

PHASE TRANSITION FOR EXTREMES OF A FAMILY OF STATIONARY MULTIPLE-STABLE PROCESSES

SHUYANG BAI AND YIZAO WANG

ABSTRACT. We investigate a family of multiple-stable processes that may exhibit either long-range or short-range dependence, depending on the parameters. There are two parameters for the processes, the memory parameter $\beta \in (0, 1)$ and the multiplicity parameter $p \in \mathbb{N}$. We investigate the macroscopic limit of extremes of the process, in terms of convergence of random sup-measures, for the full range of parameters. Our results show that (i) the extremes of the process exhibit long-range dependence when $\beta_p := p\beta - p + 1 \in (0, 1)$, with a new family of random sup-measures arising in the limit, (ii) the extremes are of short-range dependence when $\beta_p < 0$, with independently scattered random sup-measures arising in the limit, and (iii) there is a delicate phase transition at the critical regime $\beta_p = 0$.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

1.1. Background. Extensive investigations on stationary stable processes started in 1980s. These processes extend naturally Gaussian processes, have regularly-varying tails, and they exhibit very rich dependence structures. The monograph by Samorodnitsky and Taquq [55] summarizes foundational earlier developments of stable processes, and remains a classic on the topic.

In early developments of stable processes, one of the main driving questions was to understand their ergodic properties. A modern approach in this direction was initiated by Rosiński [48], who first related every stationary stable process to a dynamical system, more precisely an underlying flow on a certain space, and then revealed that the ergodic properties of the stationary stable process of interest can be derived from the one of the underlying flow. Then, instead of working on stable processes directly, one benefits from known results on dynamical systems, which shed light in turn on the studies of stable processes. Thanks to the seminal work of Rosiński and another fundamental contribution later from Samorodnitsky [52], it is now well understood that all stationary stable processes can be divided into three categories according to the ergodic-theoretic classification of the underlying flows, and each category of stable processes is with distinct ergodic properties. More precisely, the underlying flow can be positively recurrent, null recurrent (a.k.a. null-conservative) and dissipative: when the flow is dissipative, the corresponding stable process has a mixed moving average representation and is known to be mixing; when the flow is positively recurrent, the stable process is known to be non-ergodic; when the flow is null recurrent, the stable process is ergodic and weakly mixing, and yet it does not necessarily have the mixing property.

From a different aspect, stable processes driven by positively- or null-recurrent flows are often associated with the notion of *long-range dependence* (a.k.a. long memory), while those driven by dissipative flows are often associated with the notion of *short-range dependence*. The investigation of stochastic processes with long-range dependence has a long history [11, 43], and in these studies stable processes provide important examples with representative properties. The recent monograph by Samorodnitsky [53] provided a first systematic presentation on stable processes (and more generally infinitely-divisible processes) incorporating the points of view of both ergodic-theoretic classifications and long-/short-range dependence.

Some later advances focus on further refinements of the aforementioned classifications of stable processes. When the underlying flow is dissipative, it is known that the stable process is a mixed moving average process, and further classifications can be found in Pipiras and Taquq [44], summarizing mostly a series of extensive

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60F17; 60G70; Secondary, 60G52; 60K05.

Key words and phrases. stable regenerative set, random sup-measure, long-range dependence, infinite ergodic theory, phase transition, regular variation, multiple integral.

investigations by the same authors since 2000s. Within this class of stochastic processes with relatively simple structures, the situation is already very delicate. At the same time, it was argued in Samorodnitsky [52] that the most challenging case is when the underlying flow is null-recurrent. In words, for processes within this category, while they are ergodic, they already exhibit abnormal asymptotic behaviors in terms of limit fluctuations.

Many recent advances on stable processes concern their limit theorems: for the partial-sum processes, for the extremes, and for total variations, just to mention a few. Sometimes, qualitatively different asymptotic behaviors are shown in complete correspondence to the aforementioned classifications based on ergodic properties, which is not surprising; but often much more elaborated information on the asymptotic behaviors in terms of limit theorems for fluctuations have been established, and new stochastic processes arise in such investigations. Our object of interest is a class of stable processes driven by null-recurrent flows and its extensions to be explained below. We shall focus on limit theorems regarding their extremes, following the recent developments [35, 41, 56]. For recent limit theorems of other types for stable and infinitely-divisible processes, we mention [8–10, 21, 39, 53].

1.2. Random sup-measures. The asymptotic extremes at macroscopic level are commonly characterized by convergence of random sup-measures. The foundation of random sup-measures and the corresponding limit theorems has been established in the 1980s and 1990s, and standard references are [38, 58]. A sup-measure (throughout assumed to take values in $[0, \infty]$) is a set function m that satisfies

$$m\left(\bigcup_{\lambda} A_{\lambda}\right) = \sup_{\lambda} m(A_{\lambda}),$$

for any collection of sets $\{A_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda}$ from its domain, and $m(\emptyset) = 0$. A random sup-measure, in particular, can be viewed as a set-indexed stochastic process, and we shall take this convention: *throughout in this paper, by a random sup-measure, we mean a set-indexed process $\{M(G)\}_{G \in \mathcal{G}}$* , where \mathcal{G} is the collection of all open subsets with respect to the subspace topology of $[0, 1]$. We are concerned with the finite-dimensional distributions of $M \equiv \{M(G)\}_{G \in \mathcal{G}}$, and convergence of finite-dimensional distributions of a sequence $\{M_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$. All random sup-measures in discussions below, denoted by M , satisfy $M(\cup_{\lambda} G_{\lambda}) = \sup_{\lambda} M(G_{\lambda})$ for all $\{G_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda} \subset \mathcal{G}$ and $M(\emptyset) = 0$ almost surely, which are immediately seen from construction. Then it is known that M can be uniquely extended to all subsets of $[0, 1]$. In other words, M can be made into a random element in the space of sup-measures equipped with the so-called sup vague topology, see [38, Theorem 3.2]. Our results then can be accordingly strengthened to limit theorems for random sup-measures in the sense of [38], and we choose to not to do so here for the sake of simplicity.

As an example of random sup-measures, consider first

$$(1.1) \quad \mathcal{M}_{\alpha}^{\text{is}}(G) := \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{\Gamma_i^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{U_i \in G\}}, G \in \mathcal{G}, \quad \text{with} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{(\Gamma_i, U_i)} \stackrel{d}{=} \text{PPP}((0, \infty) \times [0, 1], dxdu),$$

where $\alpha > 0$ and the right-hand side stands for the Poisson point process with the space and the intensity measure as indicated. The random sup-measure $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha}^{\text{is}}$ is known as *independently scattered α -Fréchet random sup-measure* with Lebesgue control measure on $[0, 1]$. Here, it is α -Fréchet in the sense that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_{\alpha}^{\text{is}}(G) \leq x) = e^{-\text{Leb}(G)x^{-\alpha}}$ for all $x > 0, G \in \mathcal{G}$, and it is independently scattered in the sense that for disjoint $G_1, \dots, G_n \in \mathcal{G}$, $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha}^{\text{is}}(G_1), \dots, \mathcal{M}_{\alpha}^{\text{is}}(G_n)$ are independent. It is a classical result that, for i.i.d. random variables $\{X_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\mathbb{P}(X_k > x) \sim x^{-\alpha}$,

$$(1.2) \quad \frac{1}{c_n} \{M_n(G)\}_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \xrightarrow{f.d.d.} \{\mathcal{M}_{\alpha}^{\text{is}}(G)\}_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \quad \text{with} \quad M_n(G) := \max_{k/n \in G} X_k,$$

with $c_n = n^{1/\alpha}$. Note that the convergence of type (1.2) is in terms of the standard notion of weak convergence of finite-dimensional distributions of set-indexed stochastic processes.

For a general stationary sequence of random variables, the above (1.2) may continue to hold with possibly different normalizations c_n and also different random sup-measures in place of $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha}^{\text{is}}$. Heuristically, the dependence of extremes of $\{X_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is considered weak, or of local nature, if the same $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha}^{\text{is}}$ arises in the limit

with possibly a different normalization c_n . O'Brien et al. [38] advocated using such a framework as (1.2) to characterize macroscopic limit of extremes of a stationary sequence when the limit is *not independently scattered*. Therein, a thorough characterization of all possible limit random sup-measures (from a general sequence not necessarily with regularly varying tails) was carried out, and in particular the shift invariance and self-similarity properties of the limit are established. For the model of our interest later, we shall see that the independently scattered Fréchet random sup-measures as well as another family, denoted by $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,p}$ below, may arise in the limit, depending on the range of the parameters of the model.

For readers familiar with functional central limit theorems (Donsker's theorem) for the partial-sum process but not as much with extremal limit theorems, it is worth noting that the convergence of random sup-measures reveals strictly more information than the convergence of the partial-maximum process

$$\frac{1}{c_n} \left\{ \max_{k=1,\dots,[nt]} X_k \right\}_{t \in [0,1]} \Rightarrow \{\mathbb{M}_t\}_{t \in [0,1]},$$

as different limits of random sup-measures may correspond to the same time-indexed process $\{\mathbb{M}_t\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ [22, Proposition A.1].

1.3. Stable-regenerative models. The model of our interest stems from a family of stable processes introduced first by Rosiński and Samorodnitsky [49]. The original model can be viewed as a prototype of stable processes driven by a null-recurrent flow. The investigations of its limit theorems dated back to the early 2000s [45, 46, 51]. Key advances appeared recently in [29, 40, 41, 56], and it is understood since these work that the large-scale behavior of this family is closely related to *stable-regenerative sets* [12], and hence we name the original discrete-time stable processes *stable-regenerative stable processes* or *stable-regenerative models*. (We prefer the latter as the two 'stable' in the former name may cause confusion.)

Let $\{X_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ denote such a stable-regenerative model. This is a symmetric α -stable process a parameter $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ and a memory parameter $\beta \in (0, 1)$. The representation is intrinsically related to renewal processes, and for which we introduce some notations. Consider a discrete-time renewal process starting at the origin with the consecutive renewal times denoted by $\boldsymbol{\tau} := \{\tau_0, \tau_1, \tau_2, \dots\}$, where $\tau_0 = 0 < \tau_1 < \tau_2 < \dots$. We let F denote the renewal distribution, that is $F(x) = \mathbb{P}(\tau_{i+1} - \tau_i \leq x)$, $i \in \mathbb{N}_0 := \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$, $x \in \mathbb{N}$. Throughout, we assume

$$(1.3) \quad \overline{F}(x) = 1 - F(x) \sim C_F x^{-\beta} \text{ as } x \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{with} \quad \beta \in (0, 1),$$

and the following technical assumption, with $f(n) := F(n) - F(n-1)$ denoting the probability mass function of the renewal distribution,

$$(1.4) \quad \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{nf(n)}{\overline{F}(n)} < \infty.$$

In this paper a renewal process is often *delayed* so that the starting point may not be the origin. An important notion is the *stationary delayed distribution* of the renewal process, denoted by π . Since the renewal distribution has infinite mean, the stationary delayed distribution π is a σ -finite and infinite measure on \mathbb{N}_0 unique up to a multiplicative constant. We shall work with

$$(1.5) \quad \pi(\{k\}) := \overline{F}(k), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Then it is well-known that the law of the delayed renewal process $d + \boldsymbol{\tau} := \{d, d + \tau_1, d + \tau_2, \dots\}$ is shift-invariant. Here by the law of

$$\boldsymbol{\tau}^* := d + \boldsymbol{\tau},$$

we mean the pushforward of the product measure between π and the law of $\boldsymbol{\tau}$. We shall also need

$$(1.6) \quad w_n := \sum_{k=1}^n \pi(\{k\}) = \sum_{k=1}^n \overline{F}(k) \sim \frac{C_F}{1-\beta} n^{1-\beta} \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

We are now ready to define the stable-regenerative model through a series representation. Let π be as in (1.5), and consider

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{(\eta_i, d_i)} \stackrel{d}{=} \text{PPP} \left((0, \infty) \times \mathbb{N}, \alpha x^{-\alpha-1} dx d\pi \right).$$

Suppose $\{\tau^{(i)}\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ are i.i.d. copies of the non-delayed renewal process τ which are independent of the point process above. Set $\tau^{(i, d_i)} := d_i + \tau^{(i)}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, the stable-regenerative model is defined as

$$(1.7) \quad \{X_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon_i \eta_i \mathbf{1}_{\{k \in \tau^{(i, d_i)}\}} \right\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}},$$

where $\{\varepsilon_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ are i.i.d. Rademacher random variables independent from all other random elements previously introduced.

The model (1.7) exhibits long-range dependence in terms of limit theorems as revealed in [40, 41, 56]. In particular, it was shown in [56] that the random sup-measures arising as macroscopic limits of extremes of (1.7) are represented as (note that we restrict to random sup-measures on $[0, 1]$ by default)

$$(1.8) \quad \mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \beta}(G) := \sup_{t \in G} \zeta_{\alpha, \beta}(t), G \in \mathcal{G} \quad \text{with} \quad \zeta_{\alpha, \beta}(t) := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\varepsilon_i}{\Gamma_i^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{t \in \mathcal{R}_{\beta, i}\}}, t \in [0, 1],$$

where $\{\Gamma_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ are consecutive arrival times of a standard Poisson process, $\{\mathcal{R}_{\beta, i}\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ are i.i.d. randomly shifted β -stable-regenerative sets, and the two families are independent. More precisely, a β -stable-regenerative set, say $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\beta}$, can be defined as the closure of the image of a β -stable subordinator, and here each $\mathcal{R}_{\beta, i}$ has the same law as $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\beta} + B_{1-\beta, 1}$, where $B_{1-\beta, 1}$ is a Beta($1 - \beta, 1$) distributed shift ($\mathbb{P}(B_{1-\beta, 1} \leq x) = x^{1-\beta}$, $x \in [0, 1]$) independent from $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\beta}$. The stable-regenerative sets have very rich structures and many fundamental developments took place in 1980s and 1990s [12, 24–26]. They are important examples of random closed sets, of which our reference is [36]. The appearance of $B_{1-\beta, 1}$ is necessary to make the randomly shifted stable-regenerative sets stationary (a.k.a. shift-invariant) in an appropriate sense, and this has been well understood (see e.g. [56]).

We refer to the limit $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \beta}$ as the stable-regenerative random sup-measure with aggregation [37, 59]. One can verify that for $\beta \leq 1/2$, $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \beta}$ is an α -Fréchet random sup-measure, in the sense that for all $G_1, \dots, G_d \in \mathcal{G}$, $(\mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \beta}(G_i))_{i=1, \dots, d}$ has multivariate α -Fréchet distribution, that is, for all $a_1, \dots, a_d > 0$, $\max_{i=1, \dots, d} a_i \mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \beta}(G_i)$ has an α -Fréchet distribution [57] (a random variable Z has an α -Fréchet distribution of $\mathbb{P}(Z \leq x) = e^{-\sigma x^{-\alpha}}$, $x > 0$ for some $\sigma > 0$), and yet it is no longer independently scattered. Moreover, with $\beta > 1/2$, even the marginal distribution $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \beta}(G)$ is not α -Fréchet. This is because with $\beta > 1/2$, any pairwise intersection $\mathcal{R}_{\beta, i_1} \cap \mathcal{R}_{\beta, i_2}$, $i_1 \neq i_2$, is non-empty almost surely. More generally it was shown in [56] that the intersection of p i.i.d. copies of \mathcal{R}_{β} , provided $\beta_p \in (0, 1)$, has the law of \mathcal{R}_{β_p} (a β_p -stable regenerative set).

The random sup-measure $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \beta}$ first appeared in [35] with $\beta \in (0, 1/2)$ and [56] with $\beta \in (0, 1)$, where the following extremal limit theorem were proved: with the empirical random sup-measure M_n as in (1.2), as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\frac{1}{w_n^{1/\alpha}} \{M_n(G)\}_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \xrightarrow{f.d.d.} \{\mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \beta}(G)\}_{G \in \mathcal{G}}.$$

The model of interest in this paper is the following extension of (1.7). With the same ingredients defining (1.7) above, consider

$$(1.9) \quad \{X_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} = \left\{ \sum_{0 < i_1 < \dots < i_p} [\varepsilon_{i_1} \dots \varepsilon_{i_p}] [\eta_{i_1} \dots \eta_{i_p}] \mathbf{1}_{\{k \in \bigcap_{r=1}^p \tau^{(i_r, d_{i_r})}\}} \right\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}},$$

where $[\varepsilon_{i_1} \dots \varepsilon_{i_p}] = \varepsilon_{i_1} \times \dots \times \varepsilon_{i_p}$, and similar notation for $[\eta_{i_1} \dots \eta_{i_p}]$. It is known that such multiple series converges almost surely and unconditionally (e.g., [54, Theorem 1.3 and Remark 1.5]). Note that when $p = 1$ it recovers the model (1.7).

From now on, we shall use the term *stable-regenerative model* to refer to the more general class of models (1.9). The stable-regenerative model and its variants have been investigated in literature recently. In particular, when $p \geq 2$ and

$$(1.10) \quad \beta_p := p\beta - p + 1 \in (0, 1),$$

a functional central limit theorem has been established for (1.9) in [4], where the limits are a new family of a self-similar multiple-stable process with stationary increments. See also [3, 5] for variations of the model that scale to multiple-Gaussian processes known as Hermite processes. Our main motivation is to investigate the case $\beta_p \leq 0$, about which little has been known in the literature.

Remark 1.1. It might be helpful to interpret the stable-regenerative model as follows. Consider the case $p = 1$ in (1.7) for the sake of simplicity. Then, one may view each renewal process $\tau^{(i, d_i)}$ recording the visit times of a certain state of a null-recurrent Markov chain, and each value $\varepsilon_i \eta_i$ is the reward collected by the chain when the Markov chain visits the state. This interpretation has a flavor of aggregated random walks in random scenery, as explained in [59].

Remark 1.2. It is well-known that a series representation as in (1.9) can be alternatively expressed as a multiple stable integral, whence the name *multiple-stable processes*. We sketch the representation, starting with $p = 1$. In this case, (1.7) has the equivalent stochastic-integral representation

$$\{X_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \stackrel{d}{=} C_\alpha \left\{ \int_{\tilde{\Omega} \times \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{1}_{\{k \in s + \tilde{\tau}(\tilde{\omega})\}} M_\alpha(d\tilde{\omega} ds) \right\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}},$$

for some explicit constant C_α , where the stochastic integral is defined on a by-default probability space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$, and the $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$ is a measure space equipped with a probability measure $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$, and moreover on $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$, $\tilde{\tau} = \{\tilde{\tau}_0, \tilde{\tau}_1, \tilde{\tau}_2, \dots\}$, $\tilde{\tau}_0 = 0 < \tilde{\tau}_1 < \tilde{\tau}_2 < \dots$, is a renewal process with renewal distribution F as before, and M_α is a symmetric α -stable random measure on $\tilde{\Omega} \times \mathbb{N}$ with control measure $\tilde{\mathbb{P}} \times \pi$, with π as in (1.5). The above equivalence holds only for $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ [55], while the stochastic integral representation is valid for $\alpha = 2$, and in this case the stochastic integral is with respect to a Gaussian random measure.

The multiple-stable integral representations would take more effort to explain. In particular, the integral *excludes* the diagonals. Since the development of our proofs rely exclusively on the series representation, we choose not to further elaborate the multiple-stable-integral representation, but refer the interested readers to [4, Section 3.1 and Example 4.2] for more details.

Remark 1.3. For processes represented by multiple-integrals with respect to Gaussian random measures, most commonly known as Gaussian chaos, the literature is extensive. However, much less has been devoted to multiple-stable (non-Gaussian) processes since early investigations in the 1980s and 1990s [32, 34, 50, 54]. In most of the aforementioned papers, the focus is rather on the properties of multiple-stable integrals, instead of the stochastic processes represented by such integrals.

