

REGULARITY AND ASYMPTOTICS OF DENSITIES OF INVERSE SUBORDINATORS

GIACOMO ASCIONE¹, MLADEN SAVOV^{2,3}, AND BRUNO TOALDO⁴

ABSTRACT. In this article densities (and their derivatives) of subordinators and inverse subordinators are considered. Under minor restrictions, milder than the existing in the literature, using a useful modification of the saddle point method, we obtain the large asymptotic behaviour of these densities (and their derivatives) for a specific region of space and time and quantify how the ratio between time and space affects the explicit speed of convergence. The asymptotics is governed by an exponential term depending on the Laplace exponent of the subordinator and the region represents the behaviour of the subordinator when it is atypically small (the inverse one is larger than usual). As a result a route to the derivation of novel general or particular fine estimates for densities with explicit constants in the speed of convergence in the region of the lower envelope/the law of iterated logarithm is available. Furthermore, under mild conditions, we provide a power series representation for densities (and their derivatives) of subordinators and inverse subordinators. This representation is explicit and based on the derivatives of the convolution of the tails of the corresponding Lévy measure, whose smoothness is also investigated. In this context the methods adopted are based on Laplace inversion and strongly rely on the theory of Bernstein functions extended to the cut complex plane. As a result, smoothness properties of densities (and their derivatives) and their behaviour near zero immediately follow.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Preliminaries	4
3. Main results concerning densities and their derivatives	7
3.1. Behaviour at infinity of densities and their derivatives of the inverse subordinator and of the subordinator itself	8
3.2. A power series representation of densities and their derivatives and their behaviour at zero	14
4. Smoothness of the densities and their integral representation	19
4.1. Smoothness and Laplace inversion under (\mathbb{A}_1)	20
4.2. Smoothness and Laplace inversion under (\mathbb{B}_1) and (\mathbb{B}_2)	21
5. Proofs	29
5.1. Proofs for Subsection 3.1	29
5.2. Proofs of the power series representation and the behaviour at zero	38
Acknowledgements	41
References	41

Date: April 18, 2023.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 60G51, 60G22, 60K50.

Key words and phrases. Inverse subordinators, subordinators, densities, Bernstein functions, Complete Bernstein functions, Laplace inversion, Saddle point method.

1. INTRODUCTION

Subordinators are Lévy processes, i.e. càdlàg stochastic processes with stationary and independent increments, whose paths are almost surely non-decreasing. For this reason, they constitute a special class of Lévy processes of fundamental interest in probability theory. In this paper, wherever possible, we consider potentially killed subordinators, that is to say that for any proper subordinator $\sigma := (\sigma(t))_{t \geq 0}$ we allow for killing at an exponentially distributed random variable $\mathbf{e}_q, q \geq 0$ ($\mathbf{e}_0 = \infty$) that is independent of σ , by setting $\sigma(t) = \infty$ provided $t \geq \mathbf{e}_q$ and keeping the original process until \mathbf{e}_q . With each potentially killed subordinator one defines the (right-)inverse process through the passage times $L := (L(t))_{t \geq 0}$. In this work, our main aim is to offer a detailed study of the densities of L . In more detail, under mild and natural conditions, we prove that such densities are smooth in both variables and we provide for them and their derivatives a series representation and precise non-classical Tauberian asymptotics (with explicit speed of convergence). The latter is obtained by means of Laplace inversion, as, indeed, the Laplace transform of the density of $L(t)$ with respect to the variable t admits a simple form in terms of the Laplace exponent of the subordinator σ . Furthermore, we also extend the results to densities (and their derivatives) of the subordinators themselves. Our results expand uniformly the existing knowledge on these quantities and allow for specific applications. We shall discuss the literature, offer motivation for our study and outline our methodology below.

We first mention that, in recent years, the interest in subordinators and their hitting-times has grown fast and has reached an increasingly large audience also outside the probability community, involving many areas of mathematics. This is due, in particular, to the connection with the so-called anomalous processes (or anomalous diffusion) and semi-Markov processes. Take a Markov process $X = (X(t))_{t \geq 0}$ and consider the time-changed process $Y = (Y(t))_{t \geq 0}$, with $Y(t) := X(L(t))$, for any $t \geq 0$. Then the process Y has intervals of constancy, induced by the time-change, that are distributed according to the jumps of σ (which are not necessarily exponentials). Under suitable assumptions, these time-changed processes are prototypes of semi-Markov processes (e.g., [15; 28; 39; 49]). The importance of these processes arise in several applications in very different fields, among others: they are scaling limit of continuous time random walks (e.g., [5; 7; 36; 39]), they are useful to model anomalous diffusion and fractional kinetics (see, for example, [2; 8; 22; 24; 29; 30; 37; 40; 43; 48; 49; 53; 57]), they appear in economics and mathematical finance (e.g., [26; 50; 51; 56]) and recently also in neuronal modelling (e.g., [3; 4]). It is clear that in this context the one-dimensional distributions of the random variables $L(t)$ play a central role. For instance, if we assume that X admits as state space \mathbb{R}^d , for some $d \geq 1$, and we denote by $p(x, y, t)$ the transition densities of X , then one can show that

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \ni E \mapsto \mathbb{P}(Y(t) \in E \mid Y(0) = x) = \int_E \int_0^\infty p(x, y, s) f(s; t) ds dy, \quad (1.1)$$

where, for any $t > 0$, $f(s; t)$ is the density of $L(t)$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the Borel σ -algebra of \mathbb{R}^d . In practice, the time-changed process admits a density that can be written in terms of the one-dimensional distributions of $L(t)$. Hence, in order to determine some features of the one-dimensional distribution of Y , it may be necessary to rely also on some specific properties of the ones of $L(t)$ itself. Therefore, a more detailed study of the main features of the densities of inverse subordinators is needed. This point of view inspired several other works on this topic (e.g., [16; 31; 32; 38; 58]).

Two of the key objectives in the study of the one-dimensional distributions of random processes are to understand the asymptotic behaviour in time and space of their tails and to find representations for their densities and those of related quantities, e.g. such as passage times. This information is usually in the form of explicit asymptotic terms at zero and/or at infinity, series expansions, integral representations, etc. In this work we provide results for densities (and their derivatives) of inverse

subordinators and, via interchangeability, of subordinators. These include the derivation of precise, universal and explicit form of the large asymptotic behaviour with speed of convergence and general series expansions. The results go well beyond the current state-of-art which we briefly review below.

On the large asymptotics the first papers, see [21; 27], offered results for lower tails of subordinators. They have been subsequently refined for densities with the most up-to-date results contained in [18; 23]. General bounds with conditions in the spirit of [18] are derived in [14; 23]. Particular cases of bounds and estimates on densities for a class of subordinators can be found in the recent work [14]. Similar asymptotic results (without speed of convergence) are contained in [46] which deals with densities (and their derivatives) of spectrally negative Lévy processes with necessarily positive Brownian component. For our new results in the context of the large asymptotics we use the saddle point method, as applied in [42], with a novel modification which allows us to capture speed of convergence. This speed depends on the ratio of time and space, i.e. t/x , in $\mathbb{P}(L(t) \in dx; \sigma(L(t)) > t) = f(x, t)dx$, as it ranges between the drift of σ and $\mathbb{E}[\sigma(1)]$, and the closer t/x is to the drift the faster the speed of convergence is. As a result, under conditions significantly milder than the existing in the literature, we present in Theorems 3.2, 3.6, 3.8, 3.10 explicit expressions for the aforementioned densities (and their derivatives) which are dominated by rather explicit exponential terms stemming from the Laplace exponent of σ . It is important to highlight once again that these representations are valid for $t/x < \mathbb{E}[\sigma(1)]$ and therefore capture non-typical slow growth of σ or equivalently fast growth of L . For example, when the subordinator has a finite second moment, our results capture the region below that of the central limit theorem, see Section 3.1.1 for more details. If $\mathbb{E}[\sigma(1)] = \infty$ then our estimates capture the region of the lower envelope of subordinators and therefore one can obtain more precise local estimates for densities including explicit constants in the speed of convergence and hence furnish estimates for the probabilities that lead up to the law of the iterated logarithm as in [10; 21], see Section 3.1.1. One is also able to study particular classes of subordinators for which our main results can be further specialized. Also, given the nature of the saddle point method, we can derive under milder assumptions concrete bounds for fixed times as in [14; 23]. These are directions for further investigations.

