphs $(\mathcal{G}_s)_{s > 0}$ is obtained from \mathcal{G} by keeping only the nodes $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\theta_i \leq s$ and such that they have at least one connection with a node $\theta_j \leq s$ (with possibly $j = i$): $\mathcal{G}_s = (\mathcal{V}_s, \mathcal{E}_s)$, with $\mathcal{V}_s = \{i : \theta_i \leq s, \sum_{j: \theta_j \leq s} \tilde{n}_{i,j} > 0\}$.

The previous construction describes a parametric model for multigraphs whose parameters are (σ, τ) , for a given size s . As shown by [13, 15], within this model, the parameter σ , when in the range $(0, 1)$, can be interpreted as the sparsity parameter α_0 presented in the introduction; as we show in Section 4, it also controls the asymptotic degree distribution. The expected number of edges under this model is asymptotically $\mathbb{E}[D_s^*] \sim 2s^2\tau^{2\sigma-2}$, and thus τ controls the overall number of edges.

As the effective size s is typically unobserved, it is customary to also consider it as a parameter of the model, so that we have a parametric family with parameter $\phi := (\sigma, \tau, s)$. An important aspect of this model is that $(N_{t,j})_{j \geq 1}$ is a sufficient statistic for ϕ . Note that in the notation $N_{t,j}$, t represents a size index, which can be thought of as the number nodes or the true (unknown) size if the observed multigraph is generated from the model of [13].

2.1. Maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) and concentration of the likelihood function

Having observed a multigraph \mathcal{G}_t , the log-likelihood $L_t(\phi)$, with $\phi := (\sigma, \tau, s)$, has the following expression (see [28, Section S1.1])

$$e^{L_t(\phi)} \propto s^{N_t} \prod_{i=1}^{N_t} \left[\frac{\Gamma(D_{t,i} - \sigma)}{\Gamma(1 - \sigma)} \right] \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} e^{-(x+y)^2} \frac{x^{D_t^* - \sigma N_t - 1} e^{-\tau x}}{\Gamma(D_t^* - \sigma N_t)} G_\phi(dy) dx, \quad (3)$$

where G_ϕ is the *exponentially tilted stable distribution* on \mathbb{R}_+ , whose Laplace transform is

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} e^{-\xi x} G_\phi(dx) = e^{-s\psi(\sigma, \tau; \xi + \tau)}, \quad \psi(\sigma, \tau; \xi) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sigma} (\xi^\sigma - \tau^\sigma) & \text{if } \sigma \neq 0, \\ \log(\xi/\tau) & \text{if } \sigma = 0, \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

for $\xi \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}_-^*$.

The log-likelihood defined in (3) is complex, but we show in Theorem 7 that it is close to the function

$$\mathcal{Q}_t(\phi) := N_t \log(s) + \mathcal{C}_t(\sigma) - D_t^* \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi)) - \frac{\log(2)}{2}, \quad (5)$$

where $\mathcal{C}_t : (-\infty, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{C}_t(\sigma) := \log \left(\prod_{i=1}^{N_t} \left[\frac{\Gamma(D_{t,i} - \sigma)}{\Gamma(1 - \sigma)} \right] \right) = \sum_{j \geq 2} N_{t,j} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \log(k - \sigma),$$

and,

$$\mathcal{A}(\phi; z) := -\frac{(z - \tau)^2}{4D_t^*} + \left(1 - \frac{\sigma N_t}{D_t^*}\right) \log(z) + \frac{s}{D_t^*} \psi(z; \sigma, \tau); \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}_-^*, \quad (6)$$

and $\zeta(\phi)$ is the (unique) positive real value solution of the equation in z : $\partial_z \mathcal{A}(\phi; z) = 0$. Note that $\mathcal{C}_t(\sigma)$ appears in the definition of $L_t(\phi)$ in (3).

In this paper we do not characterize the maximizer of L_t but instead the maximizer $\hat{\phi}_t$ of \mathcal{Q}_t , which, from Theorem 7, is close to any maximizer of L_t . With a slight abuse, we call $\hat{\phi}_t$ the MLE.

To ensure that $\hat{\phi}_t$ has a limit in t , we also require some assumptions on the observed multigraph. Let $\hat{\alpha}_t \in (0, 1)$ be the solution to the equation $\hat{\alpha}_t \mathcal{C}'_t(\hat{\alpha}_t) = -N_t$. It can be easily seen that $\hat{\alpha}_t$ exists uniquely as soon as $N_{t,1} \neq N_t$. We then consider the following assumption on \mathcal{G}_t .

Assumption 1. We assume that $N_{t,1} \neq N_t$ and the existence of $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1)$ and $\tau_* \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ such that the following two conditions are satisfied:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{2D_t^*} \left(\frac{\alpha_0 N_t}{D_t^*} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha_0}} = \tau_*, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \log(N_t) |\hat{\alpha}_t - \alpha_0| = 0 \quad (7)$$

where $\hat{\alpha}_t$ is solution of the equation $-\hat{\alpha}_t \mathcal{C}'_t(\hat{\alpha}_t) = N_t$; that is solution of

$$\sum_{j \geq 2} N_{t,j} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{\hat{\alpha}_t}{k - \hat{\alpha}_t} = N_t. \quad (8)$$

The first part of (7) requires the graph sequence to be sparse, with sparsity constant α_0 , as it implies that as $t \rightarrow \infty$

$$D_t^* \sim C(\alpha_0, \tau_*) \times N_t^{2/(1+\alpha_0)}, \quad \text{where } C(\alpha_0, \tau_*) = \left(\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\tau_*} \right)^{1-\alpha_0} \alpha_0 \right)^{2/(1+\alpha_0)}. \quad (9)$$

To interpret the second part of (7), first note that we will see in the proof of [Theorem 1](#) in [Section 5.2](#) that $\hat{\sigma}_t$ is very close to $\hat{\alpha}_t$ since $\hat{\sigma}_t$ satisfies $\mathcal{C}'_t(\hat{\sigma}_t) = -N_t/\hat{\sigma}_t(1 + o(1))$. Note also that $\hat{\alpha}_t$ is a stationary point of functions of $\alpha \mapsto N_t \log(\alpha) + C_t(\alpha)$. It follows that $\hat{\alpha}_t$ takes the alternative form

$$\hat{\alpha}_t = \arg \max_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \log \left(\prod_{i=1}^{N_t} \frac{\alpha \Gamma(D_{t,i} - \alpha)}{D_{t,i}! \Gamma(1 - \alpha)} \right), \quad (10)$$

and may therefore be interpreted as the maximum likelihood estimator under a model where the degrees $D_{t,i}$ are drawn i.i.d. from the Karlin-Rouault distribution [[24](#), [33](#)], whose probability mass function is

$$p_j = \frac{\alpha \Gamma(j - \alpha)}{j! \Gamma(1 - \alpha)}, \quad j \geq 1. \quad (11)$$

This distribution originally arose as the limit of the proportion of clusters of a given size in infinite-urn/random partition models [[22](#)]. Under some assumptions, this distribution also arises as the asymptotic degree distribution for graphex processes [[15](#)], multigraphex processes (see [Section 4](#) and in particular [Corollary 1](#)), and some edge-exchangeable multigraphs [[17](#), [12](#)]. In light of this, the second condition in (7) may be interpreted as an implicit assumption on the asymptotic degree distribution of the graph, and how this asymptotic degree distribution relates to the sparsity parameter α_0 . Note that this condition is weaker than requiring that the asymptotic degree distribution of the sequence of graphs $(\mathcal{G}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is the Karlin-Rouault law; we provide some examples in [Section 3](#) where it departs from it.

The estimator $\hat{\alpha}_t$ may also be related to the popular two-parameter Poisson-Dirichlet partition model [[31](#)]. If one interprets N_t as the number of clusters, and $D_{t,i}$ as the size of cluster i , then the right-handside of [Equation \(10\)](#) is almost identical (up to a constant independent of α) to the Poisson-Dirichlet partition model with parameters $(\alpha, 0)$ (also known as α -stable Poisson-Kingman model, see [[32](#), [19](#)]), which is recovered if one replaces the term α^{N_t} by α^{N_t-1} . See also [Section 3](#) for the discussion on the Hollywood model, a random graph based on the two-parameter Poisson-Dirichlet partition model.

Theorem 1. *Let [Assumption 1](#) be valid. Then,*

1. There exists a unique maximizer $\hat{\phi}_t = (\hat{\sigma}_t, \hat{\tau}_t, \hat{s}_t)$ of \mathcal{Q}_t , which we call MLE.
2. For every $K > 0$, there exists $K' > 0$ such that for all ϕ satisfying $|\sigma - \hat{\sigma}_t| > K' \sqrt{\log(D_t^*)/N_t}$ or $|\tau - \hat{\tau}_t| > K' \sqrt{\log(D_t^*)/(D_t^*)^{1/2}}$ or $|\frac{s}{s_t} - 1| > K' \sqrt{\log(D_t^*)/N_t}$, then

$$\mathcal{Q}_t(\phi) - \sup \mathcal{Q}_t \leq -K \log(D_t^*).$$

3. With $s_{*,t} := \tau_*^{1-\alpha_0} \sqrt{2D_t^*}/2$, the MLE satisfies

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \log(D_t^*) |\hat{\sigma}_t - \alpha_0| = 0, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\tau}_t = \tau_*, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\hat{s}_t}{s_{*,t}} = 1.$$

The proof of [Theorem 1](#) is given in [Section 5.2](#). A remarkable feature of [Theorem 1](#) is that it does not require the model to be well specified and it holds under a weak assumption on the true data generating process, namely [Assumption 1](#). In [Section 3](#) we discuss the generality of this assumption in more details. Note also that [Theorem 1](#) is a consistency result not a convergence rate. We study in the case were the true generating process of \mathcal{G}_t belongs to the model of [\[14\]](#) a much faster rate is obtained, as seen in [Section 2.3](#).

2.2. Posterior concentration and asymptotic normality of the posterior distribution

In this Section we study the posterior distribution associated to Model [\(3\)](#) and a prior distribution on $\phi = (\sigma, \tau, s)$. We derive two results on posterior consistency: one under [Assumption 1](#), *i.e.* for sparse graphs and the other for dense graphs. We also provide a Bernstein von Mises type of result in the sparse regime. The Bernstein von Mises result applies to the rescaled parameters $\phi_u = (\sigma, \tau, u)$, with $u := s/s_{*,t}$ and to the rescaled estimate $\hat{\phi}_{t,u} = (\hat{\sigma}_t, \hat{\tau}_t, \hat{u})$ with $\hat{u} := \hat{s}_t/s_{*,t}$. Define the 3×3 matrix $\Sigma_t(\phi_u)$ (as a function of ϕ_u) as minus the inverse of the Hessian matrix of the mapping $\phi_u \mapsto \mathcal{Q}_t(\sigma, \tau, us_{*,t})$ and set $\hat{\Sigma}_t = \Sigma_t(\hat{\phi}_{t,u})$. In many ways, the matrix $\hat{\Sigma}_t^{-1}$ can be seen as the empirical Fisher Information matrix. Analytic expressions as well as various estimates for $\Sigma_t(\phi_u)^{-1}$ are available in [\[28, Section S3\]](#).

Theorem 2 (Bayes, Sparse regime). *Assume model [\(3\)](#) together with a proper prior on ϕ , which has positive and continuous density on \mathcal{S} and such that for all $x > 0$ there are $c, B > 0$ such that for all $u \leq D_t^*$*

$$\Pi \left(\left| \frac{s}{\sqrt{2D_t^*}} - x \right| \leq u \right) \geq c \left(\frac{u}{D_t^*} \right)^B. \quad (12)$$

If [Assumption 1](#) is valid, then for all $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Pi \left(|\sigma - \alpha_0| + |\tau - \tau_*| + \left| \frac{s}{s_{*,t}} - 1 \right| > \epsilon \mid \mathcal{G}_t \right) = 0. \quad (13)$$

Moreover, assume that the prior has a density π such that for all $\epsilon' > 0$ there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that for all t large enough,

$$\sup_{B_\epsilon(\phi_*)} \left| \frac{\pi(\phi)}{\pi(\phi_*)} - 1 \right| \leq \epsilon', \quad B_\epsilon(\phi_*) = \left\{ \phi : |\sigma - \sigma_*| + |\tau - \tau_*| + \left| \frac{s}{s_{*,t}} - 1 \right| \leq \epsilon \right\}. \quad (14)$$

Then, under [Assumption 1](#), the posterior distribution of $\hat{\Sigma}_t^{-1/2}(\phi_u - \hat{\phi}_{t,u})$, written here $\tilde{\Pi}_t$, satisfies,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{\Pi}_t - \mathcal{N}(0, 1)^{\otimes 3}\|_{\text{TV}} = 0, \quad (15)$$

where $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)^{\otimes 3}$ denote the standard Normal distribution on \mathbb{R}^3 . Furthermore when t is large enough, there are constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that for all $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$

$$\begin{aligned} x^t \hat{\Sigma}_t^{-1} x &\geq C_1 \left(s_{*,t}^{1+\alpha_0} x_1^2 + s_{*,t} x_2^2 + \frac{N_t}{\log(D_t^*)^2} x_3^2 \right) \\ &\leq C_2 \left(s_{*,t}^{1+\alpha_0} \log(D_t^*)^2 x_1^2 + s_{*,t} x_2^2 + N_t x_3^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

The proof of [Theorem 2](#) is given in [Section 5.3](#). From [Equation \(13\)](#) we see that the posterior concentrates around $(\alpha_0, \tau_*, s_{*,t})$ and the [Equation \(15\)](#) refines the analysis by stating a Bernstein von Mises type of result, namely that the posterior is asymptotically normally around the MLE with variance matrix $\hat{\Sigma}_t$. It is interesting to see that the posterior on σ and s concentrates at the rate $\sqrt{N_t}$ while the posterior on τ concentrates at the rate $(D_t^*)^{1/4} = o(\sqrt{N_t})$, up to $\log N_t$ terms. This reveals that there is much more signal in the likelihood on σ and s .

Note that condition [\(12\)](#) on the prior is very mild and allows any smooth prior on s which decreases polynomially with s . Condition [\(14\)](#) is very similar. It is in particular satisfied if σ, τ, s are a priori independent with positive and continuous density and if the prior density on s is regularly varying at infinity. For instance the conditions are satisfied if $1 - \sigma$ and τ follow Gamma distributions, and s is the positive part of a student random variable.

[Theorem 2](#) does not cover the dense case. In the following theorem we prove that in the dense case the posterior distribution concentrates on non positive values of σ .

Theorem 3 (Bayes, dense regime). *Assume model [\(3\)](#) together with a proper prior on ϕ . Assume that there exists $c_1 > 0$ such that*

$$\forall c > 0, \quad \liminf_t \frac{D_t^*}{N_t^{2-c}} = +\infty, \quad \liminf_t \frac{\sum_{j \geq 2} N_{t,j} \log(j)}{N_t \log D_t^*} \geq c_1, \quad (16)$$

and assume that a priori σ, τ, s are independent and that there exists $c_2, c_3, c_4 > 0$ such that for all $(D_t^*)^{-c_3} \leq x \leq 1$ and all $\tau < 1$

$$\Pi \left(\left| \frac{s}{s_{*,t}} - x \right| \leq \frac{1}{N_t (\log D_t^*)^2} \right) \geq e^{-c_2 N_t}, \quad \pi_\tau(\tau) \geq e^{-c_4 / \tau^{c_4}}. \quad (17)$$

Then for all $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\Pi(\sigma > \epsilon \mid \mathcal{G}_t) \rightarrow 0.$$

The proof of [Theorem 3](#) is given in [Section 5.4](#). To simplify the presentation we have assumed that σ, τ, s are a priori independent. This is however not necessary. A weaker sufficient condition is that for all $\epsilon, c > 0$, $\Pi(B_t) > e^{-c N_t}$ when t is large enough, where B_t is a set whose precise definition is given in the proof of the [Theorem 3](#).

A consequence of [Equation \(17\)](#) is that when the true graph is dense then the posterior distribution on σ concentrates on $(-\infty, 0]$, which in the model of [\[14\]](#) also corresponds to dense graphs.

As proved in [Section 4.4](#), if the true data generating process comes from [\[13\]](#), i.e. if the model is well specified [Assumption 1](#) and [Theorem 2](#) and [Theorem 3](#) are valid with $\alpha_0 = \sigma_0, \tau_* = \tau_0, t = t$, i.e. the true values of the parameters. In the following Section we prove that $\hat{\phi}_t$ concentrates around the true value of the parameters with a rate given by Σ_t .

2.3. Well-specified case

We now investigate the behaviour of the MLE when the multigraph \mathcal{G}_t has been obtained as a sample of the GGP model of [\[13\]](#); see also [Section 4](#) below for details. In other words, we consider the situation where the model [\(3\)](#) is well specified. In particular, we show that if \mathcal{G}_t is generated according to the GGP model with parameters (σ_0, τ_0) and size t , then the MLE concentrates on $(\hat{\sigma}_t, \hat{\tau}_t) \approx (\sigma_0, \tau_0)$ and $\hat{s}_t/t \approx 1$, at least when $\sigma_0 > 0$. This specializes the [Theorem 1](#) to the well-specified scenario. Obviously this implies similar results for the Bayesian counterparts of [Section 2.2](#) with straightforward adaptations.

Theorem 4. *Let $(\mathcal{G}_t)_{t>0}$ be a sequence of random multigraphs generated according to the multigraph GGP model of [\[13\]](#) with parameters (σ_0, τ_0) . If $\sigma_0 > 0$, then in addition to the results of [Theorems 1](#) and [2](#), we have*

$$|\hat{\sigma}_t - \sigma_0| = O_p\left(t^{-(1+\sigma_0)/2}\right), \quad |\hat{\tau}_t - \tau_0| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{t}\right), \quad \left|\frac{\hat{s}_t}{t} - 1\right| = O_p\left(t^{-(1+\sigma_0)/2} \log(t)\right).$$

The proof of [Theorem 4](#) is given in [Section 5.5](#). We see in the proof of [Theorem 4](#), that in fact

$$\left(\hat{\sigma}_t - \sigma_0, \hat{\tau}_t - \tau_0, \frac{\hat{s}_t}{t} - 1\right) = \Sigma_t(\phi_0)^{-1} \nabla L_t(\phi_0) + o_p(1),$$

where the variance of $\Sigma_t(\phi)^{-1} \nabla L_t(\phi_0)$ is equal to 1. Asymptotic normality of the MLE could then be deduced from the asymptotic normality of the asymptotic normality of $\nabla L_t(\phi_0)$, which is a non trivial result. In particular, $\nabla L_t(\phi_0)$ is a nonlinear functional of a Poisson process, for which no generic theorem for asymptotic normality exists in the literature. A first step toward understanding the asymptotic normality of $\nabla L_t(\phi_0)$ has been investigated in [\[15\]](#), where the authors establish the (marginal) asymptotic normality of D_t^* and N_t , yet it is unclear if the techniques they use can be adapted to understand the limiting distribution of $\nabla L_t(\phi_0)$.

An interesting consequence of [Theorem 4](#), together with [Equation \(13\)](#) is that in the well specified case, Bayesian credible regions on ϕ will have reasonable frequentist coverage. For instance consider a credible interval for σ in the form (σ_1, σ_2) with

$$\Pi(\sigma < \sigma_1 | \mathcal{G}_t) = \Pi(\sigma > \sigma_2 | \mathcal{G}_t) = \gamma/2,$$

then [Equation \(15\)](#) in [Theorem 2](#) implies that

$$\sigma_1 = \hat{\sigma}_t + (\hat{\Sigma}_t^{-1})_{1,1} \Phi^{-1}(\gamma/2)(1 + o(1)), \quad \sigma_2 = \hat{\sigma}_t + (\hat{\Sigma}_t^{-1})_{1,1} \Phi^{-1}(1 - \gamma/2)(1 + o(1))$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma_0 \notin (\sigma_1, \sigma_2)) \leq \frac{2}{\Phi^{-1}(1 - \gamma/2)(1 + o(1))}$$

is small when γ is small.

3. Examples of Random Graphs satisfying Assumption 1

Theorems 1, 2 and 3 provide results which are non stochastic in nature, in the sense that the results hold true as soon as Assumption 1 or Equation (16) are valid. The interest is that these results do not require particular probabilistic models on the multi-graph. However, Assumption 1 can be shown to hold for a variety of probabilistic models on sparse graphs or multigraphs. In particular we do not require that \mathcal{G}_t is a multigraph and Assumption 1 can still hold if we observe a simple graph. In this section we investigate which types of models satisfy Assumption 1. A special interest will be given in multigraphex processes in Section 4, which the model of [13] is a special case of. In this section, we restrict our attention to models outside the family of multigraphex processes.

Configuration models A first example is the class of configuration models, which by definition are constructed conditionally on the degree sequence $(D_{t,i})_{i \geq 1}$, see [27, 35, 9]. The simplest version of configuration models is to consider that the degrees $D_{t,1}, \dots, D_{t,N_t}$ are drawn i.i.d. from some distribution¹, where the number of nodes $N_t = t$ is deterministic. An obvious example would be to take this distribution to be the Karlin-Rouault distribution with pmf given by (11) for some $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1)$. This would automatically satisfy the second part of condition (7) of Assumption 1 as $\hat{\alpha}_t$ is the MLE under this model, as discussed in Section 2. However, using limit theorems for iid random variables with polynomial tails, we have $D_t^* = \sum_{i=1}^{N_t} D_{t,i} \asymp N_t^{1/\alpha_0}$ almost-surely, which does not match the first part of condition (7) of Assumption 1.

We now consider a variation of the above iid configuration model, proposed by [34]. In this model, we condition the degrees to be less or equal than some value $D_{\max,t}$, which increases with t . More specifically, for a pmf $(f_j)_{j \geq 1}$ and a given sequence $(D_{\max,t})_{t \geq 0}$ of maximum degrees, we draw a sequence $(D_{t,1}, \dots, D_{t,t})$ that are independent and identically distributed according to

$$\Pr(D_{t,i} = j) = \begin{cases} \frac{f_j}{\sum_{k=1}^{D_{\max,t}} f_k} & j = 1, \dots, D_{\max,t} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

We obtain the degree sequence $(\tilde{D}_{t,1}, \dots, \tilde{D}_{t,t})$ of the configuration model from $(D_{t,1}, \dots, D_{t,t})$ by letting $\tilde{D}_{t,i} = D_{t,i}$ if $i = 1, \dots, t-1$, and $\tilde{D}_{t,t} = D_{t,t}$ if $\sum_{i=1}^t D_{t,i}$ is even, $\tilde{D}_{t,t} = D_{t,t} + 1$ otherwise. This guarantees that $\sum_{i=1}^t \tilde{D}_{t,i}$ is always even, as required to build the graph [27].

Lemma 1. *Let $(f_j)_{j \geq 1}$ be a probability mass function on $\{1, 2, \dots\}$. Assume $f_1 < 1$ and $1 - \sum_{k=1}^j f_k \sim Lj^{-\alpha_1}$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, for some $\alpha_1 \in (0, 1)$ and $c > 0$. Then the equation*

$$\sum_{j \geq 1} f_j \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{\alpha}{k - \alpha} = 1. \quad (19)$$

has a unique solution α_0 in $(0, 1)$. Moreover, if $D_{\max,t} = AN_t^{\frac{1-\alpha_0}{(1+\alpha_0)(1-\alpha_1)}}$ for some $A > 0$, then there exists $\tau_* > 0$ (which can be made explicit; see the proof for the exact expression) such that the iid configuration model with constrained maximum degree (18) satisfies the two conditions (7) of Assumption 1 (in probability as $t \rightarrow \infty$).

¹Except the last degree, which should be chosen so that the sum of the degrees is even; as this makes no difference asymptotically, we ignore this technical point in this discussion.

In general, $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_0$, and the sparsity parameter α_0 does not correspond to the exponent of the tail of the degree distribution. An exception is when (f_j) is the Karlin-Rouault distribution (11). In this case, $\alpha_1 = \alpha_0$.

Sparse heterogeneous random graphs Degree corrected sparse graph models will typically satisfy [Assumption 1](#) if the sequence of degrees is chosen accordingly, see for instance [30]. We illustrate this point in the next lemma in the case of the simpler degree corrected Erdős-Rényi graph. The proof of [Lemma 2](#) is given in [28, Section S5.2].

Lemma 2. *Consider the degree corrected Erdős-Rényi graph where the probability of an edge between two vertices i, j is given by:*

$$P(Z_{ij} = 1) = \theta_i \theta_j p_N, \quad p_N = p_0 N^{-2\alpha_0/(1+\alpha_0)}.$$

Define $\bar{\theta} := N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \theta_i$, and suppose $(\theta_i)_{i \leq N}$ is chosen so that $p_N (N\bar{\theta})^2 = c_0 N^{2/(1+\alpha_0)}$ for some constant c_0 , so that for all $j = 1, \dots, N$

$$p(j) := \frac{\sum_{u=1}^N 1_{\lceil \theta_u N p_N \bar{\theta} \rceil = j}}{N}, \quad \text{with} \quad \sum_{j=2}^N p(j) \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{\alpha_0}{k - \alpha_0} = 1.$$

Then [Assumption 1](#) is satisfied with $\tau_* = c_0^{-(1+\alpha_0)/(2-2\alpha_0)}$.

Edge-exchangeable models and extensions Edge-exchangeable (multi)graphs [17] are natural candidates for checking [Assumption 1](#) due to their close proximity with graphex processes. We show that, however, they behave rather differently and do not satisfy the [Assumption 1](#). To illustrate this, let consider the so-called *Hollywood process* [17, Section 5]. This process generates almost-surely sequence of multigraphs $(\mathcal{G}_t)_{t>0}$ whose degree distributions satisfy for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$

$$\frac{N_{t,j}}{N_t} \sim \frac{\alpha j^{-(1+\alpha)}}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)}, \quad t \rightarrow \infty.$$

This power-law behaviour of the degree distribution is identical to those of the model of [13] (in this respect, see also [Remark 2](#)), so that one might expect the Hollywood process to satisfy the [Assumption 1](#) as well. In fact they don't, because the Hollywood process generates multigraphs with way more multi-edges. In particular, from [17] we see that the number of multi-edges for the Hollywood process is almost-surely $D_t^* \asymp N_t^{1/\alpha}$, $t \rightarrow \infty$, while we need $D_t^* \asymp N_t^{2/(1+\alpha)}$ in order to satisfy [Assumption 1](#). This begs the question of what happens if we consider the simple random graph obtained from the Hollywood process by merging the multiedges. It is inferred in [17] that the power-law behaviour may be preserved in this case and later [23] has studied the property of such graphs, yet the analysis is tricky and it is not obvious if whether or not they can satisfy our assumptions.

Interestingly, [18] proposes a non-exchangeable partition model that can be used as model for random multigraphs, in the same way that exchangeable partitions are used in edge-exchangeable models. The non-exchangeability brings additional flexibility. In particular, replacing the two-parameters Poisson Dirichlet process used by [17] to construct the Hollywood process by the random partition model of [18, Section 3] adds an extra parameter ξ such that $D_t^* \asymp (N_t)^{(1+\xi)/(\sigma+\xi)}$, $t \rightarrow \infty$, while the shape of the degree distribution remains preserved. Taking $\xi = 1$ gives a model with the same behaviour than the model of [13] and such model may thus satisfy [Assumption 1](#).

4. The special case of multigraphex processes

In this section we study a wide class of random multigraphs, called multigraphex, and show that the assumptions considered in the previous section are satisfied for this class. Multigraphex are extensions of graphex models [14, 37, 8, 15] to multigraphs. The first multigraphex model was introduced by [14]; the term multigraphex was coined by [9], who provided a general definition and made the connection between multigraphex and some sparse configuration models.

This Section derives additional properties of multigraphex. In particular it shows that, multigraphex models satisfy [Assumption 1](#). Additionally, an interesting feature of these graphs is that most nodes have ties with multiplicity 1, see [Proposition 1](#); hence the sparsity property and power-law properties of such multigraph can be directly derived from the properties of graphex models [15], see [Theorem 5](#) and [Corollary 1](#).

4.1. Definition of multigraphex processes

A multigraphex process is a growing family of random multigraphs $(\mathcal{G}_t)_{t \geq 0}$, indexed by the size $t \geq 0$, where \mathcal{G}_t is a multigraph with no isolated vertex (that is, no vertex of degree zero). Ignoring terms corresponding to isolated edges and (multi-)stars, a multigraphex process is characterized by a measurable function $W_m : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$, called a *multigraphon*, and satisfying $W_m(x, y, k) = W_m(y, x, k)$, $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} W_m(x, y, k) = 1$ as well as some integrability conditions. We refer to [9, Definition 4] for details. To generate a multigraphex process, one first draws a unit rate Poisson process $M := \{(\vartheta_i, \theta_i) : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ on \mathbb{R}_+^2 . Conditional on M , generate an infinite symmetric array $(\tilde{n}_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2}$ such that for $i \leq j$ the variables $\tilde{n}_{i,j}$ are independent with distribution on \mathbb{Z}_+ given by

$$\Pr(\tilde{n}_{i,j} = k \mid M) = W_m(\vartheta_i, \vartheta_j, k), \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

The infinite array $(\tilde{n}_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2}$ can be seen as the adjacency matrix of an infinite multigraph \mathcal{G} . Then for $t > 0$, \mathcal{G}_t is obtained from \mathcal{G} by keeping only the nodes $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\theta_i \leq t$ and such that they have at least one connection with a node $\theta_j \leq t$ (with possibly $j = i$). We note that this construction implies that each \mathcal{G}_t has no isolated vertex. Also, the statistics of interest for us can be easily seen to satisfy

$$D_{t,i} = \sum_k \tilde{n}_{i,k} \mathbb{1}_{\theta_k \leq t}, \quad N_{t,j} = \sum_i \mathbb{1}_{\theta_i \leq t} \mathbb{1}_{D_{t,i}=j}, \quad D_t^* = \sum_{i \geq 1} D_{t,i} \mathbb{1}_{\theta_i \leq t}.$$

Remark 1. *Most of the recent attention on multigraphex processes has been drawn on the situation where the multigraphon function is of the form*

$$W_m(x, y, k) = \begin{cases} \text{Poisson}(k; 2\bar{\rho}^{-1}(x)\bar{\rho}^{-1}(y)) & x \neq y \\ \text{Poisson}(k; \bar{\rho}^{-1}(x)^2) & x = y, \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

with $\text{Poisson}(\cdot; \lambda)$ the probability density function of the $\text{Poisson}(\lambda)$ distribution, and with $\bar{\rho}^{-1}$ the generalized inverse of the tail of a Lévy intensity $\bar{\rho}(x) = \int_x^\infty \rho(dw)$, where ρ is some Lévy measure on \mathbb{R}_+ . Depending on the properties of the tail Lévy intensity, one can obtain sparse and dense multigraph processes, potentially with power-law degree distributions. [9] recently showed that this class of models is the limit of some configuration and preferential attachment models, underlining the relevance of such models for statistical network modeling. It is also worth mentioning that, the model of [13], which is also summarized in [Section 2.1](#), is easily seen to be a special case of multigraphex processes with W_m as in [Equation \(20\)](#) with ρ the Lévy measure defined in [Equation \(2\)](#). The multigraphs are sparse for $\sigma_0 \geq 0$ and dense otherwise, with power-law degree distribution if $\sigma_0 > 0$.

4.2. Assumptions

We start by assuming some integrability conditions on functions related to W_m . These integrability conditions are sufficient (though not necessary) for the number of edges and vertices to be almost surely finite, and the multigraph process well defined [9, Definition 4]. In particular, we define for $r \geq 0$ the r 's multigraphon moment function as

$$\overline{W}_r(x, y) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^r W_m(x, y, k),$$

and we assume the following.

Assumption 2. W_m is such that

$$\int_0^{\infty} \overline{W}_2(x, x) dx < \infty, \text{ and, } \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \overline{W}_2(x, y) dx dy < \infty.$$

In many occasions it is of interest to consider the simple graph obtained from a multigraph process by merging the multiedges. It is easily seen that a simple graph obtained by this mechanism is a ‘‘standard’’ graphon process in the sense of [13, 36], with graphon function given by

$$W(x, y) := 1 - W_m(x, y, 0) \tag{21}$$

In particular, it is a consequence of [Proposition 1](#) below that many properties of the multigraph can be deduced from their counterparts in the simple graph model with graphon W . It is known from [36, 15] that a key quantity to characterize the behaviour of the simple graph is the marginal graphon function

$$\mu(x) := \int_0^{\infty} W(x, y) dy = \int_0^{\infty} (1 - W_m(x, y, 0)) dy.$$

We observe that the [Assumption 2](#) implies that μ is an integrable function.

The following assumption, used by [15], characterises the behaviour of μ at infinity or, equivalently, of its generalised inverse μ^{-1} at 0. We require μ^{-1} to behave approximately as a power function $x^{-\alpha_0}$ around 0, for some $\alpha_0 \in [0, 1]$. As demonstrated in the simple graph case in [15], this power law behaviour drives the asymptotics of key statistics of the graph such as the number of vertices or the degree distribution. [Theorem 5](#) establishes the same result in the multigraph context.

Assumption 3. Assume μ is non-increasing, right-continuous, with generalised inverse $\mu^{-1}(x) = \inf\{y > 0 : \mu(y) \leq x\}$, such that

$$\mu^{-1}(x) \sim \ell_1(1/x)x^{-\alpha_0} \text{ as } x \rightarrow 0,$$

where $\alpha_0 \in [0, 1]$ and ℓ_1 is a slowly varying function at infinity.

Many examples of (simple) graphon functions are studied in [15] which satisfy [Assumption 3](#). In particular, we show in [Theorem 6](#) that the GGP model of [13] satisfies [Assumption 3](#) with ℓ_1 a constant function.

The following is a technical assumption needed in order to obtain the almost sure results. A similar assumption has been made by [36] and [15] for the analysis of graphon models. In particular it permits to obtain sufficiently sharp bounds on the variance of the key statistics of the multigraphs. It is slightly stronger than [Assumption 2](#) in [15].

Assumption 4. Let $\nu(x, y) := \int_0^\infty W(x, z)W(y, z)dz$, and assume that there exists a positive, locally bounded function ℓ_3 such that $\ell_3(x)$ converges to a strictly positive constant as $x \rightarrow \infty$, and for all $x, y > 0$

$$\nu(x, y) \leq \ell_3(x)\ell_3(y)\mu(x)^a\mu(y)^a, \quad \begin{cases} a > \max(\frac{1}{2}, \alpha_0) & \text{if } \alpha_0 \in [0, 1), \\ a = 1 & \text{if } \alpha_0 = 1. \end{cases}$$

In comparison with [15] which only deals with the simple graph models, in order to study multi-graphex we need to consider assumptions on the distribution of the number of multiedges given that there is an edge. This is provided by the following assumption.

Assumption 5. Assume that, for all $x, y > 0$,

$$W_m(x, y, 1) \geq W(x, y)(1 - W(x, y)).$$

Clearly the Assumption 5 is satisfied if W_m is of the form of Equation (20), and hence it is satisfied by the important class of graphex processes considered in [9] and also by the model of [13]. Interestingly, the Assumption 5 is also satisfied if W_m is of the form of Equation (20) but with the Poisson distribution replaced with a Binomial, a Geometric, or even a Negative Binomial distribution.

The Assumptions 2 to 5 allow us to derive the first order asymptotic behaviour of $N_t, D_t^*, N_{t,j}$. However to check if the multi-graphex satisfies Assumption 1 we need to consider a strengthened version of Assumption 3.

Assumption 6. There exist $\beta, c_0 > 0$ such that

$$|\mu^{-1}(x) - x^{-\alpha_0}c_0| = O(x^{\beta-\alpha_0}), \quad \text{when } x \rightarrow 0.$$

Assumption 6 is a second order assumption on the tail behaviour of μ^{-1} similar to the assumptions found in extreme value theory, see for instance [16, 10]. The first-order assumption Assumption 3 is sufficient to show that $\hat{\sigma}_t \rightarrow \alpha_0$ almost-surely. Unfortunately, to ensure the concentration of the other parameters ($\hat{\tau}_t, \hat{s}_t$), we need to establish that $\log(t)|\hat{\alpha}_t - \alpha_0| = o(1)$, which cannot be guaranteed if we only assume $\mu^{-1}(x) \sim x^{-\alpha_0}\ell_1(1/x)$; whence the second order assumption.

4.3. Sparsity and Power-law properties of multi-graphex processes

Here we derive sparsity and power-law properties of multi-graphex processes. These results are the counterpart of the results derived by [13] for (simple) graphex processes.

The results follow from the following Proposition which shows that the number of nodes connected to at least one edge of multiplicity larger than 1 is negligible.