We also mention that the multiple-stable process (1.9) is of its own interest as it has lead to a new representation of Hermite processes in terms of stable regenerative sets and their intersections [2].

1.4. Main results: phase transition for extremes. Recall the model in (1.9) and consider the empirical random sup-measure $M_n(G)$ as before in (1.2). Recall β_p in (1.10). Introduce

$$(1.11) \quad \mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \beta, p}(G) := \sup_{t \in G} \zeta_{\alpha, \beta, p}(t) \quad \text{with} \quad \zeta_{\alpha, \beta, p}(t) := \sum_{0 < i_1 < \dots < i_p} \frac{[\varepsilon_i]}{[\Gamma_i]^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{t \in \cap_{r=1}^p \mathcal{R}_{\beta, i_r}\}}, \quad t \in [0, 1],$$

where $\{\Gamma_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\{\varepsilon_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\mathcal{R}_{\beta, i}\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ are as before in (1.8). Recall independently scattered α -Fréchet random sup-measure $\mathcal{M}_\alpha^{\text{is}}$ in (1.1).

The main result of this paper is the following.

Theorem 1.4. *We have*

$$\frac{1}{c_n} \{M_n(G)\}_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \xrightarrow{f.d.d.} \begin{cases} \left\{ \mathfrak{C}_{F,p}^{1/\alpha} \mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,p}(G) \right\}_{G \in \mathcal{G}}, & \text{if } \beta_p > 0, \\ \left\{ \mathfrak{C}_{F,p}^{1/\alpha} \mathcal{M}_{\alpha}^{\text{is}}(G) \right\}_{G \in \mathcal{G}}, & \text{if } \beta_p = 0, \\ \left\{ \mathfrak{C}_{F,p}^{1/\alpha} \mathcal{M}_{\alpha}^{\text{is}}(G) \right\}_{G \in \mathcal{G}}, & \text{if } \beta_p < 0, \end{cases}$$

with

$$c_n = \begin{cases} n^{(1-\beta_p)/\alpha}, & \text{if } \beta_p > 0, \\ \left(\frac{n(\log \log n)^{p-1}}{\log n} \right)^{1/\alpha}, & \text{if } \beta_p = 0, \\ (n \log^{p-1} n)^{1/\alpha}, & \text{if } \beta_p < 0, \end{cases}$$

and the constant $\mathfrak{C}_{F,p}$, depending on F (and hence β) and p only, to be specified in (3.10), (4.1) and (5.1) in later sections (where we shall restate the limit theorem before the proof in each regime again for convenience).

As a corollary, we summarize the limit theorem for the partial maxima.

Corollary 1.5. *With c_n and $\mathfrak{C}_{F,p}$ as above, we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{c_n} \max_{k=1, \dots, n} X_k \leq x \right) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{P}(Z_{\alpha,\beta,p} \leq x), & \text{if } \beta_p > 0, \\ \exp(-\mathfrak{C}_{F,p} x^{-\alpha}), & \text{if } \beta_p \leq 0, \end{cases}$$

with $Z_{\alpha,\beta,p}$ defined in (3.8) below. In particular, $Z_{\alpha,\beta,p}$ is not an α -Fréchet random variable unless $p = 1, \beta \in (0, 1/2]$.

There are three different regimes as illustrated by Theorem 1.4.

- (1) Super-critical regime: $\beta_p > 0$. The limit theorem of this regime is a generalization of [56], which corresponds to $p = 1, \beta_p = \beta$ here, and in this case $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta} = \mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,1}$. It is worth emphasizing that not only $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,p}$ is not independently scattered with $\beta_p > 0$, but also that except the case $p = 1, \beta \in (0, 1/2]$, $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,p}$ is not even α -Fréchet, indicating very strong dependence of the original model. The dependence is of an aggregation nature as explained in Section 3, and a more refined phase transition within this regime regarding the size of the *aggregated cluster* of extremes (to be introduced) is explained in Remark 3.3.
- (2) Sub-critical regime: $\beta_p < 0$. In this regime, the limit random sup-measure is independently scattered, and hence illustrates that the extremes of the original model are of short-range dependence. Note that it is a macroscopic property for the limit random sup-measure to be independently scattered, and yet limit theorems for random sup-measures are unable to characterize precisely the *local-clustering* of extremes. Instead, combined with the fact $P(X_1 > x) \sim \frac{\alpha^{p-1}}{2p!(p-1)!} x^{-\alpha} \log^{p-1}(x)$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$ which follows from accompanying paper [6], what we can learn from Theorem 1.4 in this regime is that the *extremal index* (e.g., [33, Section 7.5]) of the process has the value

$$\theta = 2p!(p-1)! \mathfrak{C}_{F,p} = \mathfrak{q}_{F,p} \mathfrak{D}_{\beta,p} \in (0, 1),$$

where $\mathfrak{q}_{F,p}$ is given in (2.2) and $\mathfrak{D}_{\beta,p}$ is given in (4.3). The fact that $\theta \in (0, 1)$ indicates the local clustering of extremes in the limit, of which as a more precise elaboration we investigate the tail processes [7, 33] in the accompanying paper [6]; it is worth pointing out that the extremal index here is not the same as the so-called *candidate extremal index*, which equal to $\mathfrak{q}_{F,p}$.

- (3) Critical regime: $\beta_p = 0$. In this regime, one can argue that the extremal index is zero (this is well-known to be an immediate consequence of the following observation: the normalization constant c_n in this regime is of strictly smaller order than $(n \log^{p-1} n)^{1/\alpha}$ as in the sub-critical regime; we omit the details),

suggesting that the local clustering of extremes is unbounded (with infinite size). This again can be made precise by characterizing the tail processes as addressed in [6].

The critical regime is of particular interest in the sense that it provides a rare example where at the microscopic level the extremes of the process do not exhibit typical behavior of short-range dependence (which normally assume the local clustering is of finite size), and yet at the macroscopic level they do.

We shall address tail processes in a separate paper [6], and more details on local clustering, extremal index and tail processes shall be provided therein only. All these notions have been extensively investigated in the literature of extremes for stationary time series, and our reference on these topics is the latest monograph by Kulik and Soulier [33].

1.5. Comments. We conclude the introduction with several remarks regarding our main results, proofs, and follow-up questions.

Remark 1.6. We assume \bar{F} to be regularly varying *without a slowly varying function that goes to either zero or infinity*. This constraint is for convenience only, as the proof is quite involved already. We do not expect the slowly varying function will change qualitatively the limiting objects in either super or sub-critical regime. In the critical regime, however, the limit tail process studied in the accompanying paper [6] may have qualitatively different behaviors when the limit of slowly varying function is not a finite non-zero constant. We shall leave the investigation of the effects of slowly-varying functions at the critical regime in a future work.

Remark 1.7. One could also choose to work with multiple-infinitely-divisible process with other types of tails. If the tail decays like $C|x|^{-\alpha}$ at $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ for $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$ (including our case here with $\alpha \in (0, 2)$), the same phase transition shall occur (note that the limits $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha, \beta, p}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha}^{\text{is}}$ are both valid for all $\alpha > 0$). If the tail decays like $L(x)x^{-\alpha}$ for some slowly varying function, then this shall introduce some delicacy, but we do not expect an essential difference from our results here. We hence do not pursue such a generalization. A more challenging problem is to consider other types of heavy tails that are not regularly varying. For $p = 1$, Chen and Samorodnitsky [15, 16] recently revealed a very delicate phase transition from this respect: restricted to stable-regenerative model with heavy-tailed distributions (but not necessarily with regularly-varying tails), they proved that with different heaviness of the tails, different random sup-measures may arise in the limit.

Remark 1.8. We provide a brief and heuristic proof for each case of $\beta_p > 0$ and $\beta_p \leq 0$, to illustrate the different mechanisms of the formulation of extremes in the limit. Our proof for the super-critical regime follows the same idea as in [56] and a slightly simplified representation in [59]. Working with (1.7), the key observation is that in this regime where $\beta_p \in (0, 1)$, for every $i_1 < \dots < i_p$, the intersection $\bigcap_{r=1}^p \tau^{(i_r, d_{i_r})}$ scaled properly has a limit law as that of the shifted β_p -stable-regenerative set \mathcal{R}_{β_p} . *In words, every collection of p chains indexed by $i_1 < \dots < i_p$ has a contribution to the limit random sup-measure.* However, the situation of intersections of random closed sets here is more delicate than the one in [56] (when $p = 1$), and we shall work with a different representation from the one in (1.11), based on the *aggregated clusters* to be introduced in Section 3.1.

For the sub-critical and critical regime $\beta_p \leq 0$, $\bigcap_{r=1}^p \tau^{(i_r, d_{i_r})}$ is eventually an empty set, and the picture is completely changed. In words, for each fixed $i_1 < \dots < i_p$, the event that $\bigcap_{r=1}^p \tau^{(i_r, d_{i_r})} \cap \{1, \dots, n\} \neq \emptyset$ becomes a rare one for n large, and essentially we shall identify an appropriately chosen region $\mathcal{D}^* \subset \{(i_1, \dots, i_p) \in \mathbb{N}^p : i_1 < \dots < i_p\}$, so that on this region a Poisson limit theorem holds for the total number of occurrence of a large collection of rare events (in the exact rare events to be considered, additionally the magnitude of $[\varepsilon_i][\eta_i]$ shall exceed an properly chosen growing threshold, which we omit in this remark). *In words, the formulation of extreme values in this regime is due to the occurrence of rare events, and every fixed collection of p chains indexed by $i_1 < \dots < i_p$ do not have contribution to the limit.*

Remark 1.9. Our proof for the critical and sub-critical regimes is based on the two-moment method for Poisson approximation [1]. Our proofs, actually, suggest a full point-process convergence of

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \delta_{(X_k/c_n, k/n)},$$

as in [7]. Such a full point-process convergence has many other consequences, including the convergence of the random sup-measures as in Theorem 1.4. Another notable consequence would be a functional central limit theorem for the partial-sum process. However, proving such a full point-process convergence presents challenges to us as the widely applied standard approach [7, 17, 18, 33] does not apply, essentially due to the issue that the candidate extremal index $\vartheta = \mathfrak{q}_{F,p}$ and extremal index $\theta = \mathfrak{q}_{F,p} D_{\beta,p}$ do not equal, and yet the classical approach requires necessarily $\vartheta = \theta$. See [6] for more discussions.

Instead, we prove the convergence for the independently scattered random sup-measures *directly* by an argument based on the two-moment method. This step is the most involved argument in our paper. In particular we have to truncate the process first carefully to avoid certain local dependence that may block the method (see Remark 4.10). Moreover, although the same method applies to both critical and sub-critical regimes, there are several delicate differences already due to the different underlying geometries for the local clustering of extremes at the two regimes (see Remark 5.2).

We expect our method can be adapted to prove the full point-process convergence, and this will be addressed in another paper.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides related backgrounds, notably on multiple-stable processes and renewal processes. For Theorem 1.4, the super-critical, sub-critical and critical regimes are proved in Sections 3, 4 and 5, respectively.

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank Larry Goldstein, Takashi Owada and Gennady Samorodnitsky for very helpful discussions. YW's research was partially supported by Army Research Office, US (W911NF-20-1-0139).

2. PRELIMINARY RESULTS

2.1. Intersections of renewal processes with infinite mean. Throughout, our references on discrete-time renewal processes are Giacomini [27, Appendix A.5] and Bingham et al. [14, Section 8.7.1]. Besides the notations and properties of renewal processes in Section 1, we shall also use the renewal mass function of a standard renewal process (no delay) with renewal distribution F :

$$u(k) := \mathbb{P}(k \in \tau), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Note that $u(0) = 1$. It is well-known (e.g., [14, Theorem 8.7.3]) that the relation

$$(2.1) \quad u(n) \sim \frac{n^{\beta-1}}{C_F \Gamma(\beta) \Gamma(1-\beta)}, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

implies the assumption (1.3), and furthermore under the assumption (1.4) the two are equivalent (cf. [20]).

Next, we recall some properties of the intersected process of p i.i.d. copies of τ , $\boldsymbol{\eta} := \bigcap_{r=1}^p \tau^{(r)} = \{\eta_0 = 0, \eta_1, \eta_2, \dots\}$. This is again a (non-delayed) renewal process, although when $\beta_p < 0$, it is terminating, namely, $\eta_1 = \infty$ with strictly positive probability

$$(2.2) \quad \mathfrak{q}_{F,p} = \mathbb{P}(\eta_1 = \infty) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \overline{F}_p(n) \in (0, 1).$$

Here and below $\overline{F}_p(x) = 1 - F_p(x)$ with F_p denoting the cumulative distribution function of η_1 . Recall the renewal process $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is said to be null-recurrent, if $\mathbb{P}(\eta_1 < \infty) = 1$ and $\mathbb{E}\eta_1 = \infty$.

Lemma 2.1. *If $\beta_p \geq 0$, then the renewal process $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is null-recurrent and*

$$\overline{F}_p(n) \sim \begin{cases} n^{-\beta_p} \frac{(\mathbf{C}_F \Gamma(\beta) \Gamma(1-\beta))^p}{\Gamma(\beta_p) (\Gamma(1-\beta_p))^p}, & \text{if } \beta_p > 0, \\ \frac{(\mathbf{C}_F \Gamma(\beta) \Gamma(1-\beta))^p}{\log n}, & \text{if } \beta_p = 0. \end{cases}$$

If $\beta_p < 0$, then the renewal process $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is terminating with $P(\eta_1 = \infty) = \mathbf{q}_{F,p}$ in (2.2).

Proof. Let $u_p(n)$ denote the renewal mass function of $\boldsymbol{\eta}$. Clearly by independence,

$$(2.3) \quad u_p(n) = u(n)^p \sim \frac{n^{\beta_p-1}}{(\mathbf{C}_F \Gamma(\beta) \Gamma(1-\beta))^p}, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

regardless of the value of β_p (and $u_p(0) = 1$ always). In the case $\beta_p > 0$, and necessarily $\beta_p < 1$, (2.3) implies

$$\overline{F}_p(n) \sim n^{-\beta_p} \frac{(\mathbf{C}_F \Gamma(\beta) \Gamma(1-\beta))^p}{\Gamma(\beta_p) (\Gamma(1-\beta_p))^p}.$$

This follows again from [14, Theorem 8.7.3] and was already used in [56, Lemma A.1]. The critical regime $\beta_p = 0$ is similar. In this case,

$$\sum_{k=1}^n u_p(k) \sim \frac{1}{(\mathbf{C}_F \Gamma(\beta) \Gamma(1-\beta))^p} \log n,$$

and hence by [14, Theorem 8.7.3], it follows that

$$(2.4) \quad \overline{F}_p(n) \sim \frac{(\mathbf{C}_F \Gamma(\beta) \Gamma(1-\beta))^p}{\log n}.$$

The null-recurrence in these two cases readily follows.

In the case $\beta_p < 0$, consider

$$G = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{1}_{\{n \in \boldsymbol{\eta}\}}.$$

The conclusion follows since

$$\mathbb{E}G = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_p(n) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u(n)^p < \infty.$$

(In fact, by the renewal property, G is a geometric random variable satisfying $\mathbb{P}(G = k) = \mathbf{q}_{F,p}(1 - \mathbf{q}_{F,p})^{k-1}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, so that $\mathbb{E}G = 1/\mathbf{q}_{F,p}$.) \square

2.2. A representation of multiple-stable processes. We shall work with the following equivalent representation of finite-dimensional distributions of $\{X_k\}_{k=1,\dots,n}$ in (1.9):

$$(2.5) \quad \{X_k\}_{k=1,\dots,n} \stackrel{d}{=} \{X_{n,k}\}_{k=1,\dots,n} := \left\{ w_n^{p/\alpha} \sum_{0 < i_1 < \dots < i_p} \frac{[\varepsilon_i]}{[\Gamma_i]^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{k \in \bigcap_{k=1}^p R_{n,i_k}\}} \right\}_{k=1,\dots,n},$$

where w_n is as in (1.6), $\{\varepsilon_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ are i.i.d. Rademacher random variables, $\{\Gamma_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ are consecutive ordered points from a standard Poisson process, and $\{R_{n,i}\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ are i.i.d. copies of certain random closed set R_n , all three families are independent. Here R_n is described as follows. Suppose $\boldsymbol{\tau}^*$ is a shifted renewal process with the stationary delayed distribution π and renewal distribution F defined on a certain measurable space with respect to certain infinite measure μ^* (since π is an infinite measure). Then, one can introduce a probability measure μ_n on the same measurable space via

$$\frac{d\mu_n}{d\mu^*} = \frac{\mathbf{1}_{\{\boldsymbol{\tau}^* \cap \{1,\dots,n\} \neq \emptyset\}}}{\mu^*(\{\boldsymbol{\tau}^* : \boldsymbol{\tau}^* \cap \{1,\dots,n\} \neq \emptyset\})} = \frac{\mathbf{1}_{\{\boldsymbol{\tau}^* \cap \{1,\dots,n\} \neq \emptyset\}}}{w_n}.$$

Then, the law of R_n is the one induced by $\boldsymbol{\tau}^*$ with respect to the probability measure μ_n . Moreover, it is immediately verified that

- (i) $\mathbb{P}(k \in R_n) = 1/w_n, k = 1, \dots, n$ (shift invariance).
- (ii) $\mathbb{P}(\min(R_n \cap \{k+1, k+2, \dots\}) \leq k+j \mid k \in R_n) = F(j)$ (Markov/renewal property).

We refer to [40, 56] for details. Note that we write $\{X_{n,k}\}_{k=1,\dots,n}$ to emphasize that the last expression of (2.5) depends on $n \in \mathbb{N}$, although they correspond consistently to the same process $\{X_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$.

3. CONVERGENCE FOR RANDOM SUP-MEASURES, $\beta_p > 0$

We shall first introduce an equivalent representation of the limit random sup-measure $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,p}$ in (1.11), based on the magnitude-location representation of cluster of extremes. This representation, (3.6) below, explains better the formulation of long-range clustering of extremes and their possible aggregations, and our proof for the limit theorem is based on this representation.

Throughout C denotes a generic positive constant whose value may change from line to line.