On representations of densities with series expansions the literature is mainly concerned with stable processes, despite the fact that some generalizations have been obtained. Series representations for stable laws can be found, e.g., in [20, Chapter XVII.6]. In the specific case of the stable subordinator, a series representation for its density has been provided in [47]. It is clear that such a representation can be extended to the density of the inverse stable subordinator by means of the relation that links the two quantities, as for instance highlighted in [35, Corollary 3.1]. A similar result has been proven for the inverse tempered stable subordinator in [32], while a further integral representation for the density of the inverse gamma subordinator has been provided in [33] and further improved in [16]. We remark that in both cases the results have been widely used, especially in applications regarding anomalous diffusion (see, e.g., [41] and references therein) and in the context of governing equations of time-changed processes (see, e.g., [57] and references therein). Furthermore, in [13], the authors obtained explicit representations for some subordinators of the Thorin class. Despite in general such explicit representations do not provide power-series expansions, some of them can be still rewritten in this way. Here, under mild assumptions on the Laplace exponent of the subordinator, we obtain an explicit power series representation for the density (and its derivatives) of the inverse subordinator, in Theorem 3.15, and of the subordinator itself, in Theorem 3.20. We highlight that our power series representation holds, in particular, whenever the Laplace exponent of σ is a complete Bernstein function, thus covering also the cases discussed in [47; 32], for which comparison is carried on in Section 3.2.1. The assumption on the completeness of the Laplace exponent is sufficient, but not necessary,

as the power-series representation can be applied on a wider class of subordinators, as discussed in Section 3.2.1.

As already mentioned, both the asymptotic behaviour and the power-series representation are obtained via Laplace inversion. On the one hand, the assumptions used to derive the asymptotic behaviour first lead to the absolute convergence of the integral involved in the Laplace inversion (see [1, Theorem 4.1.21]). On the other hand, the assumptions adopted to obtain the power-series representation consider a suitable keyhole-type contour, on which the inversion integral becomes absolutely convergent. Furthermore, as a consequence, we get the smoothness of the involved densities starting from any of the two sets of assumptions. We think that the derived integral representations could be of independent interest and thus are discussed separately in Section 4. Finally, let us remark that the proofs of the main results presented in Section 3 are given separately in Section 5.

2. PRELIMINARIES

We assume everywhere that we work on the standard (for subordinators) probability space, namely the space of càdlàg functions on $[0, \infty]$ endowed with the Skorohod topology, the sigma-algebra generated by it and a suitable probability measure on the latter.

Let $\sigma = (\sigma(t))_{t \geq 0}$ be a possibly killed one-dimensional subordinator, that is to say that there exists a conservative subordinator $\sigma^\Delta := (\sigma^\Delta(t))_{t \geq 0}$ and an independent exponential random variable \mathbf{e}_q with parameter $q \geq 0$ (where, if $q = 0$, we set $\mathbf{e}_0 = \infty$) such that $\sigma(t) = \sigma^\Delta(t)$ for any $t < \mathbf{e}_q$, while $\sigma(t) = \infty$ for any $t \geq \mathbf{e}_q$. Each σ is uniquely determined (in law) by a Bernstein function in the following manner

$$\begin{aligned} \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-z\sigma(1)} \right] &= \phi(z) = q + \mathbf{b}z + \int_0^\infty (1 - e^{-zy}) \mu_\phi(dy) \\ &= q + \mathbf{b}z + z \int_0^\infty e^{-zy} \bar{\mu}_\phi(y) dy, \quad \operatorname{Re}(z) \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

where $q, \mathbf{b} \geq 0$, μ_ϕ is a sigma-finite measure on $(0, \infty)$ satisfying the integrability condition $\int_0^\infty \min\{y, 1\} \mu_\phi(dy) < \infty$ (called the Lévy measure of σ) and $\bar{\mu}_\phi(x) = \int_x^\infty \mu_\phi(dy)$, $x \geq 0$, is the tail of μ_ϕ . In fact the right-hand side of (2.1) serves as an equivalent definition of Bernstein functions and thus they are in bijection with the potentially killed subordinators. Due to their importance in other areas of mathematics, Bernstein functions have been studied in detail. An exposition on the current knowledge of their properties can be found in [52] and some additional information is scattered in references such as [6; 44; 45]. Classical references for Lévy processes and subordinators, in particular, are the books [9; 10; 34].

With each σ one defines the (right-)inverse-subordinator $L := (L(t))_{t \geq 0}$ via the passage times

$$L(t) := \inf \{s > 0 : \sigma(s) > t\}. \tag{2.2}$$

Note that $\mathbb{P}(L(t) = \infty) = 0$ for every $t \in [0, \infty)$, even if $q > 0$, since for $t > \sigma(\mathbf{e}_q -)$ the process $L(t)$ remains stuck in the position \mathbf{e}_q . Also, note that the paths of L are almost surely continuous if and only if $\mathbf{b} \neq 0$ or $\bar{\mu}_\phi(0) = \infty$, that is σ is not a pure-jump compound Poisson process. When $q = \mathbf{b} = 0$ and $\bar{\mu}_\phi(0) = \infty$, it is well-known, see [36, Theorem 3.1], that, for any $t > 0$, $L(t)$ admits density on $(0, \infty)$ and the requirement $q = 0$ is immediately seen to be unnecessary. Indeed, it is not hard to see, by a conditioning argument using independence between \mathbf{e}_q and σ^Δ , that

$$\mathbb{P}(L(t) \leq x) = 1 - e^{-qx} + e^{-qx} \mathbb{P}(L^\Delta(t) \leq x), \tag{2.3}$$

where we used L^Δ for the inverse of σ^Δ . Furthermore, if $q = 0$, i.e., if we are working with the processes σ^Δ and its inverse L^Δ , the measure $\mathbb{P}(L^\Delta(t) \in dx, \sigma^\Delta(L^\Delta(t)) > t)$ has a density on $(0, t/\mathbf{b})$, where we

set $t/0 = \infty$, (see [17, Lemma 11] and [18, prior to Theorem 2.3]), given by the relation

$$\mathbb{P}(L^\Delta(t) \in dx, \sigma^\Delta(L^\Delta(t)) > t) = \int_0^t \bar{\mu}_\phi(t-y) \mathbb{P}(\sigma^\Delta(x) \in dy) dx =: f_\phi^\Delta(x, t) dx. \quad (2.4)$$

However, since $\mathbb{P}(\sigma^\Delta(L^\Delta(t)) > t) < 1$ if and only if $\mathfrak{b} > 0$, see [10, Propositions 1.7 and 1.9], we observe that if $\mathfrak{b} = 0$ then f_ϕ^Δ is the density of L^Δ . Otherwise, it stands for the density of $L^\Delta(t)$ on the event that σ^Δ jumps across t . On the event that σ^Δ creeps up on t , i.e. on $\sigma^\Delta(L^\Delta(t)) = t$, $L^\Delta(t)$ does not necessarily admit a density. However, it has been shown, in the proof of [18, Lemma 3.3], that if $\sigma^\Delta(x)$ admits a density $g_\phi^\Delta(x, \cdot)$ on $(\mathfrak{b}x, \infty)$, then $L^\Delta(t)$ on the event $\sigma^\Delta(L^\Delta(t)) = t$ admits a density in $(0, t/\mathfrak{b})$ and such a density is given by

$$f_\phi^{c,\Delta}(x, t) dx := \mathbb{P}(L^\Delta(t) \in dx, \sigma^\Delta(L^\Delta(t)) = t) = \mathfrak{b} g_\phi^\Delta(x, t) dx \quad (2.5)$$

Plugging (2.4) and (2.5) into (2.3), we get

$$\mathbb{P}(L(t) \leq x) = 1 - e^{-qx} + e^{-qx} \int_0^x \left[\int_0^t \bar{\mu}_\phi(t-y) g_\phi^\Delta(s, y) dy + \mathfrak{b} g_\phi^\Delta(s, t) \right] ds. \quad (2.6)$$

Furthermore, if $\sigma^\Delta(x)$ admits a density $g_\phi^\Delta(x, \cdot)$ on $(\mathfrak{b}x, \infty)$, so does $\sigma(x)$ with density given by

$$g_\phi(x, t) dt := \mathbb{P}(\sigma(x) \in dt) = e^{-qx} g_\phi^\Delta(x, t) dt. \quad (2.7)$$

Differentiating (2.6) in x , we know that $L(t)$ admits a density on $(0, t/\mathfrak{b})$, that is given by

$$\mathbb{P}(L(t) \in dx) = q \mathbb{P}(\sigma(x) \leq t) dx =: f_\phi^k(x, t) dx \quad (2.8)$$

$$+ \left(\int_0^t \bar{\mu}_\phi(t-y) g_\phi(x, y) dy \right) dx =: f_\phi(x, t) dx \quad (2.9)$$

$$+ \mathfrak{b} g_\phi(x, t) dx =: f_\phi^c(x, t) dx. \quad (2.10)$$

The functions f_ϕ , f_ϕ^k and f_ϕ^c are defined on the set

$$\mathbb{D} := \left\{ (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : t > 0, 0 < x < \frac{t}{\mathfrak{b}} \right\} \quad (2.11)$$

and then extended to 0 outside \mathbb{D} .