Proposition 1. Let (\mathcal{G}_t) be a multi-graphex with multi-graphon function W_m . Let $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t$ denote the sub-graph of \mathcal{G}_t obtained by removing all edges of multiplicity 1, and all nodes whose ties all have multiplicity 1. Denote \tilde{N}_t the number of nodes in $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t$. Suppose Assumptions 2 to 5 hold for some $\alpha_0 > 0$. We have, for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\tilde{N}_t = o(t^{1+\alpha_0/2+\delta}) = o(N_t)$$

almost surely as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

The proof of [Proposition 1](#) is given in [Section 5.6](#). As a consequence of [Proposition 1](#), most of analyses involving multigraphexes can be reduced to the analysis of a classical graphex process, *i.e.* a simple graph analysis. This turns out to be convenient since asymptotic behaviour of simple graphex processes has been extensively studied in [\[15\]](#). In particular, from their result, we can establish the following theorem for multigraphex processes.

Theorem 5 (Asymptotic properties of the multigraphex process). *Suppose [Assumption 2](#) holds. All the results below hold in mean and almost surely as $t \rightarrow \infty$. We have*

$$D_t^* \sim t^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \overline{W}_1(x, y) dx dy, \quad N_t \sim \begin{cases} t^{1+\alpha_0} \Gamma(1-\alpha_0) \ell_1(t) & \text{if } \alpha_0 \in [0, 1) \\ t^2 \tilde{\ell}_1(t) & \text{if } \alpha_0 = 1, \end{cases}$$

where the result on N_t holds under the extra [Assumptions 3](#) and [4](#) for some $\alpha_0 \in [0, 1]$ and some slowly varying function ℓ_1 , with $\tilde{\ell}_1(t) = \int_t^\infty y^{-1} \ell_1(y) dy$. If $\alpha_0 = 0$, then for any $j \geq 1$ we have $N_{t,j} = o(t \ell_1(t))$. Assume now [Assumption 5](#) also hold. Then, for any $j \geq 1$,

$$N_{t,j} \sim \frac{\alpha_0 \Gamma(j - \alpha_0)}{j!} t^{1+\alpha_0} \ell_1(t).$$

Finally, if $\alpha_0 = 1$, then for any $j \geq 1$ we have

$$N_{t,j} \sim \begin{cases} t^2 \tilde{\ell}_1(t) & \text{if } j = 1, \\ o(t^2 \tilde{\ell}_1(t)) & \text{if } j \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

The proof of [Theorem 5](#) is given in [\[28, Section S4.1\]](#). The following is a straightforward corollary showing giving the power-law and sparsity properties of the multigraph.

Corollary 1 (Sparsity and power-law degree distribution). *Suppose [Assumptions 2](#) to [5](#) hold. The multigraph is dense if $\alpha_0 = 0$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \ell_1(t) = C < \infty$, as $D_t^*/N_t^2 \rightarrow C^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \overline{W}_1(x, y) dx dy$ almost surely. Otherwise, if $\alpha_0 > 0$ or $\alpha_0 = 0$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \ell_1(t) = \infty$, the multigraph is sparse, as $D_t^*/N_t^2 \rightarrow 0$. Additionally, for $\alpha_0 \in [0, 1)$, for any $j = 1, 2, \dots$,*

$$\frac{N_{t,j}}{N_t} \rightarrow \frac{\alpha_0 \Gamma(j - \alpha_0)}{j! \Gamma(1 - \alpha_0)}$$

almost surely as $t \rightarrow \infty$. If $\alpha_0 > 0$, this corresponds to a degree distribution with a power-law behaviour as, for j large

$$\frac{\alpha_0 \Gamma(j - \alpha_0)}{j! \Gamma(1 - \alpha_0)} \sim \frac{\alpha_0}{\Gamma(1 - \alpha_0) j^{1+\alpha_0}}.$$

For $\alpha_0 = 1$, $N_{t,1}/N_t \rightarrow 1$ and $N_{t,j}/N_t \rightarrow 0$ for $j \geq 2$, hence the nodes of degree 1 dominate in the graph.

4.4. Multigraphex processes satisfy [Assumption 1](#)

Here we prove that sequence of multigraphs issued from certain multigraphex processes satisfy the [Assumption 1](#), and thus for those processes, [Theorem 1](#) and [Theorem 2](#) hold.

Theorem 6. *Let $(\mathcal{G}_t)_{t>0}$ be generated according to a multigraphex process with multigraphon function W_m satisfying all the [Assumptions 3 to 6](#). If in addition we have $\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mu(x)^2 dx < \infty$, then [Assumption 1](#) holds in probability with*

$$\tau_* = \left\{ \frac{2\alpha_0 c_0 \Gamma(1 - \alpha_0)}{\left(2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \bar{W}_1(x, y) dx dy\right)^{(1+\alpha_0)/2}} \right\}^{1/(1-\alpha_0)}.$$

The proof of [Theorem 6](#) is given in [Section 5.7](#).

Remark 2. *The fact that ℓ_1 converges to a constant in the previous theorem seems necessary to ensure concentration of the MLE. Indeed, by analysis of the proof of the theorem, we infer that if ℓ_1 converges to zero or diverge, then either $\hat{\tau}_t \rightarrow 0$ and $\hat{s}_t/t \rightarrow 0$ or $\hat{\tau}_t \rightarrow \infty$ and $\hat{s}_t/t \rightarrow \infty$ in probability. The difficulty comes in particular from the fact that the size of the network is inferred.*

Remark 3. *The results shown in [Theorem 1](#) suggest that $\hat{\alpha}_t$ can also be used as an alternative to [\[29, 15\]](#) for producing an estimator for the tail-index of graphex processes.*

5. Proofs of the main results

5.1. Approximation of the likelihood: [Theorem 7](#)

A key step to analyse the likelihood which is only available in the form of an integral is to obtain an approximation of the integral in [Equation \(3\)](#). In [Theorem 7](#), we obtain an upper-bound on the log-likelihood which is valid for all parameters ϕ , and an asymptotic equivalence which is valid uniformly over all parameters in the bounded sets

$$\mathcal{S}_K := \left\{ \phi = (\sigma, \tau, s) : -K \leq \sigma < 1, K^{-1} \leq \tau \leq K, 0 < s \leq K \sqrt{2D_t^*} \right\},$$

with $K > 0$ an arbitrarily large number.

Theorem 7. *For every $\sigma \in (-\infty, 1)$, every $\tau > 0$ and every $s > 0$, let $\phi = (\sigma, \tau, s)$, and let $\zeta(\phi)$ be a non-negative real solution to $\partial_z \mathcal{A}(\phi; z) = 0$. Then,*

1. *For every ϕ , $\zeta(\phi)$ exists uniquely.*
2. *There exists $\mathcal{E}_t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for every ϕ ,*

$$L_t(\phi) \leq N_t \log(s) + \mathcal{C}_t(\sigma) - D_t^* \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi)) + \mathcal{E}_t,$$

3. *For the same \mathcal{E}_t as in [Item \(2\)](#), for all $K > 1$, as $D_t^* \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{S}_K} \left| L_t(\phi) - N_t \log(s) - \mathcal{C}_t(\sigma) + D_t^* \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi)) - \mathcal{E}_t + \frac{\log(2)}{2} \right| = o(1).$$

We can see from [Item \(3\)](#) that the upper-bound of [Item \(2\)](#) is sharp up to $\log(2)/2$ for all ϕ in \mathcal{S}_K . Interestingly, we note that [Item \(3\)](#) gives an upper bound on $L_t(\phi)$ which is valid for all $\phi \in \mathcal{S}$, while the asymptotic equivalence only holds uniformly on \mathcal{S}_K . This is not a problem, as to understand the maximum likelihood estimator we only need to lower bound $L_t(\phi)$ for ϕ in a neighborhood of the

maximizer. Indeed, by [Theorem 7](#), we have for any $\phi \in \mathcal{S}$ that $L_t(\phi) - L_t(\hat{\phi}_t) \leq \mathcal{Q}_t(\phi) - \mathcal{Q}_t(\hat{\phi}_t) + \frac{\log(2)}{2} + o(1) \leq 0$. ϕ is away from $\hat{\phi}_t$, where the latter is proved in [Theorem 1](#). Hence, this will imply that any maximizer of L_t must be close to $\hat{\phi}_t$.

Proof of [Theorem 7](#). Here we prove only [Items \(1\) and \(2\)](#). The proof of the [Item \(3\)](#) is similar to the proof of [Item \(2\)](#) but with extra cares to handle the asymptotic equivalence instead of simply getting an upper bound. For this reason, the proof of the [Item \(3\)](#) is deferred to [[28, Section S1.4](#)]. The proof of [Item \(1\)](#) is a consequence of the [Lemma 3](#) below. We now prove [Item \(2\)](#). Set

$$I(\phi) := \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} e^{-(x+y)^2} \frac{x^{D_t^* - \sigma N_t - 1} e^{-\tau x}}{\Gamma(D_t^* - \sigma N_t)} G_\phi(dy) dx.$$

Then, by [Equation \(3\)](#), there is a constant $\mathcal{E}_t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that L_t can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} L_t(\phi) &= N_t \log s + \sum_{i=1}^{N_t} \log \frac{\Gamma(D_{t,i} - \sigma)}{\Gamma(1 - \sigma)} + \log I(\phi) + \mathcal{E}_t \\ &= N_t \log s + \sum_{j \geq 2} \sum_{i=1}^{N_t} \mathbf{1}_{D_{t,i}=j} \log \frac{\Gamma(j - \sigma)}{\Gamma(1 - \sigma)} + \log I(\phi) + \mathcal{E}_t \\ &= N_t \log s + \mathcal{C}_t(\sigma) + \log I(\phi) + \mathcal{E}_t. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Hence to approximate $L_t(\phi)$ we need only approximate $I(\phi)$.

The first step is to express $I(\phi) = (2\sqrt{\pi})^{-1} \int_{\Gamma} \exp\{-D_t^* \mathcal{A}(\phi; z)\} dz$ where Γ denotes the line in the complex plane that goes from $(\tau, +i\infty)$ to $(\tau, -i\infty)$. This is done in [Lemma 3](#) by noting that $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\{-\frac{\xi^2}{4} + i(x+y)\xi\} d\xi = 2\sqrt{\pi} \exp\{-(x+y)^2\}$. This trick allows in particular to separate x and y in the integral. We then analyse $I(\phi)$ using a saddlepoint approximation: first, by the [Lemma 3](#), the saddlepoint $\zeta(\phi) > \tau$. Thus, we can deform the contour of integration so that it goes through $\zeta(\phi)$. For every $L > 0$ let \mathcal{C}_L be the contour that goes from $(\tau, +iL)$ to $(\tau, -iL)$, then from $(\tau, -iL)$ to $(\zeta(\phi), -iL)$, and then from $(\zeta(\phi), -iL)$ to $(\zeta(\phi), +iL)$, and finally from $(\zeta(\phi), +iL)$ to $(\tau, +iL)$. Then \mathcal{C}_L is a rectifiable and closed path, and $z \mapsto \mathcal{A}(\phi; z)$ is complex-analytic in the region delimited by \mathcal{C}_L . Hence Cauchy's integral theorem implies that

$$\int_{\mathcal{C}_L} \exp\{-D_t^* \mathcal{A}(\phi; z)\} dz = 0.$$

As $L \rightarrow \infty$, the integrals of $z \mapsto \exp\{-D_t^* \mathcal{A}(\phi; z)\}$ from $(\tau, -iL)$ to $(\zeta(\phi), -iL)$ and from $(\zeta(\phi), +iL)$ to $(\tau, +iL)$ vanish and thus we obtain from the previous display that,

$$\begin{aligned} I(\phi) &= -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{(\zeta(\phi), -i\infty)}^{(\zeta(\phi), +i\infty)} \exp\{-D_t^* \mathcal{A}(\phi; z)\} dz \\ &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\{-D_t^* \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi) - iu)\} du. \end{aligned}$$

Now let $R_1(\phi; z)$ denote the second-order remainder of the Taylor expansion of $z \mapsto \mathcal{A}(\phi; z)$ near $\zeta(\phi)$, that is we have,

$$\mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi) + z) = \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi)) + \frac{z^2}{2} \partial_z^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi)) + R_1(\phi; z), \tag{23}$$

and then,

$$I(\phi) = \frac{\exp\{-D_t^* \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi))\}}{\sqrt{-2D_t^* \partial_z^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi))}} (1 + \Delta(\phi)), \quad (24)$$

where,

$$\Delta(\phi) := -1 + \sqrt{\frac{-D_t^* \partial_z^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi))}{2\pi}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\left\{\frac{D_t^*}{2} \partial_z^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi)) z^2 - D_t^* R_1(\phi; -iz)\right\} dz. \quad (25)$$

It is easily seen that $\partial_z^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi))$ is pure real and always (strictly) negative, so that [Equations \(24\)](#) and [\(25\)](#) are indeed well-defined. Using [Lemma 4](#) combined with [Equation \(25\)](#), we find that

$$|1 + \Delta(\phi)| \leq \sqrt{\frac{-D_t^* \partial_z^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi))}{2\pi}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-z^2/4} dz = \sqrt{-2D_t^* \partial_z^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi))}.$$

The last display and [Equation \(24\)](#) give the bound which established the [Item \(2\)](#),

$$\log I(\phi) \leq -D_t^* \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi)).$$

□

Lemma 3. For every ϕ , let $(\phi, z) \mapsto \mathcal{A}(\phi; z)$ be the function defined in [Equation \(6\)](#). Then, for every ϕ , we have

$$I(\phi) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\{-D_t^* \mathcal{A}(\phi; \tau - i\xi)\} d\xi. \quad (26)$$

In addition, there exists a unique non-negative solution $\zeta(\phi)$ for the equation $\partial_z \mathcal{A}(\phi; z) = 0$, which satisfies $\zeta(\phi) > \tau$ and

$$\zeta(\phi)^2 = \tau \zeta(\phi) + 2s\zeta(\phi)^\sigma + 2D_t^* \left(1 - \frac{\sigma N_t}{D_t^*}\right). \quad (27)$$

Lemma 4. For every ϕ and for every $z \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\Re\left(\frac{D_t^*}{2} \partial_z^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi)) z^2 - D_t^* R_1(\phi; -iz)\right) \leq -\frac{z^2}{4},$$

where $\Re(z)$ denotes the real part of $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

The proofs of [Lemmas 3](#) and [4](#) as well as the remaining parts of the proof of the [Theorem 7](#) can be found in [[28, Section S1](#)].

5.2. Proof of [Theorem 1](#)

A first difficulty in the proof of [Theorem 1](#) is to show that there exists a unique MLE. Indeed the function \mathcal{Q}_t is a complicated function of ϕ . We first introduce a new parameterization which simplifies its analysis. Define

$$\varepsilon(\phi) := 1 - \frac{2s\zeta(\phi)^\sigma + 2D_t^*(1 - \sigma N_t/D_t^*)}{\zeta(\phi)^2}, \quad u(\phi) := \frac{2s\zeta(\phi)^\sigma}{2D_t^*(1 - \sigma N_t/D_t^*)}.$$

Observe that $\varepsilon(\phi) \in (0, 1)$ and $u(\phi) > 0$. We also define for convenience $\beta_\sigma := 1 - \sigma N_t / D_t^*$. Our goal is to re-express the likelihood in term of the new parameterization (σ, ε, u) . By [Equation \(27\)](#), $\tau = \zeta(\phi) \cdot \varepsilon(\phi)$; therefore we can also rewrite $\zeta(\phi) - \tau = \zeta(\phi) \cdot (1 - \varepsilon(\phi))$ so that

$$\zeta(\phi)^2 = 2D_t^* \beta_\sigma \frac{1 + u(\phi)}{1 - \varepsilon(\phi)}.$$

Define $f(\sigma, \varepsilon) := (1 - \varepsilon^\sigma) / \sigma$ if $\sigma \neq 0$, and $f(\sigma, \varepsilon) = \log(1/\varepsilon)$ if $\sigma = 0$. Then, we have $s\psi(\sigma, \tau; \zeta(\phi)) = D_t^* \beta_\sigma u(\phi) f(\sigma, \varepsilon(\phi))$ for all $\sigma \in (-\infty, 1)$ and $s\psi(\sigma, \tau; \zeta(\phi)) = D_t^* \beta_\sigma u(\phi) g(\sigma, \varepsilon(\phi)) + \frac{D_t^*}{2} (1 - \varepsilon(\phi)) \beta_\sigma u(\phi)$, where $g(\sigma, \varepsilon) := f(\sigma, \varepsilon) - \frac{1-\varepsilon}{2}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_t(\phi) &= N_t \log u(\phi) + N_t \log D_t^* + N_t \log \beta_\sigma + \mathcal{C}_t(\sigma) + \frac{D_t^*}{2} \beta_\sigma (1 + u(\phi)) (1 - \varepsilon(\phi)) \\ &\quad - \frac{D_t^*}{2} \log(2D_t^*) - \frac{D_t^*}{2} \log \beta_\sigma + \frac{D_t^*}{2} \log(1 - \varepsilon(\phi)) - \frac{D_t^*}{2} \log(1 + u(\phi)) \\ &\quad - D_t^* \beta_\sigma u(\phi) g(\sigma, \varepsilon(\phi)) - \frac{D_t^*}{2} (1 - \varepsilon(\phi)) \beta_\sigma u(\phi) + \frac{\log(2)}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

This leads us to define,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) &:= N_t \log \beta_\sigma - \frac{D_t^*}{2} \log \beta_\sigma + \mathcal{C}_t(\sigma) + N_t \log u + \frac{D_t^*}{2} (1 - \varepsilon) \beta_\sigma \\ &\quad + \frac{D_t^*}{2} \log(1 - \varepsilon) - \frac{D_t^*}{2} \log(1 + u) - D_t^* \beta_\sigma u g(\sigma, \varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

which satisfies $\mathcal{Q}_t(\phi) - \mathcal{Q}_t(\phi') = \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\sigma, \varepsilon(\phi), u(\phi)) - \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\sigma', \varepsilon(\phi'), u(\phi'))$ for any pair $(\phi, \phi') \in \mathcal{S}^2$. In many occasions, we will decompose $\mathcal{Q}_t^*(\sigma, \varepsilon, u)$ as $\mathcal{Q}_t^*(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) = H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) + K(\sigma)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) &:= N_t \log u - \frac{D_t^*}{2} \log(1 + u) - D_t^* \beta_\sigma g(\sigma, \varepsilon) u + \frac{D_t^*}{2} \log(1 - \varepsilon) + \frac{D_t^*}{2} (1 - \varepsilon) \beta_\sigma, \\ K(\sigma) &:= N_t \log \beta_\sigma - \frac{D_t^*}{2} \log \beta_\sigma + \mathcal{C}_t(\sigma). \end{aligned}$$

From that we analyze $\Psi(\sigma) := \sup\{\mathcal{Q}_t^*(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) : \varepsilon \in (0, 1), u > 0\}$, proving first that $\Psi(\sigma) = \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma), \tilde{u}(\sigma))$ where $(\tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma), \tilde{u}(\sigma))$ is unique and that under [Assumption 1](#), Ψ has a unique maximizer $\hat{\sigma}_t$, which satisfies $\lim_t \hat{\sigma}_t = \alpha_0$.

We first show in [Lemma 5](#) that Ψ is small for $\sigma \leq -C$ or $\sigma > c_2$ for any $C > 0$ and if $c_2 < 1$ is large enough. More precisely, for all $C > 0$, $c_0 \in (0, 1)$, there exists $c_2 \in (0, 1)$ and $K > 0$ such that $\Psi(\sigma) - \Psi(c_0) \leq -K \log D_t^*$ over $(-\infty, -C) \cup [c_2, 1)$, which implies that the maximizer must be within $[-C, c_2]$.

Moreover from [Lemma 6](#), for any $\sigma \in [-C, c_2]$, there exists a unique $(\tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma), \tilde{u}(\sigma))$ such that $\Psi(\sigma) = \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma), \tilde{u}(\sigma))$, also $\Psi'(c_2) < 0$ and there exists $c_1 > 0$ such that $\Psi'(\sigma) > 0$ on $[-C, c_1]$ so that $\Psi(\sigma) \leq \Psi(c_1)$ if $\sigma \leq c_1$ and any maximizer of Ψ must belong to $[c_1, c_2]$. From [Lemma 7](#) $\Psi''(\sigma) < 0$ on $[c_1, c_2]$, and since $\Psi'(c_1) > 0, \Psi'(c_2) < 0$, there is a unique $\hat{\sigma}_t \in (c_1, c_2)$ which maximizes Ψ . Hence $(\hat{\sigma}_t, \tilde{\varepsilon}(\hat{\sigma}_t), \tilde{u}(\hat{\sigma}_t))$ maximizes \mathcal{Q}_t^* and it must be the unique maximizer.

We now study $\hat{\phi}_t$ and we prove [Item \(1\)](#). Indeed, we established that \mathcal{Q}_t^* has a unique maximizer $(\hat{\sigma}_t, \hat{\varepsilon}_t, \hat{u}_t)$ with $\hat{\varepsilon}_t := \tilde{\varepsilon}(\hat{\sigma}_t)$ and $\hat{u}_t = \tilde{u}(\hat{\sigma}_t)$, yet it remains to establish that this implies that \mathcal{Q}_t also has a unique minimizer. We proceed by obtaining asymptotic expressions for $(\hat{\sigma}_t, \hat{\varepsilon}_t, \hat{u}_t)$ and showing

that the map $\phi \mapsto (\sigma, \varepsilon(\phi), u(\phi))$ is locally invertible. Note that if $\sigma \in [c_1, c_2]$ then $\partial_\sigma \log f(\sigma, \varepsilon) = -\frac{1+O(\varepsilon^\sigma \log \varepsilon^{-1})}{\sigma}$. Hence, by (35) in Lemma 6, it comes that $\hat{\sigma}_t$ must satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} -C'_t(\hat{\sigma}_t) &= \frac{N_t}{\hat{\sigma}_t} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{N_t}{D_t^*}\right)\right) \left(1 + O\left(\hat{\varepsilon}_t^{\hat{\sigma}_t} \log \frac{1}{\hat{\varepsilon}_t}\right)\right) + O\left(\frac{N_t^2}{D_t^{*2}}\right) \\ &= \frac{N_t}{\hat{\sigma}_t} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{N_t}{D_t^*} \sqrt{\hat{\varepsilon}_t^{\hat{\sigma}_t} \log \frac{1}{\hat{\varepsilon}_t}}\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover using [28, Lemma S2.2], since $\hat{u}_t = \bar{u}(\hat{\sigma}_t, \hat{\varepsilon}_t)$ and $\frac{1}{2} + \beta_\sigma g(\hat{\sigma}_t, \hat{\varepsilon}_t) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1-\hat{\varepsilon}_t^{\hat{\sigma}_t}}{\hat{\sigma}_t} - \frac{1-\hat{\varepsilon}_t}{2} + O(N_t/D_t^*) = \frac{1}{\hat{\sigma}_t} (1 + O(\frac{N_t}{D_t^*} \sqrt{\hat{\varepsilon}_t^{\hat{\sigma}_t}}))$, then,

$$\hat{u}_t = \frac{\hat{\sigma}_t N_t}{D_t^*} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{N_t}{D_t^*} \sqrt{\hat{\varepsilon}_t^{\hat{\sigma}_t}}\right)\right) = o(1) \quad (28)$$

Finally since $\partial_\varepsilon H(\hat{\sigma}_t, \hat{\varepsilon}_t, \hat{u}_t) = 0$, we deduce that,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= D_t^* \hat{u}_t \left(1 - \frac{\hat{\sigma}_t N_t}{D_t^*}\right) \left(\hat{\varepsilon}_t^{-1+\hat{\sigma}_t} - \frac{1}{2}\right) - \frac{D_t^*}{2} \frac{1}{1-\hat{\varepsilon}_t} - \frac{D_t^*}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\hat{\sigma}_t N_t}{D_t^*}\right) \\ &= D_t^* \left\{ \hat{u}_t \left(1 - \frac{\hat{\sigma}_t N_t}{D_t^*}\right) \left(\hat{\varepsilon}_t^{-1+\hat{\sigma}_t} - \frac{1}{2}\right) - 1 + O\left(\frac{N_t}{D_t^*} \sqrt{\hat{\varepsilon}_t}\right) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

That is, using (28),

$$\hat{\varepsilon}_t^{-1+\hat{\sigma}_t} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1 + O(\frac{N_t}{D_t^*} \sqrt{\hat{\varepsilon}_t})}{\hat{u}_t} = \frac{D_t^*}{\hat{\sigma}_t N_t} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{N_t}{D_t^*} \sqrt{\hat{\varepsilon}_t^{\hat{\sigma}_t}}\right)\right).$$

From the previous, we also obtain $\hat{\varepsilon}_t \asymp (\frac{N_t}{D_t^*})^{1/(1-\hat{\sigma}_t)}$. Then, under Assumption 1, since $x \rightarrow xC'_t(x)$ is decreasing and since its derivative is bounded from below by $-CN_t$ for some $C > 0$,

$$|\hat{\alpha}_t - \hat{\sigma}_t| = O\left(\frac{N_t}{D_t^*} \sqrt{\hat{\varepsilon}_t^{\hat{\sigma}_t} \log \frac{1}{\hat{\varepsilon}_t}}\right) \quad (29)$$

and

$$\hat{\varepsilon}_t \asymp 1/\sqrt{D_t^*}, \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\varepsilon}_t^{\hat{\sigma}_t} \asymp \frac{\sqrt{D_t^*}}{N_t}. \quad (30)$$

This finished to establish the asymptotic expressions of $(\hat{\sigma}_t, \hat{\varepsilon}_t, \hat{u}_t)$. To prove that $\hat{\phi}_t$ exists and is unique we prove in Lemma 8 that

$$\sup_{(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) \notin \varphi(U_t(K'))} \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) - \sup_{(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times (0,1) \times \mathbb{R}_+} \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) \leq -K \log D_t^*, \quad (31)$$

where

$$U_t(C) := \left\{ \phi : |\sigma - \hat{\sigma}_t|^2 \leq \frac{C \log(D_t^*)}{N_t}, |\varepsilon(\phi) - \hat{\varepsilon}_t|^2 \leq \frac{C \log(D_t^*)}{(D_t^*)^{3/2}}, |u(\phi) - \hat{u}_t|^2 \leq \frac{CN_t \log(D_t^*)}{D_t^{*2}} \right\},$$

and that on U_t the function $\phi \rightarrow \varphi(\phi) = (\sigma, \varepsilon(\phi), u(\phi))$ is invertible. This guarantees that $\hat{\phi}_t = \varphi^{-1}((\hat{\sigma}_t, \hat{\varepsilon}(\hat{\sigma}_t), \hat{u}(\hat{\sigma}_t))) \in U_t$. Hence the 1 in Item (1) is proved.

We now prove points 2 of [Theorem 1](#). The starting point is the [Equation \(31\)](#). Moreover, from part (ii) of [Lemma 8](#) the function $\varphi(\phi) = (\sigma, \varepsilon(\phi), u(\phi))$ has a continuously differentiable inverse whose gradient is given by [\(36\)](#). Hence by doing a Taylor expansion of φ^{-1} , if $\phi \in U_t$, we have,

$$|\tau - \hat{\tau}_t| \lesssim \sqrt{2D_t^*} |\varepsilon - \hat{\varepsilon}_t| \lesssim \frac{\sqrt{\log D_t^*}}{(D_t^*)^{1/4}},$$

and,

$$|s - \hat{s}_t| \lesssim c_8 \sqrt{2D_t^*} \log(2D_t^*) |\sigma - \hat{\sigma}_t| + c_7 \frac{(2D_t^*)^{3/2}}{N_t} |u(\phi) - \hat{u}_t| \lesssim \sqrt{2D_t^*} \frac{\log D_t^*}{\sqrt{N_t}},$$

It remains to prove that 3 of [Theorem 1](#) holds. But, from the expression of $\hat{\sigma}_t, \hat{\varepsilon}_t, \hat{u}_t$, we obtain

$$\hat{\tau}_t = \sqrt{2D_t^*} \left(\frac{\hat{\sigma}_t N_t}{D_t^*} \right)^{1/(1-\hat{\sigma}_t)} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{N_t}{D_t^*} \sqrt{\frac{D_t^*}{N_t}} \right) \right), \quad \hat{s}_t = \frac{\hat{\sigma}_t N_t}{(\sqrt{2D_t^*})^{\hat{\sigma}_t}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{N_t}{D_t^*} \sqrt{\frac{D_t^*}{N_t}} \right) \right). \quad (32)$$

which terminates the proof of [Theorem 1](#).

Lemma 5. Under [Assumption 1](#), for all $c_0 \in (0, 1)$ fixed, we have:

- For all $C > 0$ there exists $B, t_0 > 0$ such that for all $\sigma \leq -C$, and for all $t > t_0$,

$$\Psi(\sigma) - \Psi(c_0) \leq -BN_t \log \frac{D_t^*}{N_t}. \quad (33)$$

- For all $K > 0$ there exists $c_2 > 0$

$$\Psi(\sigma) - \Psi(c_0) \leq -KN_t \quad \forall \sigma \in (c_2, 1). \quad (34)$$

Lemma 6. Let $-C \leq \sigma < c_2 < 1$. Then, if $N_t = o(D_t^*)$, the equation $(\varepsilon, u) \mapsto H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u)$ has a unique maximizer $(\tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma), \tilde{u}(\sigma))$. Furthermore $\tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \leq \frac{3CN_t}{D_t^*}$, $\tilde{u}(\sigma) = \frac{N_t}{D_t^*} \frac{1+O(N_t/D_t^*)}{f(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma))}$ and

$$\Psi'(\sigma) = C_t'(\sigma) - N_t \left(1 + O\left(\frac{N_t}{D_t^*} \right) \right) \frac{\partial_\sigma f(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma))}{f(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma))} + O\left(\frac{N_t^2}{D_t^*} \right), \quad \sigma \in [-C, c_2]. \quad (35)$$

In addition, under [Assumption 1](#), there exists $0 < c_1 < c_2$ such that $\Psi'(\sigma) > 0$ for all $-C \leq \sigma \leq c_1$, and for c_2 sufficiently large $\Psi'(c_2) < 0$.

Lemma 7. For all $\sigma \in [c_1, c_2]$,

$$\Psi''(\sigma) = C_t''(\sigma) - \frac{N_t(1+o(1))}{\sigma^2} < 0.$$

Lemma 8. Under [Assumption 1](#), we have :

1. For all $K > 0$ there exists $K' > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) \in \varphi(U_t(K'))^c} \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) - \sup \mathcal{Q}_t^* \leq -K \log D_t^*.$$

2. The map φ is invertible on $U_t(C)$, for any $C > 0$ if t is large enough. Consequently, there is a unique $\hat{\phi}_t = (\hat{\sigma}_t, \hat{\tau}_t, \hat{s}_t) \in U_t$, and thus in \mathcal{S} which maximizes \mathcal{Q}_t and the Jacobian is given by

$$J(\phi)^{-1} \sim \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{2D_t^*} & 0 \\ c_8 \sqrt{2D_t^*} \log(2D_t^*) & 0 & c_7 \frac{(2D_t^*)^{3/2}}{N_t} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (36)$$

Lemmas 5 to 8 are proved in [28, Section S2.1].

5.3. Proof of Theorem 2

Set $\phi_* = (\alpha_0, \tau_*, s_{*,t})$ with $s_{*,t} = \sqrt{2D_t^*} \tau_*^{1-\alpha_0} / 2$ and τ_* as defined in Theorem 1, and define

$$B_t(M) = \left\{ \phi : \left| \frac{s}{s_{*,t}} - \frac{\hat{s}_t}{s_{*,t}} \right| \leq \frac{M}{s_{*,t}^{(1+\hat{s}_t)/2}}; |\tau - \hat{\tau}_t| \leq \frac{M}{\sqrt{s_{*,t}}}; |\sigma - \hat{\sigma}_t| \leq \frac{M}{s_{*,t}^{(1+\hat{s}_t)/2}} \right\}.$$

Then under Assumption 1, for all $\epsilon > 0$, $|\hat{\sigma}_t - \alpha_0| + |\hat{\tau}_t - \tau_*| + |\hat{s}_t/s_{*,t} - 1| \leq \epsilon/2$ if t is large enough. Hence for all $M > 0$, when t is large enough,

$$\left\{ |\sigma - \alpha_0| + |\tau - \tau_*| + \left| \frac{s}{s_{*,t}} - 1 \right| > \epsilon \right\} \subset B_t(M \log s_{*,t})^c.$$

Moreover, using Theorem 7

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(B_t(M \log^2 s_{*,t})^c | \mathcal{G}_t) &= \frac{\int_{B_t(M \log^2 s_{*,t})^c} e^{L_t(\phi) - L_t(\hat{\phi}_t)} d\pi(\phi)}{\int_{\mathcal{S}} e^{L_t(\phi) - L_t(\hat{\phi}_t)} d\pi(\phi)} \\ &\leq \frac{2 \int_{B_t(M \log^2 s_{*,t})^c} e^{\mathcal{Q}_t(\phi) - \mathcal{Q}_t(\hat{\phi}_t)} d\pi(\phi)}{\int_{B_t(1/\log s_{*,t})} e^{\mathcal{Q}_t(\phi) - \mathcal{Q}_t(\hat{\phi}_t)} d\pi(\phi)} \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Using [28, Lemma S3.5], on $B_t(1/\log s_{*,t})$, $\Sigma_t(\sigma, \tau, s/s_{*,t})^{-1} \lesssim \text{diag} \left(s_{*,t}^{1+\alpha_0} \log^2 s_{*,t}, s_{*,t}, s_{*,t}^{1+\alpha_0} \right)$ so by a Taylor expansion, for all $\phi \in B_t(1/\log s_{*,t})$ and since $\nabla \mathcal{Q}_t(\hat{\phi}_t) = 0$

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{Q}_t(\phi) - \mathcal{Q}_t(\hat{\phi}_t) \\ &\gtrsim -(\sigma - \hat{\sigma}_t)^2 s_{*,t}^{1+\alpha_0} \log^2 s_{*,t} - (\tau - \hat{\tau}_t)^2 s_{*,t} - \left(\frac{s - \hat{s}_t}{s_{*,t}} \right)^2 s_{*,t}^{1+\alpha_0} \gtrsim -C \end{aligned}$$

for some $C > 0$. Thus the denominator of the right hand side of Equation (37) is bounded from below by $e^{-C} \Pi(B_t(1/\log s_{*,t}))$. We use part 2 of Theorem 1 to bound the numerator by $(D_t^*)^{-M'}$ with $M' > 0$ arbitrarily large by choosing $M > 0$ large enough and using Equation (12),

$$\Pi(B_t(M \log^2 s_{*,t})^c | \mathcal{G}_t) \leq \frac{e^C (D_t^*)^{-M'}}{\Pi(B_t(1/\log s_{*,t}))} = o(1)$$

We now prove (15). On $B_t(M\sqrt{\log s_{*,t}})$, using the notation from [28, Section S3.1] in particular $\mathcal{Q}_t^*(\sigma, \tau, u) = \mathcal{Q}_t(\sigma, \tau, s_{*,t}u)$ and $\phi_u = (\sigma, \tau, u)$, and by a Taylor expansion,

$$\begin{aligned} L_t(\phi) - L_t(\hat{\phi}_t) &= \mathcal{Q}_t(\phi) - \mathcal{Q}_t(\hat{\phi}_t) + o(1) =: \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\phi_u) - \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\hat{\phi}_{t,u}) + o(1) \\ &= \frac{-(\phi_u - \hat{\phi}_{t,u})^T \Sigma_t(\bar{\phi}_u)^{-1} (\phi_u - \hat{\phi}_{t,u})}{2} + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\phi}_u = \gamma\phi_u + (1-\gamma)\hat{\phi}_{t,u}$ for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. From [28, Lemma S3.5], the matrix $\Sigma_t(\bar{\phi}_u)^{-1}$ is positive definite and satisfies $\Sigma_t(\bar{\phi}_u)^{-1} = \Sigma_t(\hat{\phi}_{t,u})^{-1}(1 + o(1))$, so that on $B_t(M\log^2 s_{*,t})$

$$L_t(\phi) - L_t(\hat{\phi}_t) = \frac{-(\phi_u - \hat{\phi}_{t,u})^T \Sigma_t(\hat{\phi}_{t,u})^{-1} (\phi_u - \hat{\phi}_{t,u})}{2} (1 + o(1)).$$

Now denote $\tilde{\pi}_u$ (resp. $\tilde{\pi}_u(\phi | \mathcal{G}_t)$) the prior (resp. posterior) density of ϕ_u , $\tilde{\pi}_u(\phi_u | \mathcal{G}_t) = s_{*,t}\pi_t(\phi | \mathcal{G}_t)$ with $\pi_t(\phi | \mathcal{G}_t)$ the posterior density of ϕ ; and keeping the notation $B_t(M\log^2 s_{*,t})$ for its transformation by the function $\phi \mapsto \phi_u$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_t(M\log^2 s_{*,t})} e^{\frac{-(\phi_u - \hat{\phi}_{t,u})^T \Sigma_t(\hat{\phi}_{t,u})^{-1} (\phi_u - \hat{\phi}_{t,u})}{2} (1+o(1))} \tilde{\pi}_u(\phi_u) d\phi_u \\ &= \tilde{\pi}_u(\hat{\phi}_{t,u})(1 + o(1)) \int_{B_t(M\log^2 s_{*,t})} e^{\frac{-(\phi_u - \hat{\phi}_{t,u})^T \Sigma_t(\hat{\phi}_{t,u})^{-1} (\phi_u - \hat{\phi}_{t,u})}{2}} d\phi_u. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover using the lower bound on $\Sigma_t(\hat{\phi}_{t,u})^{-1}$ from [28, Section S3.1]

$$(\phi_u - \hat{\phi}_{t,u})^T \Sigma_t(\hat{\phi}_{t,u})^{-1} (\phi_u - \hat{\phi}_{t,u}) \gtrsim (\sigma - \hat{\sigma}_t)^2 s_{*,t}^{1+\alpha_0} + (\tau - \hat{\tau}_t)^2 s_{*,t} + (s_{*,t} - \hat{s}_t)^2 s_{*,t}^{\alpha_0-1} / \log^2 s_{*,t}.$$