3.1. A representation in terms of aggregated clusters. Throughout, denote

$$\mathcal{D}_p = \{\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_p) \in \mathbb{N}^p : i_1 < \dots < i_p\}.$$

Recall the representation (1.11), which we repeat here for convenience,

$$\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,p}(G) = \sup_{t \in G} \zeta_{\alpha,\beta,p}(t) \quad \text{with} \quad \zeta_{\alpha,\beta,p}(t) = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{D}_p} \frac{[\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}}]}{[\Gamma_{\mathbf{i}}]^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{t \in \mathcal{R}_{\beta,\mathbf{i}}\}}.$$

It may be helpful to revisit first the simple situation $p = 1$, in which case each cluster of extremes is with magnitude $\varepsilon_i/\Gamma_i^{1/\alpha}$, supported on a fractal set $\mathcal{R}_{\beta,i}$. In this case, we have

$$\{\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,1}(G)\}_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \stackrel{d}{=} \left\{ \sup_{t \in G} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{\varepsilon_i}{\Gamma_i^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{t \in \mathcal{R}_{\beta,i}\}} \right\}_{G \in \mathcal{G}}.$$

As explained in [59, Section 2.2], the summation is due to an aggregation effect of the original stable-regenerative model. An alternative and more helpful way to represent $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,1}$ is as follows. We say each $J = \{i_1, \dots, i_r\}$ corresponds to an *aggregated cluster* (of individual clusters indexed by i_1, \dots, i_r), of which the magnitude and locations are represented by

$$(3.1) \quad \sum_{i \in J} \frac{\varepsilon_i}{\Gamma_i^{1/\alpha}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}_{\beta,J} = \bigcap_{i \in J} \mathcal{R}_{\beta,i}.$$

This aggregated cluster is non-trivial (not identically zero) if and only if $|J| \leq p'$ with

$$(3.2) \quad p' := \max\{q \in \mathbb{N} : \beta_q > 0\} \geq p.$$

More precisely, if $|J| > p'$, then almost surely the intersection $\mathcal{R}_{\beta,J}$ is an empty set, and otherwise (so $\beta_{|J|} \in (0, 1)$) $\mathcal{R}_{\beta,J}$ has the same law of $\mathcal{R}_{\beta,|J|}$ [56]. Then we can represent $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,1}$ in terms of aggregated clusters as

$$(3.3) \quad \mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,1}(G) = \sup_{J \subset \mathbb{N}, |J| \leq p'} \mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,J}(G) \quad \text{with} \quad \mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,J}(G) := \sum_{i \in J} \frac{\varepsilon_i}{\Gamma_i^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{R}_{\beta,J} \cap G \neq \emptyset\}}.$$

Remark 3.1. The representation (3.3) was used implicitly in the proof of [56]. It may be helpful to compare with the following representation for independently scattered α -Fréchet random sup-measure $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha}^{\text{is}}$: the corresponding magnitudes and locations of extremes of $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha}^{\text{is}}$ are encoded in the point process $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_{(\Gamma_i^{-1/\alpha}, U_i)}$ (recall (1.1)), and one may write $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha}^{\text{is}}(G) = \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{M}_{\alpha,i}(G)$ with $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,i}(G) = \Gamma_i^{-1/\alpha} \mathbf{1}_{\{U_i \in G\}}$ playing a similar role as $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,J}(G)$.

For $p \geq 2$, representations similar to (3.3) also exist. The point process

$$\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{D}_p} \delta_{([\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}}]/[\Gamma_{\mathbf{i}}]^{1/\alpha}, \mathcal{R}_{\beta,\mathbf{i}})}$$

encodes the magnitude and locations of each extremal clustering now indexed by $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{D}_p$, *without* taking into account of the aggregation due to intersections of $\mathcal{R}_{\beta,\mathbf{i}}$. This time, however, not every collection of elements

of \mathcal{D}_p forms an aggregated cluster. Instead, each aggregated cluster is indexed by some $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_q) \in \mathcal{D}_q$ for some $q \geq p$ as follows. Introduce

$$J(\mathbf{c}) := \{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{D}_p : \mathbf{i} \subset \mathbf{c}\},$$

where by $\mathbf{i} \subset \mathbf{c}$ we mean $\{i_1, \dots, i_p\} \subset \{c_1, \dots, c_q\}$. In particular, $|J(\mathbf{c})| = \binom{q}{p}$. For example, if $p = 3, q = 4$, then $J((1, 3, 5, 6)) = \{(1, 3, 5), (1, 3, 6), (1, 5, 6), (3, 5, 6)\}$. Next, define

$$(3.4) \quad \mathcal{J}_{p,p'} := \{J(\mathbf{c}) : \mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{D}_q, q = p, \dots, p'\},$$

where p' is as in (3.2). Now we say each $J \in \mathcal{J}_{p,p'}$ corresponds to an aggregated cluster, of which the magnitude and locations are represented by

$$(3.5) \quad \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in J} \frac{[\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}}]}{[\Gamma_{\mathbf{i}}]^{1/\alpha}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}_{\beta,J} = \bigcap_{\mathbf{i} \in J} \mathcal{R}_{\beta,\mathbf{i}},$$

respectively. Note that by our choice of p' , $\mathcal{R}_{\beta,J} \neq \emptyset$ almost surely, and (3.5) includes (3.1) as a special case (with $p = 1$). We now provide a representation of $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,p}(G)$ in terms of the aggregated clusters, as an extension of (3.3).

Lemma 3.2. *For $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,p}(G)$ defined in (1.11) with any $G \in \mathcal{G}$, we have almost surely*

$$(3.6) \quad \mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,p}(G) = \sup_{J \in \mathcal{J}_{p,p'}} \mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,J}(G)$$

with

$$(3.7) \quad \mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,J}(G) := \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in J} \frac{[\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}}]}{[\Gamma_{\mathbf{i}}]^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{R}_{\beta,J} \cap G \neq \emptyset\}}, \quad G \in \mathcal{G}.$$

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Fix $G \in \mathcal{G}$, and set right-hand side of (3.6) as $\sup_{J \in \mathcal{J}_{p,p'}} \mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,J}(G) =: \mathcal{M}'_{\alpha,\beta,p}(G)$. Recall $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,p}(G) = \sup_{t \in G} \zeta_{\alpha,\beta,p}(t)$ as in (1.11). It is clear that almost surely $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,p}(G) \leq \mathcal{M}'_{\alpha,\beta,p}(G)$. Indeed, for any $t \in G$, note that the random set

$$J_t := \{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{D}_p : t \in \mathcal{R}_{\beta,\mathbf{i}}\} \in \mathcal{J}_{p,p'}$$

almost surely. Since also $t \in \mathcal{R}_{\beta,J_t} \cap G$, we have $\zeta_{\alpha,\beta,p}(t) = \mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,J_t}(G) \leq \mathcal{M}'_{\alpha,\beta,p}(G)$ almost surely.

We now prove $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,p}(G) \leq \mathcal{M}'_{\alpha,\beta,p}(G)$. First, since $[\Gamma_{\mathbf{i}}]^{-1/\alpha} \rightarrow 0$ when $\max(\mathbf{i}) \rightarrow \infty$ almost surely, it follows that the supremum over $J \in \mathcal{J}_{p,p'}$ is almost surely a maximum. Assume that the maximum is achieved at $J(\widehat{\mathbf{c}})$ for some $\widehat{\mathbf{c}} \in \mathcal{D}_q$ with $q = p, \dots, p'$, and in particular $\mathcal{R}_{\beta,J(\widehat{\mathbf{c}})} \cap G \neq \emptyset$. It suffices to show that $J(\widehat{\mathbf{c}}) = J_t$ for some $t \in \mathcal{R}_{\beta,J(\widehat{\mathbf{c}})} \cap G$ almost surely (in words, the location t is covered by the aggregated cluster corresponding to $J(\widehat{\mathbf{c}})$). We prove this by contradiction: assume it does not hold. This means that with strictly positive probability we have $J(\widehat{\mathbf{c}}) \subsetneq J_t$ for every $t \in \mathcal{R}_{\beta,J(\widehat{\mathbf{c}})} \cap G$ (in words, every t is covered by some aggregated cluster ‘larger’ than the one corresponding to $J(\widehat{\mathbf{c}})$), and since $J_t \in \mathcal{J}_{p,p'}$ almost surely, necessarily $q \leq p' - 1$. It then follows that with positive probability,

$$\emptyset \neq \mathcal{R}_{\beta,J(\widehat{\mathbf{c}})} \cap G \subset \left(\bigcup_{t \in \mathcal{R}_{\beta,J(\widehat{\mathbf{c}})} \cap G} \mathcal{R}_{\beta,J_t} \right) \cap G \subset \left(\bigcup_{q'=p+1}^{p'} \bigcup_{\mathbf{c}' \in \mathcal{D}_{q'}, \widehat{\mathbf{c}} \subset \mathbf{c}'} \mathcal{R}_{\beta,J(\mathbf{c}')} \right) \cap G,$$

But this is impossible: conditioning on $\widehat{\mathbf{c}}$, $\mathcal{R}_{\beta,J(\widehat{\mathbf{c}})}$ has Hausdorff dimension β_q , while $\mathcal{R}_{\beta,J(\mathbf{c}')}$ in the last expression above with $\mathbf{c}' \in \mathcal{D}_{q'}$ has Hausdorff dimension $\beta_{q'} < \beta_q$, and hence the countable union in the last expression has Hausdorff dimension $\beta_{q+1} < \beta_q$ almost surely in view of the countable stability property (cf. [23, Section 3.2]). \square

Remark 3.3. In view of (3.6), the number p' defined in (3.2) may be called the largest ‘size’ of an aggregated cluster given β and p . From (3.2), we see that there is another layer of phase transitions within the supercritical regime $\beta > 1 - 1/p$, in the sense that as β increases towards 1, the maximum ‘size’ q' of the aggregated cluster will also increase to infinity.

Now we are ready to provide a description of $Z_{\alpha,\beta,p}$ in Corollary 1.5. It is an immediate consequence of Lemma 3.2 that

$$(3.8) \quad Z_{\alpha,\beta,p} := \sup_{J \in \mathcal{J}_{p,p'}} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in J} \frac{[\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}}]}{[\Gamma_{\mathbf{i}}]^{1/\alpha}}.$$

Some simplification may be obtained. If $p' = p$, then $Z_{\alpha,\beta,p} = \sup_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{D}_p} [\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}}]/[\Gamma_{\mathbf{i}}]^{1/\alpha}$, and if $p' = p = 1$ (which is exactly the case $p = 1, \beta \in (0, 1/2]$), then $Z_{\alpha,\beta,1} \stackrel{d}{=} 2^{-1/\alpha} \Gamma^{-1/\alpha}$.

Remark 3.4. In the case $p = 1$, we have a further simplified representation as follows. First, as an alternative representation of (3.3) is

$$\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,1}(G) = \sup_{J \subset \mathbb{N}, |J| \leq p'} \mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,J}^+(G) \quad \text{with} \quad \mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,J}^+(G) := \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in J} \frac{(\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}})_+}{\Gamma_{\mathbf{i}}^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{R}_{\beta,J} \cap G \neq \emptyset\}},$$

once one realizes that for those $\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}} = -1$, $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}}/\Gamma_{\mathbf{i}}^{1/\alpha}$ has no contribution to the limit. Then, one may further drop all these terms by a standard thinning argument of Poisson point process, and arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,1}(G)\}_{G \in \mathcal{G}} &\stackrel{d}{=} \left\{ 2^{-1/\alpha} \sup_{J \subset \mathbb{N}, |J| \leq p'} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in J} \frac{1}{\Gamma_{\mathbf{i}}^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{R}_{\beta,J} \cap G \neq \emptyset\}} \right\}_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \\ &\stackrel{d}{=} \left\{ 2^{-1/\alpha} \sup_{t \in G} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{\Gamma_{\mathbf{i}}^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{R}_{\beta,\mathbf{i}} \cap G \neq \emptyset\}} \right\}_{G \in \mathcal{G}}. \end{aligned}$$

For $p \geq 2$, such a simplification is no longer available.

Remark 3.5. The representation (3.6) involving $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,J}$ is the most convenient for our proof. However, it is worth keeping in mind that $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,J}$ defined this way is *not* a random sup-measure (neither in $\text{SM}([0, 1], \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+)$ or $\text{SM}([0, 1], \overline{\mathbb{R}})$). A simple way to make it a valid random sup-measure in $\text{SM}([0, 1], \overline{\mathbb{R}})$ is to modify it as

$$\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,J}(G) := \begin{cases} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in J} \frac{[\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}}]}{[\Gamma_{\mathbf{i}}]^{1/\alpha}}, & \text{if } \mathcal{R}_{\beta,J} \cap G \neq \emptyset, \\ -\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The representation involving $\zeta_{\alpha,\beta,p}(t)$ follows the convention in the earlier paper [56], although it is worth keeping in mind that $\zeta_{\alpha,\beta,p}(t)$ is not an upper-semi-continuous function.

3.2. Proof of Theorem 1.4, $\beta_p > 0$. The goal of this section is to prove the following case of Theorem 1.4, $\beta_p > 0$:

$$(3.9) \quad \frac{1}{w_n^{p/\alpha}} \{M_n(G)\}_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \xrightarrow{f.d.d.} \{\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,p}(G)\}_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \stackrel{d}{=} \left\{ \sup_{J \subset \mathcal{J}_{p,p'}} \mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,J}(G) \right\}_{G \in \mathcal{G}}.$$

So in view of (1.6), in Theorem 1.4,

$$(3.10) \quad \mathfrak{C}_{F,p} = \left(\frac{\mathfrak{C}_F}{1-\beta} \right)^p.$$

Recall that $M_n(G) = \max_{i/n \in G} X_i$ with X_i in (2.5). We start with a truncation argument. Define first

$$R_{n,\mathbf{i}} := \bigcap_{k=1}^p R_{n,i_k}, \quad \mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_p) \in \mathcal{D}_p.$$

For each $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, consider

$$(3.11) \quad M_{n,\ell}(G) := \max_{k/n \in G} w_n^{p/\alpha} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{D}_p, i_p \leq \ell} \frac{[\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}}]}{[\Gamma_{\mathbf{i}}]^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{k \in R_{n,\mathbf{i}}\}}.$$

Lemma 3.6. *For any $\epsilon > 0$, we have*

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{k=1, \dots, n} \left| \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{D}: i_p > \ell} \frac{[\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}}]}{[\Gamma_{\mathbf{i}}]^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{k \in R_{n, \mathbf{i}}\}} \right| > \epsilon \right) = 0.$$

Proof. The argument is similar to those in [4, 56]. Fix finite $M \geq 2p/\alpha$. It suffices to show for any $0 \leq q \leq p-1$ and fixed $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_q) \in \mathcal{D}_q$ with $i_q \leq M$ that

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{k=1, \dots, n} \left| \frac{[\varepsilon_{i_1:q}]}{[\Gamma_{i_1:q}]^{1/\alpha}} \sum_{M < i_{q+1} < \dots < i_p, i_p > \ell} \frac{[\varepsilon_{i_{q+1:p}}]}{[\Gamma_{i_{q+1:p}}]^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{k \in R_{n, \mathbf{i}}\}} \right| > \epsilon \right) = 0.$$

Here and below we write $\varepsilon_{i_a:b} = (\varepsilon_{i_a}, \varepsilon_{i_{a+1}}, \dots, \varepsilon_{i_b})$ and $[\varepsilon_{i_a:b}] = \prod_{r=a}^b \varepsilon_{i_r}$. By Markov inequality, union bound and stationarity in k , the probability above is bounded by

$$\frac{n}{\epsilon^r} \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{[\varepsilon_{i_1:q}]}{[\Gamma_{i_1:q}]^{1/\alpha}} \sum_{M < i_{q+1} < \dots < i_p, i_p > \ell} \frac{[\varepsilon_{i_{q+1:p}}]}{[\Gamma_{i_{q+1:p}}]^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{1 \in R_{n, \mathbf{i}}\}} \right|^r$$

for some $r > 0$ satisfying $1/r = 1/r' + 1/\gamma$, where γ is chosen large enough so that

$$\gamma > \frac{2}{1-\beta},$$

and r' is chosen so that $(p-1)r'/\alpha < 1$ which ensures $\mathbb{E}([\Gamma_{i_1:q}]^{-r'/\alpha}) < \infty$ for all $q \leq p-1$ (cf. [54, eq. (3.2)]). By Hölder's inequality, it remains to show

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{M < i_{q+1} < \dots < i_p, i_p > \ell} \frac{[\varepsilon_{i_{q+1:p}}]}{[\Gamma_{i_{q+1:p}}]^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{1 \in R_{n, \mathbf{i}}\}} \right|^\gamma = 0.$$

By a generalized Khinchine inequality [54, Theorem 1.3(ii)], exploring the orthogonality induced by $[\varepsilon_{i_{q+1:p}}]$, and the fact $\mathbb{P}(1 \in R_{n, \mathbf{i}}) = \mathbb{P}(1 \in R_{n, 1})^{p-q} = w_n^{-(p-q)}$, the expectation in the displayed line above is bounded from above by, up to a multiplicative constant,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{M < i_{q+1} < \dots < i_p, i_p > \ell} \frac{[\varepsilon_{i_{q+1:p}}]}{[\Gamma_{i_{q+1:p}}]^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{1 \in R_{n, \mathbf{i}}\}} \right|^2 \right)^{\gamma/2} \\ & \leq w_n^{-\gamma(p-q)/2} \left(\sum_{M < i_{q+1} < \dots < i_p, i_p > \ell} \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_{i_{q+1:p}}]^{-2/\alpha} \right)^{\gamma/2}. \end{aligned}$$

By the choice of γ , we have $n w_n^{-\gamma(p-q)/2} \leq n w_n^{-\gamma/2} \rightarrow 0$. To conclude the proof, we apply the bound

$$(3.12) \quad \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_{i_{q+1:p}}]^{-2/\alpha} \leq C [i_{q+1:p}]^{-2/\alpha},$$

which holds since $i_{q+1} > M \geq 2p/\alpha \geq 2(p-q)/\alpha$ [54, eq. (3.2)], so that the last multiple sum above is bounded. \square

Next, we define for any $J = \{\mathbf{i}_1, \dots, \mathbf{i}_r\}$, $\mathbf{i}_s = (i_{s,1}, \dots, i_{s,p})$, $s = 1, \dots, r$, that

$$\cup J := \{i_{s,h} : s = 1, \dots, r, h = 1, \dots, p\} \subset \mathbb{N}$$

and introduce of a finite truncation of $\mathcal{J}_{p,p'}$ in (3.4) as

$$\mathcal{J}_{p,p'}(\ell) := \{J \in \mathcal{J}_{p,p'} : \max(\cup J) \leq \ell\}.$$

Next, as a discrete analog of Lemma 3.2, we approximate $M_{n,\ell}(G)$ in (3.11) by

$$(3.13) \quad \widetilde{M}_{n,\ell}(G) := \max_{J \subset \mathcal{J}_{p,p'}(\ell)} \widetilde{M}_{n,J}(G),$$

where

$$(3.14) \quad \widetilde{M}_{n,J}(G) := w_n^{p/\alpha} \sum_{i \in J} \frac{[\varepsilon_i]}{[\Gamma_i]^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\frac{1}{n} R_{n,J} \cap G \neq \emptyset\}} \quad \text{with} \quad R_{n,J} := \bigcap_{i \in J} R_{n,i}.$$

Lemma 3.7. *For every $G \in \mathcal{G}$ fixed,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(M_{n,\ell}(G) = \widetilde{M}_{n,\ell}(G) \right) = 1.$$

Proof. Consider the following event:

$$\Omega_{n,1}(\ell) := \left\{ \max_{k=1,\dots,n} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \mathbf{1}_{\{k \in R_{n,i}\}} \leq p' \right\}.$$

Restricted to $\Omega_{n,1}(\ell)$, one readily checks that $M_{n,\ell}(G) \leq \widetilde{M}_{n,\ell}(G)$. For the other direction, introduce further

$$\Omega_{n,2}(J) := \{R_{n,J} \cap G = \emptyset\} \cup \left\{ \exists k \in \{1, \dots, n\} \text{ s.t. } k \in R_{n,J}, k \notin \bigcup_{i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\} \setminus (\cup J)} R_{n,i} \right\},$$

and

$$\Omega_{n,2}(\ell) := \bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{J}_{p,p'}(\ell)} \Omega_{n,2}(J).$$

Restricted to $\Omega_{n,2}(\ell)$, one has $\widetilde{M}_{n,\ell}(G) \leq M_{n,\ell}(G)$ because the J set which maximizes (3.13) can always be realized by $\{\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_p) \in \mathcal{D}_p, i_p \leq \ell : k \in R_{n,i}\}$ for some k . Therefore, it remains to prove that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\Omega_{n,i}(\ell)) = 1$ for $i = 1, 2$. For $\Omega_{n,1}(\ell)$, this follows from the fact that $R_{n,i} \Rightarrow \emptyset$ (e.g. [56, Theorem 3.1]) for all $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{D}_{p'+1}$. The fact that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\Omega_{n,2}(\ell)) = 1$ has played a crucial role in [56, Lemma 5.5] (see also [59, Lemma 3.7]). \square