Our main results concern the quantities (2.7) and (2.9). They will be applied to (2.8) and (2.10).

Despite the fact that the formulations of f_ϕ^k , f_ϕ and f_ϕ^c in (2.8), (2.9) and (2.10) are quite implicit, their Laplace transforms in the variable t can be expressed in terms of ϕ in a simple way. Indeed, for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 0$, we have

$$\int_0^\infty f_\phi^k(x, t) e^{-zt} dt = \frac{q}{z} e^{-x\phi(z)}, \quad \int_0^\infty f_\phi^c(x, t) e^{-zt} dt = \mathfrak{b} e^{-x\phi(z)} \quad (2.12)$$

and

$$\int_0^\infty f_\phi(x, t) e^{-zt} dt = \frac{\phi^\dagger(z)}{z} e^{-x\phi(z)}, \quad (2.13)$$

where

$$\phi^\dagger(z) := \phi(z) - q - \mathfrak{b}z. \quad (2.14)$$

Expression (2.13) is the starting point of our study.

Let us now fix some notation. Here and hereafter, we use \mathbb{C} for the complex plane and we write $z = a + ib = \operatorname{Re}(z) + i\operatorname{Im}(z)$. We denote, for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{H}_a := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{Re}z > a\}$, for any $\alpha, \beta \in (-\pi, \pi]$

$$\mathbb{C}(\alpha, \beta) := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \beta < \operatorname{Arg}(z) < \alpha, |z| > 0\}$$

and $\mathbb{C}(\alpha) := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |\text{Arg}(z)| < \alpha, |z| > 0\}$.

Throughout the paper, we use C to denote any constant whose value is inessential. If needed we underline the dependence of C on some parameters p_1, p_2, \dots by using $C(p_1, p_2, \dots)$.

We use $o(\cdot)$, $O(\cdot)$ in the standard fashion with, e.g. $o(g(x))$, as $x \rightarrow a$, denoting a generic function f such that $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} |f(x)|/|g(x)| = 0$, while $O(g(x))$, as $x \rightarrow \infty$, meaning a generic function f with $\limsup_{x \rightarrow a} |f(x)|/|g(x)| \leq C < \infty$. The same notation is also reserved for functions on regions of \mathbb{C} . Furthermore, we say that $f \asymp g$, as $x \rightarrow a$, if $f = O(g(x))$ and $g = O(f(x))$, as $x \rightarrow a$. For any two functions $f, g : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we denote the convolution product of f and g as

$$(f * g)(t) = \int_0^t f(s)g(t-s)ds, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Furthermore, we denote the convolution powers as

$$f^{*0}(t) = \delta_0 \quad f^{*1}(t) = f(t) \quad f^{*n}(t) = (f * f^{*(n-1)})(t), \quad n \geq 2.$$

The next lemma collects well-known properties of Bernstein functions used throughout this paper.

Lemma 2.1. *Let ϕ be a non-zero Bernstein function. Then*

- (1) ϕ is non-decreasing on $[0, \infty)$ with $\phi(\infty) = \infty \iff \bar{\mu}_\phi(0) = \infty$ or $\mathfrak{b} > 0$;
- (2) for any $z \in \overline{\mathbb{H}_0}$ we have that $\text{Re}\phi(z) \geq 0$;
- (3) ϕ' is completely monotone on $(0, \infty)$ with $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \phi'(x) = \mathfrak{b}$, that is, for all $n \geq 1$, it holds that $(-1)^{n-1} \phi^{(n)}(x) \geq 0$ on $(0, \infty)$; as a result $\phi'' < 0$ and $\phi''' > 0$ on $(0, \infty)$ and $\phi'(0^+) < \infty \iff \int_0^\infty y \mu_\phi(dy) < \infty$;
- (4) for all $x > 0$ it holds that $x\phi'(x) \leq \phi(x)$ and $-x^2\phi''(x) \leq 2\phi(x)$;
- (5) for any $z \in \mathbb{H}_0$ and any $n \geq 1$ it holds that $|\phi^{(n)}(z)| \leq |\phi^{(n)}(\text{Re}(z))|$;
- (6) for any ϕ it holds that $|\phi(z)| = \mathfrak{b}|z|(1 + o(1))$, as $z \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly on $\overline{\mathbb{H}_0}$, and if $\phi(0) = q > 0$, $\phi(\mathbf{u}_\phi) = 0$, where \mathbf{u}_ϕ is the first zero of ϕ on $(-\infty, 0)$ and ϕ extends analytically (continuously at the boundary) at least to $\overline{\mathbb{H}_{\mathbf{u}_\phi}}$ then $|\phi(z)| = \mathfrak{b}|z|(1 + o(1))$, as $z \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly on the same region $\overline{\mathbb{H}_{\mathbf{u}_\phi}}$;
- (7) if ϕ_1, ϕ_2 are two Bernstein function, then $z \in [0, +\infty) \mapsto \phi_1(\phi_2(z)) \in \mathbb{R}$ is a Bernstein function;
- (8) if $(\phi_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is a sequence of Bernstein functions and $\phi : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi_n(z) = \phi(z)$ for any $z > 0$, then ϕ is a Bernstein function.

Remark 2.2. *Items 1, 3, 7 and 8 are standard and can be found in [52]. Item 2 is in fact Item 9 of [44, Proposition 3.1]. Item 4 can be located in [44, (3.3) of Proposition 3.1], whereas item 5 is contained in [6, (3.11) of Proposition 3.3]. Item 6 is taken from [44, Proposition 3.1, Item (4)].*

We will always make use of the following property.

Proposition 2.3. *For any Bernstein function ϕ and for any $a > 0, |b| > 0$, it holds true that*

$$\left| \frac{\phi(a(1+ib))}{\phi(a)} \right| \leq 3 \max\{1, b^2\}. \quad (2.15)$$

Proof. We have that

$$\left| \frac{\phi(a(1+ib))}{\phi(a)} \right| = \left| 1 + \frac{\text{Re}(\phi(a(1+ib))) - \phi(a)}{\phi(a)} + i \frac{\text{Im}(\phi(a(1+ib)))}{\phi(a)} \right|.$$

From inequality [45, (4.26)] and since $y\phi'(y) \leq \phi(y)$, see Item (4) of Lemma 2.1, we have that

$$\frac{|\operatorname{Im}(\phi(a(1+ib)))|}{\phi(a)} \leq |b| a \frac{\phi'(a)}{\phi(a)} \leq |b|.$$

Also, from (4.25) in [45] and $y|\phi''(y)| \leq 2\phi(y)$, see Item (4) of Lemma 2.1, we deduce that

$$\frac{\operatorname{Re}(\phi(a(1+ib))) - \phi(a)}{\phi(a)} \leq \frac{b^2 a^2 - \phi''(a)}{2\phi(a)} \leq b^2.$$

Using $|1+z| \leq 1 + |\operatorname{Re}(z)| + |\operatorname{Im}(z)|$ we get (2.15). \square

In this paper and its examples we use the class of complete Bernstein functions. Recall that a Bernstein function ϕ is said to be complete if the Lévy measure μ_ϕ admits a completely monotone density. The next lemma collects some well-known facts on complete Bernstein functions

Lemma 2.4. *The following properties hold true:*

- (1) *A non-negative function $\phi : (0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ is a complete Bernstein function if and only if it admits an analytic continuation on $\mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$ (that we still denote ϕ) such that $\operatorname{Im}(z)\operatorname{Im}(\phi(z)) \geq 0$ for any $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$ and such that $\lim_{(0, +\infty) \ni z \rightarrow 0} f(z)$ exists and is real;*
- (2) *A non-negative function $\phi : (0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ is a complete Bernstein function if and only if it admits an analytic continuation on $\mathbb{C}(0, \pi)$ (that we still denote ϕ) such that $\operatorname{Im}(\phi(z)) \geq 0$ for any $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0]$ and such that $\lim_{(0, +\infty) \ni z \rightarrow 0} f(z)$ exists and is real;*
- (3) *if ϕ_1, ϕ_2 are two complete Bernstein functions, then $z \in [0, +\infty) \mapsto \phi_1(\phi_2(z)) \in \mathbb{R}$ is a complete Bernstein function;*
- (4) *if $(\phi_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is a sequence of complete Bernstein functions and $\phi : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \phi_n(z) = \phi(z)$ for any $z > 0$, then ϕ is a complete Bernstein function;*
- (5) *if ϕ is a complete Bernstein function, then for any $\alpha \in (0, \pi)$ one has $\lim_{\mathbb{C}(\alpha) \ni z} \frac{\phi(z)}{z} = \mathbf{b}$.*

Remark 2.5. *All the items of the previous lemma can be found in [52, Chapter 6 ad 7].*

We give here a further characterization of complete Bernstein functions, which is a direct consequence of the previous lemma.