Hence there exists $c > 0$ such that writing $\tilde{B}_t = \{\Sigma_t(\hat{\phi}_{t,u})^{-1/2}(\phi_u - \hat{\phi}_{t,u}); \phi_u \in B_t(M\log^2 s_{*,t})\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_t(M\log^2 s_{*,t})} e^{\frac{-(\phi_u - \hat{\phi}_{t,u})^T \Sigma_t(\hat{\phi}_{t,u})^{-1} (\phi_u - \hat{\phi}_{t,u})}{2} (1+o(1))} \tilde{\pi}_u(\phi_u) d\phi_u \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \tilde{\pi}_u(\hat{\phi}_{t,u}) \int_{B_t(M\log s_{*,t})} e^{\frac{-(\phi_u - \hat{\phi}_{t,u})^T \Sigma_t(\hat{\phi}_{t,u})^{-1} (\phi_u - \hat{\phi}_{t,u})}{2} (1+o(1))} d\phi_u \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \tilde{\pi}_u(\hat{\phi}_{t,u}) |\Sigma_t(\hat{\phi}_{t,u})|^{1/2} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} e^{-\frac{\|z\|^2}{2}} dz - \int_{\tilde{B}_t^c} e^{-\frac{\|z\|^2}{2}} dz \right] \end{aligned}$$

and using $\int_{\tilde{B}_t^c} e^{-\frac{\|z\|^2}{2}} dz \leq (2\pi)^{3/2} Pr(\|\mathcal{X}^2(3)\|^2 > M) = o(1)$ by choosing M large, we obtain that

$$\tilde{\pi}_u(\phi_u | \mathcal{G}_t) = \frac{(1 + o(1)) \tilde{\pi}_u(\phi_u) e^{\frac{-(\phi_u - \hat{\phi}_{t,u})^T \Sigma_t(\hat{\phi}_{t,u})^{-1} (\phi_u - \hat{\phi}_{t,u})}{2} (1+o(1))}}{\int_{B_t(M\log^2 s_{*,t})} e^{\frac{-(\phi_u - \hat{\phi}_{t,u})^T \Sigma_t(\hat{\phi}_{t,u})^{-1} (\phi_u - \hat{\phi}_{t,u})}{2} (1+o(1))} \tilde{\pi}_u(\phi_u) d\phi_u}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{(1+o(1))\tilde{\pi}_u(\phi_*)e^{\frac{-(\phi_u-\hat{\phi}_{t,u})^T \Sigma_t(\hat{\phi}_{t,u})^{-1}(\phi_u-\hat{\phi}_{t,u})}{2}}(1+o(1))}{\tilde{\pi}_u(\hat{\phi}_{t,u})|\Sigma_t(\hat{\phi}_{t,u})|^{1/2}(2\pi)^{3/2}} \\
&= \frac{(1+o(1))e^{\frac{-(\phi_u-\hat{\phi}_{t,u})^T \Sigma_t(\hat{\phi}_{t,u})^{-1}(\phi_u-\hat{\phi}_{t,u})}{2}}(1+o(1))}{|\Sigma_t(\hat{\phi}_{t,u})|^{1/2}(2\pi)^{3/2}},
\end{aligned}$$

uniformly over $\phi \in B_t(M \log^2 s_{*,t})$, where we have used the consistency of $\hat{\phi}_{t,u}$. This implies that

$$\|\Pi_t - \mathcal{N}(0,1)^{\otimes 3}\|_{TV} \leq o(1) + \Pi(B_t(M \log^2 s_{*,t})^c | \mathcal{G}_t) = o(1).$$

5.4. Proof of Theorem 3

Following from the proof of Equation (34), for any $\epsilon > 0$ fixed and $\sigma > \epsilon$,

$$\Psi(\sigma) - \Psi(\epsilon) \leq \sum_{j \geq 2} N_{t,j} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \log \frac{k-\sigma}{k-\epsilon} + O(N_t) \leq -(\sigma - \epsilon) \sum_{j \geq 2} N_{t,j} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{1}{k-\epsilon} + O(N_t)$$

Moreover

$$\sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{1}{k-\epsilon} \geq \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{1}{k} \geq \log j + O(1)$$

Hence, when t is large enough and under Equation (16),

$$\Psi(\sigma) - \Psi(\epsilon) \leq -(\sigma - \epsilon) \sum_{j \geq 2} N_{t,j} \log j + O(N_t) \leq -c_2(\sigma - \epsilon) N_t \log D_t^* + O(N_t).$$

which thus leads to : for all ϕ such that $\sigma > 2\epsilon$

$$L_t(\sigma, \tau, s) - \sup_{\tau, s} L_t(\epsilon, \tau, s) \leq -c_2(\sigma - \epsilon) N_t \log D_t^* + O(N_t)$$

Using the computations of the derivatives of \mathcal{Q}_t in the proof of [28, Lemma S3.5], $\sup_{\tau, s} L_t(\epsilon, \sigma, \tau)$ is attained at

$$\hat{\tau}_\epsilon = \left(\frac{2\hat{s}_\epsilon}{\sqrt{2D_t^*}} \right)^{1/(1-\epsilon)} (1+o(1)), \quad \hat{s}_\epsilon = \frac{N_t \epsilon}{(1-\epsilon/2)(2D_t^*)^{\epsilon/2}} (1+o(1))$$

and choosing

$$\phi \in B_t = \left\{ |\sigma - \epsilon| + |\tau - \hat{\tau}_\epsilon| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{N_t \log D_t^*}, |s - \hat{s}_\epsilon| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{N_t} \right\}$$

together with $\nabla \mathcal{Q}_t$ in [28, Section S3.1],

$$\left| L_t(\sigma, \tau, s) - \sup_{\tau, s} L_t(\epsilon, \tau, s) \right| \leq C\epsilon$$

for some positive constant C . Hence

$$\int_{B_t} e^{L_t(\sigma, \tau, s) - \Psi(\epsilon)} \pi(\phi) d\phi \geq e^{-\epsilon C} \Pi(B_t)$$

and from Equation (17),

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(B_t) &\geq \pi(\epsilon, \hat{\tau}_\epsilon) \left(\frac{\epsilon}{N_t \log D_t^*} \right)^2 (1 + o(1)) \Pi \left(\left| \frac{s}{\sqrt{2D_t^*}} - \frac{N_t \epsilon}{(1 - \epsilon/2)(2D_t^*)^{(1+\epsilon)/2}} (1 + o(1)) \right| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{N_t} \right) \\ &\geq e^{-\frac{c_2 N_t}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

since if ϵ is small enough and when t is large enough

$$\frac{1}{(D_t^*)^{c_3}} \leq \frac{N_t \epsilon}{(1 - \epsilon/2)(2D_t^*)^{(1+\epsilon)/2}} \leq 1, \quad \text{and} \quad o(1) = \hat{\tau}_\epsilon \geq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \frac{1}{(2D_t^*)^\epsilon}.$$

We finally obtain

$$\Pi(\sigma > 2\epsilon \mid \mathcal{G}_t) \leq e^{-\frac{c_2(\sigma - \epsilon)N_t \log D_t^*}{2}} = o(1).$$

5.5. Proof of Theorem 4

Since the GGP model of [13] is a special case of multigraphex processes, we establish the concentration result in the well-specified case by using the concentration result for more general multigraphex processes of Theorem 6. To do so, in a first time we check that the GGP model satisfies all the Assumptions 3 to 6 and we characterize what are the constants involved in those assumptions in term of the true parameters. In particular we show that the GGP model satisfies the Assumption 1 by the general result of Theorem 6, with $\alpha_0 = \sigma_0$, $\tau_* = \tau_0$ and $\tau_*^{1-\alpha_0} = 2$. Hence, by the Theorem 1 ($\hat{\sigma}_t, \hat{\tau}_t$) is a consistent estimator of (σ_0, τ_0) and $\hat{s}_t/t \rightarrow 1$ in probability as well. In a second time, we leverage the well-specification of the model to obtain the exact rates of convergence via adaptation of standard techniques involving asymptotic expansion of the log-likelihood.

The GGP model satisfies Assumptions 3 to 6 Recall that we consider only $\sigma_0 \in (0, 1)$. From the definition of the GGP model (see Section 4), we obtain that the model is a multigraphex process with marginal graphon function

$$\mu(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left(1 - e^{-2\bar{\rho}^{-1}(x)\bar{\rho}^{-1}(y)} \right) dy, \quad (38)$$

where $\bar{\rho}$ is the tail of the Lévy intensity defined in Equation (2). It has been established in [15, Proposition 16] that μ in Equation (38) satisfies the Assumptions 3 and 4 with $\alpha_0 = \sigma_0$ and $a = 1$. By Equation (20), we also have that when $x \neq y$,

$$\begin{aligned} W(x, y)(1 - W(x, y)) &= \left(1 - e^{-2\bar{\rho}^{-1}(x)\bar{\rho}^{-1}(y)} \right) e^{-2\bar{\rho}^{-1}(x)\bar{\rho}^{-1}(y)} \\ &\leq 2\bar{\rho}^{-1}(x, y)\bar{\rho}^{-1}(y) e^{-2\bar{\rho}^{-1}(x)\bar{\rho}^{-1}(y)} = W_m(x, y, 1). \end{aligned}$$

A similar computation in the case $x = y$ gives that the GGP model also satisfies the [Assumption 5](#). It remains to establish the validity of [Assumption 6](#). The proof is very similar to [[15](#), Proposition 16] but with extra cares to get the second order terms. They in particular show that $\mu^{-1}(x) = \bar{\rho}(\psi^{-1}(x)/2)$ where $\psi(t) := \int_0^\infty (1 - e^{-wt})\rho(dw)$. Then, $\psi(t) = t \int_0^\infty w\rho(dw) + O(t^2)$ as $t \rightarrow 0$, namely $\psi(t) = t \cdot \tau_0^{-1+\sigma_0} + O(t^2)$. We deduce that as $t \rightarrow 0$,

$$\psi^{-1}(t) = t \cdot \tau_0^{1-\sigma_0} + O(t^2). \quad (39)$$

On the other hand,

$$\bar{\rho}(x) = \int_x^\infty \frac{w^{-1-\sigma_0} e^{-\tau_0 w} dw}{\Gamma(1-\sigma_0)} = \frac{x^{-\sigma_0}}{\Gamma(1-\sigma_0)} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sigma_0} - \int_1^\infty w^{-1-\sigma_0} (1 - e^{-\tau_0 x w}) dw \right\}.$$

But, for $x \rightarrow 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \int_1^\infty w^{-1-\sigma_0} (1 - e^{-\tau_0 x w}) dw \leq \int_1^{1/x} x \tau_0 w^{-\sigma_0} dw + \int_{1/x}^\infty w^{-1-\sigma_0} dw \\ &\leq \frac{\tau_0 x^{\sigma_0}}{1-\sigma_0} + \frac{x^{\sigma_0}}{\sigma_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, as $x \rightarrow 0$,

$$\bar{\rho}(x) = \frac{x^{-\sigma_0}}{\sigma_0 \Gamma(1-\sigma_0)} + O(1). \quad (40)$$

Combining [Equations \(39\)](#) and [\(40\)](#), we find as $x \rightarrow 0$,

$$\mu^{-1}(x) - \frac{2^{\sigma_0}}{\sigma_0 \tau_0^{\sigma_0 (1-\sigma_0)} \Gamma(1-\sigma_0)} x^{-\sigma_0} = O(1).$$

Then [Assumption 6](#) is satisfied by the GGP model with $\alpha_0 = \sigma_0$, $\beta = \sigma_0 > 0$ and

$$c_0 = \frac{2^{\sigma_0}}{\sigma_0 \tau_0^{\sigma_0 (1-\sigma_0)} \Gamma(1-\sigma_0)}. \quad (41)$$

We note that the previous also implies that [Assumption 3](#) is satisfied. We now show that the previous implies $\tau_* = \tau_0$. The expression for τ_* when $(\mathcal{G}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a multigraphex process is given in the [Theorem 6](#). The only term that remains to compute is

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \bar{W}_1(x, y) dx dy = 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \bar{\rho}^{-1}(x) \bar{\rho}^{-1}(y) dx dy = 2 \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \frac{w^{-\sigma_0} e^{-\tau_0 w} dw}{\Gamma(1-\sigma_0)} \right\}^2 = 2 \tau_0^{-2+2\sigma_0}.$$

Rates of convergence via asymptotic expansion of the log-likelihood We start by getting a slow, but polynomial, rate of convergence. Indeed, we have from [Equation \(44\)](#), $|\hat{\sigma}_t - \sigma_0| = O_p(t^{-\eta})$ for some $\eta > 0$. By [Equation \(41\)](#), [Equation \(42\)](#) and [Theorem 6](#),

$$\tau_* = \left\{ \frac{2^{1+\sigma_0} \tau_0^{-\sigma_0(1-\sigma_0)}}{(4\tau_0^{-2+2\sigma_0})^{(1+\sigma_0)/2}} \right\}^{1/(1-\sigma_0)} = \tau_0.$$

and using [28, Section S4], for some $\eta > 0$,

$$\left| \sqrt{2D_t^*} \left(\frac{\sigma_0 N_t}{D_t^*} \right)^{1/(1-\sigma_0)} - \tau_0 \right| = O_p(t^{-\eta}).$$

Combining the above with Equation (32), we obtain that

$$|\hat{\tau}_t - \tau_0| = O_p(t^{-\eta}), \quad \left| \hat{s}_t - t \frac{\sqrt{2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \bar{W}_1(x, y) dx dy} \tau_0^{1-\sigma_0}}{2} \right| = |\hat{s}_t - t| = O_p(t^{1-\eta}). \quad (42)$$

We now refine these rates. The Lemma 9 below controls the bias of the score based on $\mathcal{Q}_t^*(\phi_{0,u})$ with $\phi_{0,u} = (\sigma_0, \tau_0, 1)$ and implies that

$$\nabla_{\phi_u} \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\hat{\phi}_{t,u}) = 0 = \nabla_{\phi_u} \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\phi_{0,u}) + \int_0^1 D_{\phi_u}^2 \mathcal{Q}_t^*(v\hat{\phi}_{t,u} + (1-v)\phi_{0,u})(\hat{\phi}_{t,u} - \phi_{0,u}) dv \quad (43)$$

and

$$-D_{\phi_u}^2 \mathcal{Q}_t^*(v\hat{\phi}_{t,u} + (1-v)\phi_{0,u}) = \Sigma(v\hat{\phi}_{t,u} + (1-v)\phi_{0,u})^{-1}$$

which is definite positive from [28, Section S3.1]. We then write $\bar{\Sigma}^{-1} = \int_0^1 \Sigma(v\hat{\phi}_{t,u} + (1-v)\phi_{0,u})^{-1} dv$, so

$$\hat{\phi}_{t,u} - \phi_{0,u} = \bar{\Sigma} \nabla_{\phi_u} \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\phi_{0,u})$$

Since $|\hat{\phi}_{t,u} - \phi_{0,u}| = O(t^{-\delta})$, we have uniformly for v in $(0, 1)$

$$\Sigma(v\hat{\phi}_{t,u} + (1-v)\phi_{0,u})^{-1} = \Sigma(\phi_{0,u})^{-1} (1 + o_p(1))$$

and $\bar{\Sigma} = \Sigma(\phi_{0,u}) (1 + o_p(1))$. Hence Equation (43) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_t(\phi_{0,u})^{-1/2} (\hat{\phi}_{t,u} - \phi_{0,u}) &= (1 + o(1)) \Sigma_t(\phi_{0,u})^{1/2} \nabla_{\phi_u} \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\phi_{0,u}) \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \Sigma_t(\phi_{0,u})^{1/2} \nabla_{\phi_u} L_t(\phi_{0,u}) \\ &\quad + (1 + o(1)) \Sigma_t(\phi_{0,u})^{1/2} [\nabla_{\phi_u} \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\phi_{0,u}) - \nabla_{\phi_u} L_t(\phi_{0,u})] \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \Sigma_t(\phi_{0,u})^{1/2} \nabla_{\phi_u} L_t(\phi_{0,u}) + o(1) \end{aligned}$$

where the term $o(1)$ comes from Lemma 9. From the beginning of [28, Section S3.1],

$$\Sigma_t(\phi_{0,u})^{-1} \geq \begin{pmatrix} ct^{1+\sigma_0} + M_1(\phi_0) & 0 & M_2(\phi_0) \\ 0 & ct & 0 \\ M_2(\phi_0) & 0 & N_t \end{pmatrix} (1 + o(1))$$

so that

$$\Sigma_t(\phi_{0,u}) \leq \frac{c'}{t} \begin{pmatrix} c_1 t^{-\sigma_0} & 0 & c_2 t^{-\sigma_0} \log t \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ t^{-\sigma_0} \log t & 0 & t^{-\sigma_0} \log^2 t \end{pmatrix} (1 + o(1)),$$

for some $c', c_1, c_2 > 0$. Moreover

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\|\Sigma_t(\phi_{0,u})^{1/2}\nabla_{\phi_u}L_t(\phi_{0,u})\| > M) &\leq \frac{\text{Tr}[\Sigma_t(\phi_{0,u})\mathbb{E}[-D^2\phi_uL_t(\phi_{0,u})]]}{M} \\ &\leq \frac{\text{Tr}[\Sigma_t(\phi_{0,u})\mathbb{E}[-D^2\phi_u\mathcal{Q}_t^*(\phi_{0,u})]]}{M} + \frac{\text{Tr}[\Sigma_t(\phi_0)\mathbb{E}[-D^2\mathcal{Q}_t^*(\phi_{0,u})]]}{M} + o(1) \lesssim \frac{1}{M} \end{aligned}$$

using [Lemma 9](#), so that $\Sigma_t(\phi_{0,u})^{-1/2}(\hat{\phi}_{t,u} - \phi_{0,u}) = O_p(1)$.

Lemma 9. *There exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that if $V_2 = \text{diag}(t^{-(1+\sigma_0)/2}, t^{-1/2}, t^{-(1+\sigma_0)/2} \log t)$,*

$$\mathbb{P}_0\left(\|V_2\nabla_{\phi_u}(\mathcal{Q}_t^* - L_t)(\sigma_0, \tau_0, 1)\| > t^{-\delta_0}\right) = o(1).$$

and

$$\text{Tr}\left[V_2D_{\phi_u}^2(\mathcal{Q}_t^* - L_t)(\sigma_0, \tau_0, 1)\right] = O(1).$$

The proof of [Lemma 9](#) is given in [[28, Section S3.2](#)].

5.6. Proof of [Proposition 1](#)

The family of random multigraphs $(\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t)$ is a multigraphex process with multigraphon function

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{W}_m(x, y, 0) &= W_m(x, y, 0) + W_m(x, y, 1), \quad \tilde{W}_m(x, y, 1) = 0 \\ \tilde{W}_m(x, y, k) &= W_m(x, y, k) \text{ for all } k \geq 2. \end{aligned}$$

The associated simple graph $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t^{(s)}$ obtained by discarding multiple edges from $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t$ is therefore a graphon process with graphon function $\tilde{W}(x, y) = W(x, y) - W_m(x, y, 1)$. Denote $\tilde{\mu}(x) = \int_0^\infty \tilde{W}(x, y) dy$. If $\int \tilde{\mu}(x) dx = 0$, then $\tilde{N}_t = 0$ almost surely. We now assume $\int \tilde{\mu}(x) dx > 0$. Using [[36](#)], the expectation of the number of nodes \tilde{N}_t in the simple subgraph $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t^{(s)}$ (which is the same as the number of nodes in $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_t$) is

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{N}_t] = t \int_0^\infty \left(1 - (1 - \tilde{W}(x, x))e^{-t\tilde{\mu}(x)}\right) dx.$$

Under [Assumption 5](#), $\tilde{W}(x, y) \leq W(x, y)^2$ hence, under [Assumption 4](#), $\tilde{\mu}(x) \leq \ell_3(x)^2 \mu(x)^2$. Under the [Assumption 3](#) with $\alpha_0 > 0$, using [Proposition 1.5.15](#) in [[3](#)], we additionally have

$$\mu^2(x) \sim x^{-2/\alpha_0} \tilde{\ell}_1^*(x) \text{ as } x \rightarrow \infty.$$

for some slowly varying function $\tilde{\ell}_1^*$. We obtain, using [Lemma S3.2](#) in [[15](#)] and assuming without loss of generality that ℓ_3 is monotone decreasing and right-continuous

$$\int_0^\infty (1 - e^{-t\tilde{\mu}(x)}) dx \leq \int_0^\infty (1 - e^{-t\ell_3(x)^2 \mu(x)^2}) dx = o(t^{\alpha_0/2+\delta})$$

for any $\delta > 0$. By dominated convergence, as $\int \widetilde{W}(x, x) dx < \infty$, $\int \widetilde{W}(x, x) e^{-t\widetilde{\mu}(x)} dx = o(1)$. Hence, we obtain, for any $\delta > 0$ $\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{N}_t] = o(t^{1+\alpha_0/2+\delta})$. Using Markov inequality,

$$\Pr\left(\frac{\widetilde{N}_t}{t^{1+\alpha_0/2+2\delta}} > \epsilon\right) = o(t^{-\delta}).$$

Let $t_m = m^{2/\delta}$ for $m = 1, 2, \dots$. By the Borel-Cantelli lemma, almost surely $\widetilde{N}_{t_m} = o(t_m^{1+\alpha_0/2+2\delta})$. For any $t_m < t \leq t_{m+1}$, noting that \widetilde{N}_t is monotone increasing, we have

$$\frac{\widetilde{N}_t}{t^{1+\alpha_0/2+2\delta}} \leq \frac{\widetilde{N}_{t_{m+1}}}{t_{m+1}^{1+\alpha_0/2+2\delta}} \left(\frac{t_{m+1}}{t_m}\right)^{1+\alpha_0/2+2\delta} = o(1)$$

almost surely.

5.7. Proof of Theorem 6

The fact that $N_{t,1} \neq N_t$ is almost-surely true by Theorem 5. The same theorem implies that there is $\tau_* > 0$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{2D_t^*} \left(\frac{\alpha_0 N_t}{D_t^*}\right)^{1/(1-\alpha_0)} = \tau_*$ almost-surely. It also implies that $\log \frac{D_t^*}{N_t} \sim (1 - \alpha_0) \log(t)$ almost-surely. We prove below that there exists $\eta > 0$ such that

$$|\hat{\alpha}_t - \alpha_0| = O_p(t^{-\eta}), \quad (44)$$

which then implies Theorem 6.

where we call that $\hat{\alpha}_t$ is the (unique) solution of $-\hat{\alpha}_t \mathcal{C}'_t(\hat{\alpha}_t) = N_t$. We define the functions $\hat{\Phi}(\alpha) := \mathcal{C}'_t(\alpha) + \alpha^{-1} N_t$, and $\Phi(\alpha) := \mathbb{E}[\hat{\Phi}(\alpha)]$. Likewise, $\hat{\alpha}_t \in (0, 1)$ is solution to $\hat{\Phi}(\hat{\alpha}_t) = 0$. Similarly we let $\alpha_* \in (0, 1)$ be solution to $\Phi(\alpha_*) = 0$. We prove Equation (44) by showing that $|\alpha_* - \alpha_0| \lesssim t^{-\eta}$ for some $\eta > 0$ and $|\hat{\alpha}_t - \alpha_*| \lesssim t^{-\eta}$ with probability going to 1, where $\eta > 0$ is defined in Lemma 10.

Bounding $\mathbb{P}(|\hat{\alpha}_t - \alpha_*| > t^{-\eta/2})$ Using a Taylor expansion of $\hat{\Phi}$ we find that there exists $\bar{\alpha}$ between $\hat{\alpha}_t$ and α_* such that $\hat{\Phi}(\alpha_*) = \hat{\Phi}(\hat{\alpha}_t) + \hat{\Phi}'(\bar{\alpha})(\alpha_* - \hat{\alpha}_t)$, whence $\hat{\Phi}(\alpha_*) = \hat{\Phi}'(\bar{\alpha})(\alpha_* - \hat{\alpha}_t)$. But, $\hat{\alpha}_t, \alpha_* \in [0, 1]$, and so $\bar{\alpha} \in [0, 1]$ as well. Since $\hat{\Phi}'(\alpha) = -\sum_{j \geq 2} N_{t,j} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{1}{(k-\alpha)^2} - \alpha^{-2} N_t$, it follows that $|\hat{\Phi}'(\bar{\alpha})| \geq \bar{\alpha}^{-2} N_t$, and hence $\bar{\alpha}^{-2} N_t |\alpha_* - \hat{\alpha}_t| \leq |\hat{\Phi}'(\bar{\alpha})(\alpha_* - \hat{\alpha}_t)| = |\hat{\Phi}(\alpha_*)|$. We deduce that

$$|\hat{\alpha}_t - \alpha_*| \leq \frac{\bar{\alpha}^2}{N_t} \left(|\mathcal{C}'_t(\alpha) - \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{C}'_t(\alpha))| + \alpha_*^{-1} |N_t - \mathbb{E}(N_t)| \right)$$

so that for all $\delta > 0$, when t is large enough

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(|\hat{\alpha}_t - \alpha_*| > t^{-\eta+\delta} N_t\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(N_t < t^{1+\alpha_0-\delta/2}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(|\hat{\alpha}_t - \alpha_*| > t^{1+\alpha_0-\eta+\delta/2}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{4\text{var}(N_t)}{\mathbb{E}(N_t)^2} + t^{-\delta} = O(t^{-\delta}) \end{aligned}$$

by choosing $\delta > 0$ small enough and using Chebyshev inequality for the term N_t and Lemma 10 for the second term.

Bounding $|\alpha_* - \alpha_0|$ Recall that $\Phi(\alpha) = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{C}'_t(\alpha)] + \alpha^{-1}\mathbb{E}[N_t]$. Hence, by combining [Lemma 10](#) with [\[28, Lemma S4.6\]](#), we find that as $t \rightarrow \infty$, for some $\eta > 0$,

$$\Phi(\alpha) = t\bar{F}(t^{-1})\Gamma(1 - \alpha_0) \left\{ \left(\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha} - 1 \right) \frac{\Gamma(1 - \alpha)\Gamma(\alpha_0)}{\Gamma(1 + \alpha_0 - \alpha)} + O(t^{-\eta}) \right\}. \quad (45)$$

Remember that $\Phi(\alpha) = 0$ has a unique solution α_* (because Φ is monotone), but from the previous, it is clear that asymptotically this solution has to lie in an interval of the form $[\alpha_0 - O(t^{-\eta}), \alpha_0 + O(t^{-\eta})]$. Indeed from [Equation \(45\)](#), for $c > 0$ large enough, $\Phi(\alpha_0 + ct^{-\eta}) < 0$, while $\Phi(\alpha_0 - ct^{-\eta}) > 0$. Since Φ is monotone, then $\Phi(\alpha) < 0$ for all $\alpha \geq \alpha_0 + ct^{-\eta}$ and $\Phi(\alpha) > 0$ for all $\alpha \leq \alpha_0 - ct^{-\eta}$. Consequently $|\alpha_* - \alpha_0| \leq ct^{-\eta}$.

Lemma 10. *Let [Assumptions 3 to 6](#) be satisfied, together with $\int_0^\infty \mu(x)^2 dx < \infty$. Then, there exists $\eta > 0$, depending only on α_0, γ_0 and a , such that as $t \rightarrow \infty$, for every fixed $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[-\mathcal{C}'_t(\alpha)] = t\mu^{-1}(t^{-1})\Gamma(1 - \alpha_0) \left(1 + O(t^{-\eta}) \right) \left\{ \frac{1}{\alpha} + \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha} \right) \frac{\Gamma(1 - \alpha)\Gamma(\alpha_0)}{\Gamma(1 + \alpha_0 - \alpha)} \right\}, \quad (46)$$

and for any $\delta > 0$

$$\mathbb{P} \left(|\mathcal{C}'_t(\alpha) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{C}'_t(\alpha)]| > t^{1+\alpha_0-\eta+\delta} \right) = O(t^{-2\delta}). \quad (47)$$

The proof of [Lemma 10](#) can be found in [\[28, Section S4.3\]](#).

Acknowledgements

The project leading to this work has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 834175).

References

- [1] BICKEL, P. J. and CHEN, A. (2009). A nonparametric view of network models and Newman–Girvan and other modularities. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **106** 21068–21073.
- [2] BICKEL, P. J., CHEN, A. and LEVINA, E. (2011). The method of moments and degree distributions for network models. *The Annals of Statistics* **39** 2280–2301.
- [3] BINGHAM, N. H., GOLDIE, C. M. and TEUGELS, J. L. (1987). *Regular variation* **27**. Cambridge university press.
- [4] BOLLOBÁS, B. and RIORDAN, O. (2009). *Metrics for sparse graphs*. In *Surveys in Combinatorics 2009. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series* 211–288. Cambridge University Press.
- [5] BORGS, C., CHAYES, J. T., COHN, H. and ZHAO, Y. (2014). An L^p theory of sparse graph convergence II: LD convergence, quotients, and right convergence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1408.0744*.
- [6] BORGS, C., CHAYES, J. T., COHN, H. and ZHAO, Y. (2014). An L^p theory of sparse graph convergence I: Limits, sparse random graph models, and power law distributions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1401.2906*.

- [7] BORGS, C., CHAYES, J. T., COHN, H. and GANGULY, S. (2021). Consistent nonparametric estimation for heavy-tailed sparse graphs. *Annals of Statistics* **49** 1904-1930.
- [8] BORGS, C., CHAYES, J. T., COHN, H. and HOLDEN, N. (2018). Sparse exchangeable graphs and their limits via graphon processes. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **18** 1-71.
- [9] BORGS, C., CHAYES, J. T., DHARA, S. and SEN, S. (2019). Limits of sparse configuration models and beyond: Graphexes and Multi-Graphexes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.01605*.
- [10] BOUCHERON, S., THOMAS, M. et al. (2015). Tail index estimation, concentration and adaptivity. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **9** 2751-2792.
- [11] BRIX, A. (1999). Generalized gamma measures and shot-noise Cox processes. *Advances in Applied Probability* **31** 929-953.
- [12] CAI, D., CAMPBELL, T. and BRODERICK, T. (2016). Edge-exchangeable graphs and sparsity. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 4249-4257.
- [13] CARON, F. and FOX, E. (2017). Sparse Graphs using Exchangeable Random Measures. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B* **79** 1-44. Part 5.
- [14] CARON, F. and FOX, E. B. (2014). Bayesian Nonparametric Models of Sparse and Exchangeable Random Graphs. *ArXiv e-prints* 1401.1137.
- [15] CARON, F., PANERO, F. and ROUSSEAU, J. (2017). On sparsity, power-law and clustering properties of graphex processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.03120*.
- [16] CARPENTIER, A. and KIM, A. K. (2015). Adaptive and minimax optimal estimation of the tail coefficient. *Statistica Sinica* 1133-1144.
- [17] CRANE, H. and DEMPSEY, W. (2018). Edge exchangeable models for interaction networks. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **113** 1311-1326.
- [18] DI BENEDETTO, G., CARON, F. and TEH, Y. W. (2017). Non-exchangeable random partition models for microclustering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.07287*.
- [19] FAVARO, S. and NAULET, Z. (2021). Near-optimal estimation of the unseen under regularly varying tail populations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.03251*.
- [20] GAO, C., LU, Y., MA, Z. and ZHOU, H. (2016). Optimal estimation and completion of matrices with biclustering structures. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* **17** 5602-5630.
- [21] GAO, C. and MA, Z. (2021). Minimax Rates in Network Analysis: Graphon Estimation, Community Detection and Hypothesis Testing. *Statistical Science* **36** 16-33.
- [22] GNEDIN, A., HANSEN, B. and PITMAN, J. (2007). Notes on the occupancy problem with infinitely many boxes: general asymptotics and power laws. *Probability Surveys* **4** 88.
- [23] JANSON, S. (2018). On edge exchangeable random graphs. *Journal of statistical physics* **173** 448-484.
- [24] KARLIN, S. (1967). Central limit theorems for certain infinite urn schemes. *J. Math. Mech* **17** 373-401.
- [25] KLOPP, O., TSYBAKOV, A. and VERZELEN, N. (2017). Oracle inequalities for network models and sparse graphon estimation. *The Annals of Statistics* **45** 316-354.
- [26] KLOPP, O. and VERZELEN, N. (2019). Optimal graphon estimation in cut distance. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **174** 1033-1090.
- [27] MOLLOY, M. and REED, B. (1995). A critical point for random graphs with a given degree sequence. *Random structures & algorithms* **6** 161-180.
- [28] NAULET, Z., ROUSSEAU, J. and CARON, F. (2021). Asymptotic Analysis of Statistical Estimators related to MultiGraphex Processes under Misspecification: supplementary material.
- [29] NAULET, Z., ROY, D. M., SHARMA, E. and VEITCH, V. (2021). Bootstrap estimators for the tail-index and for the count statistics of graphex processes. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **15** 282-325.

- [30] OUADAH, S., ROBIN, S. and LATOUCHE, P. (2020). Degree-based goodness-of-fit tests for heterogeneous random graph models: Independent and exchangeable cases. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **47** 156-181.
- [31] PITMAN, J. (1995). Exchangeable and partially exchangeable random partitions. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **102** 145–158.
- [32] PITMAN, J. (2003). Poisson-Kingman partitions. *Lecture Notes-Monograph Series* 1–34.
- [33] ROUAULT, A. (1978). Lois de Zipf et sources markoviennes. *Annales de l'IHP Probabilités et statistiques* **14** 169–188.
- [34] VAN DEN ESKEER, H., VAN DER HOFSTAD, R., HOOGHIEMSTRA, G. and ZNAMENSKI, D. (2005). Distances in random graphs with infinite mean degrees. *Extremes* **8** 111–141.
- [35] VAN DER HOFSTAD, R. (2014). Random graphs and complex networks. Vol. I. Technical Report, Eindhoven University of Technology.
- [36] VEITCH, V. and ROY, D. M. (2015). The class of random graphs arising from exchangeable random measures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.03099*.
- [37] VEITCH, V. and ROY, D. M. (2019). Sampling and Estimation for (Sparse) Exchangeable Graphs. *Annals of Statistics* **47** 3274-3299.
- [38] WILLIAMSON, S. A. (2016). Nonparametric network models for link prediction. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* **17** 7102–7121.
- [39] WOLFE, P. J. and OLHEDE, S. C. (2013). Nonparametric graphon estimation. *ArXiv preprint arXiv:1309.5936*.

Asymptotic Analysis of Statistical Estimators related to MultiGraphex Processes under Misspecification : supplementary material

ZACHARIE NAULET¹, JUDITH ROUSSEAU^{2,*} and FRANÇOIS CARON^{2,†}

¹Université Paris-Saclay, Laboratoire de mathématiques d'Orsay, 91405, Orsay, France.

E-mail: zacharie.naulet@universite-paris-saclay.fr

²University of Oxford, Department of Statistics, Oxford, UK.

E-mail: *judith.rousseau@stats.ox.ac.uk; †caron@stats.ox.ac.uk

This document is supplementary material for the article. It contains the missing proofs. We refer to the main document for all the definitions.

Keywords: Bayesian Nonparametrics; Networks; Random Graphs; Sparsity; Caron and Fox model; Inference; Maximum Likelihood Estimation; Bayesian Estimation; Misspecification

S1. Asymptotic expansion of the log-likelihood: auxiliary results

S1.1. Proof of the expression of the likelihood in [4, Equation (3)]

[4, Equation (3)] is a consequence of [2, Theorem 6]. Using exchangeability, we assume without loss of generality that the non isolated vertices corresponds to the indices $1, \dots, N_t$. Then, from their theorem, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{L_t(\phi)} &\propto s^{N_t} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{N_t}} \exp \left\{ - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N_t} w_i + w_* \right)^2 \right\} \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^{N_t} w_i^{D_{t,i}} \rho(dw_i) \right\} G_\phi(dw_*) \\ &= s^{N_t} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{N_t}} \exp \left\{ - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N_t} w_i + w_* \right)^2 \right\} \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^{N_t} \frac{w_i^{D_{t,i}-1-\sigma} e^{-\tau w_i} dw_i}{\Gamma(1-\sigma)} \right\} G_\phi(dw_*). \end{aligned}$$

That is, introducing the PDF of the Gamma distribution,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{L_t(\phi)} &\propto s^{N_t} \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^{N_t} \frac{\Gamma(D_{t,i}-\sigma)}{\Gamma(1-\sigma)\tau^{D_{t,i}-\sigma}} \right\} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{N_t}} \exp \left\{ - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N_t} w_i + w_* \right)^2 \right\} \\ &\quad \times \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^{N_t} \frac{\tau^{D_{t,i}-\sigma} w_i^{D_{t,i}-1-\sigma} e^{-\tau w_i} dw_i}{\Gamma(D_{t,i}-\sigma)} \right\} G_\phi(dw_*). \end{aligned}$$

Remark that the inner integral is the expectation of $\exp\{-(\sum_{i=1}^{N_t} W_i + w_*)^2\}$ under $(W_1, \dots, W_{N_t}) \sim \otimes_{i=1}^{N_t} \text{Gamma}(D_{t,i} - \sigma, \tau)$. But under this distribution we have that $\sum_{i=1}^{N_t} W_i$ has a $\text{Gamma}(\sum_{i=1}^{N_t} D_{t,i} - \sigma N_t, \tau)$ distribution. Hence, the conclusion follows.