Proof of Theorem 1.4. $\beta_p > 0$. The goal is to show (3.9). Recall $M_{n,\ell}$ in (3.11) and $\widetilde{M}_{n,\ell}$ in (3.13), which serve as approximations for M_n . Introduce the truncated version of $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,p}$ as

$$\mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{(\ell)}(G) := \max_{J \in \mathcal{J}_{p,p'}(\ell)} \mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,J}(G).$$

We first show

$$(3.15) \quad \left\{ \frac{1}{w_n^{p/\alpha}} \widetilde{M}_{n,\ell}(G) \right\}_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \xrightarrow{f.d.d.} \left\{ \mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{(\ell)}(G) \right\}_{G \in \mathcal{G}}.$$

Indeed, the above follows if for all $G_s \in \mathcal{G}, s = 1, \dots, d, d \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(3.16) \quad \left\{ \frac{1}{w_n^{p/\alpha}} \widetilde{M}_{n,J}(G_s) \right\}_{J \in \mathcal{J}_{p,p'}(\ell), s=1,\dots,d} \Rightarrow \left\{ \mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,J}(G_s) \right\}_{J \in \mathcal{J}_{p,p'}(\ell), s=1,\dots,d}.$$

Comparing the two sides (see (3.14) and (3.7)), it suffices to show

$$\left\{ \frac{1}{n} R_{n,i} \right\}_{\substack{\mathbf{i}=(i_1,\dots,i_q) \in \mathcal{D}_q \\ i_q \leq \ell, q=p,\dots,p'}} \Rightarrow \left\{ \mathcal{R}_{\beta,\mathbf{i}} \right\}_{\substack{\mathbf{i}=(i_1,\dots,i_q) \in \mathcal{D}_q \\ i_q \leq \ell, q=p,\dots,p'}}$$

a joint convergence in distribution of finitely many random closed sets. This joint convergence, a non-trivial result since $R_{n,i}$ and $R_{n,i'}$ are dependent when $\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{i}' \neq \emptyset$, was established in [56, Theorem 5.4]. The desired (3.16) and hence (3.15) now follow. Next, we have

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{w_n^{p/\alpha}} \left| M_n(G) - \widetilde{M}_{n,\ell}(G) \right| \geq \epsilon \right) = 0.$$

Indeed, the above follows from Lemmas 3.6 and 3.7 applied to the two probabilities respectively on right-hand side of following inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{w_n^{p/\alpha}} \left| M_n(G) - \widetilde{M}_{n,\ell}(G) \right| \geq \epsilon\right) \\ \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{w_n^{p/\alpha}} |M_n(G) - M_{n,\ell}(G)| > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(M_{n,\ell}(G) \neq \widetilde{M}_{n,\ell}(G)\right). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, by Lemma 3.2 and monotonicity, one has

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,p}^{(\ell)}(G) = \mathcal{M}_{\alpha,\beta,p}(G) \text{ almost surely.}$$

The desired result now follows from a routine triangular approximation argument [13, Theorem 3.2]. \square

4. CONVERGENCE FOR RANDOM SUP-MEASURES, $\beta_p < 0$

The goal of this section is to prove the following case of Theorem 1.4, with $\beta_p < 0$:

$$(4.1) \quad \frac{1}{c_n} \{M_n(G)\}_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \xrightarrow{f.d.d.} \left\{ \mathfrak{C}_{F,p}^{1/\alpha} \mathcal{M}_\alpha^{\text{is}}(G) \right\}_{G \in \mathcal{G}},$$

where we have

$$(4.2) \quad c_n = (n \log^{p-1} n)^{1/\alpha} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{C}_{F,p} = \frac{1}{2p!(p-1)!} q_{F,p} \mathsf{D}_{\beta,p},$$

with $q_{F,p}$ as in (2.2), and

$$(4.3) \quad \mathsf{D}_{\beta,p} := \sum_{s=q_{\beta,p}}^p (-1)^{p-s} \binom{p}{s} (-\beta_s)^{p-1} \quad \text{with} \quad q_{\beta,p} := \min\{q \in \mathbb{N} : \beta_q < 0\}.$$

It can be shown that the parameter $\mathsf{D}_{\beta,p}$ takes value in $(0, 1)$ when $\beta \in (0, 1 - 1/p)$ (see [6]). Recall that we assume $w_n \sim C_F(1 - \beta)^{-1} n^{1-\beta}$. Throughout this section we set

$$(4.4) \quad r_n = \frac{w_n^p}{c_n^\alpha} \sim \left(\frac{C_F}{1 - \beta} \right)^p \frac{n^{-\beta p}}{\log^{p-1} n}.$$

To prove (4.1), the strategy is to first approximate the series representation (2.5) by a truncated version, and then to establish the point-process convergence of block maxima for the truncated process. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we recall the series representation of finite-dimensional distribution $\{X_{n,k}\}_{k=1,\dots,n} \stackrel{d}{=} \{X_k\}_{k=1,\dots,n}$ in (2.5): Introduce, for a sequence $d_n \rightarrow \infty$ and $k_n := \lfloor n/d_n \rfloor$,

$$\mathcal{I}_{n,j} := \{(j-1)d_n + 1, \dots, jd_n\}, \quad j = 1, \dots, k_n,$$

which are k_n non-overlapping blocks each of length d_n . Introduce a sub-domain of \mathcal{D}_p with a product constraint as

$$\mathcal{D}_p^*(x) := \{\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_p) \in \mathbb{N}^p : i_1 < \dots < i_p, [\mathbf{i}] = i_1 \dots i_p \leq x\}, \quad x > 0,$$

as well as

$$(4.5) \quad \mathcal{H}(n, K) := \{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{D}_p^*(Kr_n) : i_p \leq w_n\},$$

where r_n is as in (4.4). Note that $\mathcal{H}(n, K) = \mathcal{D}_p^*(Kr_n)$ if $r_n \leq w_n$, which holds for large n if $\beta_{p-1} \geq 0$. It is crucial to work with $\mathcal{H}(n, K)$ instead of $\mathcal{D}_p^*(Kr_n)$ when $\beta_{p-1} < 0$. See Remark 4.10 for explanations.

Now we introduce the truncated process, for $K > 0$,

$$X_{n,k}^{(K)} := \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{H}(n,K)} w_n^{p/\alpha} \frac{[\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}}]}{[\Gamma_{\mathbf{i}}]^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{k \in R_{n,\mathbf{i}}\}}, \quad k = 1, \dots, n,$$

and a point process involving block maxima:

$$\xi_{n,K} := \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} \delta_{(\widehat{m}_{n,j}^{(K)}/c_{n,j/k_n})} \mathbf{1}_{\{\widehat{m}_{n,j}^{(K)} \neq 0\}} \quad \text{with} \quad \widehat{m}_{n,j}^{(K)} := \max_{k \in \mathcal{I}_{n,j}} X_{n,k}^{(K)}, \quad j = 1, \dots, k_n.$$

The key behind the proof of (4.1) is the following. Throughout, we let $\mathfrak{M}_p((0, \infty) \times [0, 1])$ denote the space of Radon point measures on $(0, \infty) \times [0, 1]$ with the vague topology. The standard reference is Resnick [47].

Proposition 4.1. *With $\beta_p < 0$, $d_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have the following weak convergence*

$$(4.6) \quad \xi_{n,K} \Rightarrow \xi_K := \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \delta_{(\mathfrak{C}_{F,p}^{1/\alpha} \Gamma_{\ell}^{-1/\alpha}, U_{\ell})} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathfrak{C}_{F,p}^{1/\alpha} \Gamma_{\ell}^{-1/\alpha} > K^{-1/\alpha}\}},$$

in $\mathfrak{M}_p((0, \infty) \times [0, 1])$, where $\mathfrak{C}_{F,p}$ is as in (4.2).

Note that the limit ξ_K in (4.6) is a Poisson point process.

In order to prove Proposition 4.1, we shall work with the following point processes

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{n,K} &:= \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}(n,K)} \delta_{([\varepsilon_i]([\Gamma_i]/r_n)^{-1/\alpha}, j/k_n)} \mathbf{1}_{\{R_{n,i} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j} \neq \emptyset\}}, \\ \bar{\eta}_{n,K} &:= \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{H}(n,K)} \delta_{([\varepsilon_i]([i]/r_n)^{-1/\alpha}, j/k_n)} \mathbf{1}_{\{R_{n,i} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j} \neq \emptyset\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that there is only one difference between the two above: the random product $[\Gamma_i]$ in $\eta_{n,K}$ replaced by the non-random product $[i]$ in $\bar{\eta}_{n,K}$. An overview of the approximations behind Proposition 4.1 is as follows. For some test set E ,

$$(4.7) \quad \xi_{n,K}(E) \underbrace{\approx \eta_{n,K}(E)}_{\text{Lemma 4.8}} \approx \bar{\eta}_{n,K}(E) \underbrace{\Rightarrow \xi_K(E)}_{\text{Lemma 4.2}}.$$

Then, for the proof of (4.1), we have

$$(4.8) \quad \mathbb{P}(M_n(E) \leq x) \underbrace{\approx}_{\text{Lemma 4.9}} \mathbb{P}(\xi_{n,K}(E) = 0).$$

The approximations above are understood with letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, with E fixed and K properly picked depending on E . The meaning of the approximations ‘ \approx ’ will be made precise in the lemmas indicated. In particular, we shall consider set of the form

$$(4.9) \quad E := (y_0, y_1] \times I \subset (0, \infty) \times [0, 1] \quad \text{with} \quad I = (a, b] \text{ or } [0, b] \subset [0, 1],$$

for some $0 < y_0 < y_1 \leq \infty$, and each set satisfying

$$(4.10) \quad 0 < K^{-1/\alpha} < y_0.$$

We mention that for proving Proposition 4.1 we shall fix K and consider all E described above, whereas for proving (4.1), we shall work with a fixed collection of E_1, \dots, E_d , and let $K \rightarrow \infty$ so that (4.10) is eventually satisfied.

The most involved step is a Poisson approximation between $\bar{\eta}_{n,K}$ and ξ over certain test sets, which will be proved first in Section 4.1. We then prove Proposition 4.1 in Section 4.2 and finally (4.1) in Section 4.3.

4.1. Two-moment method for Poisson approximation.

Lemma 4.2. *For $K > 0$ fixed and for all disjoint sets $E_s = (y_{s,0}, y_{s,1}] \times I_s$, $s = 1, \dots, d$, of the form (4.9) and suppose*

$$0 < K^{-1/\alpha} < \min_{s=1, \dots, d} y_{s,0}.$$

We have,

$$(4.11) \quad (\bar{\eta}_{n,K}(E_1), \dots, \bar{\eta}_{n,K}(E_d)) \Rightarrow (\xi_K(E_1), \dots, \xi_K(E_d)).$$

Moreover, $\bar{\eta}_{n,K} \Rightarrow \xi_K$ in $\mathfrak{M}_p((0, \infty) \times [0, 1])$.

Lemma 4.2 is a multivariate Poisson limit theorem for sums of dependent Bernoulli variables

$$\chi_{\mathbf{i},j} := \mathbf{1}_{\{[\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}}]=1\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{R_{n,\mathbf{i}} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j} \neq \emptyset\}},$$

with summation index sets

$$\mathfrak{J}_{n,s} := \left\{ (\mathbf{i}, j) \in \mathcal{H}(n, K) \times \{1, \dots, k_n\} : (([\mathbf{i}]r_n)^{-1/\alpha}, j/k_n) \in E_s \right\}, \quad s = 1, \dots, d,$$

In this way, we write

$$\bar{\eta}_{n,K}(E_s) = \sum_{(\mathbf{i},j) \in \mathfrak{J}_{n,s}} \chi_{\mathbf{i},j}, \quad s = 1, \dots, d.$$

We apply the well-known two-moment method of Arratia et al. [1, Theorem 2]. The dependence structure of the Bernoulli random variables $\chi_{\mathbf{i},j}$ can be described by a dependency graph ([42, Section 2.1]), where disconnection of subsets of nodes implies independence. Obviously for $\chi_{\mathbf{i},j}$, we can define $(\mathbf{i}, j) \sim (\mathbf{i}', j')$, namely, these two nodes to be connected, if $\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{i}' \neq \emptyset$ (regardless of j and j'). Here and below $\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{i}'$ is understood in the obvious way by regarding \mathbf{i} and \mathbf{i}' as subsets of \mathbb{N} and the elements of $\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{i}'$ listed in increasing order if it is nonempty.

Before stating the conditions for the two-moment method, we introduce a few notations. First, introduce the following counting numbers (recall $\mathcal{H}(n, K)$ in (4.5)):

$$(4.12) \quad C_{n,1}(K) := |\mathcal{H}(n, K)|,$$

$$(4.13) \quad C_{n,2}(r, K) := |\{(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{i}') : \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{i}' \in \mathcal{H}(n, K), |\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{i}'| = r\}|, \quad r = 1, \dots, p,$$

and the following probabilities

$$(4.14) \quad \rho_n := \mathbb{E}\chi_{\mathbf{i},j} = \mathbb{P}([\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}}] = 1) \cdot \mathbb{P}(R_{n,\mathbf{i}} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,1} \neq \emptyset) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \mathbb{P}(R_{n,\mathbf{i}} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,1} \neq \emptyset),$$

$$(4.15) \quad \rho_{n,\mathbf{i},\mathbf{i}',j,j'} := \mathbb{E}(\chi_{\mathbf{i},j} \chi_{\mathbf{i}',j'}) \leq \mathbb{P}(R_{n,\mathbf{i}} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j} \neq \emptyset, R_{n,\mathbf{i}'} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j'} \neq \emptyset).$$

Note that $C_{n,2}(p, K) = C_{n,1}(K)$, and for all j, j' fixed, $\rho_{n,\mathbf{i},\mathbf{i}',j,j'}$ has an identical value for all \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{i}' such that $|\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{i}'| = r$. Note also that in (4.15) we bound $\mathbb{P}([\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}}] = 1, [\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}'}] = 1) \leq 1$. Introduce

$$(4.16) \quad \rho_n(r) := \begin{cases} \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} \sum_{j'=1}^{k_n} \rho_{n,(1,\dots,p),(1,\dots,r,p+1,\dots,2p-r),j,j'}, & \text{if } r = 1, \dots, p-1, \\ \sum_{j,j' \in \{1,\dots,k_n\}, j \neq j'} \rho_{n,(1,\dots,p),(1,\dots,p),j,j'}, & \text{if } r = p. \end{cases}$$

In this way, we have

$$(4.17) \quad \mathbb{E}\bar{\eta}_{n,K}(E_s) = \sum_{(\mathbf{i},j) \in \mathfrak{J}_{n,s}} \mathbb{E}\chi_{\mathbf{i},j} = |\mathfrak{J}_{n,s}| \cdot \rho_n, \quad s = 1, \dots, d,$$

Next, we introduce, with $\mathfrak{J}_n := \mathcal{H}(n, K) \times \{1, \dots, k_n\}$,

$$(4.18) \quad b_{n,1}(K) := \sum_{(\mathbf{i},j) \in \mathfrak{J}_n} \sum_{\substack{(\mathbf{i}',j') \in \mathfrak{J}_n \\ (\mathbf{i},j) \sim (\mathbf{i}',j')}} \mathbb{E}\chi_{\mathbf{i},j} \mathbb{E}\chi_{\mathbf{i}',j'} = k_n^2 \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{i}' \in \mathcal{H}(n,K) \\ |\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{i}'| > 0}} \rho_n^2 = k_n^2 \rho_n^2 \sum_{r=1}^p C_{n,2}(r, K)$$

$$(4.19) \quad b_{n,2}(K) := \sum_{(\mathbf{i},j) \in \mathfrak{J}_n} \sum_{\substack{(\mathbf{i}',j') \in \mathfrak{J}_n \\ (\mathbf{i},j) \sim (\mathbf{i}',j')}} \mathbb{E}(\chi_{\mathbf{i},j} \chi_{\mathbf{i}',j'}) = \sum_{r=1}^p \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{i}' \in \mathcal{H}(n,K) \\ |\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{i}'| = r}} \rho_n(r) = \sum_{r=1}^p C_{n,2}(r, K) \rho_n(r),$$

Then, by [1, Theorem 2], the Poisson convergence (4.11) follows once we show

$$(4.20) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}\bar{\eta}_{n,K}(E_s) = \mathbb{E}\xi_K(E_s), \quad s = 1, \dots, d, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (b_{n,1}(K) + b_{n,2}(K)) = 0.$$

It remains to provide estimates for $C_{n,1}(K)$, $C_{n,2}(r, K)$, ρ_n and $\rho_n(r)$, and we shall proceed one by one. Note that we need exact asymptotics of $C_{n,1}(K)$ and ρ_n , and only the orders of $C_{n,2}(r, K)$ and $\rho_n(r)$.

Lemma 4.3. *As $r \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$(4.21) \quad |\mathcal{D}_p^*(r)| \sim \frac{r \log^{p-1}(r)}{p!(p-1)!}.$$

Proof. The key is to argue the integral approximation $|\mathcal{D}_p^*(r)| \sim \int_{[1,r]^p} \mathbf{1}_{\{x_1 \cdots x_p \leq r\}} d\mathbf{x}$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. Here we omit its proof, which is similar to a more sophisticated case below in the proof of Lemma 4.4. Then by change of variables,

$$(4.22) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{[1,r]^p} \mathbf{1}_{\{x_1 \cdots x_p \leq r\}} d\mathbf{x} &= \int_{[0, \log(r)]^p} e^{y_1 + \cdots + y_p} \mathbf{1}_{\{y_1 + \cdots + y_p \leq \log(r)\}} d\mathbf{y} \\ &= \frac{1}{(p-1)!} \int_0^{\log(r)} z^{p-1} e^z dz \sim \frac{r \log^{p-1}(r)}{(p-1)!}, \end{aligned}$$

as $r \rightarrow \infty$. □

Lemma 4.4. *Assume $\beta_p < 0$. We have, for all $K > 0$,*

$$C_{n,1}(K) = |\mathcal{H}(n, K)| \sim \frac{K}{p!(p-1)!} \mathbb{D}_{\beta,p} \cdot \frac{w_n^p}{n},$$

where

$$\mathbb{D}_{\beta,p} := \sum_{s=q_{\beta,p}}^p (-1)^{p-s} \binom{p}{s} (-\beta_s)^{p-1} \quad \text{with} \quad q_{\beta,p} := \min\{q \in \mathbb{N} : \beta_q < 0\}.$$

Proof. We shall approximate summations by the corresponding integrals as follows. For a general summable function $f : \mathbb{N}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}^p} f(\mathbf{i}) = \int_{[0,\infty)^p} f(\lceil x_1 \rceil, \dots, \lceil x_p \rceil) d\mathbf{x} = \int_{[0,\infty)^p} f(\lfloor x_1 \rfloor + 1, \dots, \lfloor x_p \rfloor + 1) d\mathbf{x}$. Here and below $\lfloor x \rfloor$ ($\lceil x \rceil$, resp.) denotes the greatest (smallest, resp.) integer less than or equal to (greater than or equal to, resp.) x , which should be distinguished with \mathbf{x} which denotes the product of all components of a vector \mathbf{x} . We first derive a crude upper bound. Let U_1, \dots, U_p be i.i.d. uniform random variables in $[0, 1]$. Then

$$(4.23) \quad \begin{aligned} C_{n,1}(K) &\leq \frac{1}{p!} \int_{[0,\infty)^p} \mathbf{1}_{\{\lceil x_1 \rceil \cdots \lceil x_p \rceil \leq Kr_n, \lceil x_i \rceil \leq w_n, i=1, \dots, p\}} d\mathbf{x} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{p!} \int_{\substack{x_1 \cdots x_p \leq Kr_n \\ 0 \leq x_i \leq w_n, i=1, \dots, p}} d\mathbf{x} \leq \frac{w_n^p}{p!} \mathbb{P}(U_1 \cdots U_p \leq Kr_n/w_n^p) \\ &\sim \frac{w_n^p}{p!} \frac{K(r_n/w_n^p)(-\log(r_n/w_n^p))^{p-1}}{(p-1)!} \sim \frac{K \alpha^{p-1}}{p!(p-1)!} \cdot r_n \log^{p-1}(n), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $r_n/w_n^p = c_n^{-\alpha} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and recalled in the third step that for $s \in (0, 1)$,

$$\mathbb{P}(U_1 \cdots U_p \leq s) = s \sum_{k=0}^{p-1} \frac{(-\log s)^k}{k!} \sim \frac{s(-\log s)^{p-1}}{(p-1)!}$$

as $s \downarrow 0$ [54, Lemma 3.1]. (This upper bound (4.23) is of the correct order $O(w_n^p/n)$, but not sharp in the multiplicative constant as shown below.)