Proposition 2.6. *Let ϕ be a Bernstein function and denote for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\phi_\alpha(z) := \phi(z^\alpha)$ for $z \geq 0$. Then the following two properties are equivalent:*

- (i) *ϕ is a complete Bernstein function;*
- (ii) *There exists a sequence $(\alpha_n)_{n \geq 0}$ in $(0, 1)$ with $\alpha_n \rightarrow 1$ such that ϕ_{α_n} is a complete Bernstein function for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. Clearly, (i) implies (ii) by Item 3 of Lemma 2.4. To show that (ii) implies (i), observe that $\phi(z) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \phi_{\alpha_n}(z)$ and then we obtain the desired result by Item 4 of Lemma 2.4. \square

3. MAIN RESULTS CONCERNING DENSITIES AND THEIR DERIVATIVES

In this section we present results concerning $f_\phi(x, t)$, see (2.9), which in the case of $\mathbf{b} = 0$ is the density of $L(t)$. The results are in two directions - series expansion and behaviour at zero, and large asymptotics together with speed of convergence for $f_\phi(x, t)$ and its derivatives. We complement the latter results by providing information about $f_\phi^c(x, t)$ (see (2.10)). We also furnish results for the density of $\sigma(t)$ and its derivatives.

3.1. Behaviour at infinity of densities and their derivatives of the inverse subordinator and of the subordinator itself. In this part we offer results concerning the large asymptotic behaviour of densities (and their derivatives) of inverse subordinators and subordinators themselves. Since, via the saddle point method, we prove the results for all derivatives simultaneously, we impose a condition which may not be optimal but is general enough and easy to implement. For this purpose, we set

$$\Delta(x) := \int_0^{\frac{1}{x}} y^2 \mu_\phi(dy), \quad x > 0, \quad (3.1)$$

for the truncated second moment of the unkilld and driftless version of σ . Then, the main condition in our work is

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{x^2 \Delta(x)}{\ln(x)} = L \in (0, \infty]. \quad (\mathbb{A}_1)$$

The mild requirement

$$\overline{\lim}_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{x \phi'''(x)}{-\phi''(x)} = K < \infty \quad (\mathbb{A}_2)$$

plays a role only in some results. We offer discussion of these conditions in Section 3.1.1, we present alternative formulation of (\mathbb{A}_2) and we demonstrate that they are milder than those in the literature. First of all, let us underline that condition (\mathbb{A}_1) is related to the regularity of the function f_ϕ defined in (2.9).

Theorem 3.1. *Let ϕ be the Laplace exponent of some potentially killed subordinator and assume that condition (\mathbb{A}_1) holds. Then, for any $n \geq 0$ there exists $x_0(n, L) \geq 0$ such that, for any $k, l \geq 0$ with $k + l \leq n$ and $(x, t) \in \mathbb{D}$ with $x > x_0(n, L)$ $\frac{\partial^k}{\partial x^k} \frac{\partial^l}{\partial t^l} f_\phi(x, t)$ is well-defined and*

$$\frac{\partial^l}{\partial t^l} \frac{\partial^k}{\partial x^k} f_\phi(x, t) = (-1)^k \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{\phi^\dagger(a + ib)(\phi(a + ib))^k}{(a + ib)^{1-l}} e^{t(a+ib) - x\phi(a+ib)} db, \quad (3.2)$$

where the integral is absolutely convergent. If $L = \infty$ in (\mathbb{A}_1) , then for any $n \geq 0$, $x_0(n, \infty) = 0$.

Theorem 3.1 is proved in Section 4 and it is needed for the study of the asymptotic behaviour of f_ϕ . The first result in this direction considers the behaviour of $f_\phi(x, t)$ when $t/x \downarrow \mathfrak{b}$, as $x \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 3.2. *Let ϕ be the Laplace exponent of some potentially killed subordinator and assume that conditions (\mathbb{A}_1) and (\mathbb{A}_2) hold true. If $t = t(x)$ is such that $t(x)/x \in (\mathfrak{b}, \phi'(0^+))$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} t(x)/x = \mathfrak{b}$ from above, then, for any $k \geq 0, l \geq 0$, we have*

$$\frac{\partial^k \partial^l}{\partial x^k \partial t^l} f_\phi(x, t) = \frac{(-1)^k}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{a_* t - x\phi(a_*)} \frac{\phi^\dagger(a_*) \phi^k(a_*)}{a_*^{1-l} \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} \left(1 + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\sqrt{\ln(a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x})}}{a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} \right) \right), \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.3)$$

where $a_* := a_*(x)$ is the unique solution of

$$\phi'(a_*) = \frac{t(x)}{x} \in (\mathfrak{b}, \phi'(0^+)). \quad (3.4)$$

Furthermore, for any $M < L$, $a_* \geq M e^{-1}(t/x - \mathfrak{b})^{-1}$ for all x large enough.

Remark 3.3. In Section 3.1.1 we prove that (\mathbb{A}_1) and (\mathbb{A}_2) are milder than the respective one in [18]. (\mathbb{A}_2) is very mild as it holds even for some Compound Poisson processes, e.g., when $\mu_\phi(dy) = e^{-y}dy$. It cannot be deduced from the more stringent (\mathbb{A}_1) as it implies $\phi(\infty) = \infty$. (\mathbb{A}_1) typically holds with $L = \infty$ as in the regular variation case treated as a standing example in Section 3.1.1.

Remark 3.4. The asymptotic (3.3) is in fact uniform. Indeed, since ϕ' is decreasing then a_* in (3.4) is monotone in t/x . Hence, if $t/x - \mathbf{b} \leq h(x)$, with $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} h(x) = 0$, then (3.3) is valid uniformly in t on this region with a_* evaluated for $t = \mathbf{b}x + xh(x)$. Even more, for this theorem and all others concerning the large asymptotic behaviour one can track explicitly the constants in the speed of convergence, see (3.3), and thereby obtain strict upper bounds on the densities and its derivatives. Those upper bounds will be in the line of studies of [14; 23] but under milder assumptions. For lower bounds as in [14; 23] a further study is needed but the saddle point method is poised to deliver these too. For more information see the discussion in Section 3.1.1 and note that the same reasoning applies for our other main results below.

Next, for the sake of clarity, we formulate a corollary which deals with the most usual case, i.e. when $\mathbf{b} = q = 0$ and $L = \infty$ in (\mathbb{A}_1) .

Corollary 3.5. Let ϕ be a Laplace exponent of subordinator such that $\mathbf{b} = q = 0$, let (\mathbb{A}_2) hold and (\mathbb{A}_1) be valid with $L = \infty$. Then $f_\phi(x, t)$ is infinitely differentiable on $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+$ and, for any fixed $t > 0$, one has, for any $k, l \geq 0$,

$$\frac{\partial^k \partial^l}{\partial x^k \partial t^l} f_\phi(x, t) = \frac{(-1)^k}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{a_* t - x\phi(a_*)} \frac{\phi^{k+1}(a_*)}{a_*^{1-l} \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} \left(1 + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\sqrt{\ln(a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x})}}{a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} \right) \right), \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.5)$$

where $a_* = a_*(x)$ is the unique solution of

$$\phi'(a_*) = \frac{t(x)}{x} \in (0, \phi'(0^+)), \quad (3.6)$$

which in addition satisfies $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} a_* x^{-1} = \infty$.

Next, we consider the case when t/x does not converge to \mathbf{b} or $\phi'(0^+)$.

Theorem 3.6. Let ϕ be the Laplace exponent of some potentially killed subordinator and assume that (\mathbb{A}_1) holds. If $t = t(x)$ is such that $t(x)/x \in (\mathbf{b}, \phi'(0^+))$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} t(x)/x = \bar{x} \in (\mathbf{b}, \phi'(0^+))$, then, for any $k \geq 0, l \geq 0$, we have

$$\frac{\partial^k \partial^l}{\partial x^k \partial t^l} f_\phi(x, t) = \frac{(-1)^k \phi^\dagger(\bar{a}) \phi^k(\bar{a})}{\sqrt{2\pi} \bar{a}^{1-l} \sqrt{-\phi''(\bar{a})}} \frac{e^{\bar{a}t - x\phi(\bar{a})}}{\sqrt{x}} \left(1 + \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\ln(x)} x^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \right), \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.7)$$

where \bar{a} is defined via the limit

$$\phi'(\bar{a}) = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \phi'(a_*) = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{t(x)}{x} = \bar{x}. \quad (3.8)$$

Remark 3.7. Due to $\bar{a} < \infty$, see (3.8), condition (\mathbb{A}_2) is not needed and the speed of convergence and the asymptotics are explicit. For f_ϕ only, such a result is contained in Theorem 2 of [18] and we discuss the conditions in Section 3.1.1. Following the argument in Remark 3.4 the asymptotic in (3.7) is uniform for $t/x \in [c, d] \subsetneq (\mathbf{b}, \phi'(0^+))$.