S1.2. Proof of [4, Lemma 3]

Using the definition of $I(\phi)$, we introduce the PDF of the Gamma($D_t^* - \sigma N_t, \tau$) distribution,

$$I(\phi) = \frac{1}{\tau D_t^* - \sigma N_t} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} e^{-(x+y)^2} \frac{\tau D_t^* - \sigma N_t x^{D_t^* - \sigma N_t - 1} e^{-\tau x}}{\Gamma(D_t^* - \sigma N_t)} G_\phi(dy) dx.$$

We rewrite the previous integral by using that the Fourier transform of a Gaussian is Gaussian. In particular,

$$\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\left\{-\frac{\xi^2}{4} + i(x+y)\xi\right\} d\xi = \exp\{-(x+y)^2\}.$$

Inserting the last display in the previous expression for $I(\phi)$, it follows from Fubini's theorem and the expressions for the Fourier transforms of G_ϕ (see [4, Equation (4)]) and the Gamma distribution,

$$\begin{aligned} I(\phi) &= \frac{1}{\tau D_t^* - \sigma N_t} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\frac{\xi^2}{4} + i(x+y)\xi} d\xi \frac{\tau D_t^* - \sigma N_t x^{D_t^* - \sigma N_t - 1} e^{-x}}{\Gamma(D_t^* - \sigma N_t)} G_\phi(dy) dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi} \tau D_t^* - \sigma N_t} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\frac{\xi^2}{4}} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} e^{ix\tau - 1} \xi \frac{x^{D_t^* - \sigma N_t - 1} e^{-x}}{\Gamma(D_t^* - \sigma N_t)} dx \right\} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} e^{i\xi y} G_\phi(dy) \right\} d\xi \\ &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi} \tau D_t^* - \sigma N_t} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(1 - \frac{i\xi}{\tau}\right)^{-(D_t^* - \sigma N_t)} \exp\left\{-\frac{\xi^2}{4} - s\psi(\sigma, \tau; \tau - i\xi)\right\} d\xi \\ &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\tau - i\xi)^{-(D_t^* - \sigma N_t)} \exp\left\{-\frac{\xi^2}{4} - s\psi(\sigma, \tau; \tau - i\xi)\right\} d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

The conclusion follows because for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$, from [4, Equation (6)],

$$-\frac{\xi^2}{4} = -D_t^* \mathcal{A}(\phi; \tau - i\xi) + s\psi(\sigma, \tau; \tau - i\xi) + (D_t^* + \sigma N_t) \log(\tau - i\xi).$$

Now we establish [4, Equation (27)], the uniqueness of $\zeta(\phi)$, and that $\zeta(\phi) > \tau$. Remark that for all σ (including $\sigma = 0$), we have from the definition of ψ that $\partial_z \psi(\sigma, \tau; z) = 1/z^{1-\sigma}$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}_-$. Then for all ϕ ,

$$\partial_z \mathcal{A}(\phi; z) = -\frac{z}{2D_t^*} + \frac{\tau}{2D_t^*} + \left(1 - \frac{\sigma N_t}{D_t^*}\right) \frac{1}{z} + \frac{s}{D_t^*} z^{-1+\sigma}. \quad (\text{S1.1})$$

Therefore,

$$\partial_z \mathcal{A}(\phi; z) = 0 \iff z^2 = \tau z + 2s z^\sigma + 2D_t^* \left(1 - \frac{\sigma N_t}{D_t^*}\right).$$

Since $D_t^* \geq N_t$ and $\sigma < 1$, the last display implies that any solution of $\partial_z \mathcal{A}(\phi; z) = 0$ must satisfy $z^2 > \tau z$, i.e. $z > \tau$ since we retained the non-negative solution. By differentiating Equation (S1.1) another time with respect to z , we see that $\partial_z^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi; z) < 0$ for $z > 0$, hence $\zeta(\phi)$ must be unique. Further $\lim_{z \rightarrow 0} \partial_z \mathcal{A}(\phi; z) = +\infty$ and $\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} \partial_z \mathcal{A}(\phi; z) = -\infty$ by Equation (S1.1) again, so $\zeta(\phi)$ must exist.

S1.3. Proof of [4, Lemma 4]

Using the defining equation of $z \mapsto R_1(\phi; z)$, it is clear that for any $z \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\frac{1}{2} \partial_z^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi)) z^2 - R_1(\phi; -iz) = -\{\mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi) - iz) - \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi))\}. \quad (\text{S1.2})$$

From the definition of \mathcal{A} , we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi) - iz) - \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi)) &= -\frac{(\zeta(\phi) - iz)^2 - \zeta(\phi)^2}{4D_t^*} + \frac{\tau(\zeta(\phi) - iz) - \tau\zeta(\phi)}{2D_t^*} \\ &\quad + \left(1 - \frac{\sigma N_t}{D_t^*}\right) \left(\log(\zeta(\phi) - iz) - \log(\zeta(\phi))\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{s}{D_t^*} \left(\psi(\sigma, \tau; \zeta(\phi) - iz) - \psi(\sigma, \tau; \zeta(\phi))\right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence for every $z \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Re\{\mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi) - iz) - \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi))\} &= \frac{z^2}{4D_t^*} + \left(1 - \frac{\sigma N_t}{D_t^*}\right) \left(\log \sqrt{\zeta(\phi)^2 + z^2} - \log \zeta(\phi)\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{s}{D_t^*} \Re\left(\psi(\sigma, \tau; \zeta(\phi) - iz) - \psi(\sigma, \tau; \zeta(\phi))\right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for all $z \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\Re\{\mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi) - iz) - \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi))\} \geq \frac{z^2}{4D_t^*} + \frac{s}{D_t^*} \Re\left(\psi(\sigma, \tau; \zeta(\phi) - iz) - \psi(\sigma, \tau; \zeta(\phi))\right). \quad (\text{S1.3})$$

Assume first that $\sigma = 0$. Then, whenever $z \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Re\left(\psi(\sigma, \tau; \zeta(\phi) - iz) - \psi(\sigma, \tau; \zeta(\phi))\right) &= \Re\left(\log(\zeta(\phi) - iz) - \log(\zeta(\phi))\right) \\ &= \log \sqrt{\zeta(\phi)^2 + z^2} - \log \zeta(\phi) \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The previous display combined with [Equations \(S1.2\) and \(S1.3\)](#) gives the proof of the proposition in the case $\sigma = 0$.

When $\sigma \neq 0$, because $\zeta(\phi) > 0$ we have $\arg(\zeta(\phi) - iz) = -\arctan(z/\zeta(\phi))$, and then,

$$\begin{aligned} \Re\left(\psi(\sigma, \tau; \zeta(\phi) - iz) - \psi(\sigma, \tau; \zeta(\phi))\right) &= \Re\left(\frac{(\zeta(\phi) - iz)^\sigma - \zeta(\phi)^\sigma}{\sigma}\right) \\ &= \frac{(\zeta(\phi)^2 + z^2)^{\sigma/2} \cos(\sigma \arctan(z/\zeta(\phi))) - \zeta(\phi)^\sigma}{\sigma} \\ &= \zeta(\phi)^\sigma f_\sigma(z/\zeta(\phi)), \end{aligned}$$

where for simplicity, we defined $f_\sigma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$f_\sigma(y) := \frac{(1 + y^2)^{\sigma/2} \cos(\sigma \arctan(y)) - 1}{\sigma}.$$

To finish the proof of the proposition, it suffices to show that f is non-negative. When $\sigma < 0$, we have $\cos(\sigma \arctan(y)) \leq 1$ uniformly, and hence

$$f_\sigma(y) \geq \frac{(1+y^2)^{\sigma/2} - 1}{\sigma} \geq \frac{1}{-\sigma} - \frac{(1+y^2)^{\sigma/2}}{-\sigma} \geq 0.$$

Now we consider the case $0 < \sigma < 1$. Because f is symmetric, it suffices to do the analysis for $y \geq 0$. By differentiation, we get

$$f'_\sigma(y) = (1+y^2)^{-1+\sigma/2} \cos(\sigma \arctan(y)) \left(y - \tan(\sigma \arctan(y)) \right).$$

But, $y \geq 0 \Rightarrow \arctan(y) \in [0, \pi/2]$, and hence $\cos(\sigma \arctan(y)) \geq 0$ as $0 < \sigma < 1$. Similarly, $y > \tan(\sigma \arctan(y))$ when $0 < \sigma < 1$, and thus $f'_\sigma(y) \geq 0$ when $y \geq 0$ and $0 < \sigma < 1$. This means that f is increasing on \mathbb{R}_+ , and thus $f_\sigma(y) \geq f_\sigma(0) = 0$.

S1.4. Remaining part of the proof of [4, Theorem 7]

To finish the proof of [4, Theorem 7], it remains to prove the [Item \(3\)](#). The proof is almost identical to the proof of the [Item \(2\)](#) established in [4, Section 5.1], and consists mostly on obtaining a refinement in the bound for $\Delta(\phi)$. In particular, the starting point to the proof is [4, Equation (24)]. To ease the notations, we write $a(\phi) := (-D_t^* \partial_z^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi)))^{1/2}$. Then, it follows from [4, Equations (23) and (25)] and a suitable change of variables that for some $C > 0$ to be chosen accordingly

$$1 + \Delta(\phi) = \int_{[-Ca(\phi), Ca(\phi)]} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-u^2/2} e^{-D_t^* R_1(\phi, -iu/a(\phi))} du + \int_{[-C, C]^c} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{a(\phi)^2}{2} z^2 - D_t^* R_1(\phi; -iz)} dz. \quad (\text{S1.4})$$

Now remark that because of [4, Lemma 4] the second integral in the last display is a $O(e^{-C^2/4})$ as $C \rightarrow \infty$, where we have used the well-known tail bound for the Normal distribution. On the other hand, it is seen that $D_t^* \partial_z^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi, z) \leq -1/2$ for all admissible ϕ and for all z , since $\sigma < 1$, $s > 0$ and $N_t \leq D_t^*$. This entails that $a(\phi) \geq 1/2$ for any ϕ , and thus $\int_{[-Ca(\phi), Ca(\phi)]^c} e^{-u^2/2} du = O(e^{-C^2/8})$. By [Equation \(S1.4\)](#), it follows as $C \rightarrow \infty$

$$\Delta(\phi) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{[-Ca(\phi), Ca(\phi)]} e^{-u^2/2} \left(e^{-D_t^* R_1(\phi; \frac{-iu}{a(\phi)})} - 1 \right) du + O(e^{-C^2/8}). \quad (\text{S1.5})$$

In order to control $\Delta(\phi)$, it thus remain to control $x \mapsto D_t^* R_1(\phi; -ix)$ for $x \in [-C, C]$, in virtue of [Equation \(S1.5\)](#). We will proceed using Cauchy's integral formula. In particular, from our choice for the determination of the complex logarithm, the function $z \mapsto \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi) + z)$ is complex-analytic on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \Re(z) = 0, \Im(z) \leq -\zeta(\phi)\}$. Then, by Cauchy's integral formula, for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|z| < \zeta(\phi)/2$, we have

$$R_1(\phi; z) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{|\xi|=\zeta(\phi)/2} \frac{\mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi) + \xi) z^3}{\xi - z} \frac{1}{\xi^3} d\xi.$$

Since $|\xi - z| \geq |\xi| - |z|$, the previous implies for every $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|z| \leq \zeta(\phi)/4$ that

$$\begin{aligned} |R_1(\phi; z)| &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{4}{\zeta(\phi)} \frac{2^3}{\zeta(\phi)^3} |z|^3 \sup_{|\xi|=\zeta(\phi)/2} |\mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi) + \xi)| \times 2\pi \frac{\zeta(\phi)}{2} \\ &= \frac{16|z|^3}{\zeta(\phi)^3} \sup_{\varphi \in [-\pi, \pi]} |\mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi)(1 + e^{i\varphi}/2))| \\ &\leq \frac{16|z|^3}{\zeta(\phi)^3} \sup_{1/2 \leq x \leq 2} \sup_{\varphi \in [-\pi, \pi]} |\mathcal{A}(\phi; x\zeta(\phi)e^{i\varphi})|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S1.6})$$

But, assuming without loss of generality $\sigma \neq 0$, for all $x > 0$ and all $\varphi \in (-\pi, \pi)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(\phi; x\zeta(\phi)e^{i\varphi}) &= -\frac{\tau^2}{4D_t^*} - \frac{x^2\zeta(\phi)^2 e^{2i\varphi}}{4D_t^*} + \frac{\tau\zeta(\phi)x e^{i\varphi}}{2D_t^*} + \left(1 - \frac{\sigma N_t}{D_t^*}\right) \log(x\zeta(\phi)) \\ &\quad + i \left(1 - \frac{\sigma N_t}{D_t^*}\right) \varphi + \frac{s}{D_t^*} \frac{(x\zeta(\phi))^\sigma e^{i\sigma\varphi} - \tau^\sigma}{\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark that,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(x\zeta(\phi))^\sigma e^{i\sigma\varphi} - \tau^\sigma}{\sigma} &= \frac{(x\zeta(\phi))^\sigma - \tau^\sigma}{\sigma} e^{i\sigma\varphi} + \frac{\tau^\sigma}{\sigma} (e^{i\sigma\varphi} - 1) \\ &= \psi(\sigma, \tau; x\zeta(\phi)) e^{i\sigma\varphi} + \frac{\tau^\sigma}{\sigma} (e^{i\sigma\varphi/2} - e^{-i\sigma\varphi/2}) e^{i\sigma\varphi/2} \\ &= \psi(\sigma, \tau; x\zeta(\phi)) e^{i\sigma\varphi} + \varphi \tau^\sigma \frac{\sin(\sigma\varphi/2)}{\sigma\varphi/2} e^{i\sigma\varphi/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{A}(\phi; x\zeta(\phi)e^{i\varphi})| &\leq \frac{\tau^2 + x^2\zeta(\phi)^2 + 2\tau\zeta(\phi)}{4D_t^*} + 2 \left(1 - \frac{\sigma N_t}{D_t^*}\right) \left(\pi + |\log(x\zeta(\phi))|\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{s}{D_t^*} \left| \psi(\sigma, \tau; x\zeta(\phi)) + \pi\tau^\sigma \right|. \end{aligned}$$

By [4, Equation (27)], we find that for every ϕ we always have $\zeta(\phi) \geq \tau$, and $\zeta(\phi)^2 \geq 2D_t^*(1 - \sigma N_t/D_t^*)$. Thus, from the previous display we obtain for all $x \in [1/2, 2]$ and all $\varphi \in [-\pi, \pi]$

$$|\mathcal{A}(\phi; x\zeta(\phi)e^{i\varphi})| \lesssim \frac{\zeta(\phi)^2 |\log(\zeta(\phi))|}{D_t^*} + \frac{s}{D_t^*} \left| \psi(\sigma, \tau; x\zeta(\phi)) + \pi\tau^\sigma \right|. \quad (\text{S1.7})$$

Now, consider the case $\sigma \geq 0$. Then assuming without loss of generality $\sigma \neq 0$ (it suffices to extend by continuity), we have for any $x \in [1/2, 2]$ and any $\tau > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} |s\psi(\sigma, \tau; x\zeta(\phi))| &\leq s \left| \frac{x^\sigma - 1}{\sigma} \zeta(\phi)^\sigma \right| + s \left| \frac{\zeta(\phi)^\sigma - \tau^\sigma}{\sigma} \right| \\ &\leq (1 \vee x^\sigma) s \zeta(\phi)^\sigma \sup_{u \in [1/2, 1]} \left| \frac{1 - u^\sigma}{\sigma} \right| + s \zeta(\phi)^\sigma \frac{1 - (\tau/\zeta(\phi))^\sigma}{\sigma} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \left(2 \log(2) + \log \frac{\zeta(\phi)}{\tau}\right) s\zeta(\phi)^\sigma, \quad (\text{S1.8})$$

where for the last line we have used that $(1 - z^\sigma)/\sigma \leq \log(1/z)$ for all $z \in (0, 1)$ and all $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ (this can be seen by differentiating with respect to σ). We also have used that $\zeta(\phi) \geq \tau$, which can be deduced from [4, Equation (27)]. From [4, Equation (27)] again, we also see that $\zeta(\phi)^2 \geq s\zeta(\phi)^\sigma$. Also, because $\phi \in \mathcal{S}_K$ we have $s\tau^\sigma = O(\sqrt{2D_t^*}) = O(\zeta(\phi))$ and $\tau \geq K^{-1}$, and thus we obtain from Equation (S1.7) that $|\mathcal{A}(\sigma; x\zeta(\phi)e^{i\varphi})| = O(\zeta(\phi)^2 \log(\zeta(\phi))/D_t^*)$, at least for $\sigma \geq 0$. When $\sigma < 0$, it is easily seen with a similar reasoning that $|s\psi(\sigma, \tau; x\zeta(\phi))| \lesssim \zeta(\phi)^2 + s\tau^\sigma \log(\zeta(\phi))$, and hence, we obtain from Equation (S1.7) that for any $x \in [1/2, 2]$, any $\varphi \in [-\pi, \pi]$ and any $\phi \in \mathcal{S}_K$,

$$|\mathcal{A}(\phi; x\zeta(\phi)e^{i\varphi})| = o(\zeta(\phi)^3/D_t^*).$$

It then follows by combining Equations (S1.5) to (S1.7) that as $D_t^* \rightarrow \infty$

$$\Delta(\phi) = C^3 a(\phi)^3 \times o(1) + O(e^{-C^2/8}), \quad (\text{S1.9})$$

We already have shown that $a(\phi) \geq 1/2$, we now need a more precise estimate. Recalling that $a(\phi)^2 = -D_t^* \partial_z^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi))$, we have under the assumptions of the Lemma,

$$\begin{aligned} a(\phi)^2 &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\sigma N_t}{D_t^*}\right) \frac{2D_t^*}{\zeta(\phi)^2} + (1 - \sigma) \frac{s\zeta(\phi)^\sigma}{\zeta(\phi)^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\zeta(\phi)^2} \left(2D_t^* \left(1 - \frac{\sigma N_t}{D_t^*}\right) + (1 - \sigma) s\zeta(\phi)^\sigma\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\zeta(\phi)^2} \left(\zeta(\phi)^2 - \tau\zeta(\phi) - \sigma s\zeta(\phi)^\sigma\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from the definition of $\zeta(\phi)$, in [4, Equation (27)]. Thus, under the assumptions of the Lemma we have $a(\phi)^2 = 1 + o(1)$. Since Equation (S1.9) is true for arbitrary choice of $C > 0$, this indeed shows that $\Delta(\phi) = o(1)$ if the conditions of the Lemma are met. Then by [4, Equation (24)], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log I(\phi) &= -D_t^* \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi)) - \log \sqrt{2a(\phi)} + \log(1 + \Delta(\phi)) \\ &= -D_t^* \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi)) - \frac{\log(2)}{2} + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

S2. Existence and uniqueness of the MLE, concentration of the likelihood: auxiliary results

S2.1. Proof of [4, Lemma 5]

We will use multiple times that under [4, Assumption 1] we have for any $x \in (0, 1)$ that $\mathcal{C}'_t(x) = O(N_t)$, otherwise it cannot be the case that $\hat{\alpha}_t$ converges in $(0, 1)$.

We first study $\sigma \leq -C$, for $C > 0$. Observe that for any $c_0 \in (0, 1)$, we have $\mathcal{C}_t(c_0) = \mathcal{C}_t(0) + O(N_t)$. By definition $\Psi(\sigma)$ and by Lemma S2.1,

$$\Psi(\sigma) - \Psi(c_0) \leq N_t \log(-\sigma) + \{\mathcal{C}_t(\sigma) - \mathcal{C}_t(0)\} - D_t^* \log \beta_\sigma - \sigma N_t \log \frac{\beta_\sigma - 1}{\beta_\sigma} + O(N_t)$$

$$=: F(\sigma) + O(N_t).$$

We consider two situations here, according to whether $\sigma \leq -bD_t^*/N_t$ or $\sigma > -bD_t^*/N_t$ for some constant $b > 0$. For any $b > 0$, if $\sigma \leq -bD_t^*/N_t$, [Lemma S2.3](#) implies that

$$\Psi(\sigma) - \Psi(c_0) \leq -\frac{1}{2} \frac{D_t^*(1+o(1))}{1 + \frac{1}{2b}} + O(N_t).$$

If $\sigma \in (-bD_t^*/N_t, -C)$, then using $\beta_\sigma = 1 - \sigma N_t/D_t^*$

$$\begin{aligned} F'(\sigma) &= -\frac{N_t}{-\sigma} + \partial_\sigma \zeta(\phi) + N_t \frac{1}{1 - \sigma N_t/D_t^*} + \frac{N_t^2}{D_t^*} \frac{-\sigma}{1 - \sigma N_t/D_t^*} + N_t \log\left(1 - \frac{\sigma N_t}{D_t^*}\right) \\ &\quad - N_t - N_t \log\left(\frac{-\sigma N_t}{D_t^*}\right) \\ &= -\frac{N_t}{-\sigma} + \partial_\sigma \zeta(\phi) + N_t \log\left(1 - \frac{\sigma N_t}{D_t^*}\right) - N_t \log\left(\frac{-\sigma N_t}{D_t^*}\right) \\ &= -\frac{N_t}{-\sigma} + \partial_\sigma \zeta(\phi) + N_t \log\left(1 + \frac{D_t^*}{-\sigma N_t}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\partial_\sigma^2 \zeta(\phi) < 0$ on $(-\infty, 1)$, $\sup_{\sigma \leq -C} \{-C_t'(\sigma)\} \leq -C_t'(\hat{\alpha}_t) = O(N_t)$ under [\[4, Assumption 1\]](#). On the other hand, $N_t \log(1 + \frac{D_t^*}{-\sigma N_t}) \geq N_t \log(1 + \frac{1}{b})$, which can be made arbitrary larger than any multiple constant of N_t by choosing b small enough. Hence $F'(\sigma) > 0$ on $(-bD_t^*/N_t, -C)$ and for all $\sigma \in (-bD_t^*/N_t, -C)$,

$$\Psi(\sigma) - \Psi(c_0) \leq N_t \log(C) + \{C_t(-C) - C_t(0)\} - CN_t \log\left\{1 + \frac{D_t^*}{CN_t}\right\} - CN_t + O\left(\frac{N_t^2}{D_t^*}\right).$$

With similar arguments $C_t(-C) - C_t(0) = O(N_t)$ under [\[4, Assumption 1\]](#), and [\[4, Equation \(33\)\]](#) holds.

We now study $\sigma > c_2$. Since $u > 0$ and $g(\sigma, \varepsilon) > 0$, we have

$$H_\sigma(\varepsilon, u) \leq N_t \log u - \frac{D_t^*}{2} \log(1+u) + \frac{D_t^*}{2} \log(1-\varepsilon) + \frac{D_t^*}{2} (1-\varepsilon) \beta_\sigma.$$

the right hand side is maximized in $u = 2N_t/D_t^*(1 + O(N_t/D_t^*))$ and $\varepsilon = 0$ which leads to

$$H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) \leq N_t \log \frac{N_t}{D_t^*} - N_t + N_t \log(2) + \frac{D_t^*}{2} \beta_\sigma + O\left(\frac{N_t^2}{D_t^*}\right), \quad \forall u, \varepsilon, \sigma.$$

Moreover let $c_0 > 0$ then $\Psi(c_0) = K(c_0) + \sup_{\varepsilon, u} H(c_0, \varepsilon, u) = C_t(c_0) + \sup_{\varepsilon, u} H(c_0, \varepsilon, u) + O(N_t)$. Choosing $\varepsilon_* = \frac{c_0 N_t}{D_t^*} = o(1)$, we have at $\sigma = c_0$, $\frac{1}{2} + \beta_\sigma g(\sigma, \varepsilon) = (1 + o(1))c_0^{-1}$ which combined with [Lemma S2.2](#), leads to

$$\sup_{\varepsilon, u} H(c_0, \varepsilon, u) \geq \sup_u H(c_0, \varepsilon_*, u) = -N_t \log \frac{N_t}{D_t^*} + \frac{D_t^*}{2} + O(N_t).$$

Hence, as soon as $N_t = o(D_t^*)$,

$$\Psi(c_0) \geq C_t(c_0) + N_t \log \frac{N_t}{D_t^*} + \frac{D_t^*}{2} + O(N_t). \quad (\text{S2.10})$$

Using Equation (S2.10), we then obtain that for all $\sigma > c_2$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi(\sigma) - \Psi(c_0) &\leq \{\mathcal{C}_t(\sigma) - \mathcal{C}_t(c_0)\} + O(N_t) \\
&= \sum_{j \geq 2} N_{t,j} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \log \frac{k - \sigma}{k - c_0} + O(N_t) \\
&\leq \sum_{j \geq 2} N_{t,j} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \log \frac{k - c_2}{k - c_0} + O(N_t) \\
&\leq \sum_{j \geq 2} N_{t,j} \log \frac{1 - c_2}{1 - c_0} + O(N_t) \\
&\leq -K(N_t - N_{t,1})
\end{aligned}$$

for any $K > 0$, by choosing c_2 sufficiently close to 1. Furthermore, [4, Assumption 1] implies that $N_t - N_{t,1} \asymp N_t$, otherwise $\hat{\alpha}_t$ would converge to $1 > \alpha_0$. Hence [4, Equation (34)] is proved.

Lemma S2.1. *Let $\sigma \leq -C$ for some $C > 0$. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{\varepsilon, u} H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) &= N_t \log \frac{N_t}{D_t^*} + N_t \log(-\sigma) - N_t \log \beta_\sigma - \sigma N_t \log \frac{\beta_\sigma - 1}{\beta_\sigma} \\
&\quad + \frac{D_t^*}{2} - \frac{D_t^*}{2} \log \beta_\sigma + O(N_t).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. The starting point is Lemma S2.2, and in particular the Equation (S2.12). The term $-\log(\frac{1}{2} + \beta_\sigma g(\sigma, \varepsilon))$ is not trivial to apprehend. We split the analysis into two scenarios, according to whether $1 - \varepsilon \leq \frac{a}{\beta_\sigma}$ or not, for some $a \in (0, 1)$ to be determined. Under the scenario $1 - \varepsilon \leq \frac{a}{\beta_\sigma}$, we note that $\beta_\sigma g(\sigma, \varepsilon) \geq 0$, from Equation (S2.12),

$$H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) \leq -\frac{D_t^*}{2} \left\{ \log \frac{1}{a} - a \right\} + N_t \log \frac{N_t}{D_t^*} + O(N_t). \quad (\text{S2.11})$$

We claim that the previous implies that the supremum of $(\varepsilon, u) \mapsto H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u)$ has to be achieved for $1 - \varepsilon > \frac{a}{\beta_\sigma}$. We keep that claim in mind, and we now analyse $H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u)$ for $1 - \varepsilon > \frac{a}{\beta_\sigma}$. Then, we can simplify things a bit. Indeed, by a Taylor expansion of $f(\sigma, \cdot)$ near $\varepsilon \approx 1$, we can obtain that $f(\sigma, \varepsilon) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. That means that $g(\sigma, \varepsilon) \geq \frac{1}{2} f(\sigma, \varepsilon)$. Thus, $N_t \log(\frac{1}{2} + \beta_\sigma g(\sigma, \varepsilon)) \geq N_t \log(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\beta_\sigma}{2} f(\sigma, \varepsilon)) \geq N_t \log \beta_\sigma + N_t \log f(\sigma, \varepsilon) + O(N_t)$. But, $-N_t \log f(\sigma, \varepsilon) = N_t \log(-\sigma) + N_t(-\sigma) \log \varepsilon - N_t \log(1 - \varepsilon^{-\sigma})$. Since we assume that $\varepsilon < 1 - \frac{a}{\beta_\sigma}$, and $-\sigma > 0$, then $\varepsilon^{-\sigma} \leq \exp\{-(-\sigma)(-\log(1 - \frac{a}{1 - \sigma N_t/D_t^*}))\} \leq \exp\{-\frac{(-\sigma)a}{1 - \sigma N_t/D_t^*}\}$. Because $-\sigma \geq C$, this means that $\varepsilon^{-\sigma} \leq \exp\{-\frac{Ca}{1 + CN_t/D_t^*}\}$ uniformly, which is always bounded away from 1. Consequently, $-N_t \log(1 - \varepsilon^{-\sigma}) = O(N_t)$, uniformly, and in the second scenario Equation (S2.12) becomes

$$\sup_{u > 0} H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) = N_t \log \frac{N_t}{D_t^*} + N_t \log(-\sigma) - N_t \log \beta_\sigma$$

$$-\sigma N_t \log \varepsilon + \frac{D_t^*}{2}(1-\varepsilon)\beta_\sigma + \frac{D_t^*}{2} \log(1-\varepsilon) + O(N_t).$$

That is, it is enough to maximize $G_\sigma(\varepsilon) := -\sigma N_t \log \varepsilon + \frac{D_t^*}{2} \log(1-\varepsilon) + \frac{D_t^*}{2}(1-\varepsilon)\beta_\sigma$. We note that $G'_\sigma(\varepsilon) = \frac{-\sigma N_t}{\varepsilon} - \frac{D_t^*}{2} \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} - \frac{D_t^*}{2} \beta_\sigma$, and clearly $G''_\sigma(\varepsilon) < 0$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$, whence G_σ admits a unique maximizer solution to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{-\sigma N_t}{\varepsilon} &= \frac{D_t^*}{2} \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} + \frac{D_t^*}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\sigma N_t}{D_t^*}\right) \iff \frac{-\sigma N_t}{\varepsilon} = \frac{D_t^*}{2} \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} + \frac{D_t^*}{2} + \frac{-\sigma N_t}{2} \\ &\iff -\sigma N_t(1-\varepsilon) = \frac{D_t^*}{2} \varepsilon + \frac{D_t^*}{2} (1-\varepsilon)\varepsilon + \frac{-\sigma N_t}{2} (1-\varepsilon)\varepsilon \\ &\iff -\frac{1}{2}(D_t^* - \sigma N_t)\varepsilon^2 + \left(D_t^* - \frac{3\sigma N_t}{2}\right)\varepsilon + \sigma N_t = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The previous has two easy solutions, one is seen to be $\varepsilon = 2$ so it is outside the domain of G , and the other one, of interest, is

$$\varepsilon_* := \frac{-\sigma N_t}{D_t^* - \sigma N_t} = \frac{-\sigma N_t}{D_t^*} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - \sigma N_t/D_t^*} = \frac{\beta_\sigma - 1}{\beta_\sigma}.$$

It follows, for all ε such that $1 - \varepsilon > \frac{a}{\beta_\sigma}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{u>0} H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) &\leq N_t \log \frac{N_t}{D_t^*} + N_t \log(-\sigma) - N_t \log \beta_\sigma \\ &\quad - \sigma N_t \log \frac{\beta_\sigma - 1}{\beta_\sigma} + \frac{D_t^*}{2} - \frac{D_t^*}{2} \log \beta_\sigma + O(N_t). \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that the previous is indeed achieved at ε_* , and for $a > 0$ small enough (but constant), it is also bigger than the bound in Equation (S2.11) when $\sigma \leq -C \leq 0$. Hence the conclusion. \square

Lemma S2.2. *If $N_t = o(D_t^*)$, for any fixed value of (σ, ε) , the function $u \mapsto H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u)$ admits a unique maximizer $\bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon) > 0$. Furthermore, this maximizer has the asymptotic expansion*

$$\bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon) = \frac{N_t}{D_t^*} \cdot \frac{1 + O(N_t/D_t^*)}{\frac{1}{2} + \beta_\sigma g(\sigma, \varepsilon)},$$

and,

$$\begin{aligned} H(\sigma, \varepsilon, \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon)) &= -N_t + N_t \log \frac{N_t}{D_t^*} - N_t \log \left(\frac{1}{2} + \beta_\sigma g(\sigma, \varepsilon)\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{D_t^*}{2} \log(1-\varepsilon) + \frac{D_t^*}{2} (1-\varepsilon)\beta_\sigma + O\left(\frac{N_t^2}{D_t^*}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S2.12})$$

Proof. We first establish that for fixed values of (σ, ε) the function $u \mapsto H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u)$ has a maximum. Indeed, any extremum of $H(\sigma, \varepsilon, \cdot)$ must be solution to

$$\frac{N_t}{u} - \frac{D_t^*}{2} \frac{1}{1+u} - D_t^* \beta_\sigma g(\sigma, \varepsilon) = 0. \quad (\text{S2.13})$$

The limit as $u \rightarrow 0$ of the lhs of Equation (S2.13) is $+\infty$, and the limit as $u \rightarrow \infty$ is $-D_t^* \beta_\sigma g(\sigma, \varepsilon) < 0$, and it is a continuous function of u . Hence, it is the case that $\partial_u H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) = 0$ has solutions. Furthermore, it is clear that any solution also satisfies $\frac{N_t}{u} \geq \frac{D_t^*}{2} \frac{1}{1+u}$, i.e. $\frac{u}{1+u} \leq \frac{2N_t}{D_t^*}$, whence $u \leq \frac{2N_t}{D_t^*} (1 + o(1))$. Hence, it is enough to look for solutions in $(0, \frac{3N_t}{D_t^*})$. On that interval, $\partial_u^2 H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) = -\frac{N_t}{u^2} + \frac{D_t^*}{2} \frac{1}{(1+u)^2} < 0$. Then, Equation (S2.13) has a unique solution, and it is a maximum of $H(\sigma, \varepsilon, \cdot)$. Regarding the asymptotic form of $\bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon)$, let $u = \frac{N_t}{D_t^*} \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2} + \beta_\sigma g(\sigma, \varepsilon)}$. Then, u is the solution to $\frac{N_t}{u} = \frac{D_t^*}{2} + D_t^* \beta_\sigma g(\sigma, \varepsilon)$. It then follows from Equation (S2.13) that $\frac{N_t}{u} = \frac{N_t}{\bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon)} + \frac{D_t^*}{2} \frac{\bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon)}{1 + \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon)}$. The first claim follows. The second claim follows because $\log(1+x) = x + O(x^2)$ for all $x > -1$. \square

Lemma S2.3. Under [4, Assumption 1], for all $\sigma < 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_t(\sigma) - \mathcal{C}_t(0) &\leq -N_t \log(1 - \sigma) + D_t^* \log\left(1 - \frac{\sigma N_t}{D_t^*}\right) \\ &\quad - \sigma N_t \log\left(1 - \frac{D_t^*}{\sigma N_t}\right) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{D_t^*(1 + o(1))}{1 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{D_t^*}{-\sigma N_t}} + O(N_t). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For $-\sigma \geq 0$ the function $k \mapsto \log(k - \sigma)$ is non-negative and monotone increasing on $(1, \infty)$, and hence we can bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_t(\sigma) &= \sum_{j \geq 2} N_{t,j} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \log(k - \sigma) \\ &\leq \sum_{j \geq 2} N_{t,j} \int_1^j \log(x - \sigma) dx \\ &= \sum_{j \geq 2} N_{t,j} \left\{ 1 - j - (1 - \sigma) \log(1 - \sigma) + (j - \sigma) \log(j - \sigma) \right\} \\ &= -D_t^* - N_t(1 - \sigma) \log(1 - \sigma) + \sum_{j \geq 1} N_{t,j} (j - \sigma) \log(j - \sigma). \end{aligned}$$

That is,

$$\mathcal{C}_t(\sigma) \leq -D_t^* - N_t \log(1 - \sigma) - \sigma \sum_{j \geq 1} N_{t,j} \log\left\{1 + \frac{j-1}{1-\sigma}\right\} + \sum_{j \geq 1} N_{t,j} \cdot j \log(j - \sigma).$$

By assumption, $-\sigma > 0$, and then we remark that $x \mapsto \log(1 + \frac{x}{-\sigma})$ is concave on $(1, \infty)$, hence by Jensen's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \geq 1} N_{t,j} \log\left\{1 + \frac{j-1}{1-\sigma}\right\} &\leq N_t \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{N_{t,j}}{N_t} \log\left\{1 + \frac{j}{-\sigma}\right\} \\ &\leq N_t \log\left\{1 + \frac{\sum_{j \geq 1} N_{t,j} \cdot j}{-\sigma}\right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$= N_t \log \left\{ 1 + \frac{D_t^*}{-\sigma N_t} \right\}.$$