Next we aim at precise upper and lower bounds. Write $C_{n,1}(K) = A_n + B_n$ with

$$\begin{aligned} A_n &:= |\{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}^p : \lceil \mathbf{i} \rceil \leq Kr_n, 2 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_p \leq w_n\}|, \\ B_n &:= |\{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}^p : \lceil \mathbf{i} \rceil \leq Kr_n, i_1 = 1, i_2 < \dots < i_p \leq w_n\}|. \end{aligned}$$

The crude upper bound (4.23) implies that $B_n = O(r_n(\log(n))^{p-2})$, which will be eventually negligible. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} p!A_n &= |\{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}^p : \lceil \mathbf{i} \rceil \leq Kr_n, 2 \leq i_s \leq w_n, s = 1, \dots, p, i_s \neq i_t \text{ if } s \neq t\}| \\ &= G_n - O(r_n(\log(n))^{p-2}), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$G_n = |\{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}^p : [i] \leq Kr_n, 2 \leq i_s \leq w_n, s = 1, \dots, p\}|,$$

and the negligible $O(r_n(\log(n))^{p-2})$ term follows from the upper bound (4.23) with p replaced by $p-1, p-2, \dots, 1$, which correspond to the number of distinct i_s 's.

Now we provide precise upper and lower bounds for G_n :

$$G_n = \int_{[1, \infty)^p} \mathbf{1}_{\{[x_1] \cdots [x_p] \leq Kr_n, [x_i] \leq w_n, i=1, \dots, p\}} d\mathbf{x} \leq \int_{[1, w_n]^p} \mathbf{1}_{\{[\mathbf{x}] \leq Kr_n\}} d\mathbf{x}$$

and

$$G_n = \int_{[1, \infty)^p} \mathbf{1}_{\{(\lfloor x_1 \rfloor + 1) \cdots (\lfloor x_p \rfloor + 1) \leq Kr_n, [x_i] + 1 \leq w_n, i=1, \dots, p\}} d\mathbf{x} \geq \int_{[2, w_n]^p} \mathbf{1}_{\{[\mathbf{x}] \leq Kr_n\}} d\mathbf{x}.$$

So for a fixed constant $a > 0$, we are left to compute the asymptotics of

$$G_n(a) := \int_{[a, w_n]^p} \mathbf{1}_{\{[\mathbf{x}] \leq Kr_n\}} d\mathbf{x} = (w_n - a)^p \mathbb{P}(U_{n,1} \times \cdots \times U_{n,p} \leq Kr_n),$$

where $U_{n,1}, \dots, U_{n,p}$ are i.i.d. uniform random variables over the interval (a, w_n) . The density of products of i.i.d. uniform random variables can be derived by an induction method [28] (or, see [19] for a simple complex-analysis argument), and one can derive the corresponding cumulative distribution function. In particular, from [28, (3.9)] we have, for all $a > 0$ fixed,

$$\begin{aligned} G_n(a) &:= (w_n - a)^p \mathbb{P}(U_{n,1} \cdots U_{n,p} \leq Kr_n) \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^p \binom{p}{s} (-1)^s \left(Kr_n \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \frac{(-1)^{j+1}}{(p-j)!} \left(\log \frac{Kr_n}{a^{p-s} w_n^s} \right)_+^{p-j} + (-1)^{p-1} (Kr_n - a^{p-s} w_n^s)_+ \right) \\ &\sim \frac{Kr_n}{(p-1)!} \sum_{s=0}^p (-1)^s \binom{p}{s} \left(\log \frac{r_n}{w_n^s} \right)_+^{p-1} \sim \frac{K}{(p-1)!} \sum_{s=q\beta, p}^p (-1)^{p-s} \binom{p}{s} (-\beta_s)^{p-1} \cdot \frac{w_n^p}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

where for the last asymptotic equivalence we have used (4.4). Note that the last expression does not depend on a . In summary, we have proved $C_{n,1}(K) \sim A_n \sim G_n/p! \sim G_n(1)/p!$ and the desired result follows. \square

Lemma 4.5. *For $r = 1, \dots, p-1$, we have*

$$(4.24) \quad C_{n,2}(r, K) \leq \begin{cases} C \frac{w_n^{2p}}{n^2} \log^{-2r} n, & \text{if } \beta_r > 0, \\ C \frac{w_n^{2p}}{n^2} \log^{-2r} n, & \text{if } \beta_r = 0, \\ C \frac{w_n^{2p-r}}{n} \log^{r-p} n, & \text{if } \beta_r < 0. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Write

$$\begin{aligned} (4.25) \quad C_{n,2}(r, K) &= \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{i}' \in \mathcal{H}(n, K) \\ |\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{i}'| = r}} 1 \leq C \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{H}(n, K)} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{i}' \in \mathcal{H}(n, K) \\ |\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{i}'| = r, i'_s \leq i_s, s=1, \dots, p}} 1 \\ &\leq C \binom{p}{r} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{H}(n, K)} [i_{r+1:p}] \leq C \sum_{i_{r+1} < \cdots < i_p \leq w_n} [i_{r+1:p}] \left| \mathcal{D}_r^* \left(\frac{r_n}{[i_{r+1:p}]} \right) \right| \\ &\leq Cr_n \log^{r-1} r_n \sum_{i_{r+1} < \cdots < i_p \leq w_n} 1 \leq Cr_n w_n^{p-r} \log^{r-1} r_n \sim C \frac{w_n^{2p-r}}{n} \frac{1}{\log^{p-r} r_n}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (4.21) in the first inequality of the last line.

On the other hand, using an integral re-expression of sum as in the proof of Lemma 4.3, and the fact $u/2 \leq \lfloor u \rfloor$ for $u \geq 1$, we have (recall \mathbf{v} denotes product of all components in \mathbf{v})

$$\begin{aligned}
C_{n,2}(r, K) &\leq \int_{\substack{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in [1, \infty)^{p-r} \\ \mathbf{z} \in [1, \infty)^r}} \mathbf{1}_{\{[\mathbf{x}][\mathbf{z}] \leq 2^p K r_n, [\mathbf{y}][\mathbf{z}] \leq 2^p K r_n\}} d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{z} \\
&= \int_{\mathbf{z} \in [1, \infty)^r, [\mathbf{z}] \leq 2^p K r_n} \left(\int_{\mathbf{x} \in [1, \infty)^{p-r}} \mathbf{1}_{\{[\mathbf{x}] \leq 2^p K r_n / [\mathbf{z}]\}} d\mathbf{x} \right)^2 d\mathbf{z} \\
(4.26) \quad &\leq C r_n^2 \log(r_n)^{2(p-r-1)} \int_{\mathbf{z} \in [1, \infty)^r, [\mathbf{z}] \leq 2^p K r_n} \frac{1}{[\mathbf{z}]^2} d\mathbf{z} \leq C r_n^2 \log(r_n)^{2(p-r-1)},
\end{aligned}$$

where in the third step we applied (4.22).

With our choice of r_n , $\log r_n \sim C \log n$. Then, the bound (4.25) ((4.26) resp.) is sharper if $\beta_r < 0$ ($\beta_r > 0$ resp.). If $r < p, \beta_r = 0$, then (4.25) yields an upper bound $C w_n^{2p} \log^{r-p} n / n^2$, and (4.26) $C w_n^{2p} \log^{-2r} n / n^2$. We simply use the latter upper bound for our purpose later, even it might not always be better than the former. The desired (4.24) now follows. \square

Lemma 4.6. *For ρ_n in (4.14), and with any $d_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$(4.27) \quad \rho_n \sim \frac{1}{2} \mathfrak{q}_{F,p} \frac{n}{k_n w_n^p}.$$

where $\mathfrak{q}_{F,p}$ is as in (2.2).

Proof. Introduce

$$\begin{aligned}
q_{n,1}^{(p)} &:= \mathbb{P} (R_{n,(1,\dots,p)} \cap \{1, \dots, d_n\} \neq \emptyset, \max R_{n,(1,\dots,p)} \leq d_n), \\
q_{n,2}^{(p)} &:= \mathbb{P} (R_{n,(1,\dots,p)} \cap \{1, \dots, d_n\} \neq \emptyset, \max R_{n,(1,\dots,p)} > d_n).
\end{aligned}$$

Then, $q_{n,1}^{(p)} \leq 2\rho_n \leq q_{n,1}^{(p)} + q_{n,2}^{(p)}$. For $q_{n,1}^{(p)}$ we can apply the last-renewal decomposition and Markov property:

$$\begin{aligned}
q_{n,1}^{(p)} &= \sum_{i=1}^{d_n} \mathbb{P} (\max R_{n,(1,\dots,p)} = i) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{d_n} \mathbb{P} (\max R_{n,(1,\dots,p)} = i \mid i \in R_{n,(1,\dots,p)}) \mathbb{P} (i \in R_{n,(1,\dots,p)}) = \sum_{i=1}^{d_n} \mathfrak{q}_{F,p} \frac{1}{w_n^p} = \frac{\mathfrak{q}_{F,p} d_n}{w_n^p}.
\end{aligned}$$

For $q_{n,2}^{(p)}$, write first by a similar decomposition based on the last renewal before time d_n ,

$$\begin{aligned}
q_{n,2}^{(p)} &= \sum_{i=1}^{d_n} \mathbb{P} (\max(R_{n,(1,\dots,p)} \cap \{1, \dots, d_n\}) = i, \max R_{n,(1,\dots,p)} > d_n) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^{d_n} \mathbb{P} (i \in R_{n,(1,\dots,p)}, \max R_{n,(1,\dots,p)} > d_n) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{d_n} \mathbb{P} (i \in R_{n,(1,\dots,p)}) \mathbb{P} (\max R_{n,(1,\dots,p)} > d_n \mid i \in R_{n,(1,\dots,p)}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{d_n} \frac{1}{w_n^p} \sum_{j=d_n-i+1}^{\infty} u(j)^p.
\end{aligned}$$

The last step above follows from the renewal property and then the union bound. With $v(i) := \sum_{j=i}^{\infty} u(j)^p \downarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$, the last expression becomes $w_n^{-p} \sum_{i=1}^{d_n} v(i) = d_n w_n^{-p} \sum_{i=1}^{d_n} (v(i)/d_n) = d_n w_n^{-p} o(1) = o(q_{n,1}^{(p)})$. We have thus proved (4.27). \square

Lemma 4.7. *With $\beta_p < 0$, if $d_n \rightarrow \infty, n/d_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $\rho_n(r)$ in (4.16) satisfies*

$$(4.28) \quad \rho_n(r) \leq \begin{cases} \frac{Cn^{1+\beta_r}}{w_n^{2p-r}}, & \text{if } \beta_r > 0, \\ \frac{Cn \log n}{w_n^{2p-r}}, & \text{if } \beta_r = 0, \\ \frac{Cn}{w_n^{2p-r}}, & \text{if } \beta_r < 0, r < p, \\ \frac{Cnd_n^{-(|\beta_p| \vee 1)} \log d_n}{w_n^p}, & \text{if } r = p. \end{cases}$$

In fact, the $\log d_n$ term in the case $r = p$ can be dropped if $\beta_p \neq -1$. We keep it for all values of β_p for the sake of simplicity.

Proof. We shall often use the following fact: $u(n) \leq Cn^{\beta-1}$ for some constant $C > 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (recall (2.1)). We first show that for all \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{i}' ,

$$(4.29) \quad \sum_{\substack{j, j'=1, \dots, k_n \\ |j-j'| > 1}} \rho_{n, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{i}', j, j'} \leq \begin{cases} C \frac{n^{1+\beta_r}}{w_n^{2p-r}}, & \text{if } \beta_r > 0, \\ C \frac{n \log k_n}{w_n^{2p-r}}, & \text{if } \beta_r = 0, \\ C \frac{nd_n^{\beta_r}}{w_n^{2p-r}}, & \text{if } \beta_r < 0, \end{cases} \quad \text{with } r = |\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{i}'|.$$

The relation above can be obtained in the following a unified argument for all 3 cases. Write

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{n, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{i}', j, j'} &\leq \mathbb{P}(R_{n, \mathbf{i}} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n, j} \neq \emptyset, R_{n, \mathbf{i}'} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n, j'} \neq \emptyset) \leq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}_{n, j}} \sum_{k' \in \mathcal{I}_{n, j'}} \mathbb{P}(k \in R_{n, \mathbf{i}}, k' \in R_{n, \mathbf{i}'}) \\ &= \frac{1}{w_n^{2p-2r}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}_{n, j}} \sum_{k' \in \mathcal{I}_{n, j'}} \mathbb{P}(k, k' \in R_{n, \mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{i}'}) = \frac{1}{w_n^{2p-2r}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}_{n, j}} \sum_{k' \in \mathcal{I}_{n, j'}} \left(\frac{u(|k-k'|)}{w_n} \right)^r \\ &\leq \frac{Cd_n^2}{w_n^{2p-2r}} \left(\frac{(d_n(|j-j'|-1))^{\beta-1}}{w_n} \right)^r \leq \frac{Cd_n^{1+\beta_r}}{w_n^{2p-r}} |j-j'|^{\beta_r-1}, \quad |j-j'| > 1, \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\sum_{\substack{j, j'=1, \dots, k_n \\ |j-j'| > 1}} \rho_{n, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{i}', j, j'} \leq C \frac{d_n^{1+\beta_r}}{w_n^{2p-r}} \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} (k_n - j) j^{\beta_r-1}.$$

Note $k_n \sim n/d_n \rightarrow \infty$. Now, (4.29) follows by applying

$$\sum_{j=1}^n (n-j) j^{\gamma-1} \leq \begin{cases} Cn^{\gamma+1}, & \text{if } \gamma > 0, \\ Cn \log n, & \text{if } \gamma = 0, \\ Cn, & \text{if } \gamma < 0. \end{cases}$$

For $|j - j'| \leq 1$, consider first $j' = j + 1$. Then, with $r = |\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{i}'|$,

$$\rho_{n,\mathbf{i},\mathbf{i}',j,j+1} \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{2d_n} \sum_{\substack{k \in \mathcal{I}_{n,j}, k' \in \mathcal{I}_{n,j+1} \\ |k-k'|=\ell}} \frac{u(\ell)^r}{w_n^{2p-r}} \leq \frac{C}{w_n^{2p-r}} \sum_{\ell=1}^{2d_n} \ell \cdot \ell^{\beta_r-1} \leq \begin{cases} \frac{C d_n^{\beta_r+1}}{w_n^{2p-r}}, & \text{if } \beta_r > -1, \\ \frac{C \log d_n}{w_n^{2p-r}}, & \text{if } \beta_r = -1, \\ \frac{C}{w_n^{2p-r}}, & \text{if } \beta_r < -1. \end{cases}$$

Similarly,

$$\rho_{n,\mathbf{i},\mathbf{i}',j,j} \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{d_n} \sum_{\substack{k, k' \in \mathcal{I}_{n,j} \\ |k-k'|=\ell}} \frac{u(\ell)^r}{w_n^{2p-r}} \leq \frac{C}{w_n^{2p-r}} \sum_{\ell=1}^{d_n} (d_n - \ell) \ell^{\beta_r-1} \leq \begin{cases} \frac{C d_n^{\beta_r+1}}{w_n^{2p-r}}, & \text{if } \beta_r > 0, \\ \frac{C d_n \log d_n}{w_n^{2p-r}}, & \text{if } \beta_r = 0, \\ \frac{C d_n}{w_n^{2p-r}}, & \text{if } \beta_r < 0. \end{cases}$$

One readily checks that the bounds for $\rho_{n,\mathbf{i},\mathbf{i}',j,j}$ are of equal or larger order than those for $\rho_{n,\mathbf{i},\mathbf{i}',j,j+1}$, regardless of the values of β_r . Therefore, we arrive at

$$(4.30) \quad \sum_{\substack{j, j'=1, \dots, k_n \\ |j-j'| \leq 1}} \rho_{n,\mathbf{i},\mathbf{i}',j,j'} \leq C k_n \rho_{n,\mathbf{i},\mathbf{i}',1,1} \leq \begin{cases} \frac{C n d_n^{\beta_r}}{w_n^{2p-r}}, & \text{if } \beta_r > 0, \\ \frac{C n \log d_n}{w_n^{2p-r}}, & \text{if } \beta_r = 0, \\ \frac{C n}{w_n^{2p-r}}, & \text{if } \beta_r < 0, r < p. \end{cases}$$

For the case $r = p$, recall that the summation now excludes $j = j'$ and hence in addition to (4.29) we only consider $|j - j'| = 1$. Then, by the bound on $\rho_{n,\mathbf{i},\mathbf{i}',j,j+1}$ above, we have

$$(4.31) \quad \sum_{\substack{j, j'=1, \dots, k_n \\ |j-j'|=1}} \rho_{n,\mathbf{i},\mathbf{i}',j,j'} \leq \frac{C n d_n^{-(|\beta_p| \vee 1)}}{w_n^p} \log d_n,$$

and the $\log d_n$ factor can be dropped if $\beta_p \neq -1$. Combining (4.29), (4.30) and (4.31), we obtain (4.28). \square

Proof of Lemma 4.2. Now we complete the proof of (4.20). It is straightforward to show

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \bar{\eta}_{n,K}(E_s) = \mathbb{E} \xi_K(E_s), s = 1, \dots, d,$$

Indeed, consider $E = (y_0, y_1] \times (a, b]$. Then from (4.17), by Lemma 4.4 (with $y_i^{-1/\alpha}$, $i = 0, 1$, playing the role of K there), Lemma 4.6 and the restriction $K^{-1/\alpha} < y_0 < y_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \bar{\eta}_{n,K}(E) &\sim (C_{n,1}(y_0^{-\alpha}) - C_{n,1}(y_1^{-\alpha})) \cdot (b-a) k_n \cdot \rho_n \\ &\sim (y_0^{-\alpha} - y_1^{-\alpha}) \frac{D_{\beta,p}}{p!(p-1)!} \frac{w_n^p}{n} \cdot (b-a) k_n \cdot \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{q}_{F,p} \frac{n}{k_n w_n^p} \\ &\rightarrow \frac{1}{2p!(p-1)!} (y_0^{-\alpha} - y_1^{-\alpha}) D_{\beta,p} \mathbf{q}_{F,p} (b-a) = \mathbb{E} \xi_K(E). \end{aligned}$$

Next, among the bounds for $C_{n,2}(r, K)$ in Lemma 4.5, the $r = 1$ (note that $\beta_1 = \beta > 0$) case is of the dominating order for $r = 1, \dots, p-1$. Recall also that $C_{n,2}(p, K) = C_{n,1}(K)$, for which we have the precise estimate in Lemma 4.4. Combining these into (4.18) we have

$$\begin{aligned} b_{n,1}(K) &\leq k_n^2 (CC_{n,2}(1, K) + C_{n,1}(K)) \rho_n^2 \\ &\leq Ck_n^2 \left(\frac{w_n^{2p}}{n^2} \log^{-2} n + r_n \log^{p-1} n \right) \left(\frac{n}{k_n w_n^p} \right)^2 \leq C \left(\frac{1}{\log^2 n} + n^{\beta_p} \right) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where for the last inequality we have used (4.4). At last by Lemmas 4.4, 4.5, 4.7, and the assumption $w_n \sim \frac{c_F}{1-\beta} n^{1-\beta}$,

$$\rho_n(r)C_n(r, K) \leq \begin{cases} C \log^{-2r}(n), & \text{if } \beta_r > 0, \\ C \log^{1-2r}(n), & \text{if } \beta_r = 0, \\ C \log^{r-p} n, & \text{if } \beta_r < 0, r < p, \\ C d_n^{-(|\beta_p| \vee 1)} \log d_n, & \text{if } r = p, \end{cases}$$

and in view of (4.19), we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_{n,2}(K) = 0$. We have thereby completed the proof of (4.20) and hence (4.11).