Finally, we consider case when t/x converges from below to $\phi'(0^+)$. Then, we need a local condition which is a modification of (\mathbb{A}_2) , namely

$$\overline{\lim}_{x \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{x\phi'''(x)}{-\phi''(x)} = K < \infty. \quad (\mathbb{A}'_2)$$

We have the result, whose additional assumption (3.9), as argued in Section 3.1.1, is mild.

Theorem 3.8. *Let ϕ be the Laplace exponent of some potentially killed subordinator and assume that conditions (\mathbb{A}_1) and (\mathbb{A}'_2) hold true. If $t = t(x)$ is such that $t(x)/x \in (\mathfrak{b}, \phi'(0^+))$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} t(x)/x = \phi'(0^+)$ from below in such a way that the solution to (3.4), that is $a_* = a_*(x)$ satisfies*

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} -x\phi''(a_*)a_*^2 = \infty, \quad \overline{\lim}_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln\left(\frac{1}{a_*}\right)}{x} < \infty, \quad \forall \delta > 0 \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\delta x} x\phi''(a_*)a_*^2 = 0, \quad (3.9)$$

then, for any $k \geq 0, l \geq 0$, we have asymptotically

$$\frac{\partial^k \partial^l}{\partial x^k \partial t^l} f_\phi(x, t) = \frac{(-1)^k}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{a_* t - x\phi(a_*)} \frac{\phi^\dagger(a_*)\phi^k(a_*)}{a_*^{1-l}\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{\sqrt{\ln(a_*\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x})}}{a_*\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} \right) \right), \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.10)$$

Remark 3.9. *We mention that if $\phi''(0^+) < \infty$ then the last two conditions in (3.9) follow from the first, which actually becomes $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} xa_*^2 = \infty$. Also, it is not hard to get that the latter implies (\mathbb{A}'_2) .*

Next, in the spirit of Theorem 1 in [18], we use the results above to obtain information for the densities of the subordinators themselves. Recall that $\mathbb{P}(\sigma(x) \in dt) = g_\phi(x, t)dt$ provided g_ϕ exists (see (2.7)). Furthermore, set $G_\phi(x, t) = \mathbb{P}(\sigma(x) \leq t)$. The proof of the next result uses the relation

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-zt} G_\phi(x, t) dt = \frac{e^{-x\phi(z)}}{z} = \frac{z}{\phi^\dagger(z)} \int_0^\infty f_\phi(x, t) e^{-zt} dt$$

and is therefore identical to the ones of Theorem 3.2, Theorem 3.6 and Theorem 3.8 including the existence of g_ϕ , that is the derivative of G_ϕ in t , and its derivatives. We only state the following result.

Theorem 3.10. *Let ϕ be the Laplace exponent of some potentially killed subordinator and assume that condition (\mathbb{A}_1) holds. Then, for any $n \geq 0$ there exists $x_0(n, L) \geq 0$ such that, for any $k, l \geq 0$ with $k + l \leq n$ and $(x, t) \in \mathbb{D}$ with $x > x_0(n, L)$, $\frac{\partial^k \partial^l}{\partial x^k \partial t^l} G_\phi(x, t)$ is well-defined. If $L = \infty$ in (\mathbb{A}_1) , then $x_0(n, \infty) = 0$. In particular, the density g_ϕ is well-defined for $x > x_0(1, L)$ and $\frac{\partial^k \partial^l}{\partial x^k \partial t^l} g_\phi(x, t)$ is well-defined for $x > x_0(k + l + 1, L)$. Under the conditions and the notation of Theorem 3.2, if $t/x = t(x)/x \downarrow \mathfrak{b}$, then*

$$\frac{\partial^k \partial^l}{\partial x^k \partial t^l} G_\phi(x, t) = \frac{\partial^k \partial^l}{\partial x^k \partial t^l} f_\phi(x, t) \frac{1}{\phi^\dagger(a_*)} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{\sqrt{\ln(a_*\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x})}}{a_*\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} \right) \right), \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.11)$$

If $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} t/x = \bar{x} \in (\mathfrak{b}, \phi'(0^+))$, under the conditions of Theorem 3.6 we have

$$\frac{\partial^k \partial^l}{\partial x^k \partial t^l} G_\phi(x, t) = \frac{\partial^k \partial^l}{\partial x^k \partial t^l} f_\phi(x, t) \frac{1}{\phi^\dagger(\bar{a})} \left(1 + O\left(\ln(x)x^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \right), \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.12)$$

Finally, if $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} t/x = \phi'(0^+)$ and under the assumptions of Theorem 3.8 we have the expression (3.11).

In particular, under (A_1) , we have $f_\phi^k(x, t) = qG_\phi(x, t)$ and $f_\phi^c(x, t) = \mathfrak{b}g_\phi(x, t)$, see (2.8) and (2.10). Hence, the conclusions of Theorem 3.10 can be transferred to f_ϕ^c and f_ϕ^k .

Corollary 3.11. *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.10, then (3.11) and (3.12) hold with a factor q for f_ϕ^k . Furthermore, (3.11) hold with a factor $\mathfrak{b}a_*$ and (3.12) with a factor $\mathfrak{b}\bar{a}$ for f_ϕ^c .*

3.1.1. *Comparison to existing results and examples.* The most recent results are Theorems 1-2 of [18] and Theorem 4.17 of [23]. Since [23] together with [14] develop bounds too and their conditions from Lemma 3.13 below are in the setting of [18] we do not discuss them at the level of asymptotics. [18] deals only with densities and offers no estimates on the speed of convergence. When $t(x)/x \downarrow \mathfrak{b}$ it is required that

$$\liminf_{y \rightarrow \infty} \frac{y^2 \Delta(y)}{\bar{\mu}_\phi(y^{-1})} = \liminf_{y \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\Delta(y^{-1})}{y^2 \bar{\mu}_\phi(y)} > 0, \quad (3.13)$$

which implies $\phi(\infty) = \infty$ and resembles the well-known positive increase condition, see e.g. [42, eq (6)]. However, choosing $\mu_\phi(dy) = y^{-1} \ln(y^{-1}) \mathbb{I}_{\{y \in (0,1)\}} dy$ we see that (3.13) is not satisfied whereas (A_1) and (A_2) hold since at infinity $x\phi'''(x) \asymp x^{-2} \ln(x) \asymp -\phi''(x)$ and $x^2 \Delta(x) \asymp \ln(x)$, as $x \rightarrow \infty$.

Before proceeding with a specific example we prove that (3.13) implies (A_1) and (A_2) . For this purpose we need a technical lemma.

Lemma 3.12. *Let ϕ be a Bernstein function. Then, for some absolute constant C it holds that*

$$e^{-1} \Delta(x) \leq -\phi''(x) \leq \Delta(x) + \frac{C}{x^2} \bar{\mu}_\phi\left(\frac{1}{x}\right). \quad (3.14)$$

Proof. Since $-\phi''(x) = \int_0^\infty e^{-xy} y^2 \mu_\phi(dy)$ we get that

$$-\phi''(x) \geq e^{-1} \int_0^{\frac{1}{x}} y^2 \mu_\phi(dy)$$

and the lower bound in (3.14) follows. The upper bound follows from

$$\begin{aligned} -\phi''(x) &\leq \int_0^{\frac{1}{x}} y^2 \mu_\phi(dy) + \sum_{n \geq 1} \int_{\frac{n}{x}}^{\frac{n+1}{x}} e^{-xy} y^2 \mu_\phi(dy) \leq \Delta(x) + \frac{1}{x^2} \sum_{n \geq 1} (n+1)^2 e^{-n} \int_{\frac{n}{x}}^{\frac{n+1}{x}} \mu_\phi(dy) \\ &\leq \Delta(x) + \frac{C}{x^2} \bar{\mu}_\phi\left(\frac{1}{x}\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 3.13. *Let ϕ be a Bernstein function with $\phi(\infty) = \infty$. If*

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\phi''(2x)}{\phi''(x)} > 0, \quad (A_2^*)$$

then (A_2) holds true. Subsequently, condition (3.13) implies (A_2) and (A_1) with $L = \infty$.