So,

$$C_t(\sigma) \leq -D_t^* - N_t \log(1 - \sigma) - \sigma N_t \log \left(1 + \frac{D_t^*}{-\sigma N_t} \right) + \sum_{j \geq 1} N_{t,j} \cdot j \log(j - \sigma). \quad (\text{S2.14})$$

On the other hand, the function $x \mapsto \log(x)$ is non-negative and monotone increasing on $(1, \infty)$. Hence we can bound,

$$C_t(0) = \sum_{j \geq 2} N_{t,j} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \log(k) = \sum_{j \geq 3} N_{t,j} \sum_{k=2}^{j-1} \log(k) \geq \sum_{j \geq 3} N_{t,j} \int_1^{j-1} \log(x) dx.$$

Thus,

$$C_t(0) \geq \sum_{j \geq 3} N_{t,j} \left\{ 2 - j + (j-1) \log(j-1) \right\}$$

That is,

$$\begin{aligned} C_t(0) &\geq -D_t^* + \sum_{j \geq 1} N_{t,j} \cdot j \log(j) + O(1) \cdot \sum_{j \geq 2} N_{t,j} \log(j) \\ &= -D_t^* + \sum_{j \geq 1} N_{t,j} \cdot j \log(j) + O(N_t), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S2.15})$$

where the second line is true under [4, Assumption 1], because $-C_t'(\alpha_t) \asymp \sum_{j \geq 2} N_{t,j} \log(j)$, and $-C_t'(\alpha_t) = \frac{N_t}{\alpha_t} = O(N_t)$. Hence, to finish the proof it is enough to understand,

$$\sum_{j \geq 1} N_{t,j} \cdot j \left\{ \log(j - \sigma) - \log(j) \right\} = N_t \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{N_{t,j}}{N_t} \cdot j \log \left\{ 1 + \frac{-\sigma}{j} \right\}. \quad (\text{S2.16})$$

Let $p_{t,j} := N_{t,j}/N_t$, $\mathbf{p}_t = (p_{t,1}, p_{t,2}, \dots)$, and $\Phi(x) := x \log(1 + \frac{-\sigma}{x})$. Then we may see the rhs of the last display as $N_t \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}[\Phi(J)]$. We note that Φ is concave on $(1, \infty)$, so we can use Jensen's inequality to obtain a bound, but we actually need a finer estimate. To get the next order term, we remark that $\Phi'(x) = -\log(\frac{x}{-\sigma}) - 1 + \frac{x}{1+\frac{x}{-\sigma}} + \log(1 + \frac{x}{-\sigma}) = -\log(\frac{x}{-\sigma}) + \log(1 + \frac{x}{-\sigma}) - \frac{1}{1+\frac{x}{-\sigma}}$, and then $\Phi''(x) = -\frac{1}{x} + \frac{1}{-\sigma} \frac{1}{1+\frac{x}{-\sigma}} + \frac{1}{-\sigma} \frac{1}{(1+\frac{x}{-\sigma})^2} = \frac{1}{-\sigma} \frac{1}{x(1+\frac{x}{-\sigma})^2} \{x + x(1 + \frac{x}{-\sigma}) - (-\sigma)(1 + \frac{x}{-\sigma})^2\} = -\frac{1}{x(1+\frac{x}{-\sigma})^2}$, and thus Φ is concave as claimed. Furthermore, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}[J] = \frac{D_t^*}{N_t}$, and thus by a Taylor expansion of Φ near $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}[J]$, we find that there is some J_* in the line segment between J and J_* such that,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}[\Phi(J)] &= \Phi(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}[J]) + \mathbb{E}[\Phi''(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}[J])(J - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}[J])] + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\Phi''(J_*)(J - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}[J])^2] \\ &= \Phi(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}[J]) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\Phi''(J_*)(J - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}[J])^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Now we just need a tight enough upper bound on the second term of the last display. Since $\Phi' < 0$, we can upper-bound as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}[\Phi''(J_*)(J - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}[J])^2] &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}[\Phi''(J_*)(J - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}[J])^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{J \leq \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}[J]\}}] \\
&\leq -\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}[J]^2}{4} \cdot \min_{J \leq \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}[J]} \{-\Phi''(J)\} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}[\mathbf{1}_{\{J \leq \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}[J]\}}] \\
&\leq -\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}[J]^2}{4} \cdot \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}[J](1 + \frac{\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}[J]}{-\sigma})} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}[\mathbf{1}_{\{J \leq \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}[J]\}}] \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} \frac{D_t^*}{N_t} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{D_t^*}{-\sigma N_t}} \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{N_{t,j}}{N_t} \mathbf{1}_{\{j \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{D_t^*}{N_t}\}}.
\end{aligned}$$

So the rhs of Equation (S2.16) is no more than,

$$N_t \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}_t}[\Phi(J)] \leq D_t^* \log\left(1 + \frac{-\sigma N_t}{D_t^*}\right) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{D_t^*}{1 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{D_t^*}{-\sigma N_t}} \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{N_{t,j}}{N_t} \mathbf{1}_{\{j \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{D_t^*}{N_t}\}}. \quad (\text{S2.17})$$

We finish the proof by noting that $j > \frac{D_t^*}{2N_t} \Leftrightarrow \log(j) > \log(\frac{D_t^*}{2N_t})$, and thus by Markov's inequality, we have $\sum_{j \geq 1} N_{t,j} \mathbf{1}_{\{j > \frac{D_t^*}{2N_t}\}} \leq \frac{1}{\log(D_t^*/(2N_t))} \sum_{j \geq 1} N_{t,j} \log(j) = o(N_t)$ by [4, Assumption 1]. Consequently, $\sum_{j \geq 1} N_{t,j} \mathbf{1}_{\{j \leq \frac{D_t^*}{2N_t}\}} = N_t(1 + o(1))$. Then, the conclusion follows by combining Equations (S2.14) to (S2.17). \square

S2.2. Proof of [4, Lemma 6]

We first establish the existence and uniqueness of the maximizer of $(\varepsilon, u) \mapsto H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u)$ when $\sigma \in (-C, c_2)$.

As already established in Lemma S2.2, the equation has a unique solution $\bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon) \in (0, 3N_t/D_t^*)$, and $\bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon) = \frac{N_t}{D_t^*} \frac{1 + O(N_t/D_t^*)}{\frac{1}{2} + \beta_\sigma g(\sigma, \varepsilon)}$. Similarly, if there is a solution $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ to $\partial_\varepsilon H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) = 0$, it must be the case that

$$D_t^* \beta_\sigma u \tilde{\varepsilon}^{-1+\sigma} \geq D_t^* \beta_\sigma u \left(\tilde{\varepsilon}^{-1+\sigma} - \frac{1}{2} \right) = \frac{D_t^*}{2} \frac{1}{1 - \tilde{\varepsilon}} + \frac{D_t^*}{2} \beta_\sigma \geq \frac{D_t^*}{2} (1 + \beta_\sigma).$$

Since $\sigma \geq -C$, we have $\beta_\sigma = 1 + O(N_t/D_t^*)$, and thus any solution $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ to $\partial_\varepsilon H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) = 0$ must satisfy $\tilde{\varepsilon}^{-1+\sigma} \geq u^{-1}(1 + O(N_t/D_t^*))$. In particular, if $(\tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u})$ is solution to $\partial_\varepsilon H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) = 0$ and $\partial_u H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) = 0$, then it has to be the case that

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}^{-1+\sigma} \geq \frac{1 + O(\frac{N_t}{D_t^*})}{\tilde{u}} = \frac{D_t^*}{N_t} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \beta_\sigma g(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}) \right) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{N_t}{D_t^*}\right) \right) \geq \frac{D_t^*}{N_t} g(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{N_t}{D_t^*}\right) \right).$$

Now we remark that $g(\sigma, \varepsilon) = f(\sigma, \varepsilon) - \frac{1-\varepsilon}{2} \geq \frac{1}{2} f(\sigma, \varepsilon) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1-\varepsilon^\sigma}{\sigma}$, where the last equality is assuming without loss of generality that $\sigma \neq 0$. It follows, whenever $\sigma \geq -C$, because the mapping $\sigma \mapsto \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}^{-\sigma} - 1}{\sigma}$

is monotone increasing (recall $\tilde{\varepsilon} \in (0, 1)$),

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}^{-1} \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{D_t^*}{N_t} \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}^{-\sigma} - 1}{\sigma} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{N_t}{D_t^*}\right)\right) \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{D_t^*}{N_t} \frac{1 - \tilde{\varepsilon}^C}{C} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{N_t}{D_t^*}\right)\right).$$

We have proved that $\tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma)$, if it exists, must satisfies $\tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \leq 3CN_t/D_t^*$ for all $\sigma \geq -C$, at least when t is large enough.

To prove that $(\tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma), \tilde{u}(\sigma))$ exists uniquely, it is enough to establish that $\varepsilon \mapsto H(\sigma, \varepsilon, \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon))$ has a unique maximum at $\tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma)$, and then $\tilde{u}(\sigma) = \bar{u}(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma))$. Let $\tilde{H}_\sigma(\varepsilon) := H(\sigma, \varepsilon, \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon))$. Clearly, $\tilde{H}'_\sigma(\varepsilon) = \partial_\varepsilon H_\sigma(\varepsilon, \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon))$ since $\partial_u H_\sigma(\varepsilon, \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon)) = 0$. Then, for any $\varepsilon \leq 3CN_t/D_t^*$, recalling that $\bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon) \leq 3N_t/D_t^*$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}'_\sigma(\varepsilon) &= D_t^* \beta_\sigma \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon) \left(\varepsilon^{-1+\sigma} - \frac{1}{2} \right) - \frac{D_t^*}{2} \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} - \frac{D_t^*}{2} \beta_\sigma \\ &= D_t^* \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon) (1 + o(1)) \varepsilon^{-1+\sigma} - D_t^* (1 + o(1)). \end{aligned}$$

By [Lemma S2.2](#), we obtain easily that when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ we have $\bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon) \asymp \sigma N_t/D_t^*$ if $\sigma > 0$, $\bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon) \asymp -\sigma \varepsilon^{-\sigma} N_t/D_t^*$ if $\sigma < 0$, and $\bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon) \asymp \frac{N_t}{D_t^*} \frac{1}{\log(1/\varepsilon)}$ if $\sigma = 0$. So $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \tilde{H}'_\sigma(\varepsilon) = +\infty$. We already know from the above that $\tilde{H}'_\sigma(\varepsilon) < 0$ when $\varepsilon > 3CN_t/D_t^*$. Since \tilde{H}'_σ is a continuous function of ε , there are solutions to $\tilde{H}'_\sigma(\varepsilon) = 0$ in $(0, 3CN_t/D_t^*)$, and only in this interval. To prove the uniqueness, it is enough to show that $\tilde{H}''_\sigma(\varepsilon) < 0$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 3N_t/D_t^*)$. We have,

$$\tilde{H}''_\sigma(\varepsilon) = \partial_\varepsilon^2 H(\sigma, \varepsilon, \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon)) + \partial_u \partial_\varepsilon H(\sigma, \varepsilon, \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon)) \partial_\varepsilon \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon).$$

Using $\partial_u H(\sigma, \varepsilon, \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon)) = 0$, we find that $\partial_\varepsilon \partial_u H(\sigma, \varepsilon, \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon)) + \partial_u^2 H(\sigma, \varepsilon, \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon)) \partial_\varepsilon \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon) = 0$, *i.e.*

$$\partial_\varepsilon \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon) = \frac{\partial_\varepsilon \partial_u H(\sigma, \varepsilon, \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon))}{-\partial_u^2 H(\sigma, \varepsilon, \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon))}.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}''_\sigma(\varepsilon) &= \partial_\varepsilon^2 H(\sigma, \varepsilon, \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon)) + \frac{\{\partial_\varepsilon \partial_u H(\sigma, \varepsilon, \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon))\}^2}{-\partial_u^2 H(\sigma, \varepsilon, \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon))} \\ &= -\frac{D_t^*}{2} \frac{1}{(1-\varepsilon)^2} - (1-\sigma) D_t^* \beta_\sigma \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon) \varepsilon^{-2+\sigma} + \frac{\bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon)^2 D_t^{*2}}{N_t} \left(\varepsilon^{-1+\sigma} - \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 (1 + o(1)) \\ &\leq -\frac{D_t^*}{2} - D_t^* \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon) \varepsilon^{-2+\sigma} \left((1-\sigma)(1 + o(1)) - \frac{\bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon) D_t^* \varepsilon^\sigma}{N_t} \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon^{1-\sigma}}{2}\right)^2 (1 + o(1)) \right) \\ &\leq -\frac{D_t^*}{2} - D_t^* \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon) \varepsilon^{-2+\sigma} \left((1-\sigma)(1 + o(1)) - \frac{\bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon) D_t^* \varepsilon^\sigma}{4N_t} (1 + o(1)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that

$$\bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon) = \frac{N_t}{D_t^*} \frac{1 + O(N_t/D_t^*)}{\frac{1}{2} + \beta_\sigma g(\sigma, \varepsilon)} = \frac{N_t}{D_t^*} \frac{1 + O(N_t/D_t^*)}{f(\sigma, \varepsilon)}, \quad \text{if } \varepsilon \leq 3CN_t/D_t^*.$$

Assuming without loss of generality that $\sigma \neq 0$, we have $\frac{\bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon) D_t^* \varepsilon^\sigma}{4N_t} = \frac{1+o(1)}{4} \frac{\sigma \varepsilon^\sigma}{1-\varepsilon^\sigma}$ and remark that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \sigma - \frac{\bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon) D_t^* \varepsilon^\sigma}{4N_t} &= 1 - \sigma - \frac{\sigma \varepsilon^\sigma (1+o(1))}{4(1-\varepsilon^\sigma)} = 1 - \sigma + o(1) \quad \text{if } \sigma > 0 \\ &= 1 - \frac{3\sigma}{4} + o(1) \quad \text{if } \sigma < 0, \end{aligned}$$

and in all cases it is large than $1 - c_2$. This result extends to $\sigma = 0$ by continuity. Therefore, $\tilde{H}''_\sigma(\varepsilon) \leq -D_t^*/2 < 0$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 3CN_t/D_t^*)$ and $(\tilde{u}(\sigma), \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma))$ exists and is unique.

We now prove [4, Equation (35)]. We have $\Psi(\sigma) = K(\sigma) + H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma), \tilde{u}(\sigma))$, and, $\partial_\varepsilon H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma), \tilde{u}(\sigma)) = 0$ and $\partial_u H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma), \tilde{u}(\sigma)) = 0$. Then, $\Psi'(\sigma) = K'(\sigma) + \partial_\sigma H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma), \tilde{u}(\sigma))$. Recall that $\beta_\sigma = 1 - \sigma N_t/D_t^*$, and $\tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \leq 3CN_t/D_t^*$. then

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi'(\sigma) &= -\frac{N_t^2}{D_t^*} \frac{1}{\beta_\sigma} + C_t'(\sigma) + \frac{N_t}{2} \frac{1}{\beta_\sigma} - D_t^* \beta_\sigma \tilde{u}(\sigma) \partial_\sigma g(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma)) + N_t \tilde{u}(\sigma) g(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma)) - \frac{N_t}{2} (1 - \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma)) \\ &= \partial_\sigma \zeta(\phi) - D_t^* \beta_\sigma \tilde{u}(\sigma) \partial_\sigma g(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma)) + N_t \tilde{u}(\sigma) g(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma)) + O\left(\frac{N_t^2}{D_t^*}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\tilde{u}(\sigma) = \frac{N_t}{D_t^*} \frac{1+O(N_t/D_t^*)}{f(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma))}$, so that $N_t \tilde{u}(\sigma) g(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma)) = O(N_t^2/D_t^*)$. Hence, [4, Equation (35)] follows because $\partial_\sigma g(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma)) = \partial_\sigma f(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma))$.

Finally, assuming $\sigma \neq 0$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial_\sigma f(\sigma, \varepsilon)}{f(\sigma, \varepsilon)} &= \frac{\sigma}{1-\varepsilon^\sigma} \left\{ -\frac{1-\varepsilon^\sigma}{\sigma^2} - \frac{\varepsilon^\sigma \log(\varepsilon)}{\sigma} \right\} \\ &= -\frac{1}{\sigma} \frac{\varepsilon^{-\sigma} - 1 - \sigma \log(1/\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^{-\sigma} - 1}, \end{aligned}$$

which can be extended by continuity at $\sigma = 0$. Since $\tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma) = o(1)$, this establishes that for any $K > 0$ we can choose $c_1 > 0$ such that $-N_t \frac{\partial_\sigma f(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma))}{f(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma))} \geq KN_t$ for all $\sigma \geq c_1$. But on the other hand, $\partial_\sigma^2 \zeta(\phi) < 0$, meaning that $C_t'(\sigma) \geq C_t'(c_1)$ for all $\sigma \in (-C, c_1)$. But for $c_1 \in (0, 1)$, $C_t'(c_1) = -\sum_{j \geq 2} N_{t,j} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{1}{k-c_1} \asymp \sum_{j \geq 1} N_{t,j} \cdot \log(j) = O(N_t)$, by [4, Assumption 1]. It follows that $\Psi'(\sigma) > 0$ for all $\sigma < c_1$ if $c_1 > 0$ is small enough. With similar arguments, if c_2 is close enough to one, it must be the case that $\Psi'(c_2) < 0$, by [4, Equation (35)].

S2.3. Proof of [4, Lemma 7]

By [4, Lemma 6], $\Psi(\sigma) = K(\sigma) + H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma), \tilde{u}(\sigma))$, $\partial_\varepsilon H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma), \tilde{u}(\sigma)) = 0$ and $\partial_u H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma), \tilde{u}(\sigma)) = 0$. It follows that $\Psi'(\sigma) = K'(\sigma) + \partial_\sigma H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma), \tilde{u}(\sigma))$. We now write $\tilde{\varepsilon} \equiv \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma)$ and $\tilde{u} \equiv \tilde{u}(\sigma)$ to ease the notations. Then,

$$\Psi''(\sigma) = K''(\sigma) + \partial_\sigma^2 H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u}) + \partial_\varepsilon \partial_\sigma H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u}) \tilde{\varepsilon}' + \partial_u \partial_\sigma H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u}) \tilde{u}'.$$

By definition, $\tilde{u} = \bar{u}(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon})$, so that $\tilde{u}' = \partial_\sigma \bar{u}(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}) + \partial_\varepsilon \bar{u}(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}) \tilde{\varepsilon}'$. From the fact that $\partial_u H(\sigma, \varepsilon, \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon)) = 0$, we deduce that $\partial_\sigma \partial_u H(\sigma, \varepsilon, \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon)) + \partial_\varepsilon^2 H(\sigma, \varepsilon, \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon)) \partial_\sigma \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon) = 0$, and $\partial_\varepsilon \partial_u H(\sigma, \varepsilon, \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon)) +$

$\partial_u^2 H(\sigma, \varepsilon, \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon)) \partial_\varepsilon \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon) = 0$; that is,

$$\tilde{u}' = \frac{\partial_\sigma \partial_u H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u})}{-\partial_u^2 H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u})} + \frac{\partial_\varepsilon \partial_u H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u})}{-\partial_u^2 H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u})} \tilde{\varepsilon}'. \quad (\text{S2.18})$$

It follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi''(\sigma) = & K''(\sigma) + \partial_\sigma^2 H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u}) + \frac{\{\partial_\sigma \partial_u H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u})\}^2}{-\partial_u^2 H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u})} \\ & + \left\{ \partial_\varepsilon \partial_\sigma H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u}) + \frac{\partial_u \partial_\sigma H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u}) \cdot \partial_\varepsilon \partial_u H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u})}{-\partial_u^2 H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u})} \right\} \tilde{\varepsilon}'. \end{aligned}$$

By definition $K'(\sigma) = -\frac{N_t^2}{D_t^*} \frac{1}{\beta_\sigma} + \mathcal{C}_t'(\sigma) + \frac{N_t}{2} \frac{1}{\beta_\sigma}$, and hence $K''(\sigma) = \partial_\sigma^2 \zeta(\phi) + o(N_t)$. It follows using the estimates established in [Lemma S2.4](#),

$$\Psi''(\sigma) = \mathcal{C}_t''(\sigma) - \frac{N_t(1+o(1))}{\sigma^2} - \frac{D_t^*(1+o(1)) \log \frac{D_t^*}{N_t}}{1-\sigma} \tilde{\varepsilon}' + o(N_t).$$

We obtain an estimate on $\tilde{\varepsilon}'$ by using that $\partial_\varepsilon H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u}) = 0$. Differentiating both sides of the equation with respect to σ gives $\partial_\sigma \partial_\varepsilon H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u}) + \partial_\varepsilon^2 H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u}) \tilde{\varepsilon}' + \partial_u \partial_\varepsilon H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u}) \tilde{u}' = 0$. Hence, by [Equation \(S2.18\)](#), and then by [Lemma S2.4](#), since $\tilde{\varepsilon} \lesssim [N_t/D_t^*]^{1/(1-\sigma)}$ and $0 < \sigma < 1$,

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}' = -\frac{\partial_\sigma \partial_\varepsilon H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u}) + \frac{\partial_u \partial_\varepsilon H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u}) \cdot \partial_\sigma \partial_u H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u})}{-\partial_u^2 H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u})}}{\partial_\varepsilon^2 H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u}) + \frac{\{\partial_u \partial_\varepsilon H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u})\}^2}{-\partial_u^2 H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u})}} = -\frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}(1+o(1)) \log \frac{D_t^*}{N_t}}{(1-\sigma)^2}. \quad (\text{S2.19})$$

It follows,

$$\Psi''(\sigma) = \partial_\sigma^2 \zeta(\phi) - \frac{N_t(1+o(1))}{\sigma^2} + N_t \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon} \frac{D_t^*}{N_t} \log^2 \frac{D_t^*}{N_t}}{(1-\sigma)^3} + o(N_t) = \partial_\sigma^2 \zeta(\phi) - \frac{N_t(1+o(1))}{\sigma^2} < 0$$

since $\mathcal{C}_t''(\sigma) < 0$.

Lemma S2.4. *Let $\sigma \in [c_1, c_2]$, and let $\tilde{\varepsilon} \equiv \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma)$ and $\tilde{u} \equiv \tilde{u}(\sigma)$ as given in [\[4, Lemma 6\]](#). Then, the following estimates are true.*

1. $\partial_\sigma \log f(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}) = -\frac{1+o(1)}{\sigma}$; and $\partial_\sigma^2 \log f(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}) = \frac{1+o(1)}{\sigma^2}$.
2. $\tilde{u} = \frac{\sigma N_t}{D_t^*} (1+o(1))$; and $\tilde{\varepsilon}^{1-\sigma} = \frac{\sigma N_t}{D_t^*} (1+o(1))$.
- 3.

$$\partial_\sigma^2 H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u}) \sim -\frac{2N_t}{\sigma^2}, \quad \partial_u^2 H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u}) \sim -\frac{D_t^{*2}}{\sigma^2 N_t}, \quad \partial_\varepsilon^2 H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u}) \sim -(1-\sigma) D_t^* \tilde{\varepsilon}^{-1}.$$

4. $\partial_\sigma \partial_u H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u}) = \frac{D_t^*(1+o(1))}{\sigma^2}$.
5. $\partial_\varepsilon \partial_\sigma H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u}) = -\frac{D_t^*(1+o(1)) \log \frac{D_t^*}{N_t}}{1-\sigma}$.
6. $\partial_\varepsilon \partial_u H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u}) = \frac{D_t^{*2}(1+o(1))}{\sigma N_t}$.

Proof. **Item (1).** It follows by definition of f , whenever $\varepsilon = o(1)$, and because $\sigma \in (c_2, c_1)$,

$$\partial_\sigma \log f(\sigma, \varepsilon) = \frac{\partial_\sigma f(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon})}{\partial_\sigma f(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon})} = -\frac{1}{\sigma} - \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}^\sigma \log(\tilde{\varepsilon})}{1 - \varepsilon^\sigma} = -\frac{1 + o(1)}{\sigma}.$$

From the previous computation,

$$\partial_\sigma^2 \log f(\sigma, \varepsilon) = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} - \frac{\varepsilon^\sigma \log^2(\varepsilon)}{(1 - \varepsilon^\sigma)^2} = \frac{1 + o(1)}{\sigma^2}.$$

Item (2). We already know that $\tilde{u} = \frac{N_t}{D_t^*} \frac{1+o(1)}{f(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon})}$, which follows for instance from [Lemma S2.2](#), as $\tilde{\varepsilon} = o(1)$ and $\frac{1}{2} + \beta_\sigma g(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}) = x_1 f(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon})(1 + o(1))$. Then it is obvious that $f(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}) = (1/\sigma)(1 + o(1))$ as $\sigma \in (c_2, c_1)$. The second claim follows from $\partial_\varepsilon H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u}) = 0$. **Item (3).** By definition of H , $\partial_\sigma^2 H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) = -D_t^* \beta_\sigma u \partial_\sigma^2 g(\sigma, \varepsilon) + 2N_t u \partial_\sigma g(\sigma, \varepsilon)$. Clearly $\partial_\sigma g(\sigma, \varepsilon) = \partial_\sigma f(\sigma, \varepsilon)$, and $\partial_\sigma^2 \log f(\sigma, \varepsilon) = \frac{\partial_\sigma^2 f(\sigma, \varepsilon)}{f(\sigma, \varepsilon)} - \frac{\{\partial_\sigma f(\sigma, \varepsilon)\}^2}{f(\sigma, \varepsilon)^2}$. It follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\sigma^2 H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u}) &= -D_t^* \beta_\sigma \tilde{u} f(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}) \partial_\sigma^2 \log f(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}) - D_t^* \beta_\sigma \tilde{u} \frac{\{\partial_\sigma f(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon})\}^2}{f(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon})} + o(N_t) \\ &= -D_t^* \beta_\sigma u f(\sigma, \varepsilon) \partial_\sigma^2 \log f(\sigma, \varepsilon) - u f(\sigma, \varepsilon) D_t^* \beta_\sigma \{\partial_\sigma \log f(\sigma, \varepsilon)\}^2 + o(N_t). \end{aligned}$$

Now, we have that $\tilde{u} f(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}) = \frac{N_t}{D_t^*} (1 + o(1))$, and then $\partial_\sigma^2 H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u}) = -\frac{2N_t(1+o(1))}{\sigma^2}$ by [Item \(1\)](#). Since, $\tilde{u} = \frac{N_t}{D_t^*} \frac{1+o(1)}{f(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon})} = \frac{\sigma N_t}{D_t^*} (1 + o(1))$, and $\partial_\varepsilon^2 H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u}) = -\frac{N_t}{\tilde{u}^2} + \frac{D_t^*}{2} \frac{1}{(1+\tilde{u})^2} = -\frac{N_t}{\tilde{u}^2} (1 + o(1))$ we obtain the second term of [Item \(3\)](#). Moreover $\partial_\varepsilon^2 H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) = -(1 - \sigma) D_t^* \beta_\sigma u \varepsilon^{-2+\sigma} - \frac{D_t^*}{2} \frac{1}{(1-\varepsilon)^2}$. But we know that $\tilde{\varepsilon} = o(1)$ and that $\tilde{\varepsilon}^{-1+\sigma} = \frac{1}{\tilde{u}} (1 + o(1))$. Then,

$$\partial_\varepsilon^2 H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u}) = -(1 - \sigma) D_t^* \tilde{\varepsilon}^{-1} (1 + o(1)) - \frac{D_t^* (1 + o(1))}{2}.$$

Since $\tilde{\varepsilon} = o(1)$ and $\sigma \leq c_1 < 1$, the result follows.

Item (4), we have that $\partial_u \partial_\sigma H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) = -D_t^* \beta_\sigma \partial_\sigma g(\sigma, \varepsilon) + N_t g(\sigma, \varepsilon)$, and since $\partial_\sigma g(\sigma, \varepsilon) = \partial_\sigma f(\sigma, \varepsilon)$, $f(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}) = (1 + o(1))/\sigma$ and $g(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}) = (\frac{1}{\sigma} - \frac{1}{2})(1 + o(1))$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_u \partial_\sigma H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u}) &= -D_t^* (1 + o(1)) f(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}) \partial_\sigma \log f(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}) + \frac{N_t}{\sigma} (1 + o(1)) - \frac{N_t}{2} (1 + o(1)) \\ &= \frac{D_t^* (1 + o(1))}{\sigma^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Item (5). By definition of H , $\partial_\varepsilon \partial_\sigma H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) = D_t^* \beta_\sigma u \varepsilon^{-1+\sigma} \log(\varepsilon) - N_t u \varepsilon^{-1+\sigma} + \frac{N_t}{2}$. But $\tilde{\varepsilon}^{-1+\sigma} = \tilde{u}^{-1} (1 + o(1))$ by [Item \(2\)](#), so that,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\varepsilon \partial_\sigma H(\sigma, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{u}) &= D_t^* (1 + o(1)) \log(\tilde{\varepsilon}) - \frac{N_t (1 + o(1))}{2} \\ &= \frac{D_t^* (1 + o(1))}{1 - \sigma} \log \tilde{u} - \frac{N_t (1 + o(1))}{2} \end{aligned}$$

$$= -\frac{D_t^*(1+o(1))\log\frac{D_t^*}{N_t}}{1-\sigma}.$$

Item (6). We have $\partial_\varepsilon\partial_u H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) = D_t^*\beta_\sigma(\varepsilon^{-1+\sigma} - \frac{1}{2})$. We already know that $\tilde{\varepsilon}^{-1+\sigma} = \frac{1}{u}(1+o(1)) = \frac{D_t^*}{\sigma N_t}(1+o(1))$. Hence the result. \square

S2.4. Proof of [4, Lemma 8]

We first prove [Item \(1\)](#). From [\[4, Lemma 5\]](#), we need only prove

$$\Psi(\sigma) - \sup \Psi \leq -K \log D_t^*, \quad \text{for } \sigma \in [-C, c_2]^c$$

and from [\[4, Lemma 7\]](#), the function Ψ is concave on $[c_1, c_2]$, $\Psi(\sigma) \leq \Psi(c_1)$ if $\sigma \leq c_1$ and for any $\eta = o(1)$, and any $\sigma \in [c_1, c_2]$ such that $|\sigma - \hat{\sigma}_t| > \eta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(\sigma) - \sup \Psi &\leq \max\{\Psi(\hat{\sigma}_t + \eta) - \Psi(\hat{\sigma}_t), \Psi(\hat{\sigma}_t - \eta) - \Psi(\hat{\sigma}_t)\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\Psi''(\hat{\sigma}_t)(1+o(1))\eta^2 \\ &= -\frac{1+o(1)}{2}\left(-C_t''(\hat{\sigma}_t) + \frac{N_t}{\hat{\sigma}_t^2}\right)\eta^2 \\ &\leq -K \log(D_t^*), \end{aligned}$$

choosing $\eta^2 = 4K\alpha_0 \log(D_t^*)/N_t$ since $-C_t''(\hat{\sigma}_t) > 0$, when t is large enough.

Consider now $|\sigma - \hat{\sigma}_t| \leq C\sqrt{\log(D_t^*)/N_t}$ and $|\varepsilon - \hat{\varepsilon}_t| \geq C\sqrt{\log(D_t^*)}/(D_t^*)^{3/4}$. We know from [Lemma S2.2](#) that $\tilde{H}_\sigma(\varepsilon) := \sup_u H(\sigma, u, \varepsilon) = H(\sigma, \varepsilon, \tilde{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon))$. Furthermore, we proved in [\[4, Lemma 6\]](#) that \tilde{H}_σ attains its unique maximum at $\tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma)$, and that $\tilde{H}_\sigma''(\varepsilon) < 0$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ whenever $\sigma \approx \hat{\sigma}_t \in [c_1, c_2]$. Concretely, $\sup_u H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u)$ is a concave function attaining its maximum at $\tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma)$, and thus for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ such that $|\varepsilon - \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma)| > (C/2)\sqrt{\log D_t^*/(D_t^*)^{3/4}} =: \eta_t$

$$\tilde{H}_\sigma(\varepsilon) - \tilde{H}_\sigma(\tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma)) \leq \frac{1}{2} \sup_{|x| \leq \eta_t} \tilde{H}_\sigma''(\tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma) + x) \frac{4C^2 \log D_t^*}{(D_t^*)^{3/2}},$$

and,

$$\sup_{|x| \leq \eta_t} \tilde{H}_\sigma''(\tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma) + x) \lesssim -D_t^* \cdot \frac{N_t}{D_t^*} \tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma)^{-2+\sigma} \asymp -D_t^* \cdot \frac{1}{\tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma)}.$$

Since $|\sigma - \hat{\sigma}_t| \leq C\sqrt{\log(D_t^*)/N_t}$, the [Lemma S2.4](#) together with [\[4, Equation \(30\)\]](#) imply

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \asymp [N_t/D_t^*]^{1/(1-\hat{\sigma}_t)} \asymp [N_t/D_t^*]^{1/(1-\alpha_0)} \asymp 1/\sqrt{D_t^*}$$

so that $\sup_{|x| \leq \eta_t} \tilde{H}_\sigma''(\tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma) + x) \lesssim -\sqrt{D_t^*}$, which implies that

$$\tilde{H}_\sigma(\varepsilon) - \tilde{H}_\sigma(\tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma)) \lesssim -C \log D_t^*.$$

Moreover using a Taylor expansion of $\tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma)$, there exists $\bar{\sigma} \in (\sigma, \hat{\sigma}_t)$ such that $\tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma) - \tilde{\varepsilon}(\hat{\sigma}_t) = \tilde{\varepsilon}'(\bar{\sigma})(\sigma - \hat{\sigma}_t)$. Using the approximation of $\tilde{\varepsilon}'(\sigma)$ in Equation (S2.19), we obtain

$$|\tilde{\varepsilon}(\sigma) - \tilde{\varepsilon}(\hat{\sigma}_t)| = \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}(\bar{\sigma})(1 + o(1)) \log \frac{D_t^*}{N_t}}{(1 - \bar{\sigma})^2} |\sigma - \hat{\sigma}_t| \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{D_t^*}} \cdot \log \frac{D_t^*}{N_t} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log(D_t^*)}{N_t}} = o((D_t^*)^{-3/2}).$$

Hence, if $|\varepsilon - \tilde{\varepsilon}(\hat{\sigma}_t)| \geq C\sqrt{\log D_t^*}/(D_t^*)^{3/4}$ then $|\varepsilon - \tilde{\varepsilon}(\hat{\sigma}_t)| \geq C\sqrt{\log D_t^*}/(D_t^*)^{3/4}$ and for all $|\sigma - \hat{\sigma}_t| \leq C\sqrt{\log(D_t^*)/N_t}$ and all $u > 0$,

$$\sup_{|\sigma - \hat{\sigma}_t| \leq C\sqrt{\log(D_t^*)/N_t}, u > 0} \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) - \sup \Psi \leq -K \log D_t^*.$$

Finally we consider $|\sigma - \hat{\sigma}_t| \leq C\sqrt{\log(D_t^*)/N_t}$, $|\varepsilon - \tilde{\varepsilon}(\hat{\sigma}_t)| \leq C\sqrt{\log D_t^*}/(D_t^*)^{3/4}$ and $|u - \hat{u}_t| > C\sqrt{N_t \log D_t^*}/D_t^*$. Recall that $\sup_u H(\sigma, u, \varepsilon) = H(\sigma, \varepsilon, \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon))$. Furthermore, from the proof of Lemma S2.2 we know that $\partial_u H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) < 0$ if $u > 3N_t/D_t^*$, and that $\partial_u^2 H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) = -\frac{N_t}{u^2}(1 + o(1))$ for all $0 < u \leq 3N_t/D_t^*$. Therefore, when $u > 3N_t/D_t^*$,

$$\begin{aligned} H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) - \sup_u H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) &\leq H(\sigma, \varepsilon, 3N_t/D_t^*) - \sup_u H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) \\ &= \frac{\partial_u^2 H(\sigma, \varepsilon, \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon)) \left(\frac{3N_t}{D_t^*} - \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon) \right)^2}{2} \\ &\lesssim -\frac{N_t}{(N_t/D_t^*)^2} \frac{N_t^2}{D_t^{*2}} \lesssim -N_t, \end{aligned}$$

and whenever $0 < u \leq 3N_t/D_t^*$,

$$\begin{aligned} H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) - \sup_u H(\sigma, \varepsilon, u) &\leq -\frac{1}{2} \frac{N_t}{(3N_t/D_t^*)^2} (u - \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon))^2 \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{18} \frac{D_t^{*2}}{N_t} (u - \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon))^2. \end{aligned}$$

To conclude we thus only need to prove that $|u - \hat{u}_t| > C\sqrt{N_t \log D_t^*}/D_t^* \implies |u - \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon)| > (C/2)\sqrt{N_t \log D_t^*}/D_t^*$. It is enough to show that $|\hat{u}_t - \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon)| \leq (C/2)\sqrt{N_t \log D_t^*}/D_t^*$. But $\hat{u}_t = \bar{u}(\hat{\sigma}_t, \hat{\varepsilon}_t)$, and thus by a Taylor expansion, we can find $\bar{\sigma} \in (\sigma, \hat{\sigma}_t)$ and $\bar{\varepsilon} \in (\varepsilon, \hat{\varepsilon}_t)$ such that $\bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon) - \bar{u}(\hat{\sigma}_t, \hat{\varepsilon}_t) = \partial_\sigma \bar{u}(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\varepsilon})(\sigma - \hat{\sigma}_t) + \partial_\varepsilon \bar{u}(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\varepsilon})(\varepsilon - \hat{\varepsilon}_t)$. That is (see for instance the proof of [4, Lemma 7] for details, and also Lemma S2.4),

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}(\sigma, \varepsilon) - \bar{u}(\hat{\sigma}_t, \hat{\varepsilon}_t) &= \frac{\partial_\sigma \partial_u H(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\varepsilon}, \bar{u}(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\varepsilon}))}{-\partial_u^2 H(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\varepsilon}, \bar{u}(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\varepsilon}))} (\sigma - \hat{\sigma}_t) + \frac{\partial_\varepsilon \partial_u H(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\varepsilon}, \bar{u}(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\varepsilon}))}{-\partial_u^2 H(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\varepsilon}, \bar{u}(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\varepsilon}))} (\varepsilon - \hat{\varepsilon}_t) \\ &= O\left(\frac{N_t}{D_t^*} \sqrt{\frac{\log(D_t^*)}{N_t}}\right) + O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(D_t^*)}{(D_t^*)^{3/2}}}\right) \\ &= O\left(\frac{\sqrt{N_t \log(D_t^*)}}{D_t^*}\right), \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof of Item (1) by choosing C large enough.