The fact that (4.11) implies the weak convergence of the point processes $\bar{\eta}_{n,K} \Rightarrow \xi_K$ in $\mathfrak{M}_p((0, \infty) \times [0, 1])$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ is well-known (e.g., by combining Kallenberg [30, Theorem 4.11(ii)] with Cramér–Wold Theorem.) Note that we shall need to apply (4.11) with a relaxed assumption on the test sets $E = (y_0, y_1] \times I$ so that $y_0 > 0$ (instead of $y_0 > K^{-1/\alpha}$ above). The modification does not effect the proof above as for the point processes of interest, there are no points of which the first coordinate has a value less than $K^{-1/\alpha}$ by our construction. \square

4.2. Proof of Proposition 4.1. Recall the overview of the approximations we shall work with in (4.7).

Next, we approximate $\xi_{n,K}$ by $\bar{\eta}_{n,K}$, with an intermediate approximation by $\eta_{n,K}$ as seen in the proof. Recall the set E in (4.9). Introduce accordingly

$$E^{\pm, \epsilon} := (y_0(1 \mp \epsilon)^{1/\alpha}, y_1(1 \pm \epsilon)^{1/\alpha}] \times (a, b].$$

We shall assume $0 < y_0 < y_1$ and eventually $\epsilon > 0$ small enough so that $y_0(1 + \epsilon)^{1/\alpha} < y_1(1 - \epsilon)^{1/\alpha}$. Otherwise, by convention $E^{-, \epsilon} = \emptyset$.

Lemma 4.8. *With the notations above, for all $\epsilon > 0$, with probability going to 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\bar{\eta}_{n,K}(E^{-, \epsilon}) \leq \xi_{n,K}(E) \leq \bar{\eta}_{n,K}(E^{+, \epsilon}).$$

Proof. Consider the following events

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{n,1}(K) &:= \bigcap_{j=1}^{k_n} \{ \exists \text{ at most one } \mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{H}(n, K) \text{ s.t. } R_{n,\mathbf{i}} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j} \neq \emptyset \}, \\ \Omega_{n,2}(K, \epsilon) &:= \left\{ \frac{[\Gamma_{\mathbf{i}}]}{[\mathbf{i}]} \in (1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon), \text{ for all } \mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{H}(n, K), R_{n,\mathbf{i}} \neq \emptyset \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall $\hat{m}_{n,j}^{(K)}/c_n = \max_{k \in \mathcal{I}_{n,j}} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{H}(n, K)} \frac{[\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}}]}{([\Gamma_{\mathbf{i}}]/r_n)^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{k \in R_{n,\mathbf{i}}\}}$. Then for all $K > 0$, when restricted to $\Omega_{n,1}(K)$, for each $j = 1, \dots, k_n$, the sets $\{\hat{m}_{n,j}^{(K)}/c_n : \hat{m}_{n,j}^{(K)} \neq 0\}$ and $\{[\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}}]([\Gamma_{\mathbf{i}}]/r_n)^{-1/\alpha} : \mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{H}(n, K), R_{n,\mathbf{i}} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j} \neq \emptyset\}$ coincide: both are empty if for all \mathbf{i} of interest $R_{n,\mathbf{i}} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j} = \emptyset$, or both are the same singleton set $\{\mathbf{i}\}$ (which is unique under $\Omega_{n,1}(K)$) such that $R_{n,\mathbf{i}} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j} \neq \emptyset$. It follows that $\xi_{n,K} = \eta_{n,K}$ under $\Omega_{n,1}(K)$.

Next, note that the only difference between $\bar{\eta}_{n,K}$ and $\eta_{n,K}$ is that for each \mathbf{i} , the random $[\Gamma_{\mathbf{i}}]$ in $\eta_{n,K}$ is replaced by the nonrandom $[\mathbf{i}]$ in $\bar{\eta}_{n,K}$. If restricted to $\Omega_{n,1}(K, \epsilon) \cap \Omega_{n,2}(K, \epsilon)$, it easily follows from monotonicity that $\bar{\eta}_{n,K}(E^{-, \epsilon}) \leq \eta_{n,K}(E) \leq \bar{\eta}_{n,K}(E^{+, \epsilon})$ (only those \mathbf{i} with $R_{n,\mathbf{i}} \neq \emptyset$ and $[\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}}] = 1$ matters).

Combining the above, to prove the desired result, it remains to show that the two events $\Omega_{n,1}(K)$ and $\Omega_{n,2}(K)$ each occur with probability tending to one as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

We first prove $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\Omega_{n,1}(K)) = 1$. This follows from the fact that the limit of $\bar{\eta}_{n,K}$ is Poisson. A more detailed argument can be given by using the estimates needed in the Poisson approximation. Indeed, setting $N_n(K) = \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{i}' \in \mathcal{H}(n,K)} \mathbf{1}_{\{R_{n,i} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j} \neq \emptyset, R_{n,i'} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j} \neq \emptyset\}}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\Omega_{n,1}(K)^c) &= \mathbb{P}(N_n(K) \geq 1) \leq \mathbb{E}N_n(K) = \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{i}' \in \mathcal{H}(n,K)} \rho_{n,\mathbf{i},\mathbf{i}',j} \\ &\leq C_{n,1}(K)^2 k_n \rho_n^2 + \sum_{r=1}^{p-1} C_{n,2}(r,K) \rho_n(r) \end{aligned}$$

where the last bound is obtained by dividing the double sum over $(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{i}')$ into two cases: $\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{i}' = \emptyset$ and $\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{i}' \neq \emptyset$. The first term in the bound, in view of Lemmas 4.4 and 4.6, is bounded up to a constant by $k_n^{-1} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The second term in the bound is $b_{n,2}(K)$ in (4.19) which tends to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$ as already shown.

At last, we show that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\Omega_{n,2}(K, \epsilon)) = 1$. As an intermediate step, we claim that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ fixed,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\exists \mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_p) \in \mathcal{H}(n, K), \text{ s.t. } R_{n,\mathbf{i}} \neq \emptyset, i_1 \leq m) = 0.$$

Indeed, by a union bound, Lemma 4.6, (4.4) and (4.23) (p there replaced by $p-1$), the probability displayed above is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} (4.32) \quad nw_n^{-p} |\{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{H}(n, K) : i_1 \leq m\}| &\leq nw_n^{-p} m |\{(i_2, \dots, i_p) \in \mathcal{D}_{p-1}^*(Kr_n) : i_p \leq w_n\}| \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\log(n)} \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then, the desired result follows from the strong law of large numbers: $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{i > m} |\Gamma_i/i - 1| = 0$ almost surely. \square

Proof of Proposition 4.1. Consider any collection of E_1, \dots, E_d as in Lemma 4.2 above. Then, based on Lemmas 4.8 and 4.2, the almost sure convergence $\xi_K(E_s^{\pm, \epsilon}) \rightarrow \xi_K(E_s)$ as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$, we conclude that as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$(4.33) \quad (\xi_{n,K}(E_1), \dots, \xi_{n,K}(E_d)) \Rightarrow (\xi_K(E_1), \dots, \xi_K(E_d)).$$

The desired result now follows. \square

4.3. Proof of (4.1). We first provide a uniform control on the remainder of the truncation.

Lemma 4.9. *We have*

$$(4.34) \quad \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{C_n} \max_{k=1, \dots, n} |X_{n,k} - X_{n,k}^{(K)}| > \epsilon \right) = 0 \text{ for all } \epsilon > 0.$$

Proof. Recall $X_{n,k}^{(K)} = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{H}(n,K)} w_n^{p/\alpha} \frac{[\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}}]}{[\Gamma_{\mathbf{i}}]^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{k \in R_{n,\mathbf{i}}\}}$. With probability tending to one as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we claim that

$$X_{n,k}^{(K)} = \tilde{X}_{n,k}^{(K)} := \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{D}_p^*(Kr_n)} w_n^{p/\alpha} \frac{[\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}}]}{[\Gamma_{\mathbf{i}}]^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{k \in R_{n,\mathbf{i}}\}}, \quad k = 1, \dots, n.$$

Indeed, Note that if $r_n \leq Cw_n$ for some constant $C > 0$ (equivalently $\beta_{p-1} \geq 0$), then for n large enough, $\mathcal{H}(n, K) = \mathcal{D}_p^*(Kr_n)$, and there is nothing to prove. So assume $\beta_{p-1} < 0$. The key observation is that for $X_{n,k}^{(K)}$ and $\tilde{X}_{n,k}^{(K)}$ to differ for some k , then necessarily there exists $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_p) \in \mathcal{D}_p^*(Kr_n)$ such that $i_p > w_n$ and $k \in R_{n,\mathbf{i}}$. However, $i_p > w_n$ implies necessarily that $(i_1, \dots, i_{p-1}) \in \mathcal{D}_{p-1}^*(Kr_n/w_n)$. But,

$$(4.35) \quad \widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{p-1}^*(Kr_n/w_n) := \{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{D}_{p-1}^*(Kr_n/w_n) : R_{n,\mathbf{i}} \neq \emptyset\}$$

is an empty set with probability tending to one as $n \rightarrow \infty$, in the case $\beta_{p-1} < 0$. Indeed, using Lemma 4.6 (with $d_n = n$), (4.21) and (4.4), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{p-1}^*(Kr_n/w_n) \right| \leq C \left| \mathcal{D}_{p-1}^*(Kr_n/w_n) \right| \frac{n}{w_n^{p-1}} \leq C \frac{nr_n}{w_n^p} \log^{p-2} r_n \leq \frac{C}{\log n} \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Therefore, it suffices to show (4.34) with $X_{n,k}^{(K)}$ replaced by $\widetilde{X}_{n,k}$. To do so, we introduce fixed $m \in \mathbb{N}$ to be chosen later. By (4.4), a triangular inequality, and the inequality $\max_k (\sum_\ell a_{k\ell}) \leq \sum_\ell \max_k (a_{k\ell})$, $a_{k\ell} \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{c_n} \max_{k=1, \dots, n} \left| X_{n,k} - \widetilde{X}_{n,k}^{(K)} \right| &= \max_{k=1, \dots, n} \left| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}_p \setminus \mathcal{D}_p^*(Kr_n)} r_n^{1/\alpha} \frac{[\varepsilon_i]}{[\Gamma_i]^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{k \in R_{n,i}\}} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{q=0}^{p-1} \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_q \leq m} \frac{1}{[\Gamma_{i_1:q}]^{1/\alpha}} Z_{n,i_1, \dots, i_q}(K) \end{aligned}$$

with

$$Z_{n,i_1, \dots, i_q}(K) := \max_{k=1, \dots, n} r_n^{1/\alpha} \left| \sum_{m < i_{q+1} < \dots < i_p, i_1 \dots i_p > Kr_n} \frac{[\varepsilon_{i_{q+1:p}}]}{[\Gamma_{i_{q+1:p}}]^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{k \in R_{n,i}\}} \right|, \quad q = 0, \dots, p-1.$$

When $q = 0$, we understand $Z_{n,i_1, \dots, i_q}(K)$ above as

$$Z_{n,\emptyset}(K) := \max_{k=1, \dots, n} r_n^{1/\alpha} \left| \sum_{m < i_1 < \dots < i_p, i_1 \dots i_p > Kr_n} \frac{[\varepsilon_i]}{[\Gamma_i]^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{k \in R_{n,i}\}} \right|.$$

Therefore, it suffices to show that for each $q = 0, \dots, p-1$ and $i_1 < \dots < i_q \leq m$ fixed,

$$(4.36) \quad \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(Z_{n,i_1, \dots, i_q}(K) > \epsilon) = 0 \text{ for all } \epsilon > 0.$$

Bounding the max by a sum, using the orthogonality induced by $[\varepsilon_{i_{q+1:p}}]$, the fact $P(k \in R_{n,i}) = w_n^{-p}$ and (3.12) (for which it suffices to choose $m \geq 2p/\alpha$), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} Z_{n,i_1, \dots, i_q}(K)^2 &= r_n^{2/\alpha} \mathbb{E} \left(\max_{k=1, \dots, n} \left| \sum_{m < i_{q+1} < \dots < i_p, [i] > Kr_n} \frac{[\varepsilon_{i_{q+1:p}}]}{[\Gamma_{i_{q+1:p}}]^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{k \in R_{n,i}\}} \right|^2 \right) \\ &\leq C \frac{nr_n^{2/\alpha}}{w_n^p} \sum_{\substack{m < i_{q+1} < \dots < i_p \\ i_{q+1} \dots i_p > Kr_n/m^q}} (i_{q+1} \dots i_p)^{-2/\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we estimate the multiple sum above by an integral approximation and suitable change of variables:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{m < i_{q+1} < \dots < i_p \\ i_{q+1} \dots i_p > Kr_n/m^q}} (i_{q+1} \dots i_p)^{-2/\alpha} &\leq \int_{[m, \infty)^{p-q}} (x_{q+1} \dots x_p)^{-2/\alpha} \mathbf{1}_{\{(x_{q+1}+1) \dots (x_p+1) > Kr_n/m^q\}} d\mathbf{x} \\ &= m^{(p-q)(1-2/\alpha)} \int_{[0, \infty)^{p-q}} e^{(1-2/\alpha)(y_1 + \dots + y_{p-q})} \mathbf{1}_{\{(me^{y_1+1}) \dots (me^{y_{p-q}+1}) > Kr_n/m^q\}} d\mathbf{y} \\ &\leq m^{(p-q)(1-2/\alpha)} \int_{[0, \infty)^{p-q}} e^{(1-2/\alpha)(y_1 + \dots + y_{p-q})} \mathbf{1}_{\{y_1 + \dots + y_{p-q} > \log(Kr_n) - p \log(m+1)\}} d\mathbf{y} \\ &\leq C \int_{\log(Kr_n)}^\infty e^{(1-2/\alpha)z} z^{p-q-1} dz \leq C (Kr_n)^{1-2/\alpha} \log^{p-q-1}(Kr_n), \end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality above we used $me^{yj} + 1 \leq (m+1)e^{yj}$, $j = 1, \dots, p-q$. Hence with (4.4) one concludes

$$(4.37) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}Z_{n,i_1,\dots,i_q}(K)^2 &\leq Cnw_n^{-p}r_n^{2/\alpha}(Kr_n)^{1-2/\alpha}\log^{p-q-1}(Kr_n) \\ &\leq \frac{CK^{1-2/\alpha}\log^{p-q-1}(Kn)}{\log^{p-1}n}, \quad q = 0, \dots, p-1. \end{aligned}$$

So (4.36) follows from Markov inequality, and hence the whole proof is finished. \square

Proof of (4.1). Recall that we introduced the random sup-measures as stochastic processes indexed by open sets $G \in \mathcal{G}$. However, for the proof it suffices to focus on open intervals $G \in \mathcal{G}_0$ of $[0, 1]$ [38, Theorem 3.2]. Then, the goal is to show for any nonempty open intervals G_i , $i = 1, \dots, d$, of $[0, 1]$, that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{c_n} M_n(G_i) \leq x_i, i = 1, \dots, d \right) &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_\alpha^{\text{is}}(G_i) \leq x_i, i = 1, \dots, d) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(\xi \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^d ((x_i, \infty] \times G_i) \right) = 0 \right). \end{aligned}$$

We have established (4.33), which implies that

$$(4.38) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{c_n} \max_{j/k_n \in G_i} \widehat{m}_{n,j}^{(K)} \leq x_i, i = 1, \dots, d \right) = \mathbb{P} \left(\xi_K \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^d ((x_i, \infty] \times G_i) \right) = 0 \right).$$

This will be shown to imply that

$$(4.39) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{c_n} \max_{k/n \in G_i} \widehat{X}_{n,k}^{(K)} \leq x_i, i = 1, \dots, d \right) = \mathbb{P} \left(\xi_K \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^d ((x_i, \infty] \times G_i) \right) = 0 \right).$$

Indeed, for any open interval $G \subset [0, 1]$ and large enough n , the two terms $c_n^{-1} \max_{k/n \in G} X_{n,k}^{(K)}$ and $c_n^{-1} \max_{j/k_n \in G} \widehat{m}_{n,j}^{(K)}$ could differ due to two possibilities: first, the sets $\{k \in \mathbb{N} : k/n \in G\}$ and $\{k \in \mathcal{I}_{n,j} : j/k_n \in G\}$ possibly differ near the boundaries of G with at most $O(b_n)$ different indices; second, if $\sup G = 1$, the first term involves also the last partial block $\mathcal{I}_{n,k_n+1} := \{d_n k_n + 1, \dots, n\}$. Suppose first $G = (a, b)$ with $0 < a < b < 1$. It is clear that for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough so that $0 < a - \epsilon < a + \epsilon < b - \epsilon < b + \epsilon < 1$, and n large enough, we have

$$\max_{j/k_n \in (a+\epsilon, b-\epsilon)} \widehat{m}_{n,j}^{(K)} \leq \max_{k/n \in (a,b)} X_{n,k}^{(K)} \leq \max_{j/k_n \in (a-\epsilon, b+\epsilon)} \widehat{m}_{n,j}^{(K)}.$$

Therefore, (4.39) follows from a sandwich approximation argument based on (4.38). Similar arguments applies if $0 = \inf G < \sup G < 1$. When $\sup G = 1$, it suffices to additionally apply the fact: $c_n^{-1} \max_{k \in \mathcal{I}_{n,k_n+1}} X_{n,k}^{(K)} \stackrel{d}{=} c_n^{-1} \max_{k=1, \dots, n-k_n d_n} X_{n,k}^{(K)} = o_p(1)$, where the last relation again follows from a similar approximation argument using (4.38).