Proof. From Item 3 of Lemma 2.1 we have that ϕ''' is positive and non-increasing and therefore

$$-\phi''(x) \geq \int_x^{2x} \phi'''(y) dy \geq x\phi'''(2x).$$

Hence (\mathbf{A}_2^*) implies (\mathbf{A}_2) . Let us show that (3.13) triggers (\mathbf{A}_2^*) . From (3.14) we get at infinity $-\phi''(x) \asymp \Delta(x)$. Also from [18, eq. (3.3)] we have that

$$\Delta\left(\frac{1}{x}\right) \leq 2 \int_0^x w \bar{\mu}_\phi(w) dw = \Delta\left(\frac{1}{x}\right) + x^2 \bar{\mu}_\phi(x) \quad (3.15)$$

and we arrive for small x at

$$\int_0^x w \bar{\mu}_\phi(w) dw \asymp -\phi''(x^{-1}) \asymp \Delta(x^{-1}). \quad (3.16)$$

However, from [SC'] at page 8 of [18] we have, for any $\lambda > 1$, some $c \geq 1$ and $\alpha \in (0, 2]$, that

$$1 \leq \liminf_{x \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\int_0^{\lambda x} w \bar{\mu}_\phi(w) dw}{\int_0^x w \bar{\mu}_\phi(w) dw} \leq \lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\int_0^{\lambda x} w \bar{\mu}_\phi(w) dw}{\int_0^x w \bar{\mu}_\phi(w) dw} \leq c \lambda^{2-\alpha}.$$

Setting $\lambda = 2$ and using (3.16) with $x \rightarrow 1/2y$ we deduce that at infinity

$$-\phi''(y) \asymp -\phi''(2y)$$

and (\mathbf{A}_2^*) , (\mathbf{A}_2) follow. From [11, Definition 2.0.6] and (3.16) it follows that $-\phi''(x)$ is O-regularly varying function at infinity, see [11, Corollary 2.0.5]. Then from [11, 2.1.9 of Theorem 2.1.8] it follows that the lower Matuszewska index of $-\phi''(x)$ is larger or equal to $\alpha - 2 > -2$ and the upper index is clearly 0. Therefore, $-\phi''(x)$ is of bounded decrease as in [11, p.71] and from [11, Proposition 2.2.1] we get that $-\phi''(x) \geq x^{-2+\alpha+\epsilon}$ for all $0 < \epsilon < 2 - \alpha$ and x large enough. Therefore, from (3.16) we obtain that

$$\Delta(x) \geq Cx^{-2+\alpha+\epsilon}$$

for some $C > 0$ and all x large enough and clearly (\mathbf{A}_1) holds with $L = \infty$. \square

Let us provide an example. Take $q = \mathbf{b} = 0$ and a Lévy measure with a compactly supported density that is regularly varying at 0 with index $-1 - \alpha$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, as for instance

$$\mu_\phi(dy) = m(y) \mathbb{I}_{\{y < \frac{1}{2}\}} dy, \quad m(y) \sim y^{-\alpha-1} \text{ as } y \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.17)$$

We can opt for general regular variation and $\mathbf{b}, q > 0$ but we leave it to the interested reader. Then,

$$\phi'''(x) \sim C_3 x^{\alpha-3} \text{ and } -\phi''(x) \sim C_2 x^{\alpha-2} \text{ as } x \rightarrow \infty$$

for positive constants C_2, C_3 . Clearly, (\mathbf{A}_2) is satisfied. Also, due to the finite support of μ_ϕ we have that $|\phi''(0^+)| < \infty$, $\phi'''(0^+) < \infty$ and (\mathbf{A}_2') is valid too. Furthermore, for some $C > 0$,

$$x^2 \Delta(x) = x^2 \int_0^{\frac{1}{x}} y^2 m(y) dy \asymp Cx^\alpha$$

and (\mathbf{A}_1) holds with $L = \infty$. It is clear that, actually, assumptions (\mathbf{A}_1) and (\mathbf{A}_2) hold for any Bernstein function ϕ that is regularly varying at ∞ with index $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

Going back to the example, let $t(x)/x \downarrow 0$. Using $-\phi''(x) \sim C_2 x^{\alpha-2}$, as $x \rightarrow \infty$, we establish, for any $k, l \geq 0$,

$$\frac{\partial^k \partial^l}{\partial x^k \partial t^l} f_\phi(x, t) = \frac{(-1)^k C_0^{k+1}}{\sqrt{2\pi C_2}} e^{a_* t - x \phi(a_*)} \frac{a_*^{k+l+1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}}{\sqrt{x}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{\ln(a_* x)}{a_*^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \sqrt{x}}\right) \right), \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.18)$$

where we have used Theorem 3.2 with $\phi(y) = \phi^\dagger(y) \sim C_0 y^\alpha$ as $y \rightarrow \infty$. Finally, employing that $\phi'(y) \sim C_1 y^{\alpha-1}$ as $y \rightarrow \infty$ we get from (3.6) that

$$C_1 a_*^{\alpha-1} \sim \frac{t}{x} \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty \iff a_* \sim \left(\frac{1}{C_1} \frac{t}{x} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}}, \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty,$$

and we can plug in this expression above. The speed of convergence is of the form $(t/x)^{\alpha/(2(1-\alpha))} x^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ which offers faster decay when α approaches 1. We can choose $t = t(x)$ as we wish as long as $t/x \rightarrow 0$.

When $t(x)/x \rightarrow \bar{x} \in (\mathfrak{b}, \infty)$ we are in the setting of Theorem 3.6 whose condition is only (A₁). We have discussed the relation between (A₁) and (3.13) in [18]. We emphasize that there they have some additional hypothesis called (G) and (H). Condition (H) is more stringent than ours at least in the case when L is finite since then the integral in [18] may not be finite. To illustrate our results in the example of regular variation above take $t(x)/x = 1$, $\phi'(\bar{a}) = 1$ and note that from (3.7) we deduce that

$$\frac{\partial^k \partial^l}{\partial x^k \partial t^l} f_\phi(x, t) = \frac{(-1)^k \phi^\dagger(\bar{a}) \phi^k(\bar{a})}{\sqrt{2\pi} \bar{a}^{1-l} \sqrt{-\phi''(\bar{a})}} \frac{e^{x(\bar{a} - \phi(\bar{a}))}}{\sqrt{x}} \left(1 + O\left(\ln(x)x^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right) \right), \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty,$$

and the dependence on x is explicit. Since $x\phi'(x) \leq \phi(x)$, see (4) of Lemma 2.1, we conclude that $\bar{a} - \phi(\bar{a}) \leq 0$ as required for the asymptotic above.

Consider the case when $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} t(x)/x = \infty = \phi'(0^+)$. Then as above $a_* \sim C(t/x)^{-\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}$ and $x = o(t(x))$, as $x \rightarrow \infty$, thus

$$-a_*^2 \phi''(a_*) x \sim C a_*^\alpha x \sim C' t^{-\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} x^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}, \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty,$$

which goes to infinity if $t = o\left(x^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\right)$ and the first requirement of (3.9) is fulfilled. Also, for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\delta x} t^{-\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} x^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} = 0,$$

for $t = o\left(x^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\right)$, as $x \rightarrow \infty$, and the third condition in (3.9) holds. Under the same restrictions $\ln(1/a_*)$ is at most of logarithmic growth and the second imposition of (3.9) is valid.

Let us discuss the route to the derivation of new fine local estimates in the region of the lower envelope. We use the example above with $\alpha = 1/2$. In this case one has to consider

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sigma(x) \leq c \frac{x^2}{\log_2 x}\right),$$

where $\log_2 x = \log \log x$, $c > 0$, see [9, Chapter III]. Set $t = c \frac{x^2}{\log_2 x}$. Clearly, $t/x \rightarrow \infty$ and from above (A₁), (A₂) and (A'₂) hold. Also,

$$\phi'(a_*) = \frac{t}{x} \Rightarrow a_* \sim C \frac{\log_2^2 x}{x^2}, \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty.$$

Furthermore, as $x \rightarrow \infty$,

$$-x a_* \phi''(a_*) \sim C x a_*^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sim C \log_2(x) \rightarrow \infty$$

and the first requirement of (3.9) is fulfilled. The second and the third impositions of (3.9) are then obvious and Theorem 3.10 holds true and by virtue of its claims it yields local estimates for the densities and all derivatives of the probabilities above.

Assume that $|\phi''(0^+)| < \infty$ and hence $\phi'(0^+) < \infty$. Let us determine the speed by which t/x may approach $\phi'(0^+)$. First, we note that since $a_* \rightarrow 0$ then, as $x \rightarrow 0$,

$$-a_*\phi''(0^+) \sim \phi'(0) - \phi'(a_*) = \phi'(0) - \frac{t}{x}.$$

From Remark 3.9 we have to ensure that $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} a_*\sqrt{x} = \infty$. Hence, from the last relation we must have

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sqrt{x}}{x\phi'(0) - t} = 0.$$

Thus, $\sqrt{x} = o(x\phi'(0) - t)$, as $x \rightarrow \infty$, or alternatively $t < x\phi'(0) - K\sqrt{x}$, for all $K > 0$, and all x large enough. This captures the region below that of the central limit theorem for the density g_ϕ , see Theorem 3.10, and therefore we can approximate with high precision, as $x \rightarrow \infty$, quantities of the type

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma(x) \in [a, b]) = \int_a^b g(x, t) dt.$$

The works [14; 23] develop upper and lower bounds for g_ϕ . The most general condition seems to be in [23, Theorem 3.3] which assumes that $-x^{2-\alpha}\phi''(x)$, $\alpha < 2$, is eventually almost increasing, see [23, page 6]. The conditions on ϕ in their main Theorem 4.17 lead to the aforementioned one. From [23, Lemma 2.8] it follows that (3.16) holds and $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} x^{2-\alpha}\Delta(x) > 0$. Therefore, (A₁) is true with $L = \infty$.