We now prove [Item \(2\)](#). Recall that $\varphi(\sigma, \tau, s) = (\sigma, \varepsilon(\sigma, \tau, s), u(\sigma, \tau, s))$ and

$$U_t(C) = \left\{ \phi : |\sigma - \hat{\sigma}_t|^2 \leq \frac{C \log(D_t^*)}{N_t}, |\varepsilon(\phi) - \hat{\varepsilon}_t|^2 \leq \frac{C \log(D_t^*)}{(D_t^*)^{3/2}}, |u(\phi) - \hat{u}_t|^2 \leq \frac{CN_t \log(D_t^*)}{D_t^{*2}} \right\}$$

The maximum belongs to $U_t(C)$ from [Item \(1\)](#). We now prove that φ is invertible on U_t . To do so we compute the Jacobian of the transformation. We first compute $\nabla \zeta(\phi)$. Using [\[4, Equation \(27\)\]](#) which defined ζ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \zeta(\phi) &= \frac{2\zeta(\phi)}{2\zeta(\phi)^2 - \tau\zeta(\phi) - 2\sigma s\zeta(\phi)^\sigma} \begin{pmatrix} s\zeta(\phi)^\sigma \log \zeta(\phi) - N_t \\ \zeta(\phi)/2 \\ \zeta(\phi)^\sigma \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \frac{1}{\zeta(\phi)} \begin{pmatrix} s\zeta(\phi)^\sigma \log \zeta(\phi) - N_t \\ \zeta(\phi)/2 \\ \zeta(\phi)^\sigma \end{pmatrix} (1 + o(1)), \quad \forall \phi \in U_t(C). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S2.20})$$

Next, since $\tau = \zeta(\phi)\varepsilon(\phi)$,

$$\nabla \varepsilon(\phi) = \frac{1}{\zeta(\phi)} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} - \frac{\varepsilon(\phi)}{\zeta(\phi)} \nabla \zeta(\phi), \quad (\text{S2.21})$$

and, from the fact that $D_t^*(1 - \sigma N_t/D_t^*)u(\phi) = s\zeta(\phi)^\sigma$, when $\phi \in U_t$,

$$\nabla u(\phi) = \frac{1}{D_t^*(1 - \sigma N_t/D_t^*)} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} N_t u(\phi) + s\zeta(\phi)^\sigma \log \zeta(\phi) \\ 0 \\ \zeta(\phi)^\sigma \end{pmatrix} + \sigma s\zeta(\phi)^{-1+\sigma} \nabla \zeta(\phi) \right\}. \quad (\text{S2.22})$$

Now we define,

$$J_*(\phi) := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\zeta(\phi)} & 0 \\ \frac{N_t u(\phi) + s\zeta(\phi)^\sigma \log \zeta(\phi)}{D_t^* \beta_\sigma} & 0 & \frac{\zeta(\phi)^\sigma}{D_t^* \beta_\sigma} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{S2.23})$$

as well as,

$$E(\phi) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{\varepsilon(\phi)}{\zeta(\phi)^2} (s\zeta(\phi)^\sigma \log \zeta(\phi) - N_t) & -\frac{\varepsilon(\phi)}{\zeta(\phi)^2} \frac{\zeta(\phi)}{2} & -\frac{\varepsilon(\phi)}{\zeta(\phi)^2} \zeta(\phi)^\sigma \\ \frac{\sigma s\zeta(\phi)^{-1+\sigma}}{D_t^* \beta_\sigma \zeta(\phi)} (s\zeta(\phi)^\sigma \log \zeta(\phi) - N_t) & \frac{\sigma s\zeta(\phi)^{-1+\sigma}}{D_t^* \beta_\sigma} \frac{1}{2} & \frac{\sigma s\zeta(\phi)^{-1+\sigma}}{D_t^* \beta_\sigma \zeta(\phi)} \zeta(\phi)^\sigma \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{S2.24})$$

Likewise, by [Equations \(S2.20\) to \(S2.24\)](#), we have that the Jacobian matrix of φ is given by $J(\phi) \sim J_*(\phi) + E(\phi)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, at least when $\phi \in U_t$. We further remark that

$$J_*(\phi)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \zeta(\phi) & 0 \\ -\frac{N_t u(\phi)}{\zeta(\phi)^\sigma} + s \log \zeta(\phi) & 0 & \frac{D_t^* \beta_\sigma}{\zeta(\phi)^\sigma} \end{pmatrix}$$

S20

and, When $\phi \in U_t$, we can find constants $c_1, \dots, c_6 \in \mathbb{R}$, such that asymptotically as $t \rightarrow \infty$,

$$E(\phi) \sim \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ c_1 \frac{N_t \log(D_t^*)}{(2D_t^*)^{3/2}} & c_2 \frac{1}{2D_t^*} & c_3 \frac{N_t}{4D_t^{*2}} \\ c_4 \frac{N_t^2 \log(D_t^*)}{4D_t^{*2}} & c_5 \frac{N_t}{(2D_t^*)^{3/2}} & c_6 \frac{N_t^2}{(2D_t^*)^{5/2}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The constants c_1, \dots, c_6 depend uniquely on α_0 and τ_* and can be made explicit. We choose to not do it since this is not needed for our purpose. Similarly, we have $\zeta(\phi) \sim \sqrt{2D_t^*}$, and for some constant $c_7 \in \mathbb{R}$, we also have that $\frac{D_t^* \beta_\sigma}{\zeta(\phi)^\sigma} \sim c_7 \frac{(2D_t^*)^{3/2}}{N_t}$. Thus,

$$J_*(\phi)^{-1} E(\phi) \sim \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ c_1 \frac{N_t \log(D_t^*)}{2D_t^*} & \frac{c_2}{\sqrt{2D_t^*}} & c_3 \frac{N_t}{(2D_t^*)^{3/2}} \\ c_4 c_7 \frac{N_t \log(D_t^*)}{\sqrt{2D_t^*}} & c_5 c_7 & c_6 c_7 \frac{N_t}{2D_t^*} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The eigenvalues $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ of $J_*(\phi)^{-1} E(\phi)$ go to zero with t under [4, Assumption 1] and $\lambda_1 = 0$. Then, by a Neumann series expansion of the inverse of $J(\phi) = J_*(\phi)(I + J_*(\phi)^{-1} E(\phi))$, we obtain that whenever $\phi \in U_t$,

$$J(\phi)^{-1} \sim \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{2D_t^*} & 0 \\ c_8 \sqrt{2D_t^*} \log(2D_t^*) & 0 & c_7 \frac{(2D_t^*)^{3/2}}{N_t} \end{pmatrix}.$$

S3. Local analysis of the likelihood

S3.1. Computation of $\hat{\Sigma}_t$

In the whole Section S3, we define for convenience $\mathcal{Q}_t^*(\sigma, \tau, u) = \mathcal{Q}_t(\sigma, \tau, s_{*,t}u)$. With this definition in mind, we recall that by definition $\Sigma_t(\sigma, \tau, u)^{-1} = -D^2 \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\sigma, \tau, u)$. From [4, Equation (29) and Assumption 1], $|\hat{\sigma}_t - \alpha_0| = o(1/\log N_t)$, $|\hat{\tau}_t - \tau_*| = o(1)$ and $|\hat{s}_t - s_{*,t}| = o(s_{*,t})$. Now let $|\phi_u - \hat{\phi}_u| \leq N_t^{-\delta}$ with $\delta > 0$, Lemma S3.5 implies that $\Sigma_t(\sigma, \tau, s/s_{*,t})^{-1}$ can be written as

$$\left(-C_t''(\sigma) + \frac{s_{*,t}(2D_t^*)^{\sigma/2}}{\alpha_0^3} (1 + o(1)) \right) \text{diag}(1, 0, 0) + \begin{pmatrix} M_1(\phi) & O(s_{*,t}) & M_2(\phi) \\ O(s_{*,t}) & s(1-\sigma)\tau^{\sigma-2} + O(1) & O(s_{*,t}) \\ M_2(\phi) & O(s_{*,t}) & \frac{N_t}{u^2} + O(s_{*,t}^{2\alpha_0+2\epsilon}) \end{pmatrix}$$

where

$$M_1(\phi) := u s_{*,t} \frac{\zeta(\phi)^\sigma \log^2(\zeta(\phi))}{2\sigma} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sigma \log(\zeta(\phi))} \right)^2,$$

and

$$M_2(\phi) := s_{*,t} \frac{\zeta(\phi)^\sigma \log(\zeta(\phi))}{\sigma} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sigma \log(\zeta(\phi))} \right) (1 + O(s_{*,t}^{-\delta_1})).$$

Let $X = (x_1, x_2, x_3)^t$. We bound $X^t \Sigma_t(\sigma, \tau, s/s_{*,t})^{-1} X$ using that for $i \neq j$ it holds $2|a_{ij}x_i x_j| = \inf_{b>0} \{a_{ij}^2 x_i^2 b + x_j^2/b\}$. In particular we apply the above $i, j = 1, 2$ with $a_{12} = O(s_{*,t})$ and $b = s_{*,t}^{a-1}$ for $a < \alpha_0$ so that

$$2|s_{*,t}x_1x_2| \leq x_1^2 s_{*,t}^{1+a} + x_2^2 s_{*,t}^{1-a}$$

and similarly for $i, j = 2, 3$

$$2|s_{*,t}x_2x_3| \leq x_3^2 s_{*,t}^{1+a} + x_2^2 s_{*,t}^{1-a}.$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} X^t \Sigma_t(\sigma, \tau, s/s_{*,t})^{-1} X &\leq x_1^2 \left[-C_t''(\sigma) + \frac{s_{*,t}(2D_t^*)^{\sigma/2}}{\alpha_0^3} (1 + o(1)) \right] \\ &\quad + x_2^2 s_{*,t} (1 - \alpha_0) \tau_*^{\alpha_0 - 2} (1 + o(1)) + 2x_3^2 s_{*,t}^{1+a} \\ &\quad + (x_1, x_3) \begin{pmatrix} M_1(\hat{\phi}_t) & M_2(\hat{\phi}_t) \\ M_2(\hat{\phi}_t) & \frac{N_t}{u^2} \end{pmatrix} (x_1, x_3)^t \end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$\begin{aligned} X^t \Sigma_t(\sigma, \tau, s/s_{*,t})^{-1} X &\geq x_1^2 \left[-C_t''(\sigma) + \frac{s_{*,t}(2D_t^*)^{\sigma/2}}{\alpha_0^3} (1 + o(1)) \right] \\ &\quad + x_2^2 s_{*,t} (1 - \alpha_0) \tau_*^{\alpha_0 - 2} (1 + o(1)) - 2x_3^2 s_{*,t}^{1+a} \\ &\quad + (x_1, x_3) \begin{pmatrix} M_1(\hat{\phi}_t) & M_2(\hat{\phi}_t) \\ M_2(\hat{\phi}_t) & \frac{N_t}{u^2} \end{pmatrix} (x_1, x_3)^t \end{aligned}$$

From [4, Equation (28)], we have that $\hat{s}_t \zeta(\phi)^{\hat{\sigma}_t} = \hat{\sigma}_t N_t (1 + O(s_{*,t}^{-\delta_1}))$ for some $\delta_1 > 0$ which in turns implies that $M_1(\hat{\phi}_t) \frac{N_t}{u^2} - M_2(\hat{\phi}_t)^2 = O(s_{*,t}^{-\delta_1} M_1(\hat{\phi}_t) N_t)$. It thus implies that if $|\phi - \hat{\phi}_{t,u}| \leq s_{*,t}^{-\delta}$ for some $\delta > 0$ then

$$X^t \Sigma_t(\sigma, \tau, s/s_{*,t})^{-1} X \gtrsim x_1^2 s_{*,t}^{1+\alpha_0} + x_2^2 s_{*,t} + x_3^2 \frac{N_t}{\log^2 D_t^*}$$

and

$$X^t \Sigma_t(\sigma, \tau, s/s_{*,t})^{-1} X \lesssim x_1^2 s_{*,t}^{1+\alpha_0} \log^2(D_t^*) + x_2^2 s_{*,t} + x_3^2 N_t.$$

Lemma S3.5. *Let $\epsilon > 0$, and*

$$B_\epsilon = \{\phi : |\sigma - \sigma_*| \leq \epsilon, |\tau - \tau_*| \leq \epsilon, |s - s_{*,t}| \leq \epsilon s_{*,t}\}.$$

Then, there exists $\delta_1 > 0$ such that for all $\phi \in B_\epsilon$ and ϵ small enough

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\sigma^2 \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\sigma, \tau, u) &= C_t''(\sigma) - s \frac{\zeta(\phi)^\sigma \log^2 \zeta(\phi)}{\sigma} \left[1 - \frac{1}{\sigma \log \zeta(\phi)} \right]^2 (1 + O(s_{*,t}^{-\delta_1})), \\ \partial_\tau^2 \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\sigma, \tau, u) &= -s(1 - \sigma) \tau_*^{\sigma-2} + O(1), \quad \partial_u^2 \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\sigma, \tau, u) = -\frac{N_t}{u^2} (1 + s_{*,t}^{-\delta_1}), \end{aligned}$$

S22

and

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\sigma \partial_u \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\sigma, \tau, u) &= -s_{*,t} \frac{\zeta(\phi)^\sigma \log^2 \zeta(\phi)}{\sigma} \left[1 - \frac{1}{\sigma \log \zeta(\phi)} \right] (1 + O(s_{*,t}^{-\delta_1})), \\ \partial_\tau \partial_\sigma \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\sigma, \tau, u) &= -s \tau_*^{\sigma-1} \log(\tau) (1 + O(s_{*,t}^{-\delta_1})), \\ \partial_u \partial_\tau \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\sigma, \tau, u) &= s_{*,t} \tau^{\sigma-1} (1 + O(s_{*,t}^{-\delta_1})).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We recall the convention in the main paper that $\phi = (\sigma, \tau, s)$ and $\phi_u = (\sigma, \tau, u)$ with $u = s/s_{*,t}$. Recall that

$$\mathcal{Q}_t^*(\phi_u) = \mathcal{C}_t(\sigma) + N_t \log s - D_t^* \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)) - \log 2/2.$$

By direct computations,

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\sigma \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\phi_u) &= \mathcal{C}'_t(\sigma) - D_t^* \partial_\sigma \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)) - D_t^* \partial_\sigma \zeta(\phi) \partial_z \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)) \\ &= \mathcal{C}'_t(\sigma) - D_t^* \partial_\sigma \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi))\end{aligned}$$

since $\partial_z \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)) = 0$ for all ϕ . Similarly

$$\partial_\tau \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\phi_u) = -D_t^* \partial_\tau \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)), \quad \partial_u \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\phi_u) = \frac{N_t}{u} - s_{*,t} D_t^* \partial_s \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)),$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\sigma^2 \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\phi_u) &= \mathcal{C}''_t(\sigma) - D_t^* \partial_\sigma^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)) - D_t^* \partial_\sigma \zeta(\phi) \partial_z \partial_\sigma \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)), \\ \partial_{\sigma, \tau}^2 \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\phi_u) &= -D_t^* \partial_{\sigma, \tau}^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)) - D_t^* \partial_\tau \zeta(\phi) \partial_z \partial_\sigma \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)), \\ \partial_\tau^2 \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\phi_u) &= -D_t^* \partial_\tau^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)) - D_t^* \partial_\tau \zeta(\phi) \partial_z \partial_\tau \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)), \\ \partial_u^2 \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\phi_u) &= -\frac{N_t}{u^2} - s_{*,t}^2 D_t^* \partial_s^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)) - s_{*,t}^2 D_t^* \partial_s \zeta(\phi) \partial_z \partial_s \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)), \\ \partial_{\sigma, u}^2 \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\phi_u) &= -D_t^* s_{*,t} \partial_{\sigma, s}^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)) - s_{*,t} D_t^* \partial_\sigma \zeta(\phi) \partial_z \partial_s \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)), \\ \partial_{\tau, u}^2 \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\phi_u) &= -D_t^* s_{*,t} \partial_{\tau, s}^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)) - s_{*,t} D_t^* \partial_s \zeta(\phi) \partial_z \partial_\tau \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)),\end{aligned}$$

Moreover

$$\begin{aligned}D_t^* \partial_\sigma \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)) &= -N_t \log \zeta(\phi) + s \left[\frac{\zeta^\sigma \log \zeta - \tau^\sigma \log \tau}{\sigma} - \frac{\zeta^\sigma - \tau^\sigma}{\sigma^2} \right], \\ D_t^* \partial_\tau \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)) &= \frac{\zeta(\phi) - \tau}{2} - s \tau^{\sigma-1}, \\ D_t^* \partial_s \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)) &= \frac{\zeta^\sigma - \tau^\sigma}{\sigma},\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$D_t^* \partial_\sigma^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)) = s \left[\frac{\zeta^\sigma \log^2 \zeta - \tau^\sigma \log^2 \tau}{\sigma} - 2 \frac{\zeta^\sigma \log \zeta - \tau^\sigma \log \tau}{\sigma^2} + 2 \frac{\zeta^\sigma - \tau^\sigma}{\sigma^3} \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
D_t^* \partial_\tau^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)) &= -\frac{1}{2} - s(\sigma - 1)\tau^{\sigma-2}, \\
D_t^* \partial_s^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)) &= 0, \\
D_t^* \partial_{\sigma, \tau}^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)) &= -s\tau^{\sigma-1} \log \tau \\
D_t^* \partial_{\sigma s}^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)) &= \frac{\zeta^\sigma \log \zeta - \tau^\sigma \log \tau}{\sigma} - \frac{\zeta^\sigma - \tau^\sigma}{\sigma^2}, \\
D_t^* \partial_{\tau, s}^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)) &= -\tau^{\sigma-1},
\end{aligned}$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned}
D_t^* \partial_z \partial_\sigma \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)) &= -\frac{N_t}{\zeta(\phi)} + s\zeta^{\sigma-1} \log \zeta, \\
D_t^* \partial_z \partial_\tau \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)) &= \frac{1}{2}, \\
D_t^* \partial_z \partial_s \mathcal{A}(\phi, \zeta(\phi)) &= \zeta^{\sigma-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note also that:

$$\partial_s \zeta(\phi) = \sigma \zeta(\phi)^{\sigma-1} \left(1 - \frac{\tau}{2\zeta(\phi)} - s\sigma \zeta(\phi)^{\sigma-3} \right)^{-1} = \alpha_0 (2D_t^*)^{(\sigma-1)/2} (1 + o(1)), \quad (\text{S3.25})$$

and similarly

$$\partial_\tau \zeta(\phi) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\tau}{2\zeta(\phi)} - s\sigma \zeta(\phi)^{\sigma-3} \right)^{-1} = \frac{1}{2} (1 + o(1)),$$

and,

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_\sigma \zeta(\phi) &= \left(s\zeta(\phi)^{\sigma-1} \log \zeta(\phi) - \frac{N_t}{\zeta(\phi)} \right) \left(1 - \frac{\tau}{2\zeta(\phi)} - s\sigma \zeta(\phi)^{\sigma-3} \right)^{-1} \\
&= \left(\frac{s_{*,t} (2D_t^*)^{(\sigma-1)/2} \log(2D_t^*)}{2} (1 + o(1)) - \frac{N_t}{\sqrt{2D_t^*}} + O(1) \right) (1 + o(1)). \quad (\text{S3.26})
\end{aligned}$$

Finally we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_\sigma^2 \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\phi_u) &= \mathcal{C}_t''(\sigma) - s \left[\frac{\zeta^\sigma \log^2 \zeta}{\sigma} - 2 \frac{\zeta^\sigma \log \zeta}{\sigma^2} + 2 \frac{\zeta^\sigma}{\sigma^3} + O(1) \right] + O(s_{*,t}^{2\alpha_0+2\epsilon}) \\
\partial_u^2 \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\phi_u) &= -\frac{N_t}{u^2} + O(s_{*,t}^{2\alpha_0+2\epsilon}), \\
\partial_\tau^2 \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\phi_u) &= \frac{1}{2} - s(1-\sigma)\tau^{\sigma-2} + O(1) = -s(1-\sigma)\tau^{\sigma-2} + O(1), \\
\partial_{\sigma, u}^2 \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\phi_u) &= -s_{*,t} \frac{\zeta^\sigma \log \zeta - \tau^\sigma \log \tau}{\sigma} - s_{*,t} \frac{\zeta^\sigma - \tau^\sigma}{\sigma^2} + O(s_{*,t}^{2\alpha_0+2\epsilon}), \\
\partial_{\tau, u}^2 \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\phi_u) &= s_{*,t} \tau^{\sigma-1} + O(s_{*,t}^{\alpha_0+\epsilon}), \\
\partial_{\tau, \sigma}^2 \mathcal{Q}_t^*(\phi_u) &= s\tau^{\sigma-1} \log \tau + O(s_{*,t}^{\alpha_0+\epsilon}).
\end{aligned}$$

□

S3.2. Proof of [4, Lemma 9]

We write $\tilde{I}_0(\phi) = e^{-D_t^* \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi))} / (2\sqrt{\pi})$, from [4, Equation (22)],

$$\begin{aligned} I(\phi) &= \tilde{I}_0(\phi) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\{-D_t^*[\mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi) - iy) - \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi))]\} du; = \tilde{I}_0(\phi) \int_{\mathbb{R}} H_\phi(y) dy \\ I_0(\phi) &= \tilde{I}_0(\phi) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\left\{-\frac{y^2 D_t^*[-\partial_z^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi))]}{2}\right\} dy; = \tilde{I}_0(\phi) \int_{\mathbb{R}} H_{0,\phi}(y) dy \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S3.27})$$

and

$$\nabla[\mathcal{Q}_t - L_t] = -\nabla \log I(\phi) + \nabla \log I_0(\phi) + \frac{1}{2} \nabla \log \left(D_t^* \partial_z^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi)) \right)$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla I(\phi) &= \tilde{I}_0(\phi) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \nabla H_\phi(y) dy + \frac{\nabla \tilde{I}_0(\phi)}{\tilde{I}_0(\phi)} I(\phi) \\ \nabla I_0(\phi) &= -\frac{I_0(\phi)}{2} \nabla \log \left(D_t^* \partial_z^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi)) \right) + \frac{\nabla \tilde{I}_0(\phi)}{\tilde{I}_0(\phi)} I_0(\phi) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla[\mathcal{Q}_t - L_t] &= \frac{-\tilde{I}_0(\phi) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \nabla H_\phi(y) dy}{I(\phi)} - \frac{\nabla \tilde{I}_0(\phi)}{\tilde{I}_0(\phi)} \frac{I(\phi) - I_0(\phi)}{I_0(\phi)} \\ &= \frac{-\int_{\mathbb{R}} \nabla H_\phi(y) dy}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} H_{0,\phi}(y) dy} + \frac{I(\phi) - I_0(\phi)}{I_0(\phi)} \left[\frac{\tilde{I}_0(\phi) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \nabla H_\phi(y) dy}{I(\phi)} - \frac{\nabla \tilde{I}_0(\phi)}{\tilde{I}_0(\phi)} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S3.28})$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \nabla H_\phi(y) dy &= -D_t^* \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-D_t^*[\mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi) - iy) - \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi))]} [\nabla_\phi \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi) - iy) - \nabla_\phi \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi))] dy \\ &\quad - D_t^* \nabla \zeta(\phi) \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-D_t^*[\mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi) - iy) - \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi))]} [\nabla_z \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi) - iy) - \nabla_z \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi))] dy \\ &=: \Delta_1 + \Delta_2 \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\sqrt{-2D_t^* \partial_z^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi_0; \zeta(\phi_0))} = 2^{-1/2}(1 + o(1))$ so that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} H_{0,\phi}(y) dy = 2\sqrt{\pi}(1 + o(1)).$$

Also

$$D_t^* \partial_\sigma \mathcal{A}(\phi; z) = -N_t \log z + \frac{s}{2} \left[\frac{\log(z) z^\sigma - \log(\tau) \tau^\sigma}{\sigma} - \frac{z^\sigma - \tau^\sigma}{\sigma^2} \right] \quad (\text{S3.29})$$

$$D_t^* \partial_\tau \mathcal{A}(\phi; z) = \frac{z - \tau}{2} - s\tau^{\sigma-1}, \quad D_t^* \partial_s \mathcal{A}(\phi; z) = \frac{z^\sigma - \tau^\sigma}{\sigma}$$

In particular when $|y| \leq \sqrt{\zeta(\phi_0)}$, i.e. $|y| \leq c_0 \sqrt{t}$ for some $c_0 > 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \log(\zeta(\phi_0) - iy) - \log(\zeta(\phi_0)) &= \frac{\log(\zeta(\phi_0)^2 + u^2) - \log(\zeta(\phi_0)^2)}{2} - \frac{iu}{\zeta(\phi_0)} + O(|y|^2/t^2), \\ (\zeta(\phi_0) - iy)^{\sigma_0} - (\zeta(\phi_0))^{\sigma_0} &= -iy\sigma_0\zeta(\phi_0)^{\sigma_0-1} + O(|y|^2 t^{\sigma_0-2}) \end{aligned}$$

and also, from [Equations \(S1.6\) to \(S1.8\)](#), writing $A_0 = 2[-D_t^* \partial_z^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi_0))]$

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-D_t^* [\mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi) - iy) - \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi))]} &= e^{-y^2 A_0/4} \times \\ &\left(1 - \frac{iy^3 D_t^*}{2\pi} \left[\int_{|\xi|=\zeta(\phi_0)/2} \frac{\mathcal{A}(\phi_0; \zeta(\phi_0) + \xi)}{\xi^4} + O\left(\frac{\sup_{1/2 \leq x \leq 2} \sup_{\varphi \in [-\pi, \pi]} |\mathcal{A}(\phi_0; x\zeta(\phi_0)e^{i\varphi})|}{\zeta(\phi_0)^4} \right) \right] \right) \\ &= e^{-y^2 A_0/4} \left(1 - \frac{iy^3 D_t^*}{2\pi} \int_{|\xi|=\zeta(\phi_0)/2} \frac{\mathcal{A}(\phi_0; \zeta(\phi_0) + \xi)}{\xi^4} d\xi + O\left(\frac{|y|^4 \log t}{t^2} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

We combine this with the arguments as in the proof of [\[4, Theorem 7\]](#) in [Section S1.4](#), but we consider a decomposition into $|y| \leq \zeta(\phi)^{1/2}$ and $|y| > \zeta(\phi)^{1/2}$, instead of $|y| \leq Ca(\sigma)$ and its complement we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| D_t^* \int_{|y| \leq \sqrt{\zeta(\phi_0)}} e^{-D_t^* [\mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi) - iy) - \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi))]} [\nabla_\sigma \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi) - iy) - \nabla_\sigma \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi))] dy \right| \\ &\lesssim \left(\int e^{-y^2/4} |y|^6 dy \right) t^{\sigma_0-1} \log t = O(t^{\sigma_0-1} \log t) \\ &\left| D_t^* \int_{|y| \leq \sqrt{\zeta(\phi_0)}} e^{-D_t^* [\mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi) - iy) - \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi))]} [\nabla_\tau \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi) - iy) - \nabla_\tau \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi))] dy \right| \\ &\lesssim t^{-1} \\ &\left| D_t^* \int_{|y| \leq \sqrt{\zeta(\phi_0)}} e^{-D_t^* [\mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi) - iy) - \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi))]} [\nabla_s \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi) - iy) - \nabla_s \mathcal{A}(\phi; \zeta(\phi))] dy \right| \\ &\lesssim t^{\sigma_0-2} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, using [Equation \(S1.1\)](#), if $|y| \leq c_0 \delta t$

$$\begin{aligned} &D_t^* [\partial_z \mathcal{A}(\phi_0; \zeta(\phi_0) - iy) - \partial_z \mathcal{A}(\phi_0; \zeta(\phi_0))] \\ &= \frac{iy}{2} \left(1 + \frac{2(D_t^* - \sigma_0 N_t)}{\zeta(\phi_0)^2} + 2(1 - \sigma_0)t\zeta(\phi_0)^{\sigma_0-2} \right) + O(|y|^2 t^{-1}) \end{aligned}$$

so that combining with $\nabla \zeta(\phi_0)$ computed in the previous Section,

$$|\Delta_2(1)| \lesssim \frac{\log t}{t^{1-\sigma_0}}, \quad |\Delta_2(2)| \lesssim \frac{\log t}{t}, \quad |\Delta_2(3)| \lesssim \frac{1}{t^{1-\sigma_0}}.$$

Finally, since the integrals over $|y| > \sqrt{\zeta(\phi_0)}$ are exponentially small, we obtain that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \nabla_{\sigma} H_{\phi}(y) dy = O\left(\frac{\log t}{t^{1-\sigma_0}}\right), \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \nabla_{\tau} H_{\phi}(y) dy = O\left(\frac{1}{t}\right), \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \nabla_u H_{\phi}(y) dy = O\left(\frac{1}{t^{1-\sigma_0}}\right). \quad (\text{S3.30})$$

Combining the above upper bound, with $|I(\phi_0) - I_0(\phi_0)|/I_0(\phi_0) = O(\log t/t^2)$ and Equation (S3.29) to bound $\nabla I_0(\phi_0)/I_0(\phi_0)$ we obtain

$$\nabla_{\sigma}[\mathcal{Q}_t - L_t] \lesssim \frac{(\log t)^2}{t^{1-\sigma_0}}, \quad \nabla_{\tau}[\mathcal{Q}_t - L_t] \lesssim \frac{\log t}{t}, \quad t \nabla_s[\mathcal{Q}_t - L_t] \lesssim \frac{\log t}{t^{1-\sigma_0}}.$$

Note that the above control on $\nabla \mathcal{Q}_t - \nabla L_t$ is valid in expectation since

$$\zeta(\phi)^2 \geq 2D_t^* - 2\sigma_0 N_t \geq 2D_t^*(1 - \sigma_0), \quad \zeta(\phi) \geq (2t)^{1/(2-\sigma_0)}.$$

We now prove that

$$\Delta = \left| \text{Tr} \left(V_0 [D_{\phi_u}^2 L_t - D_{\phi_u}^2 \mathcal{Q}_t](\phi_0, u) \right) \right| = o(1)$$

with

$$V_0 = \frac{1}{t} \begin{pmatrix} c_1 t^{-\sigma_0} & 0 & c_2 t^{-\sigma_0} \log t \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ t^{-\sigma_0} \log t & 0 & t^{-\sigma_0} \log^2 t \end{pmatrix}.$$

This boils down to proving that

$$\begin{aligned} t^{-1-\sigma_0} |D_{\sigma, \sigma}^2 [L_t - \mathcal{Q}_t](\phi_0)| &= o(1) \\ t^{-1-\sigma_0} \log t |D_{\sigma, s}^2 [L_t - \mathcal{Q}_t](\phi_0)| &= o(1) \\ t^{-1} |D_{\tau, \tau}^2 [L_t - \mathcal{Q}_t](\phi_0)| &= o(1) \\ t^{-1-\sigma_0} (\log t)^2 |D_{s, s}^2 [L_t - \mathcal{Q}_t](\sigma_0)| &= o(1) \end{aligned}$$

We use Equation (S3.28) so that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\phi}^2 [\mathcal{Q}_t - L_t] &= \frac{-\int_{\mathbb{R}} D^2 H_{\phi}(u) du}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} H_{0, \phi}(u) du} + \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}} \nabla H_{\phi}(u) du \int_{\mathbb{R}} \nabla H_{0, \phi}(u) du}{[\int_{\mathbb{R}} H_{0, \phi}(u) du]^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{I(\phi) - I_0(\phi)}{I_0(\phi)} \left[\frac{\tilde{I}_0(\phi) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \nabla H_{\phi}(u) du}{I(\phi)} - \frac{\nabla \tilde{I}_0(\phi)}{\tilde{I}_0(\phi)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

First since

$$-D_t^* \partial_z^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi, z) = \frac{D_t^* - \sigma N_t}{z^2} + s(1 - \sigma) z^{-2+\sigma}$$

simple computations imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\sigma} [-D_t^* \partial_z^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi_0, \zeta(\phi_0))] &= O(t^{-1+\sigma_0} \log t), \quad \nabla_{\tau} [-D_t^* \partial_z^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi_0, \zeta(\phi_0))] = O(t^{-1}) \\ t^2 \nabla_s [-D_t^* \partial_z^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi_0, \zeta(\phi_0))] &= O(t^{\sigma_0}) \end{aligned}$$

which implies the same orders for $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \nabla H_{0,\phi}(u) du$. Moreover Equation (S3.29), together with the relation $\sigma_0 N = t\zeta(\phi_0)^{\sigma_0}(1 + O(t^{-\delta}))$ for some $\delta > 0$, imply that

$$|\nabla_{\sigma} \log \tilde{I}_0(\phi_0)| \lesssim t^{1+\sigma_0}, \quad |\nabla_{\tau} \log \tilde{I}_0(\phi_0)| \lesssim t, \quad t|\nabla_s \log \tilde{I}_0(\phi_0)| \lesssim t^{1+\sigma_0}.$$

Combining this with

$$|I(\phi_0) - I_0(\phi_0)|/I_0(\phi_0) = O(\log t/t^2)$$

implies that term by term with $D_{\phi_u}^2$ representing either $D_{\sigma,\sigma}^2$, $D_{\tau,\tau}^2$ or $t^2 D_{s,s}^2$ and ∇_{ϕ_u} representing either ∇_{σ} , ∇_{τ} or $t\nabla_s$

$$\begin{aligned} |D_{\phi_u}^2 [\mathcal{Q}_t - L_t]| &\lesssim \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} D_{\phi_u}^2 H_{\phi_u}(x) dx \right| + \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \nabla_{\phi_u} H_{\phi_u}(x) dx \right| \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \nabla_{\phi_u} H_{0,\phi_u}(x) dx \right| \\ &\quad + \frac{\log t}{t^2} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \nabla_{\phi_u} H_{\phi_u}(x) dx \right| + o(1) \end{aligned}$$

Using Equation (S3.30) we then obtain that

$$|D_{\phi_u}^2 [\mathcal{Q}_t - L_t]| \lesssim \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} D_{\phi_u}^2 H_{\phi_u}(x) dx \right| + o(1)$$

We have We now study the second derivatives .