Now (4.39) has been verified. At the same time, we also have by Lemma 4.9,

$$\left| \frac{1}{c_n} \max_{k/n \in G_i} X_{n,k} - \frac{1}{c_n} \max_{k/n \in G_i} X_{n,k}^{(K)} \right| \leq \frac{1}{c_n} \max_{k=1, \dots, n} |X_{n,k} - X_{n,k}^{(K)}|,$$

and that one readily checks $\xi_K \Rightarrow \xi$ as $K \rightarrow \infty$. Now, the desired convergence follows from a standard triangular-array approximation (e.g. [13, Theorem 3.2]). \square

Remark 4.10. In Lemma 4.2, if we do not work with $\mathcal{H}(n, K)$ but always with $\mathcal{D}_p^*(Kr_n)$ when $\beta_{p-1} < 0$, then the two-moment method fails. In particular, the convergence $b_{n,2}(K) \rightarrow 0$ (now $b_{n,2}(K)$ is summing over a larger region) no longer holds, and moreover we do not have the same asymptotics for $\mathbb{E}\overline{\eta}_{n,K}(E)$. The delicate picture is due to the emergence of conditional clusters of unbounded size. Consider

$$\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_p^*(Kr_n) := \left\{ \mathbf{i} \in \widehat{\mathcal{D}}_p^*(Kr_n) : R_{n,\mathbf{i}} \neq \emptyset \right\} = \widehat{\mathcal{D}}_p^{*,1}(Kr_n) \cup \widehat{\mathcal{D}}_p^{*,2}(Kr_n),$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_p^{*,1}(Kr_n) &:= \left\{ \mathbf{i} \in \widehat{\mathcal{D}}_p^*(Kr_n) : R_{n,\mathbf{i}} \neq \emptyset, i_p \leq w_n \right\}, \\ \widehat{\mathcal{D}}_p^{*,2}(Kr_n) &:= \left\{ \mathbf{i} \in \widehat{\mathcal{D}}_p^*(Kr_n) : R_{n,\mathbf{i}} \neq \emptyset, i_p > w_n \right\},\end{aligned}$$

and recall $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{p-1}^*(Kr_n/w_n)$ as in (4.35). We have shown that $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{p-1}^*(Kr_n/w_n)$ is an empty set as $n \rightarrow \infty$ with probability going to one, and hence so is the set $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_p^{*,2}(Kr_n)$ (so there is no contribution from random variables associated to $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_p^{*,2}(Kr_n)$ in the Poisson limit). However, one can verify that $\mathbb{E}|\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_p^{*,i}(Kr_n)|, i = 1, 2$, are of the same order w_n^p/n . This necessarily implies that given that $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_p^{*,2}(Kr_n)$ is non-empty (say with probability $p_n \downarrow 0$), its size is of order $1/p_n \rightarrow \infty$.

Similar phenomena are known in limit theorems for extremes for other models with delicate dependence. See for example [31] for the explanation of a similar situation regarding extremes for the random energy model.

5. CONVERGENCE FOR RANDOM SUP-MEASURES, $\beta_p = 0$

Throughout this section, assume $\beta_p = 0$, or equivalently

$$\beta = \frac{p-1}{p}, \quad p \geq 2.$$

The goal of this section is to prove the following case of Theorem 1.4 with $\beta_p = 0$:

$$(5.1) \quad \frac{1}{c_n} \{M_n(G)\}_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \xrightarrow{f.d.d.} \left\{ \mathfrak{C}_{F,p}^{1/\alpha} \mathcal{M}_\alpha^{\text{is}}(G) \right\}_{G \in \mathcal{G}}$$

where

$$(5.2) \quad c_n = \left(\frac{n(\log \log n)^{p-1}}{\log n} \right)^{1/\alpha} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{C}_{F,p} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{(\mathbf{C}_F \Gamma(\beta) \Gamma(1-\beta))^p}{p!(p-1)!}.$$

Again we start by presenting an overview of the approximations. Recall that $\mathcal{I}_{n,j} = \{(j-1)d_n + 1, \dots, jd_n\}, j = 1, \dots, k_n = \lfloor n/d_n \rfloor$, but this time we shall specifically work with

$$(5.3) \quad d_n \sim \frac{n}{\log^p n} \quad \text{and} \quad k_n \sim \frac{n}{d_n} \sim \log^p n.$$

Accordingly, we have now

$$(5.4) \quad r_n = \frac{w_n^p}{c_n^\alpha} \sim \left(\frac{\mathbf{C}_F}{1-\beta} \right)^p \frac{\log n}{(\log \log n)^{p-1}}.$$

We emphasize that we use the same symbols d_n, k_n, c_n, r_n as in Section 4, but they are defined differently here. We also use the same definitions for random variables $\xi_{n,K}, \eta_{n,K}, \bar{\eta}_{n,K}$ defined as in the previous section, but now with the rates chosen above.

The key behind (5.1) is again the following (in place of Proposition 4.1), but now with a different normalizing constant in the limit ξ and hence ξ_K .

Proposition 5.1. *With $\beta_p < 0$, $d_n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\xi_{n,K} := \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} \delta_{(\widehat{m}_{n,j}^{(K)}/c_{n,j}/k_n)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\widehat{m}_{n,j}^{(K)} \neq 0\}} \Rightarrow \xi_K := \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \delta_{(\mathfrak{C}_{F,p}^{1/\alpha} \Gamma_\ell^{-1/\alpha}, U_\ell)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathfrak{C}_{F,p}^{1/\alpha} \Gamma_\ell^{-1/\alpha} > K\}},$$

in $\mathfrak{M}_p((0, \infty] \times [0, 1])$, where $\mathfrak{C}_{F,p}$ is as in (5.2).

The proof is similar as the one with $\beta_p < 0$ in Section 4, and proceeds by a series of approximations as summarized below in place of (4.7) and (4.8). For the proof of Proposition 5.1, for some test set E , we have

$$\xi_{n,K}(E) \underbrace{\approx \eta_{n,K}(E)}_{\text{Lemma 5.10}} \approx \underbrace{\bar{\eta}_{n,K}(E)}_{\text{Lemma 5.4}} \Rightarrow \xi_K(E).$$

Then, for the proof of (5.1), this time we have

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n(E) \leq x) \underset{\text{Lemma 5.11}}{\approx} \mathbb{P}(\xi_{n,K}(E) = 0).$$

Lemmas 5.10, 5.4 and 5.11 respectively correspond to Lemmas 4.8, 4.2 and 4.9 for the subcritical case $\beta_p < 0$ in Section 4.

Remark 5.2. Despite the fact that in both regimes the limit extremes are independently scattered, geometries underlying the Poisson approximation for local extremes are different. Therefore so are the proofs for Lemmas 5.4 and 5.11 and Lemmas 4.2 and 4.9 mentioned above. The different geometries can be viewed from the following two aspects.

- (a) The shape of the region that contributes in each regime is different. In the sub-critical regime, it is possible that $r_n \gg w_n$ (this is the case if $\beta_{p-1} < 0$, and the shape has a delicate influence in the limit through the constant $D_{\beta,p}$), while at critical regime $r_n \ll w_n$ by our assumption. In particular, for n large enough $\mathcal{H}(n, K) = \mathcal{D}_p^*(Kr_n)$ and there is no need to work with $\mathcal{H}(n, K)$.
- (b) Second, in terms of the size d_n reflecting the size of each local extremal cluster, we see that the order is drastically different from the sub-critical regime. Recall that in that regime only $d_n \rightarrow \infty$ and $n/d_n \rightarrow \infty$ are assumed. Here, however, we have more restrictive constraints on both upper and lower bounds of the rate. Indeed, in order to apply the two-moment method we actually need (see Lemmas 5.5 and 5.6 below)

$$(5.5) \quad k_n^{\beta_{p-1}} = k_n^{1/p} \geq C \log n \quad \text{and} \quad \log k_n = o(\log d_n).$$

For a lower bound on the rate of $d_n \rightarrow \infty$, the first part of Lemma 5.6 enforces the constraint

$$C_{n,1}(K)k_n\mathbb{P}(R_{n,i} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,1}) \sim C \frac{\log n \cdot k_n d_n}{n \log d_n} = O(1),$$

which implies already a lower bound $\log d_n \geq C \log n$ on the rate $d_n \rightarrow \infty$. The estimate above is sharp and hence $d_n \rightarrow \infty$ has to grow at least at a polynomial rate, which is different from the sub-critical regime.

Remark 5.3. The more restrictive second constraint in (5.5) on the lower bound, coming from (5.8), requires that $d_n \sim nL(n)$ for some slowly varying function L as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We do not know whether (5.8) is optimal. For the upper bound on $d_n \rightarrow \infty$, the first constraint in (5.5), coming from Lemma 5.9 below, is more restrictive than $n/d_n \rightarrow \infty$. We do not know if our estimate on this part is optimal either.

5.1. Two-moment method.

Lemma 5.4. *With $\beta_p = 0$, we have*

$$\bar{\eta}_{n,K} = \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}_p^*(n,K)} \delta_{([\varepsilon_i]([i]/r_n)^{-1/\alpha}, j/k_n)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\varepsilon_i=1\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{R_{n,i} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j} \neq \emptyset\}} \Rightarrow \xi_K$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in $\mathfrak{M}_p((0, \infty] \times [0, 1])$.

Again we check the conditions of two-moments method as in (4.20). Recall that $C_{n,1}(K)$, $C_{n,2}(r, K)$, ρ_n and $\rho_n(r)$ are defined the same way as before (see (4.12), (4.13), (4.14), (4.15)), but with different rates r_n, c_n, d_n, k_n . The following estimates collect results that are similar as in Section 4.

Lemma 5.5. *We have*

$$C_{n,1}(K) \sim \frac{K}{p!(p-1)!} \left(\frac{C_F}{1-\beta} \right)^p \log n,$$

and

$$(5.6) \quad C_{n,2}(r, K) \leq C \frac{\log^2 n}{(\log \log n)^{2r}}, \quad r = 1, \dots, p-1.$$

Furthermore, as n and $d_n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$(5.7) \quad \rho_n = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \mathbb{P}(R_{n,i} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j} \neq \emptyset) \sim \frac{1}{2} \frac{d_n}{w_n^p} \frac{(\mathbb{C}_F \Gamma(\beta) \Gamma(1-\beta))^p}{\log d_n}.$$

Proof. Recall in this case $\mathcal{H}(n, K) = \mathcal{D}_p^*(Kr_n)$ when n is large enough and r_n is now as in (5.4). The first relation follows from Lemma 4.3. The second relation (5.6) follows from (4.26). For the third relation, we first recall the the p -intersection of renewal processes, and \bar{F}_p in (2.4). Thus, using a last-renewal decomposition, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(R_{n,i} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,1} \neq \emptyset) = \sum_{k=1}^{d_n} \frac{1}{w_n^p} \bar{F}_p(d_n - k) \sim \frac{d_n}{w_n^p} \frac{(\mathbb{C}_F \Gamma(\beta) \Gamma(1-\beta))^p}{\log d_n}.$$

□

The estimate of $\rho_n(r)$ in (4.16) is summarized below.

Lemma 5.6. *Furthermore,*

$$\rho_n(r) \leq \begin{cases} \frac{C}{k_n^{\beta r} \log d_n} + \frac{C}{\log^2 d_n}, & \text{if } r = 1, \dots, p-1, \\ \frac{C}{\log^{3/2} d_n} + \frac{C \log k_n}{\log^2 d_n}, & \text{if } r = p. \end{cases}$$

The proof is divided into the following three lemmas. We first estimate the summation “off the diagonal” in (4.16).

Lemma 5.7. *We have for $r := |\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{i}'| = 1, \dots, p-1$,*

$$\sum_{\substack{j, j'=1, \dots, k_n \\ |j-j'| \geq 1}} \mathbb{P}(R_{n,i} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j} \neq \emptyset, R_{n,i'} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j'} \neq \emptyset) \leq \frac{C}{\log^2 d_n},$$

and for $r = p$ (hence $\mathbf{i} = \mathbf{i}'$)

$$(5.8) \quad \sum_{\substack{j, j'=1, \dots, k_n \\ |j-j'| \geq 2}} \mathbb{P}(R_{n,i} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j} \neq \emptyset, R_{n,i} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j'} \neq \emptyset) \leq \frac{C \log k_n}{\log^2 d_n}.$$

Proof. Introduce

$$(5.9) \quad \hat{f}_{n,i,j} := \min(R_{n,i} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j}) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\ell}_{n,i,j} := \max(R_{n,i} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j}).$$

Recall again that one can find a constant $C > 0$ such that $u(n) \leq Cn^{\beta-1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Write, by the first-renewal decomposition,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(R_{n,i} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,1} \neq \emptyset, R_{n,i'} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j+1} \neq \emptyset) &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}_{n,1}} \sum_{k' \in \mathcal{I}_{n,j+1}} \mathbb{P}(\hat{f}_{n,i,1} = k, \hat{\ell}_{n,i',j} = k') \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}_{n,1}} \mathbb{P}(\hat{f}_{n,i,1} = k) \sum_{k' \in \mathcal{I}_{n,j+1}} u(k' - k)^r \frac{1}{w_n^{p-r}} \bar{F}_p((j+1)d_n - k') \\ &\leq C \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}_{n,1}} \mathbb{P}(\hat{f}_{n,i,1} = k) \sum_{k' \in \mathcal{I}_{n,j+1}} (k' - d_n)^{(\beta-1)r} \frac{1}{w_n^{p-r}} \bar{F}_p((j+1)d_n - k') \\ (5.10) \quad &= C \mathbb{P}(R_{n,i} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,1} \neq \emptyset) \frac{1}{w_n^{p-r}} \sum_{k=(j-1)d_n+1}^{jd_n} k^{\beta r - 1} \bar{F}_p(jd_n - k). \end{aligned}$$

If $j \geq 2$, $r = 1, \dots, p$, the summation above can be bounded as (recall $\beta_r < 1$ always)

$$\sum_{k=(j-1)d_n+1}^{jd_n} k^{\beta_r-1} \overline{F}_p(jd_n - k) \leq ((j-1)d_n + 1)^{\beta_r-1} \sum_{k=0}^{d_n-1} \overline{F}_p(k) \leq C \frac{j^{\beta_r-1} d_n^{\beta_r}}{\log d_n}.$$

If $j = 1$, $r < p$, and d_n is sufficiently large, exploiting monotonicity we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{d_n} k^{\beta_r-1} \overline{F}_p(d_n - k) &\leq \overline{F}_p(d_n/2) \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor d_n/2 \rfloor} k^{\beta_r-1} + (d_n/2)^{\beta_r-1} \sum_{k=\lfloor d_n/2 \rfloor+1}^{d_n} \overline{F}_p(d_n - k) \\ (5.11) \qquad \qquad \qquad &\leq C \frac{d_n^{\beta_r}}{\log d_n}. \end{aligned}$$

(Notice that we used $\beta_r < 0$ above and hence $r = p$ is excluded.) Therefore combining the above to (5.10) with also (5.7), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(R_{n,i} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,1} \neq \emptyset, R_{n,i'} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j+1} \neq \emptyset) &\leq C \frac{\rho_n}{w_n^{p-r}} \frac{d_n^{\beta_r} j^{\beta_r-1}}{\log d_n} \\ &\leq \frac{C d_n^{\beta_r+1}}{n^{\beta_r+1} \log^2 d_n} j^{\beta_r-1} \end{aligned}$$

for all (i) $r = 1, \dots, p-1, j, n \in \mathbb{N}$ or (ii) $r = p, j \geq 2, n \in \mathbb{N}$, for some constant $C > 0$. Therefore, for $|\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{i}'| = r \leq p-1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{j, j'=1, \dots, k_n \\ |j-j'| \geq 1}} \mathbb{P}(R_{n,i} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j} \neq \emptyset, R_{n,i'} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j'} \neq \emptyset) &\leq C \frac{d_n^{\beta_r+1}}{n^{\beta_r+1} \log^2 d_n} \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} (k_n - j) j^{\beta_r-1} \\ &\leq C \frac{d_n^{\beta_r+1} k_n^{\beta_r+1}}{n^{\beta_r+1} \log^2 d_n} \leq \frac{C}{\log^2 d_n}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{j, j'=1, \dots, k_n \\ |j-j'| \geq 2}} \mathbb{P}(R_{n,i} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j} \neq \emptyset, R_{n,i} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j'} \neq \emptyset) &\leq C \frac{d_n}{n \log^2 d_n} \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} (k_n - j) j^{-1} \\ &\leq C \frac{d_n k_n \log k_n}{n \log^2 d_n} \leq \frac{C \log k_n}{\log^2 d_n}, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. \square

With $r = p$ for adjoint blocks ($|j - j'| = 1$), a little more care is needed, as the previous method leads to an inferior control with $r = p$. Below is an improved estimate in this case.

Lemma 5.8. *We have*

$$\sum_{\substack{j, j'=1, \dots, k_n \\ |j-j'|=1}} \mathbb{P}(R_{n,i} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j} \neq \emptyset, R_{n,i} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j'} \neq \emptyset) \leq \frac{C}{\log^{3/2} d_n}.$$

Proof. Introduce another sequence of integers $\{s_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $s_n \rightarrow \infty$ and $s_n/d_n \rightarrow 0$. For comparison purpose we write the proof for general \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{i}' (so not necessarily $r = p$), and we shall see that at the end the method in this proof is superior than in the previous lemma *only* when $r = p$. Then recalling (5.9), we

proceed as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(R_{n,i} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,1} \neq \emptyset, R_{n,i'} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,2} \neq \emptyset) \\ & \leq \sum_{k=1}^{d_n - s_n} \mathbb{P}(\widehat{f}_{n,i,1} = k) \sum_{k'=d_n+1}^{2d_n} \mathbb{P}(\widehat{\ell}_{n,i',2} = k' \mid \widehat{f}_{n,i,1} = k) + \mathbb{P}(\widehat{f}_{n,i,1} \in \{d_n - s_n + 1, \dots, d_n\}). \end{aligned}$$

We focus on the first double summation, which becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=1}^{d_n - s_n} \mathbb{P}(\widehat{f}_{n,i,1} = k) \sum_{k'=d_n+1}^{2d_n} u(k' - k)^{r(\beta-1)} \frac{1}{w_n^{p-r}} \overline{F}_p(2d_n - k') \\ & \leq \frac{Cd_n}{n \log d_n} \sum_{k'=d_n+1}^{2d_n} s_n^{\beta_r-1} \frac{1}{w_n^{p-r}} \overline{F}_p(2d_n - k') \leq \frac{Cd_n}{n \log d_n} \frac{s_n^{\beta_r-1}}{w_n^{p-r}} \sum_{k=0}^{d_n-1} \overline{F}_p(k) \leq \frac{Cd_n^2 s_n^{\beta_r-1}}{nw_n^{p-r} \log^2 d_n}, \end{aligned}$$

where for the previous line we have applied (5.7) and (2.4). At the same time,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\widehat{f}_{n,i,1} \in \{d_n - s_n + 1, \dots, d_n\}) & \leq \sum_{k=d_n - s_n + 1}^{d_n} \mathbb{P}(\widehat{\ell}_{n,i,1} = k) \\ & = \sum_{k=d_n - s_n + 1}^{d_n} \frac{1}{w_n^p} \overline{F}_p(d_n - k) \leq \frac{Cs_n}{n \log s_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Assume that s_n grows at least at a polynomial rate. Then, the optimal rate is achieved if $d_n^2/(w_n^{p-r} \log d_n) \sim s_n^{2-\beta_r}$ (balancing the two bounds above), or equivalently

$$s_n \sim \left(\frac{d_n^2}{n^{\beta_r} \log d_n} \right)^{1/(2-\beta_r)}, \quad r = 1, \dots, p.$$

(This sequence is indeed with polynomial growth.) Therefore, with s_n as above

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{j,j'=1,\dots,k_n \\ |j-j'|=1}} \mathbb{P}(R_{n,i} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j} \neq \emptyset, R_{n,i} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,j'} \neq \emptyset) & \leq \frac{Ck_n s_n}{n \log d_n} \sim \frac{Ck_n d_n^{2/(2-\beta_r)}}{n^{2/(2-\beta_r)} \log^{(3-\beta_r)/(2-\beta_r)} d_n} \\ & \sim C \left(k_n^{\frac{\beta_r}{2-\beta_r}} \log^{\frac{3-\beta_r}{2-\beta_r}} d_n \right)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

The desired result follows with $r = p$. Notice that with $r < p$, the above is inferior from what is obtained in Lemma 5.8. \square

With Lemmas 5.7 and 5.8 above, we have control over the summation ‘‘off the diagonal’’ for ρ_n in (4.14). We are left with controlling the summation ‘‘on the diagonal’’.