Also (A₂^{*}) and hence (A₂) are valid. This could be seen from [23, Prop 2.3 and Prop. 2.4 with $b = 0$] which together with item 4 of Lemma 2.1 show that $-x^2\phi''(x) \asymp \phi(x)$ which gives (A₂^{*}) using the subadditivity of ϕ . Henceforth, we deduce that our main conditions are milder. Then upper bounds for g_ϕ and f_ϕ can be obtained by tracking the constants and terms in the application of the saddle point method for the proofs of our main results. This can be done explicitly as the inversion is done for set of values of t and x . The lower bounds will follow the same route by separating out the main term and then subtracting the contribution of the negligible. The latter may worsen the estimates but it will provide increasingly (with the growth of t, x) tighter bounds.

3.2. A power series representation of densities and their derivatives and their behaviour at zero. Here we discuss our results concerning the power-series representation of the density of the inverse subordinator and its derivatives. These will be obtained by assuming that the Laplace exponent ϕ of the involved potentially killed subordinator satisfies the following assumptions:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{There exists } \theta \in (0, \pi) \text{ such that } \phi \text{ admits a holomorphic extension} \\ \text{on } \mathbb{C}(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2}) \text{ which is continuous on } \overline{\mathbb{C}(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \end{aligned} \tag{B₁}$$

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\phi(z)}{z} = \mathfrak{b} \quad \text{uniformly in } \overline{\mathbb{C}(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}. \tag{B₂}$$

We remark that (B₁) and (B₂) are very general. They are satisfied by a wide class of Bernstein functions (see the discussion in Section 3.2.1 below). Upon the validity of (B₁) and (B₂) we have the following regularity result.

Theorem 3.14. *Let ϕ be the Laplace exponent of a potentially killed subordinator satisfying assumptions (B₁) and (B₂). Then, for any $n \geq 1$, $\bar{\mu}_\phi^{*n}$ belongs to $C^\infty(0, +\infty)$ and $f_\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{D})$.*

Theorem 3.14 is proved in Section 4. Under its conditions the following power series representation holds.

Theorem 3.15. *Let ϕ be the Laplace exponent of a potentially killed subordinator satisfying assumptions (\mathbb{B}_1) and (\mathbb{B}_2) . Then, for any $k, l \geq 0$,*

$$\frac{\partial^k \partial^l}{\partial x^k \partial t^l} f_\phi(x, t) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^j}{j!} \mathcal{I}_{j,k,l}(t), \quad (x, t) \in \mathbb{D}, \quad (3.19)$$

where

$$\mathcal{I}_{j,k,l}(t) := (-1)^{k+j} \sum_{k_1+k_2+k_3=k+j} \frac{(k+j)!}{k_1!k_2!k_3!} q^{k_1} \mathfrak{b}^{k_2} \frac{d^{l+k_2+k_3}}{dt^{l+k_2+k_3}} \bar{\mu}_\phi^{*(k_3+1)}(t) \quad (3.20)$$

and the series is absolutely convergent.

Remark 3.16. *Note that the series (3.19) which contains the tail, its convolutions and their derivatives is similar to the series expansion for the potential density of a subordinator with drift, see [19].*

Remark 3.17. *Observe that $f_\phi(x, t) = 0$ for any $x < 0$ and $t > 0$, hence the previous theorem shows that, for fixed $t > 0$, $f_\phi(x, t)$ coincides, for $0 < x < \mathfrak{b}/t$, with an entire function, i.e., the right hand side of (3.19) for $k = l = 0$.*

The series representation (3.19) yields information about the behaviour at 0 of f_ϕ and its derivatives.

Theorem 3.18. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.15, for any $k, l \geq 0$ we have*

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial^k \partial^l}{\partial x^k \partial t^l} f_\phi(x, t) = \mathcal{I}_{0,k,l}(t)$$

and

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} x^{-1} \left| \frac{\partial^k \partial^l}{\partial x^k \partial t^l} f_\phi(x, t) - \mathcal{I}_{0,k,l}(t) \right| = \mathcal{I}_{1,k,l}(t),$$

where both limits are uniform with respect to $t \in [a, b]$ for any $[a, b] \subset (0, +\infty)$.

Despite conditions (\mathbb{B}_1) and (\mathbb{B}_2) depend on a suitable $\theta \in (0, \pi)$, the series representation (3.19) is independent of θ . Indeed, the result follows once one recognize some special integral representations for both the function f_ϕ and the convolution powers $\bar{\mu}_\phi^{*n}$. Note that the series provides an explicit representation of f_ϕ whenever the convolution powers $\bar{\mu}_\phi^{*n}$ can be evaluated. On the other hand, there could be some cases in which the integral formulation of $\bar{\mu}_\phi^{*n}$ can be used to provide such an evaluation. This is the case, for instance, when we can extend ϕ on the whole complex half-plane $\overline{\mathbb{C}(0, \pi)} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \text{Im}(z) \geq 0\}$. Let us underline that such a property is not necessarily verified by all complete Bernstein functions, as for instance $\phi(z) = \log(1+z)$ cannot satisfy this.

Proposition 3.19. *Let ϕ be a complete Bernstein function and assume that ϕ can be extended with continuity on $\overline{\mathbb{C}(0, \pi)}$. Denote by ϕ_+ such extension. Assume further that*

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\phi_+^\dagger(z)}{z} = 0 \text{ uniformly in } \overline{\mathbb{C}(0, \pi)}.$$

Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and any $t > 0$, denoting by γ_ε the parametrized curve $\gamma_\varepsilon : z = \varepsilon e^{i\xi}$ for $\xi \in [-\pi, \pi]$,

$$\frac{d^r}{dt^r} \bar{\mu}_\phi^{*n}(t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_\varepsilon^{+\infty} \text{Im} \left[(-1)^{r+n+1} \frac{(\phi_+^\dagger(-\rho))^n}{\rho^{n-r}} e^{-t\rho} \right] d\rho + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_\varepsilon} e^{tz} \frac{(\phi_+^\dagger(z))^n}{z^{n-r}} dz. \quad (3.21)$$

Similarly to what we did for the asymptotic behaviour at infinity, we can use the relation

$$\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-zt} G_\phi(x, t) dt = \frac{e^{-x\phi(z)}}{z} \quad (3.22)$$

to obtain, with the same method, results on $G_\phi(x, t)$ (see (2.7)). This is stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.20. *Under (\mathbb{B}_1) and (\mathbb{B}_2) , $G_\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{D})$ and for any $k \geq 1$, $l \geq 0$ and $(x, t) \in \mathbb{D}$*

$$G_\phi(x, t) = e^{-qx} + \sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} \frac{x^j}{j!} \mathfrak{J}_{j,0,0}(t), \quad (3.23)$$

$$\frac{\partial^l}{\partial t^l} g_\phi(x, t) = \sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} \frac{x^j}{j!} \mathfrak{J}_{j,0,l+1}(t), \quad (3.24)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial^l}{\partial t^l} \frac{\partial^k}{\partial x^k} g_\phi(x, t) = \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \frac{x^j}{j!} \mathfrak{J}_{j,k,l+1}(t), \quad (3.25)$$

where

$$\mathfrak{J}_{j,k,l}(t) = (-1)^{k+j+1} \sum_{k_1+k_2+k_3=k+j-1} \frac{(k+j)!}{k_1!k_2!(k_3+1)!} q^{k_1} \mathbf{b}^{k_2} \frac{d^{k_2+k_3+l}}{dt^{k_2+k_3+l}} \bar{\mu}_\phi^{*(k_3+1)}(t). \quad (3.26)$$

In particular, all the series are absolutely convergent.

As in the previous section, under (\mathbb{B}_1) and (\mathbb{B}_2) we know that $f_\phi^k(x, t) = qG_\phi(x, t)$ and $f_\phi^c(x, t) = \mathbf{b}g_\phi(x, t)$, see (2.8) and (2.10). Hence, the results of Theorem 3.20 can be transferred to f_ϕ^k and f_ϕ^c .