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} D_{\phi_u}^2 H_{\phi_u}(x) dx &= -D_t^* \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-D_t^* [\mathcal{A}(\phi;\zeta(\phi)-iu) - \mathcal{A}(\phi;\zeta(\phi))]} \left(D_{\phi_u}^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi;\zeta(\phi) - iu) - D_{\phi_u}^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi;\zeta(\phi)) \right) du \\ &\quad - 2D_t^* \nabla_{\phi_u} \zeta(\phi_u) \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-D_t^* [\mathcal{A}(\phi;\zeta(\phi)-iu) - \mathcal{A}(\phi;\zeta(\phi))]} \left(\partial_{\phi_u} \partial_z \mathcal{A}(\phi;\zeta(\phi) - iu) - \partial_{\phi_u} \partial_z \mathcal{A}(\phi;\zeta(\phi)) \right) du \\ &\quad - D_t^* D_{\phi_u}^2 \zeta(\phi) \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-D_t^* [\mathcal{A}(\phi;\zeta(\phi)-iu) - \mathcal{A}(\phi;\zeta(\phi))]} \left(\partial_z^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi;\zeta(\phi) - iu) - \partial_z^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi;\zeta(\phi)) \right) du \\ &:= \Delta_1 + \Delta_2 + \Delta_3 \end{aligned}$$

Using Equations (S3.25) and (S3.26), we can bound

$$\partial_{\sigma,\sigma}^2 \zeta(\phi) = O(t^{\sigma_0} \log^2 t), \quad \partial_{\tau,\tau}^2 \zeta(\phi) = O(1/t), \quad t^2 \partial_{s,s}^2 \zeta(\phi) = O(t^{2\sigma_0-1}), \quad t \partial_{\sigma,s}^2 \zeta(\phi) = O(t^{\sigma_0} \log t).$$

Since $D_t^* \partial_z^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi;\zeta(\phi)) = O(1)$,

$$\text{Tr}[V_0 \Delta_3] = o(1).$$

Also using

$$D_t^* \partial_z \mathcal{A}(\phi; z) = -z/2 + \tau/2 + (D_t^* - \sigma N_t)/z + sz^{-1+\sigma}$$

we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |D_t^* \partial_{\sigma} [\partial_z \mathcal{A}(\phi;\zeta(\phi) - iu) - \partial_z \mathcal{A}(\phi;\zeta(\phi))]| &\lesssim |u| t^{\sigma_0-1} \log t, \\ |D_t^* \partial_{\tau} [\partial_z \mathcal{A}(\phi;\zeta(\phi) - iu) - \partial_z \mathcal{A}(\phi;\zeta(\phi))]| &= 0, \\ t |D_t^* \partial_{\sigma} [\partial_z \mathcal{A}(\phi;\zeta(\phi) - iu) - \partial_z \mathcal{A}(\phi;\zeta(\phi))]| &\lesssim |u| t^{\sigma_0-1}, \end{aligned}$$

which together with

$$\partial_\sigma \zeta(\phi_0) = O(t^{\sigma_0} \log t), \quad \partial_\tau \zeta(\phi_0) = O(1), \quad t \partial_s \zeta(\phi_0) = O(t^{\sigma_0})$$

lead to

$$\text{Tr}[V_0 \Delta_2] = o(1).$$

Finally using [Equation \(S3.29\)](#)

$$\begin{aligned} D_t^* \partial_{\sigma, \sigma}^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi; z) &= \frac{s}{2} \left[\frac{\log(z)^2 z^\sigma - \log(\tau)^2 \tau^\sigma}{\sigma} - 2 \frac{z^\sigma \log z - \log \tau \tau^\sigma}{\sigma^2} + 2 \frac{z^\sigma - \tau^\sigma}{\sigma^3} \right] \\ D_t^* \partial_{\tau, \tau}^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi; z) &= \frac{1}{2} - s(\sigma - 1) \tau^{\sigma-1}, \\ D_t^* \partial_{s, s}^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi; z) &= 0, \\ D_t^* \partial_{s, \sigma}^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi; z) &= \frac{z^\sigma \log z - \tau^\sigma \log \tau}{\sigma} - \frac{z^\sigma - \tau^\sigma}{\sigma^2}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} D_t^* |\partial_{\sigma, \sigma}^2 [\mathcal{A}(\phi; z - iu) - \mathcal{A}(\phi; z)]| &\lesssim t^{\sigma_0} |u| \log^2 t \\ |D_t^* \partial_{\tau, \tau}^2 [\mathcal{A}(\phi; z - iu) - \mathcal{A}(\phi; z)]| &= 0 \\ t |D_t^* \partial_{s, \sigma}^2 [\mathcal{A}(\phi; z - iu) - \mathcal{A}(\phi; z)]| &\lesssim t^{\sigma_0} \log t |u|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\text{Tr}[V_0 \Delta_1] = o(1)$$

and

$$\left| \text{Tr} \left(V_0 [D_{\phi_u}^2 L_t - D_{\phi_u}^2 \mathcal{Q}_t^*](\phi_{0,u}) \right) \right| = o(1).$$

S4. Asymptotic properties of multigraphex processes

S4.1. Proof of [\[4, Theorem 5\]](#)

S4.1.1. Number of nodes and number of multiedges

The number of nodes N_t is the same in the multigraph and simple graph. The asymptotic results for the number of nodes N_t then follow directly from Theorems 3 and 4 in [\[3\]](#).

Recall that D_t^* is twice the number of multiedges. We have, using the Slivnyak-Mecke formula,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[D_t^*] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \geq 1} D_{t,i} \mathbb{1}_{\theta_i \leq t} \right] \\ &= t \int_0^\infty \overline{W}_1(x, x) dx + t^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \overline{W}_1(x, y) dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[(D_t^*)^2] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i,j,k,\ell} \tilde{n}_{ik} \tilde{n}_{j\ell} \mathbb{1}_{\theta_i \leq t} \mathbb{1}_{\theta_j \leq t} \mathbb{1}_{\theta_k \leq t} \mathbb{1}_{\theta_\ell \leq t} \right] \\
&= t^4 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^4} \overline{W}_1(x,u) \overline{W}_1(y,v) dx dy du dv + 4t^3 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} \overline{W}_1(x,u) \overline{W}_1(y,u) dx dy du \\
&+ 2t^3 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} \overline{W}_1(x,u) \overline{W}_1(y,y) dx dy du + t^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \overline{W}_1(x,x) \overline{W}_1(y,y) dx dy + 2t^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \overline{W}_2(x,y) dx dy \\
&+ 4t^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \overline{W}_1(x,x) \overline{W}_1(x,y) dx dy + t \int_0^\infty \overline{W}_2(x,x) dx \\
&= \mathbb{E}[D_t^*]^2 + 4t^3 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} \overline{W}_1(x,u) \overline{W}_1(y,u) dx dy du \\
&+ 2t^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \overline{W}_2(x,y) dx dy + 4t^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \overline{W}_1(x,x) \overline{W}_1(x,y) dx dy + t \int_0^\infty \overline{W}_2(x,x) dx
\end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{var}(D_t^*) &= 4t^3 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^3} \overline{W}_1(x,u) \overline{W}_1(y,u) dx dy du \\
&+ 2t^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \overline{W}_2(x,y) dx dy + 4t^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \overline{W}_1(x,x) \overline{W}_1(x,y) dx dy + t \int_0^\infty \overline{W}_2(x,x) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that, for all $x, y > 0$,

$$W_1(x, y)^2 \leq W_2(x, y).$$

Hence, by Cauchy-Schwarz

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \overline{W}_1(x,x) \overline{W}_1(x,y) dx dy &\leq \left(\int \overline{W}_1(x,x)^2 dx \int \left(\int \overline{W}_1(x,y) dy \right)^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \left(\int \overline{W}_2(x,x) dx \int \left(\int \overline{W}_1(x,y) dy \right)^2 dx \right)^{1/2} < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\text{var}(D_t^*) = O(t^{-1} \mathbb{E}[D_t^*]^2)$$

and it follows from Lemma S3.1 in [3] that

$$D_t^* \sim \mathbb{E}[D_t^*] \sim t^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \overline{W}_1(x,y) dx dy$$

almost surely as t tends to infinity.

S4.1.2. Number of nodes of degree j .

Case $\alpha_0 = 0$. Let $N_{tj}^{(s)}$ denote the number of nodes of degree j in the simple graph. A node with degree j in the multigraph \mathcal{G}_t has a degree smaller or equal to j in the corresponding simple graph $\mathcal{G}_t^{(s)}$, and we therefore have, for all $j \geq 1$.

$$N_{tj} \leq \sum_{k=1}^j N_{tk}^{(s)}$$

If [4, Assumption 3] holds for $\alpha_0 = 0$ and some slowly varying function ℓ_1 , Theorems 3 and 4 in [3] imply that $N_{tk}^{(s)} = o(t\ell_1(t))$ in mean, and almost surely if [4, Assumption 4] also holds. The result for N_{tj} then follows by comparison.

Case $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1]$. We have

$$N_{tj} = N_j^{(s)} + (N_{tj} - N_{tj}^{(s)})$$

where, using [4, Proposition 1],

$$|N_{tj} - N_{tj}^{(s)}| \leq \tilde{N}_t = o(N_t).$$

and therefore, using the results for the simple graph [3], for $\alpha_0 > 0$, for all $j \geq 1$

$$N_{tj} \sim N_{tj}^{(s)}$$

almost surely, and for $\alpha_0 = 1$ $N_{t1} \sim N_{t1}^{(s)}$ and, for $j \geq 2$, $N_{tj} = o(N_t)$.

S4.2. Second order asymptotics of number of vertices

[4, Theorem 5] gives the first order asymptotic of the number of vertices as $t \rightarrow \infty$. We need, however, in the proof of [4, Theorem 6] the second order asymptotics under the additional [4, Assumption 6]. This is given in the next Lemma.

Lemma S4.6. *Let [4, Assumptions 3 and 6] be satisfied for some $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1)$, and let $\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} W(x, x) dx < \infty$. Then, there exists $\eta > 0$ such that as $t \rightarrow \infty$*

$$\mathbb{E}[N_t] = t\mu^{-1}(t^{-1})\Gamma(1 - \alpha_0)(1 + O(t^{-\eta})). \quad (\text{S4.31})$$

Proof. As for the proof of [4, Theorem 5],

$$\mathbb{E}[N_t] = t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} (1 - e^{-t\mu(x)}) dx + t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} W(x, x) e^{-t\mu(x)} dx. \quad (\text{S4.32})$$

The second term in the previous display is $O(t)$ as $x \mapsto W(x, x)$ is integrable. Define $\bar{\mu}$ as

$$\bar{\mu}(x) = c_0^{1/\alpha_0} x^{-1/\alpha_0}, \quad \text{so that } t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} (1 - e^{-t\bar{\mu}(x)}) dx = t^{1+\alpha_0} c_0 \Gamma(1 - \alpha_0). \quad (\text{S4.33})$$

Then since $|\mu^{-1}(y) - \bar{\mu}^{-1}(y)| \leq Cy^\beta$ when y is close to 0, then there exists x_0 such that for all $x \geq x_0$,

$$|x - c_0\mu(x)^{-\alpha_0}| \leq C\mu(x)^\beta \quad |\mu(x) - \bar{\mu}(x)| \leq C'\bar{\mu}(x)^{\beta+\alpha_0+1} \quad (\text{S4.34})$$

for some $C' > 0$. We split the first integral of Equation (S4.32) between $x \leq x_0$ and $x > x_0$. We have

$$|t \int_0^{x_0} (e^{-t\bar{\mu}(x)} - e^{-t\mu(x)}) dx| \leq t[e^{-t\mu(x_0)} + e^{-t\bar{\mu}(x_0)}]x_0 = o(t)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left| t \int_{x_0}^{\infty} (e^{-t\bar{\mu}(x)} - e^{-t\mu(x)}) dx \right| &\leq t^2 \int_{x_0}^{\infty} |\mu(x) - \bar{\mu}(x)| e^{-t\bar{\mu}(x)} dx \\ &\lesssim t^{1-\beta} = o(t) \end{aligned}$$

so that Equation (S4.31) is proved with $\eta = \alpha_0$. \square

S4.3. Proof of [4, Lemma 10]

The proof first approximates $-\mathcal{C}'_t(\alpha)$ using the subgraph $\mathcal{G}_t^{(s)}$ obtained from \mathcal{G}_t by removing the multiedges and selfedges and [4, Proposition 1]. More precisely define $Z_{i,j} := \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{n}_{i,j} \geq 1}$ if $i \neq j$, and $Z_{i,i} = 0$. The variables $Z_{i,j}$ with $i \neq j$ have a Bernoulli distribution with expectation $W(x, y)$ where $W(x, y) = 1 - W_m(x, y, 0)$ and let $D_{t,i}^{(s)} := \sum_{j \neq i} Z_{i,j} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_j \leq t}$ denote the degrees of node i in the simple graph $\mathcal{G}_t^{(s)}$. We define $X_t(\alpha) := \sum_i \mathbf{1}_{\theta_i \leq t} \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{k-\alpha} \mathbf{1}_{D_{t,i}^{(s)} > k}$ which is the simple graph analogous of $-\mathcal{C}'_t(\alpha)$.

In a first step, we reduce to the simple graph model by showing that under [4, Assumption 5], we have $-\mathcal{C}'_t(\alpha) - X_t(\alpha) = O((\tilde{N}_t + N_t^{\text{se}}) \log(D_t^*)) = o(t^{1+\alpha_0/2+\delta})$ for any $\delta > 0$, almost-surely, where \tilde{N}_t is as in the [4, Proposition 1] and N_t^{se} is the number of vertices with at least one selfedge in \mathcal{G}_t . This implies that is enough to understand $X_t(\alpha)$. We will proceed by showing in a second time that

$$X_t(\alpha) = U_t(\alpha) + V_t(\alpha),$$

where

$$U_t(\alpha) := \sum_i \mathbf{1}_{\theta_i \leq t} \int_0^1 \frac{1 - (1-u)^{D_{t,i}^{(s)}}}{u(1-u)^\alpha} du,$$

and,

$$V_t(\alpha) := - \sum_i \mathbf{1}_{\theta_i \leq t} \mathbf{1}_{D_{t,i}^{(s)} \geq 1} \int_0^1 \frac{(1-u)^{D_{t,i}^{(s)}}}{(1-u)^{1+\alpha}} du.$$

Finally, the proof is finished by computing the expectations and variances of $U_t(\alpha)$ and $V_t(\alpha)$.

S4.3.1. Control of $-\mathcal{C}'_t(\alpha) - X_t(\alpha)$.

By definition,

$$-\mathcal{C}'_t(\alpha) - X_t(\alpha) = \sum_i \mathbf{1}_{\theta_i \leq t} \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{k-\alpha} (\mathbf{1}_{D_{t,i} > k} - \mathbf{1}_{D_{t,i}^{(s)} > k}).$$

Since $Z_{i,j} \leq \tilde{n}_{i,j}$, $D_{t,i}^{(s)} \leq D_{t,i}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq -\mathcal{C}'_t(\alpha) - X_t(\alpha) &= \sum_i \mathbf{1}_{\theta_i \leq t} \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{k - \alpha} \mathbf{1}_{D_{t,i}^{(s)} \leq k} \mathbf{1}_{D_{t,i} > k} \\ &\leq \sum_i \mathbf{1}_{\theta_i \leq t} \mathbf{1}_{D_{t,i} - D_{t,i}^{(s)} \geq 1} \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{k - \alpha} \mathbf{1}_{D_{t,i} > k}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows because $(D_{t,i}^{(s)} \leq k \text{ and } D_{t,i} > k) \Rightarrow D_{t,i} - D_{t,i}^{(s)} \geq 1$. Now we remark that $\sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{k - \alpha} \mathbf{1}_{D_{t,i} > k} \leq \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{k - \alpha} \mathbf{1}_{D_t^* > k} = (1 + o(1)) \log(D_t^*)$. In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i \mathbf{1}_{\theta_i \leq t} \mathbf{1}_{D_{t,i} - D_{t,i}^{(s)} \geq 1} &= \sum_i \mathbf{1}_{\theta_i \leq t} \mathbf{1}_{D_{t,i} - D_{t,i}^{(s)} \geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{n}_{i,i} = 0} + \sum_i \mathbf{1}_{\theta_i \leq t} \mathbf{1}_{D_{t,i} - D_{t,i}^{(s)} \geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{n}_{i,i} \geq 1} \\ &\leq \tilde{N}_t + N_t^{\text{se}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$0 \leq -\mathcal{C}'_t(\alpha) - X_t(\alpha) \leq 2(\tilde{N}_t + N_t^{\text{se}}) \log(D_t^*).$$

Moreover, from [4, Proposition 1], for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}(\tilde{N}_t) = o(t^{1+\alpha_0/2+\delta})$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}(N_t^{\text{se}}) \leq \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_i \mathbf{1}_{\theta_i \leq t} \tilde{n}_{ii}\right) = t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} W(x, x) dx$$

so that for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}[-\mathcal{C}'_t(\alpha)] = \mathbb{E}(X_t(\alpha)) + O(\mathbb{E}([\tilde{N}_t + N_t^{\text{se}}]) \log t) = o(t^{1+\alpha_0/2+\delta}). \quad (\text{S4.35})$$

S4.3.2. Proof that $X_t(\alpha) = U_t(\alpha) + V_t(\alpha)$

The decomposition of X_t into $U_t + V_t$ follows by remarking that $\sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \frac{1}{k - \alpha} = \varphi(m - \alpha) - \varphi(1 - \alpha)$, where $\varphi(x) = \Gamma'(x)/\Gamma(x)$ is the digamma function. Using the integral representation of the digamma function, we can rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(m - \alpha) - \varphi(1 - \alpha) &= \mathbf{1}_{m \geq 1} \int_0^\infty \frac{e^{-(1-\alpha)u}}{1 - e^{-u}} \left(1 - e^{-(m-1)u}\right) du \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{m \geq 1} \int_0^1 \frac{1}{u(1-u)^\alpha} \left(1 - (1-u)^{m-1}\right) du. \end{aligned}$$

S4.3.3. Computation of $\mathbb{E}[U_t(\alpha) + V_t(\alpha)]$ and proof of [4, Equation (46)]

By the Equation (S4.35) and by the fact that $X_t(\alpha) = U_t(\alpha) + V_t(\alpha)$, it is obvious that the [4, Equation (46)] will follow from the computation of $\mathbb{E}[U_t(\alpha) + V_t(\alpha)]$, which we do now.

Since $\mathbb{E}[(1-u)^{D_{t,i}^{(s)}} | M] = \exp\{\sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_j \leq t} \log(1-uW(\vartheta_i, \vartheta_j))\}$ and by a combination of the Slivnyak-Mecke's formula, Fubini's theorem, and Campbell's formula, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[U_t(\alpha) + V_t(\alpha)] &= t \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \left(\frac{1 - e^{-ut\mu(x)}}{u(1-u)^\alpha} - \frac{e^{-ut\mu(x)}(1 - e^{-(1-u)t\mu(x)})}{(1-u)^{1+\alpha}} \right) du \\ &=: G(t, \mu) \end{aligned}$$

We show below that $G(t, \mu) - G(t, \bar{\mu}) = O(G(t, \bar{\mu})t^{-\eta})$ for some $\eta > 0$ with $\bar{\mu}(x)$ defined in Equation (S4.33), and

$$\begin{aligned} G(t, \bar{\mu}) &= \alpha_0 c_0 t^{1+\alpha_0} \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \left(\frac{1 - e^{-uy}}{u} - \frac{e^{-uy} - e^{-y}}{1-u} \right) (1-u)^{-\alpha_0} y^{-1-\alpha_0} dy du \\ &= \alpha_0 c_0 t^{1+\alpha_0} \left(\int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \frac{y^{-\alpha_0}}{(1-u)^\alpha} e^{-uy} dy du \left[\frac{1}{\alpha_0} - \frac{1}{\alpha} \right] + \int_0^\infty \frac{(1 - e^{-y})y^{-\alpha_0-1}}{\alpha} dy \right) \\ &= \frac{\alpha_0 c_0 t^{1+\alpha_0} \Gamma(1-\alpha_0)}{\alpha_0} \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} + \left[1 - \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha} \right] \int_0^1 u^{\alpha_0-1} (1-u)^\alpha du \right) \\ &= \frac{\alpha_0 c_0 t^{1+\alpha_0} \Gamma(1-\alpha_0)}{\alpha_0} \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} + \left[1 - \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha} \right] \frac{\Gamma(1-\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha_0)}{\Gamma(1+\alpha_0-\alpha)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence to prove the first part of [4, Lemma 10], it remains to show that $G(t, \mu) - G(t, \bar{\mu}) = O(G(t, \bar{\mu})t^{-\eta})$.

We have, writing $\Delta(x) = \mu(x) - \bar{\mu}(x)$,

$$\begin{aligned} G(t, \mu) - G(t, \bar{\mu}) &= t \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \left(\frac{e^{-ut\bar{\mu}(x)} - e^{-ut\mu(x)}}{u(1-u)^\alpha} - \frac{[e^{-ut\mu(x)} - e^{-ut\bar{\mu}(x)} - e^{-t\mu(x)} + e^{-t\bar{\mu}(x)}]}{(1-u)^{1+\alpha}} \right) du \\ &= t \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \left(\frac{e^{-ut\bar{\mu}(x)}(1 - e^{ut\Delta(x)})}{u(1-u)^\alpha} - \frac{[e^{-ut\bar{\mu}(x)}(1 - e^{ut\Delta(x)}) - e^{-t\bar{\mu}(x)}(1 - e^{t\Delta(x)})]}{(1-u)^{1+\alpha}} \right) du. \end{aligned}$$

We split the above integrals into $x \leq x_0$ and $x > x_0$, with x_0 defined by Equation (S4.34). We have

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= t \int_0^{x_0} \int_0^1 \left(\frac{e^{-ut\bar{\mu}(x)} - e^{-ut\mu(x)}}{u(1-u)^\alpha} - \frac{[e^{-ut\mu(x)} - e^{-ut\bar{\mu}(x)} - e^{-t\mu(x)} + e^{-t\bar{\mu}(x)}]}{(1-u)^{1+\alpha}} \right) du \\ &\leq x_0 \int_0^1 \frac{e^{-ut\bar{\mu}(x_0)} + e^{-ut\mu(x_0)}}{u(1-u)^\alpha} du + t \int_0^1 \frac{\int_0^{x_0} [\mu(x)e^{-ut\mu(x)} + \bar{\mu}(x)e^{-ut\bar{\mu}(x)}] dx}{(1-u)^\alpha} du \\ &\lesssim e^{-a_0 t} + 1 \end{aligned}$$

for some $a_0 > 0$ when t is large enough and

$$I_2 = t \int_{x_0}^\infty \int_0^1 \left(\frac{e^{-ut\bar{\mu}(x)} - e^{-ut\mu(x)}}{u(1-u)^\alpha} - \frac{[e^{-ut\mu(x)} - e^{-ut\bar{\mu}(x)} - e^{-t\mu(x)} + e^{-t\bar{\mu}(x)}]}{(1-u)^{1+\alpha}} \right) du$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= t \int_{x_0}^{\infty} \int_0^1 (1 - e^{ut\Delta(x)}) \left(\frac{e^{-ut\bar{\mu}(x)}}{u} - \frac{[e^{-ut\bar{\mu}(x)} - e^{-t\bar{\mu}(x)}]}{1-u} \right) (1-u)^{-\alpha} du \\
&\quad + t \int_{x_0}^{\infty} \int_0^1 (e^{ut\Delta(x)} - e^{t\Delta(x)}) \frac{e^{-t\bar{\mu}(x)}}{(1-u)^{\alpha+1}} du \\
&\leq t^2 \int_{x_0}^{\infty} \bar{\mu}(x)^{\beta+\alpha_0+1} \int_0^1 \frac{e^{-ut\bar{\mu}(x)}}{(1-u)^\alpha} dudx + t^2 \int_{x_0}^{\infty} \bar{\mu}(x)^{\beta+\alpha_0+1} \frac{u|e^{-ut\bar{\mu}(x)} - e^{-t\bar{\mu}(x)}|}{(1-u)^{\alpha+1}} du \\
&\quad + t \int_{x_0}^{\infty} \int_0^1 e^{ut\Delta(x)} (1 - e^{(1-u)t\Delta(x)}) \frac{e^{-t\bar{\mu}(x)}}{(1-u)^{\alpha+1}} du \\
&\lesssim t^{1-\beta} = o(t^{1+\alpha_0-\eta}).
\end{aligned}$$

So that we finally obtain that

$$G(t, \mu) = G(t, \bar{\mu})(1 + o(1))$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[X_t(\alpha)] = t\mu^{-1}(t^{-1})\Gamma(1-\alpha_0)\left(1 + O(t^{-\eta})\right) \left\{ \frac{1}{\alpha} + \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha}\right) \frac{\Gamma(1-\alpha)\Gamma(\alpha_0)}{\Gamma(1+\alpha_0-\alpha)} \right\}.$$

S4.3.4. Proof of [4, Equation (47)]

By the results of

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}(|-C'_t(\alpha) - \mathbb{E}[-C'_t(\alpha)]| > t^{1+\alpha_0-\eta+\delta}) \\
&\quad \leq \mathbb{P}(|X(t) - \mathbb{E}[X_t(\alpha)]| > t^{1+\alpha_0-\eta+\delta}/2) + \mathbb{P}([\tilde{N}_t + N_t^{\text{se}}] > t^{1+\alpha_0-\eta+\delta}/2) \\
&\quad \leq \mathbb{P}(|X(t) - \mathbb{E}[X_t(\alpha)]| > t^{1+\alpha_0-\eta+\delta}/2) + t^{-\alpha_0/2+\eta-\delta} \\
&\quad \leq \mathbb{P}(|X(t) - \mathbb{E}[X_t(\alpha)]| > t^{1+\alpha_0-\eta+\delta}/2) + 2t^{-\delta},
\end{aligned}$$

by choosing $\eta \leq \alpha_0$. We control $\mathbb{P}(|X(t) - \mathbb{E}[X_t(\alpha)]| > t^{1+\alpha_0-\eta+\delta}/2)$ by bounding the variance of U_t and of V_t .

S4.3.5. Variance of $U_t(\alpha)$

We split $\mathbb{E}[U_t(\alpha)^2]$ into two terms:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_i \leq t} \int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{(1 - (1-u)^{D_{t,i}^{(s)}})(1 - (1-v)^{D_{t,i}^{(s)}})}{uv(1-u)^\alpha(1-v)^\alpha} dudv \right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_i \leq t} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_j \leq t} \int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{(1 - (1-u)^{D_{t,i}^{(s)}})(1 - (1-v)^{D_{t,j}^{(s)}})}{uv(1-u)^\alpha(1-v)^\alpha} dudv \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Let's call for simplicity those two terms A_1 and A_2 , respectively. We start with the more delicate one, A_2 . For simplicity from now on we will write $D_i = D_{t,i}^{(s)}$, and we also define $D_i^{-j} = \sum_{k \neq j} Z_{i,k} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_k \leq t}$.

Bound on A_2 Using that $D_i = D_i^{-j} + Z_{i,j}$, we decompose,

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - (1 - u)^{D_i})(1 - (1 - v)^{D_j}) &= (1 - (1 - u)^{D_i^{-j}})(1 - (1 - v)^{D_j^{-i}}) \\ &\quad + (1 - v)^{D_j^{-i}}(1 - (1 - v)^{Z_{i,j}}) \\ &\quad + (1 - u)^{D_i^{-j}}(1 - (1 - u)^{Z_{i,j}}) \\ &\quad - (1 - u)^{D_i^{-j}}(1 - v)^{D_j^{-i}}(1 - (1 - u)^{Z_{i,j}}(1 - v)^{Z_{i,j}}), \end{aligned}$$

which is equal to,

$$\begin{aligned} &(1 - (1 - u)^{D_i^{-j}})(1 - (1 - v)^{D_j^{-i}}) \\ &\quad + (1 - v)^{D_j^{-i}}(1 - (1 - u)^{D_i^{-j}})(1 - (1 - v)^{Z_{i,j}}) \\ &\quad + (1 - u)^{D_i^{-j}}(1 - (1 - v)^{D_j^{-i}})(1 - (1 - u)^{Z_{i,j}}) \\ &\quad + (1 - u)^{D_i^{-j}}(1 - v)^{D_j^{-i}}(1 - (1 - u)^{Z_{i,j}} - (1 - v)^{Z_{i,j}} + (1 - u)^{Z_{i,j}}(1 - v)^{Z_{i,j}}). \end{aligned}$$

Using that $Z_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}$, we deduce that that,

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - (1 - u)^{D_i})(1 - (1 - v)^{D_j}) &= (1 - (1 - u)^{D_i^{-j}})(1 - (1 - v)^{D_j^{-i}}) \\ &\quad + (1 - v)^{D_j^{-i}}(1 - (1 - u)^{D_i^{-j}})(1 - (1 - v)^{Z_{i,j}}) \\ &\quad + (1 - u)^{D_i^{-j}}(1 - (1 - v)^{D_j^{-i}})(1 - (1 - u)^{Z_{i,j}}) \\ &\quad + (1 - u)^{D_i^{-j}}(1 - v)^{D_j^{-i}}(1 - (1 - uv)^{Z_{i,j}}). \end{aligned}$$

Then by symmetry, $A_2 \leq A_{2,1} + 2A_{2,2} + A_{2,3}$, where,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{2,1} &:= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_i \leq t} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_j \leq t} \int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{(1 - (1 - u)^{D_i^{-j}})(1 - (1 - v)^{D_j^{-i}})}{uv(1 - u)^\alpha(1 - v)^\alpha} dudv \right], \\ A_{2,2} &:= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_i \leq t} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_j \leq t} \int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{(1 - u)^{D_i^{-j}}(1 - (1 - v)^{D_j^{-i}})(1 - (1 - u)^{Z_{i,j}})}{uv(1 - u)^\alpha(1 - v)^\alpha} dudv \right], \\ A_{2,3} &:= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_i \leq t} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_j \leq t} \int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{(1 - u)^{D_i^{-j}}(1 - v)^{D_j^{-i}}(1 - (1 - uv)^{Z_{i,j}})}{uv(1 - u)^\alpha(1 - v)^\alpha} dudv \right] \end{aligned}$$

Bound on $A_{2,1}$ Conditional on M , the variables D_i^{-j} and D_j^{-i} are independent as long as $i \neq j$. Then, we obtain that,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(1 - (1 - u)^{D_i^{-j}})(1 - (1 - v)^{D_j^{-i}}) | M] &= \left(1 - e^{-\sum_{k \neq j} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_k \leq t} \log(1 - uW(\vartheta_i, \vartheta_k))} \right) \\ &\quad \times \left(1 - e^{-\sum_{k \neq i} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_k \leq t} \log(1 - uW(\vartheta_j, \vartheta_k))} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Write $\lambda_{u,x} := \sum_k \mathbf{1}_{\theta_k \leq t} \log(1 - uW(\vartheta_k, x))$ for simplicity. Recall that by assumption that $W(x, x)$ by assumption. From the last display and the Slivnyak-Mecke formula,

$$A_{2,1} = t^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{\mathbb{E}[(1 - e^{\lambda_{u,x}})(1 - e^{\lambda_{v,y}})]}{u(1-u)^\alpha v(1-v)^\alpha} dudvdx dy.$$

We compute the expectation within the last display using Campbell's formula,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(1 - e^{\lambda_{u,x}})(1 - e^{\lambda_{v,y}})] &= 1 - e^{-ut\mu(x)} - e^{-vt\mu(y)} + e^{-ut\mu(x)}e^{-vt\mu(y)}e^{uvt\nu(x,y)} \\ &= (1 - e^{-ut\mu(x)}) \left(1 - e^{-vt\mu(y)}\right) + e^{-ut\mu(x)}e^{-vt\mu(y)}(e^{uvt\nu(x,y)} - 1). \end{aligned}$$

From the computations of [Section S4.3.3](#), it is easily deduced that

$$\mathbb{E}[U_t(\alpha)] = t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{[0,1]} \frac{1 - e^{-ut\mu(x)}}{u(1-u)^\alpha} dudx.$$

Therefore,

$$A_{2,1} \leq \mathbb{E}[U_t(\alpha)]^2 + t^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{e^{-ut\mu(x)}e^{-vt\mu(y)}(e^{uvt\nu(x,y)} - 1)}{u(1-u)^\alpha v(1-v)^\alpha} dudvdx dy.$$

Since $e^{uvt\nu(x,y)} - 1 \leq uvt\nu(x,y)e^{uvt\nu(x,y)} \leq uvt\nu(x,y)e^{\frac{u}{2}t\mu(x)}e^{\frac{v}{2}t\mu(y)}$, see for instance [\[3, Proof of Lemma S3.7\]](#) then $e^{uvt\nu(x,y)} - 1 \leq \ell_3(x)\ell_3(y)\mu(x)^a\mu(y)^a uvt e^{\frac{u}{2}t\mu(x)}e^{\frac{v}{2}t\mu(y)}$ under the [\[4, Assumption 4\]](#), and thus

$$A_{2,1} \leq \mathbb{E}[U_t(\alpha)]^2 + t^3 \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{[0,1]} \frac{\ell_3(x)\mu(x)^a e^{-\frac{u}{2}t\mu(x)}}{(1-u)^\alpha} dudx \right\}^2$$

But,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}ut\mu(x)} du}{(1-u)^\alpha} &= \int_0^{1/2} \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}ut\mu(x)} du}{(1-u)^\alpha} + \int_{1/2}^1 \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}ut\mu(x)} du}{(1-u)^\alpha} \\ &\leq 2^\alpha \int_0^{1/2} e^{-\frac{1}{2}ut\mu(x)} du + e^{-\frac{1}{4}t\mu(x)} \int_{1/2}^1 \frac{du}{(1-u)^\alpha} \\ &\leq 2^\alpha \frac{1 - e^{-\frac{1}{4}t\mu(x)}}{t\mu(x)} + \frac{1}{1-\alpha} e^{-\frac{1}{4}t\mu(x)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} t^{3/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{[0,1]} \frac{\ell_3(x)\mu(x)^a e^{-\frac{u}{2}t\mu(x)}}{(1-u)^\alpha} dudx \\ \lesssim t^{3/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \ell_3(x)\mu(x)^a \frac{(1 - e^{-\frac{1}{4}t\mu(x)})}{t\mu(x)} dx + t^{3/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \ell_3(x)\mu(x)^a e^{-\frac{1}{4}t\mu(x)} dx. \end{aligned}$$

The second integral in the rhs of the last display is $O(t^{3/2+\alpha_0-a+\delta})$ for every $\delta > 0$ by [3, Lemma S3.4]. Regarding the first integral, we observe that $(1 - e^{-x})/x \leq 1$ for all $x > 0$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbf{1}_{t\mu(x) \leq 1} \ell_3(x) \mu(x)^a \frac{(1 - e^{-\frac{1}{4}t\mu(x)})}{t\mu(x)/4} dx &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbf{1}_{t\mu(x) \leq 1} \ell_3(x) \mu(x)^a dx \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \ell_3(x) \mu(x)^a e^{-\frac{1}{4}t\mu(x)} dx \\ &= O(t^{\alpha_0-a+\delta}), \end{aligned}$$

by the same argument as above, and also because $a \leq 1$ necessarily,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbf{1}_{t\mu(x) > 1} \ell_3(x) \mu(x)^a \frac{(1 - e^{-\frac{1}{4}t\mu(x)})}{t\mu(x)} dx &\lesssim \frac{1}{t^a} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbf{1}_{t\mu(x) > 1} \ell_3(x) \frac{1 - e^{-\frac{1}{4}t\mu(x)}}{(t\mu(x))^{1-a}} dx \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{t^a} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \ell_3(x) (1 - e^{-\frac{1}{4}t\mu(x)}) dx \\ &= O(t^{\alpha_0-a+\delta}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from [3, Lemma S3.5]. We have shown that, for any $\delta > 0$,

$$A_{2,1} \leq \mathbb{E}[U_t(\alpha)]^2 + O(t^{3-2a+2\alpha_0+\delta}). \quad (\text{S4.36})$$

Bound on $A_{2,2}$ Obviously $A_{2,2} \geq 0$. Further, since $(1 - u)^{D_i^{-j}} \leq 1$, we have the upper bound,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{2,2} &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_i \leq t} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_j \leq t} \int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{(1 - (1-v)^{D_j^{-i}})(1 - (1-u)^{Z_{i,j}})}{uv(1-u)^\alpha(1-v)^\alpha} dudv \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_i \leq t} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_j \leq t} \int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{(1 - e^{\sum_{k \neq i} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_k \leq t} \log(1-vW(\vartheta_k, \vartheta_j))})}{v(1-v)^\alpha} \frac{W(\vartheta_i, \vartheta_j)}{(1-u)^\alpha} dudv \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_i \leq t} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_j \leq t} \frac{W(\vartheta_i, \vartheta_j)}{1-\alpha} \int_{[0,1]} \frac{(1 - e^{\sum_{k \neq i} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_k \leq t} \log(1-vW(\vartheta_k, \vartheta_j))})}{v(1-v)^\alpha} dv \right] \end{aligned}$$

where the second line follows by taking the conditional expectation with respect to M . Then, by the Slivnyak-Mecke formula, and then by Campbell's formula,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{2,2} &\leq \frac{t^2}{1-\alpha} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} W(x, y) \int_{[0,1]} \frac{1 - \mathbb{E}[e^{\sum_k \mathbf{1}_{\theta_k \leq t} \log(1-vW(\vartheta_k, y))}](1 - vW(y, y))}{v(1-v)^\alpha} dv dx dy \\ &= \frac{t^2}{1-\alpha} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mu(y) \int_{[0,1]} \frac{1 - e^{-tv\mu(y)}(1 - vW(y, y))}{v(1-v)^\alpha} dv dy \\ &= \frac{t^2}{1-\alpha} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mu(y) \int_{[0,1]} \frac{1 - e^{-tv\mu(y)}}{v(1-v)^\alpha} dv dy + \frac{t^2}{1-\alpha} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{[0,1]} \frac{\mu(y)W(y, y)e^{-tv\mu(y)}}{(1-v)^\alpha} dv dy \end{aligned}$$

The second term of the last display is $o(t^2)$ by dominated convergence, so it is enough to bound the first term. For some $q \in (0, 1/2)$, we first rewrite the inner integral as

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{[0,1]} \frac{1 - e^{-ut\mu(x)}}{u(1-u)^\alpha} du &= \int_0^q \frac{1 - e^{-ut\mu(x)}}{u(1-u)^\alpha} du + \int_q^1 \frac{1 - e^{-ut\mu(x)}}{u(1-u)^\alpha} du \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(1-q)^\alpha} \int_0^q \frac{1 - e^{-ut\mu(x)}}{u} du + (1 - e^{-t\mu(x)}) \int_q^1 \frac{du}{u(1-u)^\alpha} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(1-q)^\alpha} \int_0^q t\mu(x) du + (1 - e^{-t\mu(x)}) \left\{ 2^\alpha \int_q^{1/2} \frac{1}{u} + \int_{1/2}^1 \frac{du}{(1-u)^\alpha} \right\} \\ &\leq \frac{qt\mu(x)}{(1-q)^\alpha} + (1 - e^{-t\mu(x)}) \left(2^\alpha \log \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $q = 1/t$, we obtain that as $t \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\int_{[0,1]} \frac{1 - e^{-ut\mu(x)}}{u(1-u)^\alpha} du \leq \mu(x)(1 + o(1)) + 2^\alpha (1 - e^{-t\mu(x)}) (1 + o(1)) \log(t). \quad (\text{S4.37})$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{2,2} &\leq \frac{t^2(1 + o(1))}{1-\alpha} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mu(x)^2 dx + \frac{2^\alpha t^2(1 + o(1))}{(1-\alpha)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mu(x) dx + o(t^2) \\ &= O(t^2 \log(t)), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S4.38})$$

as both μ and μ^2 are integrable by assumption.