Lemma 5.9. *For $r = |\mathbf{i} \cap \mathbf{i}'| = 1, \dots, p-1$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(R_{n,i} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,1} \neq \emptyset, R_{n,i'} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,1} \neq \emptyset) \leq \frac{C}{k_n^{\beta_r+1} \log d_n}.$$

Proof. Recall that $\beta_r > \beta_p = 0$. It is clear that $\mathbb{P}(R_{n,i} \cap R_{n,i'} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,1} \neq \emptyset) \leq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}_{n,1}} \mathbb{P}(k \in R_{n,i} \cap R_{n,i'}) = d_n/w_n^{2p-r}$ which compared with the desired bound is of smaller order. So we focus on

$$\mathbb{P}(R_{n,i} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,1} \neq \emptyset, R_{n,i'} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,1} \neq \emptyset, R_{n,i} \cap R_{n,i'} \cap \mathcal{I}_{n,1} = \emptyset),$$

which can be bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2 \sum_{1 \leq k < k' \leq d_n} \mathbb{P}(k \in R_{n,i}) \mathbb{P}(\max R_{n,i'} = k' \mid k \in R_{n,i}) \\
&= \frac{2}{w_n^p} \sum_{1 \leq k < d_n} (d_n - k) \mathbb{P}(1 \in R_{n,i}, \max R_{n,i'} = 1 + k) \\
&\leq \frac{C}{w_n^{2p-r}} \sum_{k=1}^{d_n} (d_n - k) k^{\beta_r - 1} \overline{F}_p(d_n - k) \leq C \frac{d_n^{\beta_r + 1}}{w_n^{2p-r} \log d_n} \sim C \frac{1}{k_n^{\beta_r + 1} \log d_n},
\end{aligned}$$

where for the last inequality above we have applied the bound (5.11). \square

Now we have obtained Lemma 5.6 by combining Lemmas 5.7 to 5.9.

Proof of Lemma 5.4. The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 4.2 by applying the two-moments method, and in particular, by verifying (4.20) based on the estimates in Lemmas 5.5 and 5.6 with the rate of d_n specified in (5.3). We omit the details, but only point out that the normalization constant $\mathfrak{C}_{F,p}$ is determined as (see the computation of $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \overline{\eta}_{n,K}(E_s)$ in the proof of Lemma 4.2)

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} C_{n,1}(K) k_n \rho_n = \frac{1}{2} K \frac{(\mathfrak{C}_F \Gamma(\beta) \Gamma(1 - \beta))^p}{p!(p-1)!} = K \mathfrak{C}_{F,p}.$$

\square

5.2. Proof of Proposition 5.1.

Lemma 5.10. *With the setup for $\beta_p = 0$, the conclusion of Lemma 4.8 continues to hold.*

Proof. The proof is almost identical to the proof of Lemma 4.8. We only mention that (4.32) is replaced by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(\exists \mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_p) \in |\mathcal{D}_p^*(Kr_n)|, \text{ s.t. } R_{n,i} \neq \emptyset, i_1 \leq m) \\
&\leq \frac{C}{\log(n)} |\mathcal{D}_{p-1}^*(Kr_n)| \leq \frac{Cr_n \log^{p-2}(r_n)}{\log(n)} \leq \frac{C}{\log \log n}.
\end{aligned}$$

\square

Proof of Proposition 5.1. The proof is similar to that of Proposition 4.1 in Section 4.2, which follows from Lemmas 5.10 and 5.4. \square

5.3. Proof of (5.1).

Lemma 5.11. *With the setup for $\beta_p = 0$, the uniform control (4.34) continues to hold.*

Proof. The first part of the proof is as in the proof of Lemma 4.9. With $\beta_p = 0$, we are actually in the simpler case $X_{n,k}^{(K)} = \tilde{X}_{n,k}^{(K)}$ therein, and we arrive at (4.36) as before. That is, with

$$Z_{n,i_1, \dots, i_q}(K) := \max_{k=1, \dots, n} r_n^{1/\alpha} \left| \sum_{m < i_{q+1} < \dots < i_p, [i] > Kr_n} \frac{[\varepsilon_{i_{q+1:p}}]}{[\Gamma_{i_{q+1:p}}]^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{k \in R_{n,i}\}} \right|, \quad q = 0, \dots, p-1,$$

it suffices to show that for each $q = 0, \dots, p-1, i_1, \dots, i_q \leq m$ fixed,

$$(5.12) \quad \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(Z_{n,i_1, \dots, i_q}(K) > \epsilon) = 0 \text{ for all } \epsilon > 0.$$

Recall in the proof of Lemma 4.9 for the case $\beta_p < 0$, the relation above was established by an L^2 estimation directly. In the case $\beta_p = 0$ here, we need a refinement (the previous estimate (4.37) no longer works: now $nw_n^{-p} r_n \log^{p-q-1}(r_n) \sim C \frac{\log n}{(\log \log n)^q} \rightarrow \infty$). Instead, this time we first control

$$\tilde{Z}_{n,i_1, \dots, i_q}(K) := \max_{k=1, \dots, n} r_n^{1/\alpha} \left| \sum_{m < i_{q+1} < \dots < i_p, [i] > K\tilde{r}_n} \frac{[\varepsilon_{i_{q+1:p}}]}{[\Gamma_{i_{q+1:p}}]^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{k \in R_{n,i}\}} \right|, \quad q = 0, \dots, p-1,$$

with

$$\tilde{r}_n := r_n (\log n)^{\frac{1}{2/\alpha-1}} \gg r_n.$$

The previous L^2 -estimate (4.37) now gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \tilde{Z}_{n,i_1,\dots,i_q}(K)^2 &\leq C n w_n^{-p} r_n^{2/\alpha} (K \tilde{r}_n)^{1-2/\alpha} \log^{p-q-1}(\tilde{r}_n) \\ &\leq C K^{1-2/\alpha} \frac{r_n}{\log n} \log^{p-q-1}(r_n) \sim \frac{C K^{1-2/\alpha}}{(\log \log n)^q}. \end{aligned}$$

So (5.12) holds with $Z_{n,i_1,\dots,i_q}(K)$ replaced by $\tilde{Z}_{n,i_1,\dots,i_q}(K)$.

Next, we examine the difference

$$(5.13) \quad \left| \tilde{Z}_{n,i_1,\dots,i_q}(K) - Z_{n,i_1,\dots,i_q}(K) \right| \leq r_n^{1/\alpha} \max_{k=1,\dots,n} \left| \sum_{\substack{m < i_{q+1} < \dots < i_p \\ K r_n \leq [i] \leq K \tilde{r}_n}} \frac{[\varepsilon_{i_{q+1:p}}]}{[\Gamma_{i_{q+1:p}}]^{1/\alpha}} \mathbf{1}_{\{k \in R_{n,i}\}} \right|,$$

and consider the following event

$$\Omega_n \equiv \Omega_n(i_1, \dots, i_q) := \left\{ \exists k = 1, \dots, n : \sum_{m < i_{q+1} < \dots < i_p \leq K \tilde{r}_n} \mathbf{1}_{\{k \in R_{n,i}\}} \geq 2 \right\}.$$

The key observation is that in the event Ω_n^c , for every $k = 1, \dots, n$, the summation on the right-hand side of (5.13) has at most one non-zero term, and therefore, in the event Ω_n^c , (5.13) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \tilde{Z}_{n,i_1,\dots,i_q}(K) - Z_{n,i_1,\dots,i_q}(K) \right| &\leq r_n^{1/\alpha} \max_{\substack{m < i_{q+1} < \dots < i_p \\ K r_n < [i] \leq K \tilde{r}_n}} [\Gamma_i]^{-1/\alpha} \\ &\leq r_n^{1/\alpha} \max_{\substack{m < i_{q+1} < \dots < i_p \\ K r_n < [i] \leq K \tilde{r}_n}} (K r_n)^{-1/\alpha} \frac{[\Gamma_i]^{-1/\alpha}}{[i]^{-1/\alpha}} \leq K^{-1/\alpha} \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\frac{\Gamma_i}{i} \right)^{-p/\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

However, $\sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (\Gamma_i/i)^{-p/\alpha}$ is a finite random variable, and hence

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\left\{ \left| \tilde{Z}_{n,i_1,\dots,i_q}(K) - Z_{n,i_1,\dots,i_q}(K) \right| > \epsilon \right\} \cap \Omega_n^c \right) = 0, \text{ for all } \epsilon > 0.$$

It remains to examine Ω_n . We have (recall that $i_1, \dots, i_q \leq m$ are fixed),

$$\mathbb{P}(\Omega_n) \leq \sum_{m < i_{q+1} < \dots < i_{p+1} \leq K \tilde{r}_n} \mathbb{P}(R_{n,(i_1,\dots,i_{p+1})} \neq \emptyset) \leq \binom{K \tilde{r}_n}{p-q+1} \frac{n}{w_n^{p+1}} \leq C \frac{\tilde{r}_n^{p-q+1}}{w_n} \rightarrow 0.$$

So combining the two relations above completes the proof. \square

Proof of (5.1). The proof is the same as for (4.1) in Section 4.3, with Proposition 4.1 and Lemma 4.9 replaced by Proposition 5.1 and Lemma 5.11, respectively. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Arratia, R., Goldstein, L., and Gordon, L. (1989). Two moments suffice for Poisson approximations: the Chen-Stein method. *Ann. Probab.*, 17(1):9–25.
- [2] Bai, S. (2020). Representations of Hermite processes using local time of intersecting stationary stable regenerative sets. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 57(4):1234–1251.
- [3] Bai, S. (2021). Limit theorems for conservative flows on multiple stochastic integrals. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, to appear.
- [4] Bai, S., Owada, T., and Wang, Y. (2020). A functional non-central limit theorem for multiple-stable processes with long-range dependence. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 130(9):5768–5801.
- [5] Bai, S. and Taqqu, M. S. (2020). Limit theorems for long-memory flows on Wiener chaos. *Bernoulli*, 26(2):1473–1503.

- [6] Bai, S. and Wang, Y. (2021). Tail processes for stable-regenerative model. preprint.
- [7] Basrak, B. and Segers, J. (2009). Regularly varying multivariate time series. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 119(4):1055–1080.
- [8] Basse-O’Connor, A., Heinrich, C., and Podolskij, M. (2019). On limit theory for functionals of stationary increments Lévy driven moving averages. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 24:Paper No. 79, 42.
- [9] Basse-O’Connor, A., Lachièze-Rey, R., and Podolskij, M. (2017). Power variation for a class of stationary increments Lévy driven moving averages. *Ann. Probab.*, 45(6B):4477–4528.
- [10] Basse-O’Connor, A., Podolskij, M., and Thäle, C. (2020). A Berry-Esseen theorem for partial sums of functionals of heavy-tailed moving averages. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 25:Paper No. 31, 31.
- [11] Beran, J., Feng, Y., Ghosh, S., and Kulik, R. (2013). *Long-memory processes*. Springer, Heidelberg. Probabilistic properties and statistical methods.
- [12] Bertoin, J. (1999). Subordinators: examples and applications. In *Lectures on probability theory and statistics (Saint-Flour, 1997)*, volume 1717 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 1–91. Springer, Berlin.
- [13] Billingsley, P. (1999). *Convergence of probability measures*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics: Probability and Statistics. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, second edition. A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- [14] Bingham, N. H., Goldie, C. M., and Teugels, J. L. (1987). *Regular variation*, volume 27 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [15] Chen, Z. and Samorodnitsky, G. (2020). Extremal clustering under moderate long range dependence and moderately heavy tails. Submitted. Available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2003.05038>.
- [16] Chen, Z. and Samorodnitsky, G. (2021). A new shape of extremal clusters for certain stationary semi-exponential processes with moderate long range dependence. arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.01517.
- [17] Davis, R. A. and Hsing, T. (1995). Point process and partial sum convergence for weakly dependent random variables with infinite variance. *Ann. Probab.*, 23(2):879–917.
- [18] Davis, R. A. and Mikosch, T. (1998). The sample autocorrelations of heavy-tailed processes with applications to ARCH. *Ann. Statist.*, 26(5):2049–2080.
- [19] Dettmann, C. P. and Georgiou, O. (2009). Product of n independent uniform random variables. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, 79(24):2501–2503.
- [20] Doney, R. A. (1997). One-sided local large deviation and renewal theorems in the case of infinite mean. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 107(4):451–465.
- [21] Durieu, O., Samorodnitsky, G., and Wang, Y. (2020). From infinite urn schemes to self-similar stable processes. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 130(4):2471–2487.
- [22] Durieu, O. and Wang, Y. (2018). A family of random sup-measures with long-range dependence. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 23(107):1–24.
- [23] Falconer, K. (2014). *Fractal geometry*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, third edition. Mathematical foundations and applications.
- [24] Fitzsimmons, P. J., Fristedt, B., and Maisonneuve, B. (1985a). Intersections and limits of regenerative sets. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete*, 70(2):157–173.
- [25] Fitzsimmons, P. J., Fristedt, B., and Shepp, L. A. (1985b). The set of real numbers left uncovered by random covering intervals. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete*, 70(2):175–189.
- [26] Fitzsimmons, P. J. and Taksar, M. (1988). Stationary regenerative sets and subordinators. *Ann. Probab.*, 16(3):1299–1305.
- [27] Giacomin, G. (2007). *Random polymer models*. Imperial College Press, London.
- [28] Ishihara, T. (2002). The distribution of the sum and the product of independent uniform random variables distributed at different intervals. *Transactions-Japan Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, 12(3):197–208.
- [29] Jung, P., Owada, T., and Samorodnitsky, G. (2017). Functional central limit theorem for a class of negatively dependent heavy-tailed stationary infinitely divisible processes generated by conservative flows. *Ann. Probab.*, 45(4):2087–2130.
- [30] Kallenberg, O. (2017). *Random measures, theory and applications*, volume 77 of *Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling*. Springer, Cham.

- [31] Kistler, N. (2015). Derrida’s random energy models. From spin glasses to the extremes of correlated random fields. In *Correlated random systems: five different methods*, volume 2143 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 71–120. Springer, Cham.
- [32] Krakowiak, W. and Szulga, J. (1986). Random multilinear forms. *Ann. Probab.*, 14(3):955–973.
- [33] Kulik, R. and Soulier, P. (2020). *Heavy-tailed time series*. Springer.
- [34] Kwapien, S. a. and Woyczyński, W. A. (1992). *Random series and stochastic integrals: single and multiple*. Probability and its Applications. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA.
- [35] Lacaux, C. and Samorodnitsky, G. (2016). Time-changed extremal process as a random sup measure. *Bernoulli*, 22(4):1979–2000.
- [36] Molchanov, I. (2017). *Theory of random sets*, volume 87 of *Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling*. Springer-Verlag, London. Second edition of [MR2132405].
- [37] Molchanov, I. and Strokorb, K. (2016). Max-stable random sup-measures with comonotonic tail dependence. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 126(9):2835–2859.
- [38] O’Brien, G. L., Torfs, P. J. J. F., and Vervaat, W. (1990). Stationary self-similar extremal processes. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 87(1):97–119.
- [39] Owada, T. (2016). Limit theory for the sample autocovariance for heavy-tailed stationary infinitely divisible processes generated by conservative flows. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 29(1):63–95.
- [40] Owada, T. and Samorodnitsky, G. (2015a). Functional central limit theorem for heavy tailed stationary infinitely divisible processes generated by conservative flows. *Ann. Probab.*, 43(1):240–285.
- [41] Owada, T. and Samorodnitsky, G. (2015b). Maxima of long memory stationary symmetric α -stable processes, and self-similar processes with stationary max-increments. *Bernoulli*, 21(3):1575–1599.
- [42] Penrose, M. D. and Wade, A. R. (2004). Random minimal directed spanning trees and Dickman-type distributions. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.*, 36(3):691–714.
- [43] Pipiras, V. and Taqqu, M. S. (2017a). *Long-range dependence and self-similarity*, volume 45 of *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press.
- [44] Pipiras, V. and Taqqu, M. S. (2017b). *Stable non-Gaussian self-similar processes with stationary increments*. SpringerBriefs in Probability and Mathematical Statistics. Springer, Cham.
- [45] Resnick, S. and Samorodnitsky, G. (2004). Point processes associated with stationary stable processes. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 114:191–209.
- [46] Resnick, S., Samorodnitsky, G., and Xue, F. (2000). Growth rates of sample covariances of stationary symmetric α -stable processes associated with null recurrent Markov chains. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 85(2):321–339.
- [47] Resnick, S. I. (1987). *Extreme values, regular variation, and point processes*, volume 4 of *Applied Probability. A Series of the Applied Probability Trust*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- [48] Rosiński, J. (1995). On the structure of stationary stable processes. *Ann. Probab.*, 23(3):1163–1187.
- [49] Rosiński, J. and Samorodnitsky, G. (1996). Classes of mixing stable processes. *Bernoulli*, 2(4):365–377.
- [50] Rosiński, J. and Samorodnitsky, G. (1999). Product formula, tails and independence of multiple stable integrals. In *Advances in stochastic inequalities (Atlanta, GA, 1997)*, volume 234 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 169–194. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI.
- [51] Samorodnitsky, G. (2004). Extreme value theory, ergodic theory and the boundary between short memory and long memory for stationary stable processes. *Ann. Probab.*, 32(2):1438–1468.
- [52] Samorodnitsky, G. (2005). Null flows, positive flows and the structure of stationary symmetric stable processes. *Ann. Probab.*, 33(5):1782–1803.
- [53] Samorodnitsky, G. (2016). *Stochastic processes and long range dependence*. Springer, Cham, Switzerland.
- [54] Samorodnitsky, G. and Szulga, J. (1989). An asymptotic evaluation of the tail of a multiple symmetric α -stable integral. *Ann. Probab.*, 17(4):1503–1520.
- [55] Samorodnitsky, G. and Taqqu, M. S. (1994). *Stable non-Gaussian random processes*. Stochastic Modeling. Chapman & Hall, New York. Stochastic models with infinite variance.
- [56] Samorodnitsky, G. and Wang, Y. (2019). Extremal theory for long range dependent infinitely divisible processes. *Ann. Probab.*, 47(4):2529–2562.

- [57] Stoev, S. A. and Taqqu, M. S. (2005). Extremal stochastic integrals: a parallel between max-stable processes and α -stable processes. *Extremes*, 8(4):237–266 (2006).
- [58] Vervaat, W. (1997). Random upper semicontinuous functions and extremal processes. In *Probability and lattices*, volume 110 of *CWI Tract*, pages 1–56. Math. Centrum, Centrum Wisk. Inform., Amsterdam.
- [59] Wang, Y. (2020). Choquet random sup-measures with aggregations. *Extremes*, to appear. arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.13383.

SHUYANG BAI, DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, 310 HERTY DRIVE, ATHENS, GA, 30602, USA.
Email address: `bsy9142@uga.edu`

YIZAO WANG, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI, 2815 COMMONS WAY, CINCINNATI, OH, 45221-0025, USA.
Email address: `yizao.wang@uc.edu`