Bound on $A_{2,3}$ Obviously $A_{2,3} \geq 0$. Furthermore, $(1-u)^{D_i^{-j}} \leq 1$ and $(1-v)^{D_j^{-i}} \leq 1$ too, so that we have the upper bound,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{2,3} &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_i \leq t} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_j \leq t} \int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{1 - (1-uv)^{Z_{i,j}}}{uv(1-u)^\alpha(1-v)^\alpha} dudv \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_i \leq t} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_j \leq t} W(\vartheta_i, \vartheta_j) \left\{ \int_{[0,1]} \frac{1}{(1-u)^\alpha} du \right\}^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{t^2}{(1-\alpha)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} W(x, y) dx dy, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S4.39})$$

where the second line follows by taking the conditional expectation with respect to M , and third line by the Slivnyak-Mecke formula.

Bound on A_1 Remark that we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(1 - (1-u)^{D_{i,i}^{(s)}})(1 - (1-v)^{D_{i,i}^{(s)}}) \mid M] &= 1 - e^{\sum_j \mathbf{1}_{\theta_j \leq t} \log(1-uW(\vartheta_i, \vartheta_j))} \\ &\quad - e^{\sum_j \mathbf{1}_{\theta_j \leq t} \log(1-vW(\vartheta_i, \vartheta_j))} \end{aligned}$$

$$+ e^{\sum_j \mathbf{1}_{\theta_j \leq t} \log(1-(u+v-uv)W(\vartheta_i, \vartheta_j))}.$$

Recall that $W(x, x) = 0$ by assumption. Hence, by the Slivnyak-Mecke formula and by Campbell's theorem,

$$A_1 = t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{F(x, u, v)}{uv(1-u)^\alpha(1-v)^\alpha} dudvdx,$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} F(x, u, v) &:= 1 - e^{-ut\mu(x)} - e^{-vt\mu(x)} + e^{-(u+v-uv)t\mu(x)} \\ &= (1 - e^{-ut\mu(x)})(1 - e^{-vt\mu(x)}) + e^{-(u+v-uv)t\mu(x)}(1 - e^{-uvt\mu(x)}). \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &\leq t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left\{ \int_{[0,1]} \frac{1 - e^{-ut\mu(x)}}{u(1-u)^\alpha} du \right\}^2 dx \\ &\quad + t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{e^{-(u+v-uv)t\mu(x)}(1 - e^{-uvt\mu(x)})}{uv(1-u)^\alpha(1-v)^\alpha} dudvdx. \end{aligned}$$

Using that $e^{-(u+v-uv)t\mu(x)} \leq 1$ and $1 - e^{-uvt\mu(x)} \leq uvt\mu(x)$, it is immediately seen that the second term is no more than $\frac{t^2}{(1-\alpha)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mu(x) dx$. So it is enough to bound the first term. We remark that the integral within brackets has already been bounded in Equation (S4.37) and is no more than a $1 + o(1)$ times $\mu(x) + 2^\alpha(1 - e^{-t\mu(x)}) \log(t)$. Then,

$$A_1 \lesssim t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mu(x)^2 dx + t \log^2(t) \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} (1 - e^{-t\mu(x)})^2 dx + O(t^2) = O(t^2), \quad (\text{S4.40})$$

as μ^2 is integrable by assumption, and as $\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} (1 - e^{-t\mu(x)})^2 dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} (1 - e^{-t\mu(x)}) dx = O(t^\alpha)$; see for instance [3, Lemma S3.5].

Conclusion Gathering Equations (S4.36) and (S4.38) to (S4.40), as $t \rightarrow \infty$, for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}[U_t(\alpha)^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[U_t(\alpha)]^2 + O\left(t^2 \log(t) \sqrt{t^{3-2\alpha+2\alpha_0+\delta}}\right).$$

S4.3.6. Variance of $V_t(\alpha)$

Here again we write $D_i \equiv D_{t,i}^{(s)}$ and $D_i^{-j} \equiv \sum_{k \neq j} Z_{i,k} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_k \leq t}$ for simplicity. We split $\mathbb{E}[V_t(\alpha)^2]$ into two terms

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_i \leq t} \mathbf{1}_{D_i \geq 1} \int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{(1-u)^{D_i} (1-v)^{D_i}}{(1-u)^{1+\alpha} (1-v)^{1+\alpha}} dudv\right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_i \leq t} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_j \leq t} \mathbf{1}_{D_i \geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{D_j \geq 1} \int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{(1-u)^{D_i} (1-v)^{D_j}}{(1-u)^{1+\alpha} (1-v)^{1+\alpha}} dudv\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Let call these two terms A'_1 and A'_2 , respectively. We start by bounding A'_2 .

Bound on A'_2 Using that $Z_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}$, we decompose

$$\begin{aligned} (1-u)^{D_i}(1-v)^{D_j} \mathbf{1}_{D_i \geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{D_j \geq 1} &= (1-u)^{D_i^{-j}} (1-v)^{D_j^{-i}} (1-u)^{Z_{i,j}} (1-v)^{Z_{i,j}} \mathbf{1}_{D_i \geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{D_j \geq 1} \\ &= (1-u)^{D_i^{-j}} (1-v)^{D_j^{-i}} \mathbf{1}_{D_i \geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{D_j \geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{Z_{i,j}=0} \\ &\quad + (1-u)^{D_i^{-j}+1} (1-v)^{D_j^{-i}+1} \mathbf{1}_{D_i \geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{D_j \geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{Z_{i,j}=1}. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$(1-u)^{D_i}(1-v)^{D_j} \mathbf{1}_{D_i \geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{D_j \geq 1} \leq (1-u)^{D_i^{-j}} (1-v)^{D_j^{-i}} \mathbf{1}_{D_i^{-j} \geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{D_j^{-i} \geq 1} + (1-u)(1-v) \mathbf{1}_{Z_{i,j}=1}.$$

Since D_i^{-j} , D_j^{-i} and $Z_{i,j}$ are independent conditional on M , we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(1-u)^{D_i}(1-v)^{D_j} \mathbf{1}_{D_i \geq 1} \mathbf{1}_{D_j \geq 1} \mid M] &\leq e^{\sum_{k \neq j} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_k \leq t} \log(1-uW(\vartheta_i, \vartheta_k))} e^{\sum_{k \neq i} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_k \leq t} \log(1-vW(\vartheta_j, \vartheta_k))} \\ &\quad - e^{\sum_{k \neq j} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_k \leq t} \log(1-uW(\vartheta_i, \vartheta_k))} e^{\sum_{k \neq i} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_k \leq t} \log(1-W(\vartheta_j, \vartheta_k))} \\ &\quad - e^{\sum_{k \neq j} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_k \leq t} \log(1-W(\vartheta_i, \vartheta_k))} e^{\sum_{k \neq i} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_k \leq t} \log(1-vW(\vartheta_j, \vartheta_k))} \\ &\quad + e^{\sum_{k \neq j} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_k \leq t} \log(1-W(\vartheta_i, \vartheta_k))} e^{\sum_{k \neq i} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_k \leq t} \log(1-W(\vartheta_j, \vartheta_k))} \\ &\quad + (1-u)(1-v)W(\vartheta_i, \vartheta_j). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $W(x, x) = 0$ by assumption. Then, by Slivnyak-Mecke's formula and by Campbell's theorem,

$$A'_2 \leq t^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{F(x, y, u, v) \, dudvddxdy}{(1-u)^{1+\alpha}(1-v)^{1+\alpha}} + \frac{t^2}{(1-\alpha)^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} W(x, y) \, dx dy,$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} F(x, y, u, v) &= e^{-ut\mu(x)} e^{-vt\mu(y)} e^{uvt\nu(x,y)} - e^{-ut\mu(x)} e^{-t\mu(y)} e^{ut\nu(x,y)} \\ &\quad - e^{-t\mu(x)} e^{-vt\mu(y)} e^{vt\nu(x,y)} + e^{-t\mu(x)} e^{-t\mu(y)} e^{t\nu(x,y)}. \end{aligned}$$

In view of the computations made in [Section S4.3.3](#), we have

$$\mathbb{E}[V_t(\alpha)] = - \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{[0,1]} \frac{e^{-ut\mu(x)} (1 - e^{-(1-u)t\mu(x)})}{(1+u)^\alpha} \, dudx,$$

so the previous rewrites as

$$A'_2 \leq \mathbb{E}[V_t(\alpha)]^2 + t^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{\tilde{F}(x, y, u, v) \, dudvddxdy}{(1-u)^{1+\alpha}(1-v)^{1+\alpha}} + O(t^2), \quad (\text{S4.41})$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{F}(x, y, u, v) &= e^{-ut\mu(x)}e^{-vt\mu(y)}(e^{uvtv(x,y)} - 1) - e^{-ut\mu(x)}e^{-t\mu(y)}(e^{utv(x,y)} - 1) \\ &\quad - e^{-t\mu(x)}e^{-vt\mu(y)}(e^{vtv(x,y)} - 1) + e^{-t\mu(x)}e^{-t\mu(y)}(e^{tv(x,y)} - 1).\end{aligned}$$

The main difficulty here is that none of term composing $\tilde{F}(u, v; x, y)$ is integrable with respect to the measure $\frac{dudv}{(1-u)^{1+\alpha}(1-v)^{1+\alpha}}$, though their sum is. We bypass the difficulty by decomposing the region of integration into four subdomains. For some $q \in [0, 1]$ to be chosen accordingly later, we let $D_1 := \{(u, v) \in [0, 1]^2 : 0 \leq u \leq q, 0 \leq v \leq q\}$, $D_2 := \{(u, v) \in [0, 1]^2 : q < u \leq 1, 0 \leq v \leq q\}$, $D_3 := \{(u, v) \in [0, 1]^2 : q < u \leq 1, q < v \leq 1\}$, and $D_4 := \{(u, v) \in [0, 1]^2 : 0 \leq u \leq q, q < v \leq 1\}$. By symmetry, the integral of $(u, v) \mapsto \tilde{F}(u, v; x, y)$ over D_4 is the same as the integral over D_2 , and thus

$$A'_{2,1} \leq \mathbb{E}[V_t(\alpha)]^2 + A'_{2,1} + 2A'_{2,2} + A'_{2,3},$$

where, for $j = 1, \dots, 3$,

$$A'_{2,j} := t^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^2} \int_{D_j} \frac{\tilde{F}(u, v; x, y)}{(1-u)^{1+\alpha}(1-v)^{1+\alpha}} dudvdx dy.$$

Bound on $A'_{2,1}$ Over D_1 , we can bound rather quickly the integral of $(u, v) \mapsto \tilde{F}(u, v; x, y)$ as there is no convergence issue. Indeed, it is enough to keep the non-negative terms,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{F}(u, v; x, y) &\leq e^{-ut\mu(x)}e^{-vt\mu(y)}(e^{uvtv(x,y)} - 1) + e^{-t\mu(x)}e^{-t\mu(y)}(e^{tv(x,y)} - 1) \\ &\leq 2te^{-\frac{u}{2}t\mu(x)}e^{-\frac{v}{2}t\mu(y)}\ell_3(x)\ell_3(y)\mu(x)^a\mu(y)^a,\end{aligned}$$

where the second line follows from the same arguments as in [3, Lemma S3.7]. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}A'_{2,1} &\leq 2t^3 \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \ell_3(x)\mu(x)^a \int_0^q \frac{e^{-\frac{u}{2}t\mu(x)}}{(1-u)^{1+\alpha}} dudx \right\}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{8t}{(1-q)^{2+2\alpha}} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \ell_3(x)\mu(x)^{a-1}(1 - e^{-\frac{q}{2}t\mu(x)})dx \right\}^2 \\ &= O(t^{3-2a+2\alpha_0+\delta}).\end{aligned}\tag{S4.42}$$

Bound on $A'_{2,2}$ The challenge here is to reorganize the terms in $I(u, v; x, y)$ such that we can obtain bounds and all the integrals still converge. We rewrite,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{F}(u, v; x, y) &= e^{-vt\mu(y)}(e^{-ut\mu(x)} - e^{-t\mu(x)})(e^{uvtv(x,y)} - 1) \\ &\quad + e^{-t\mu(x)}e^{-vt\mu(y)}(e^{uvtv(x,y)} - e^{vtv(x,y)}) \\ &\quad + e^{-t\mu(x)}e^{-t\mu(y)}(e^{tv(x,y)} - e^{utv(x,y)}) \\ &\quad - e^{-t\mu(y)}(e^{-ut\mu(x)} - e^{-t\mu(x)})(e^{utv(x,y)} - 1).\end{aligned}$$

As we only need an upper bound, we keep only the non-negative terms,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{F}(u, v; x, y) &\leq e^{-vt\mu(y)} (e^{-ut\mu(x)} - e^{-t\mu(x)}) (e^{uvt\nu(x,y)} - 1) \\ &\quad + e^{-t\mu(x)} e^{-t\mu(y)} (e^{t\nu(x,y)} - e^{ut\nu(x,y)})\end{aligned}$$

With the same arguments as usual [see 3, Lemma S3.7]

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{F}(u, v; x, y) &\leq t^2 uv(1-u)\ell_3(x)\ell_3(y)\mu(x)^{1+a}\mu(y)^a e^{-\frac{v}{2}t\mu(x)} e^{-\frac{u}{2}t\mu(x)} \\ &\quad + t(1-u)\ell_3(x)\ell_3(y)\mu(x)^a\mu(y)^a e^{-\frac{1}{2}t\mu(x)} e^{-\frac{1}{2}t\mu(y)}.\end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}A'_{2,2} &\leq t^4 \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_q^1 \frac{u\ell_3(x)\mu(x)^{1+a} e^{-\frac{u}{2}t\mu(x)} du dx}{(1-u)^\alpha} \right\} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_0^q \frac{v\ell_3(y)\mu(y)^a e^{-\frac{v}{2}t\mu(y)} dv dy}{(1-v)^{1+\alpha}} \right\} \\ &\quad + t^3 \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_q^1 \frac{\ell_3(x)\mu(x)^a e^{-\frac{1}{2}t\mu(x)} du dx}{(1-u)^\alpha} \right\} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_0^q \frac{\ell_3(y)\mu(y)^a e^{-\frac{v}{2}t\mu(y)} dv dy}{(1-v)^{1+\alpha}} \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Again with the usual arguments [see 3, Lemma S3.4 and Lemma S3.5]

$$A'_{2,2} \leq O(t^{3-2a+2\alpha_0+\delta}). \quad (\text{S4.43})$$

Bound on $A'_{2,3}$ The main challenge is to reorganize the terms in a way such that we can get sharp upper-bounds and such that the integrals still converges. Using that $e^{-ut\mu(x)} = e^{-t\mu(x)} + (e^{-ut\mu(x)} - e^{-t\mu(x)})$, similarly for $e^{-vt\mu(y)}$, we can rewrite that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{F}(u, v; x, y) &= e^{-t\mu(x)} e^{-t\mu(y)} (e^{uvt\nu(x,y)} - 1) + e^{-t\mu(x)} (e^{-vt\mu(y)} - e^{-t\mu(y)}) (e^{uvt\nu(x,y)} - 1) \\ &\quad + (e^{-ut\mu(x)} - e^{-t\mu(x)}) (e^{-vt\mu(y)} - e^{-t\mu(y)}) (e^{uvt\nu(x,y)} - 1) \\ &\quad - e^{-t\mu(x)} e^{-t\mu(y)} (e^{ut\nu(x,y)} - 1) - (e^{-ut\mu(x)} - e^{-t\mu(x)}) e^{-t\mu(y)} (e^{ut\nu(x,y)} - 1) \\ &\quad - e^{-t\mu(x)} e^{-t\mu(y)} (e^{vt\nu(x,y)} - 1) - e^{-t\mu(x)} (e^{-vt\mu(y)} - e^{-t\mu(y)}) (e^{vt\nu(x,y)} - 1) \\ &\quad + (e^{-ut\mu(x)} - e^{-t\mu(x)}) e^{-t\mu(y)} (e^{uvt\nu(x,y)} - 1) + e^{-t\mu(x)} e^{-t\mu(y)} (e^{t\nu(x,y)} - 1).\end{aligned}$$

Reorganizing the previous, we find that,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{F}(u, v; x, y) &= e^{-t\mu(x)} e^{-t\mu(y)} (e^{uvt\nu(x,y)} + e^{t\nu(x,y)} - e^{ut\nu(x,y)} - e^{-vt\nu(x,y)}) \\ &\quad + e^{-t\mu(x)} (e^{-vt\mu(y)} - e^{-t\mu(y)}) (e^{uvt\nu(x,y)} - e^{vt\nu(x,y)}) \\ &\quad + e^{-t\mu(y)} (e^{-ut\mu(x)} - e^{-t\mu(x)}) (e^{uvt\nu(x,y)} - e^{ut\nu(x,y)}) \\ &\quad + (e^{-ut\mu(x)} - e^{-t\mu(x)}) (e^{-vt\mu(y)} - e^{-t\mu(y)}) (e^{uvt\nu(x,y)} - 1).\end{aligned}$$

As we are only interested in an upper bound, it is enough to keep only the non-negative terms. That is,

$$\tilde{F}(u, v; x, y) \leq e^{-t\mu(x)} e^{-t\mu(y)} (e^{uvt\nu(x,y)} + e^{t\nu(x,y)} - e^{ut\nu(x,y)} - e^{-vt\nu(x,y)}) \quad (\text{S4.44})$$

$$+ (e^{-ut\mu(x)} - e^{-t\mu(x)}) (e^{-vt\mu(y)} - e^{-t\mu(y)}) (e^{uvt\nu(x,y)} - 1). \quad (\text{S4.45})$$

We now bound each of the terms in the last display. For fixed (x, y) , let define $\phi(u, v) := e^{-t(1-uv)\nu(x, y)}$, so that the term Equation (S4.44) can be rewritten as $e^{-t\mu(x)}e^{-t\mu(y)}e^{t\nu(x, y)}(\phi(1, 1) + \phi(u, v) - \phi(u, 1) - \phi(1, v))$. By a Taylor expansion of ϕ , for any $(u, v) \in D_3$,

$$\phi(1, 1) - \phi(u, 1) + \phi(u, v) - \phi(1, v) \leq (1-u)(1-v) \sup_{(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \in D_3} \partial_u \partial_v \phi(\bar{u}, \bar{v}).$$

It is clear that,

$$\partial_u \partial_v \phi(u, v) = t\nu(x, y)\phi(u, v) + t^2 uv\nu(x, y)^2 \phi(u, v)$$

Therefore, $\phi(1, 1) - \phi(u, 1) + \phi(u, v) - \phi(1, v) \leq (1-u)(1-v)(t\nu(x, y) + t^2\nu(x, y)^2)$, at least when $(u, v) \in D_3$. By the usual arguments, it is rapidly seen that the term in Equation (S4.45) is bounded by $t^3 uv(1-u)(1-v)\mu(x)\mu(y)\nu(x, y)e^{-ut\mu(x)}e^{-vt\mu(y)}e^{uv\nu(x, y)}$, and then when $(u, v) \in D_3$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{F}(u, v; x, y) &\leq t(1-u)(1-v)\ell_3(x)\ell_3(y)\mu(x)^a\mu(y)^a e^{-\frac{1}{2}t\mu(x)}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t\mu(y)} \\ &\quad + t^2(1-u)(1-v)\ell_3(x)^2\ell_3(y)^2\mu(x)^{2a}\mu(y)^{2a} e^{-\frac{1}{2}t\mu(x)}e^{-\frac{1}{2}t\mu(y)} \\ &\quad + t^3 uv(1-u)(1-v)\ell_3(x)\ell_3(y)\mu(x)^{1+a}\mu(y)^{1+a} e^{-\frac{u}{2}t\mu(x)}e^{-\frac{v}{2}t\mu(y)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} A'_{2,3} &\leq t^3 \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_q^1 \frac{\ell_3(x)\mu(x)^a e^{-\frac{1}{2}t\mu(x)} dx}{(1-u)^\alpha} \right\}^2 \\ &\quad + t^4 \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_q^1 \frac{\ell_3(x)^2\mu(x)^{2a} e^{-\frac{1}{2}t\mu(x)} dx}{(1-u)^\alpha} \right\}^2 \\ &\quad + t^5 \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_q^1 \frac{\ell_3(x)\mu(x)^{1+a} e^{-\frac{u}{2}t\mu(x)} dx}{(1-u)^\alpha} \right\}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by [3, Lemma S3.4 and Lemma S3.5] for any $\delta > 0$,

$$A'_{2,3} \leq O(t^{3-2a+2\alpha_0+\delta}). \quad (\text{S4.46})$$

Bound on A'_1 We first remark that, for any $D_i \geq 1$,

$$\int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{(1-u)^{D_i}(1-v)^{D_i}}{(1-u)^{1+\alpha}} (1-v)^{1-\alpha} = \left\{ \int_{[0,1]} \frac{(1-u)^{D_i}}{(1-u)^{1+\alpha}} du \right\}^2 = \frac{1}{(D_i - \alpha)^2} \leq \frac{1}{(1-\alpha)^2}.$$

Therefore,

$$A'_1 \leq \frac{1}{(1-\alpha)^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{\theta_i \leq t} \mathbf{1}_{D_i \geq 1} \right] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[N_t]}{(1-\alpha)^2} = O(t^{1+\alpha_0} \ell_1(t)), \quad (\text{S4.47})$$

where the last estimate follows by [4, Theorem 5].

Conclusion Gathering the Equations (S4.41) to (S4.43), (S4.46) and (S4.47), we have as $t \rightarrow \infty$, for any $\delta > 0$

$$\mathbb{E}[V_t(\alpha)^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[V_t(\alpha)]^2 + O\left(t^2 \sqrt{t^{3-2a+2\alpha_0+\delta}}\right).$$

S5. Proofs of the examples

S5.1. Proof of [4, Lemma 1]

Let define on $(0, 1)$ the function $F^*(\alpha) := \sum_{j \geq 2} f_j \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{\alpha}{k-\alpha} - 1$; so that α_0 is a solution of $F^*(\alpha) = 0$. In the conditions of the lemma, it is the case that $f_1 < 1$. Then, the function ℓ is monotonic with $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} F^*(\alpha) = -1$ and $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} F^*(\alpha) = \infty$. This establishes existence and uniqueness of α_0 .

We now prove that the second part of condition (7) of Assumption 1 is satisfied (in probability). We define for simplicity $F_t(\alpha) = \frac{-\alpha C'_t(\alpha)}{t} - 1$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} F_t(\hat{\alpha}_t) - F_t(\alpha_0) &= \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{N_{t,j}}{t} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \left(\frac{\hat{\alpha}_t}{k-\hat{\alpha}_t} - \frac{\alpha_0}{k-\alpha_0} \right) \\ &= (\hat{\alpha}_t - \alpha_0) \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{N_{t,j}}{t} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{k}{(k-\alpha_0)(k-\hat{\alpha}_t)} \\ &\geq (\hat{\alpha}_t - \alpha_0) \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{N_{t,j}}{t} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{k}{(k-\alpha_0)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} F_t(\hat{\alpha}_t) - F_t(\alpha_0) &= (\hat{\alpha}_t - \alpha_0) \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{N_{t,j}}{t} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{k}{(k-\alpha_0)^2} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\hat{\alpha}_t - \alpha_0}{k-\alpha_0}} \\ &\leq \frac{\hat{\alpha}_t - \alpha_0}{1 - \frac{\hat{\alpha}_t - \alpha_0}{1-\alpha_0}} \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{N_{t,j}}{t} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{k}{(k-\alpha_0)^2}, \end{aligned}$$

Since $F_t(\hat{\alpha}_t) = 0$ by definition of $\hat{\alpha}_t$, it follows

$$\hat{\alpha}_t - \alpha_0 \leq \frac{-F_t(\alpha_0)}{\underbrace{\sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{N_{t,j}}{t} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{k}{(k-\alpha_0)^2}}_{=: Z_t}} \leq \frac{\hat{\alpha}_t - \alpha_0}{1 - \frac{\hat{\alpha}_t - \alpha_0}{1-\alpha_0}}$$

or in other words,

$$\frac{Z_t}{1 + \frac{Z_t}{1-\alpha_0}} \leq \hat{\alpha}_t - \alpha_0 \leq Z_t. \quad (\text{S5.48})$$

Hence to prove that the second part of condition (7) of Assumption 1 is satisfied (in probability) it is enough to show that $\log(t)|Z_t| \rightarrow 0$ (in probability). First,

$$|Z_t| \leq \frac{(1-\alpha_0)^2 |F_t(\alpha_0)|}{\sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{N_{t,j}}{t}} = \frac{(1-\alpha_0)^2 |F_t(\alpha_0)|}{1 - N_{t,1}/t}. \quad (\text{S5.49})$$

Second, Recall that $N_{t,j} = \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{D}_{t,i}=j}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} |F_t(\alpha_0)| &= \left| \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^t \sum_{j \geq 2} \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{D}_{t,i}=j} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{\alpha_0}{k - \alpha_0} - 1 \right| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^t \sum_{j \geq 2} \mathbf{1}_{D_{t,i}=j} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{\alpha_0}{k - \alpha_0} - 1 \right| + \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j \geq 2} |\mathbf{1}_{\tilde{D}_{t,t}=j} - \mathbf{1}_{D_{t,t}=j}| \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{\alpha_0}{k - \alpha_0} \\ &\leq \left| \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^t \sum_{j \geq 2} \mathbf{1}_{D_{t,i}=j} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{\alpha_0}{k - \alpha_0} - 1 \right| + \frac{1}{t} \sum_{k=1}^{D_{\max,t}-1} \frac{\alpha_0}{k - \alpha_0}. \end{aligned}$$

[Note that the previous estimate will cost a $\log(D_{\max,t})/t$ term that can be improved to $1/t$ at the price of longer computations, which is not worth for our purpose]. But, by the fact that $F^*(\alpha_0) = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^t \sum_{j \geq 2} \mathbf{1}_{D_{t,i}=j} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{\alpha_0}{k - \alpha_0} \right] &= \frac{1}{\sum_{k=1}^{D_{\max,t}} f_k} \sum_{j \geq 2} f_j \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{\alpha_0}{k - \alpha_0} \\ &= \frac{1}{1 - \sum_{k > D_{\max,t}} f_k} \\ &= 1 + \frac{\sum_{k > D_{\max,t}} f_k}{1 - \sum_{k > D_{\max,t}} f_k} \end{aligned}$$

Also,

$$\text{var} \left(\frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^t \sum_{j \geq 2} \mathbf{1}_{D_{t,i}=j} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{\alpha_0}{k - \alpha_0} \right) \leq \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j \geq 2} \frac{f_j}{1 - \sum_{k > D_{\max,t}} f_k} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{\alpha_0}{k - \alpha_0} \right)^2.$$

It follows from these estimates that and the fact that $D_{\max,t}$ cannot exceed some power of t

$$|F_t(\alpha_0)| = O_p \left(D_{\max,t}^{-\alpha_1} \sqrt{\frac{\log(t)^2}{t}} \right) = o \left(\frac{1}{\log(t)} \right). \quad (\text{S5.50})$$

With a similar reasoning, it is easily seen that $1 - \frac{N_{t,1}}{t} = 1 - f_1 + o_p(1)$, so that by combining the equations (S5.48), (S5.49), and (S5.50) we obtain that $\log(t)|\hat{\alpha}_t - \alpha_0| = o_p(1)$.

We now prove that the first part of condition (7) of Assumption 1 is satisfied (in probability). We see that $D_t^* = \sum_{i=1}^t \tilde{D}_{t,i} = \sum_{i=1}^t D_{t,i} + O(1)$ almost-surely, and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^t D_{t,i} \right] = t \frac{\sum_{j \geq 1} j p_j \mathbf{1}_{j \leq D_{\max,t}}}{\sum_{j \geq 1} p_j \mathbf{1}_{j \leq D_{\max,t}}} \sim \frac{\alpha_1 L}{1 - \alpha_1} \cdot t D_{\max,t}^{1-\alpha_1} =: \bar{D}_t^*$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$ by Lemma S5.7. Also, by the same Lemma, as $t \rightarrow \infty$

$$\text{var} \left(\sum_{i=1}^t D_{t,i} \right) \leq t \frac{\sum_{j \geq 1} j^2 p_j \mathbf{1}_{j \leq D_{\max,t}}}{\sum_{j \geq 1} p_j \mathbf{1}_{j \leq D_{\max,t}}} \sim \frac{\alpha_1 L}{2 - \alpha_1} \cdot t D_{\max,t}^{2-\alpha_1}.$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{D_t^* - \bar{D}_t^*}{\bar{D}_t^*} = O_p\left(\sqrt{\frac{D_{\max,t}^{\alpha_1}}{t}}\right).$$

It follows that if $D_{\max,t} \sim A \cdot t^{\frac{1-\alpha_0}{(1+\alpha_0)(1-\alpha_1)}}$ for some constant $A > 0$, we have

$$D_t^* = \frac{\alpha_1 L A^{1-\alpha_1}}{1-\alpha_1} t^{\frac{2}{1+\alpha_0}} (1 + o_p(1)),$$

and,

$$\sqrt{2D_t^*} \left(\frac{\alpha_0 N_t}{D_t^*}\right)^{1-\alpha_0} = \sqrt{2}\alpha_0^{1-\alpha_0} \left(\frac{\alpha_1 L A^{1-\alpha_1}}{1-\alpha_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}-(1-\alpha_0)} (1 + o_p(1)).$$

This concludes the proof.

Lemma S5.7. *Let $(f_j)_{j \geq 1}$ be a probability mass function on $\{1, 2, \dots\}$ such that $1 - \sum_{k=1}^j f_k \sim Lj^{-\alpha_1}$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, for some $\alpha_1 \in (0, 1)$ and some $L > 0$. Then, as $D \rightarrow \infty$*

$$\sum_{j=1}^D j f_j \sim \frac{\alpha_1 L D^{1-\alpha_1}}{1-\alpha_1}, \quad \sum_{j=1}^D j^2 f_j \sim \frac{\alpha_1 L D^{2-\alpha_1}}{2-\alpha_1}.$$

Proof. These are famous results about regular variations [1], we briefly sketch a proof for completeness. Let $F_j := \sum_{k=1}^j f_k$. By standard computations it is seen that $\sum_{j=1}^D (1 - F_j) = \sum_{j=1}^D j f_j + D(1 - F_D)$. By assumption, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ we can find $K > 0$ such that $1 - \varepsilon \leq \frac{1 - F_j}{Lj^{-\alpha_1}} \leq 1 + \varepsilon$ for all $j \geq K$. It follows, since $0 \leq 1 - F_j \leq 1$ for all $j \geq 1$, that when $D \gg K$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^D (1 - F_j) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{K-1} (1 - F_j) + \sum_{k=K}^D \frac{1 - F_j}{Lj^{-\alpha_1}} \cdot Lj^{-\alpha_1} \leq K + (1 + \varepsilon) \sum_{k=K}^D Lj^{-\alpha_1}$$

and,

$$\sum_{j=1}^D (1 - F_j) \geq \sum_{k=K}^D \frac{1 - F_j}{Lj^{-\alpha_1}} \cdot Lj^{-\alpha_1} \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \sum_{k=K}^D Lj^{-\alpha_1}.$$

But for any $K > 0$, it can be shown that $\sum_{k=K}^D j^{-\alpha_1} \sim \frac{D^{1-\alpha_1}}{1-\alpha_1}$, and since the last two estimates are true for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we deduce the first result. The other result is proved similarly. \square

S5.2. Proof of [4, Lemma 2]

We have $\mathbb{E}[D_t^*] = N^2(\bar{\theta})^2 p_N$, so that

$$\mathbb{E}[D_t^*]^{-(1+\alpha_0)/(2-2\alpha_0)} N^{1/(1-\alpha_0)} = c_0^{-(1+\alpha_0)/(2-2\alpha_0)} =: \tau_*.$$

Furthermore

$$\sum_{j=2}^N \frac{N_{t,j}}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{\alpha_0}{k - \alpha_0} = 1 + \left(\sum_{j=2}^N \left[\frac{N_{t,j}}{N} - p(j) \right] \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{\alpha_0}{k - \alpha_0} \right).$$

Writing

$$\text{sgn}(D_i - \mu_i) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } D_i > \mu_i \\ 0 & \text{if } D_i = \mu_i \\ -1 & \text{if } D_i < \mu_i \end{cases}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{j=2}^N \left[\frac{N_{t,j}}{N} - p(j) \right] \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{\alpha_0}{k - \alpha_0} \right| &= \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \text{sgn}(D_i - \mu_i) \sum_{l=\mu_i \wedge D_i}^{\mu_i \vee D_i - 1} \frac{\alpha_0}{l - \alpha_0} \right|, \quad \mu_i = \lceil \theta_i N p_N \bar{\theta} \rceil \\ &\leq \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_i (D_i - \mu_i) \frac{\alpha_0}{\mu_i - \alpha_0} \right| + \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_i (D_i - \mu_i)^2 \frac{\alpha_0}{(\mu_i \wedge D_i - \alpha_0)^2} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_i (D_i - \mu_i)^2 \frac{\alpha_0}{(\mu_i \wedge D_i - \alpha_0)^2} \leq \frac{\alpha_0}{N} \sum_i \frac{(D_i - \mu_i)^2}{(\mu_i - \alpha_0)^2} + \frac{\alpha_0}{N} \sum_i \frac{(D_i - \mu_i)^4 + |D_i - \mu_i|^3}{(\mu_i - \alpha_0)^2}$$

and Using Theorem 2 in [5],

$$\sum_i E \frac{(D_i - \mu_i)^2}{(\mu_i - \alpha_0)^2} \lesssim p_N \sum_i \frac{\theta_i N \bar{\theta} p_N}{\lceil \theta_i N \bar{\theta} p_N \rceil} \lesssim N p_N$$

and similar computations lead to

$$\sum_i E \frac{(D_i - \mu_i)^4}{(\mu_i - \alpha_0)^2} \lesssim N p_N$$

so that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_i (D_i - \mu_i)^2 \frac{\alpha_0}{(\mu_i \wedge D_i - \alpha_0)^2} = O_p(p_N), \text{ and, } \frac{1}{N} \sum_i (D_i - \mu_i) \frac{\alpha_0}{\mu_i - \alpha_0} = O_p(\sqrt{p_N})$$

which in turns implies that

$$|\hat{\alpha}_t - \alpha_0| = O_p(\sqrt{p_N})$$

and [4, Assumption 1] is satisfied.

References

- [1] BINGHAM, N. H., GOLDIE, C. M. and TEUGELS, J. L. (1987). *Regular variation* **27**. Cambridge university press.

- [2] CARON, F. and FOX, E. (2017). Sparse Graphs using Exchangeable Random Measures. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B* **79** 1-44. Part 5.
- [3] CARON, F., PANERO, F. and ROUSSEAU, J. (2017). On sparsity, power-law and clustering properties of graphex processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.03120*.
- [4] NAULET, Z., ROUSSEAU, J. and CARON, F. (2021). Asymptotic Analysis of Statistical Estimators related to MultiGraphex Processes under Misspecification.
- [5] OUADAH, S., ROBIN, S. and LATOUCHE, P. (2020). Degree-based goodness-of-fit tests for heterogeneous random graph models: Independent and exchangeable cases. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **47** 156-181.