Corollary 3.21. *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.20, (3.23) holds for f_ϕ^k up to a multiplicative factor q . Furthermore, (3.24) and (3.25) hold for f_ϕ^c up to a multiplicative factor \mathbf{b} .*

3.2.1. Comparison to existing results and examples. Let us underline that assumptions (\mathbb{B}_1) and (\mathbb{B}_2) cover a wide class of Bernstein functions, and then of subordinators. Indeed, if ϕ is a complete Bernstein function, then Item 1 of Lemma 2.4 guarantees that assumption (\mathbb{B}_1) is satisfied, while (\mathbb{B}_2) follows from Item 5 of the same lemma. However, we can find some Bernstein functions that are not complete but still satisfy (\mathbb{B}_1) and (\mathbb{B}_2) for some θ . Indeed, if we consider a Bernstein function ϕ that is not complete, we know by Proposition 2.6 that there exists $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that ϕ_α is not a complete Bernstein function (but it is still a Bernstein function by Item 7 of Lemma 2.1). Now, if we consider $\theta \in (0, \pi)$ so that $(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})\alpha < \frac{\pi}{2}$, that exists since $\alpha < 1$, then $z \in \mathbb{C}(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2}) \mapsto z^\alpha \in \mathbb{C}((\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})\alpha) \subset \mathbb{H}_0$ is holomorphic. Furthermore, ϕ is holomorphic on \mathbb{H}_0 and thus the composition ϕ_α is holomorphic on $\mathbb{C}(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})$. The continuity of ϕ_α over $\overline{\mathbb{C}(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}$ follows similarly, thus obtaining (\mathbb{B}_1) . The uniform limit condition (\mathbb{B}_2) follows from Item 6 of Lemma 2.1 and the fact that $z^\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{H}_0}$ whenever $z \in \overline{\mathbb{C}(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}$, since

$$\frac{\phi_\alpha(z)}{z} = \frac{\phi(z^\alpha)}{z^\alpha} z^{\alpha-1} \rightarrow 0.$$

Thus, if we consider, e.g., the Bernstein function ϕ whose Lévy measure is given by (3.17), then there exists a $\beta \in (0, 1)$ such that ϕ_β satisfies (\mathbb{B}_1) and (\mathbb{B}_2) and it is not a complete Bernstein function. Let us stress that there are functions satisfying (\mathbb{A}_1) and (\mathbb{A}_2) but not (\mathbb{B}_1) and (\mathbb{B}_2) and vice versa. For instance, we have already shown that if $\mu_\phi(dy) = y^{-1} \log(y^{-1}) \mathbb{I}_{y \in (0,1)} dy$, then ϕ satisfies both (\mathbb{A}_1)

and (\mathbb{A}_2) . Furthermore, we have $\phi(z) = \frac{z}{2} \int_0^1 e^{-zy} \log^2(y) dy$, which can be clearly extended to the whole complex plane, thus it verifies (\mathbb{B}_1) . However, let us consider any $\lambda > 0$ and the sequence $z_n = -4\lambda\pi n + i4\pi n$, so that, for n big enough, since $\cos(4\pi ny) > \frac{1}{2}$ for any $y \in (\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{12n}, \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{12n})$,

$$\operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{\phi(z_n)}{z_n} \right) \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{12n}}^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{12n}} e^{4\lambda\pi ny} \cos(4\pi ny) \log^2(y) dy \geq \frac{e^{\lambda\pi n}}{24n} \log^2 \left(\frac{3}{4} \right) \rightarrow \infty.$$

Since $\lambda > 0$ is arbitrary, this implies that (\mathbb{B}_2) cannot be verified for any $\theta \in (0, \pi)$. On the the hand, if we consider $\phi(z) = 1 - e^{-z}$, then we know that $\phi_\alpha(z) := \phi(z^\alpha)$ satisfies (\mathbb{B}_1) and (\mathbb{B}_2) for some $\theta \in (0, \pi)$. However, it does not satisfies (\mathbb{A}_1) since it is a bounded Bernstein function. Indeed, in Proposition 4.2, we will show that (\mathbb{A}_1) implies that ϕ is unbounded.

As already stated in the previous section, the representation (3.19) provides some completely explicit result if we evaluate the derivatives of the convolution powers $\bar{\mu}_\phi^{*n}$. For instance, this is doable for stable subordinators in which case the tail of the Lévy measure of $\phi(z) = z^\alpha$ is given by

$$\bar{\mu}_\alpha(t) = \frac{t^{-\alpha}}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)}.$$

We use subscript α instead of ϕ since here $\phi(z) = z^\alpha$. For these specific tails, it is well-known that

$$\bar{\mu}_\alpha^{*(j+1)}(t) = \frac{t^{j-(j+1)\alpha}}{\Gamma(j+1-(j+1)\alpha)}$$

and then

$$\frac{d^j}{dt^j} \bar{\mu}_\alpha^{*j}(t) = \frac{t^{-j\alpha-1}}{\Gamma(-j\alpha)} = \frac{t^{-j\alpha-1}}{\pi} \sin(\pi j\alpha) \Gamma(1+j\alpha),$$

where we have used Euler's reflection formula, provided that $\alpha \notin \mathbb{Q}$, while for $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}$ we have to pay attention to the case in which $j\alpha$ is an integer, for which it can be simply proven that $\bar{\mu}_\alpha^{*j}(t)$ is a monomial of degree less than j and thus $\frac{d^j}{dt^j} \bar{\mu}_\alpha^{*j}(t) = 0$ as expected. For $l = 0$ substituting this into (3.26) and then into (3.24), we get that

$$g_\alpha(x, t) = \sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} (-1)^{j+1} \frac{x^j t^{-j\alpha-1}}{j! \pi} \sin(\pi j\alpha) \Gamma(1+j\alpha). \quad (3.27)$$

This series expansion is well-known in literature, see e.g. [47, Equation (7)]. The same argument can be also adopted to obtain the series representation of f_α . Indeed, with the same arguments as before

$$\frac{d^j}{dt^j} \bar{\mu}_\alpha^{*(j+1)}(t) = \frac{t^{-(j+1)\alpha}}{\pi(j+1)\alpha} \sin(\pi\alpha(j+1)) \Gamma(\alpha(j+1)+1)$$

for any $j \geq 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Thus, by using (3.19), we get

$$f_\alpha(x, t) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (-1)^j \frac{\Gamma(1+(j+1)\alpha)}{\alpha(j+1)!} \frac{\sin(\pi\alpha(j+1))}{\pi} x^j t^{-\beta(j+1)}.$$

Such a series can also be deduced by combining (3.27) with the relation

$$f_\alpha(x, t) = \frac{t}{\alpha} x^{-1-\frac{1}{\alpha}} g_\alpha(1, tx^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}),$$

see [38] for more details. It has also been obtained by means of a limit argument in [32, Remark 2.3].

A similar approach can be used to deduce some information on the relativistic (or tempered) stable subordinator, i.e. when $\phi(z) = (\lambda+z)^\alpha - \lambda^\alpha$. In [32] the authors provide both an integral and a series representation for the density $f_{\alpha,\lambda}$ of the inverse tempered stable subordinator. In the proof, they

exploit the possibility to extend ϕ to the whole complex half-plane $\overline{\mathbb{C}(0, \pi)}$ and then they integrate on a keyhole contour centered in $-\lambda$. This seems to be slightly different from our contour, which is not really a keyhole contour and it is always centered in 0. However, Proposition 3.19 lets us extend the approach to a full keyhole contour. Furthermore, if we choose $\varepsilon < \lambda$, then for any $j \geq 0$ we get

$$\int_{\gamma_\varepsilon} e^{tz} \frac{(\phi(z))^{j+1}}{z} dz = 0,$$

since the integrand is holomorphic on the disc $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < \varepsilon\}$. Furthermore, since $\phi_+(\rho)$ is real for $\rho > -\lambda$, we can rewrite

$$\frac{d^{j+1}}{dt^{j+1}} \bar{\mu}_\phi^{*j}(t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_\lambda^{+\infty} \operatorname{Im} \left[\frac{(\phi_+(-\rho))^{j+1}}{\rho} e^{-t\rho} \right] d\rho = \frac{e^{-t\lambda}}{\pi} \int_0^{+\infty} \operatorname{Im} \left[\frac{(\phi_+(\lambda - \rho))^{j+1}}{\rho + \lambda} e^{-t\rho} \right] d\rho.$$

This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} f_\phi(x, t) &= \frac{e^{-t\lambda}}{\pi} \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \frac{x^j}{j!} (-1)^j \int_0^{+\infty} \operatorname{Im} \left[\frac{(\phi_+(\lambda - \rho))^{j+1}}{\rho + \lambda} e^{-t\rho} \right] d\rho \\ &= \frac{e^{x\lambda^\alpha - t\lambda}}{\pi} \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \frac{x^j}{j!} (-1)^j \int_0^{+\infty} \operatorname{Im} \left[\frac{(\phi_+(\lambda - \rho))^{j+1}}{\rho + \lambda} e^{-x(-\rho)^\alpha - t\rho} \right] d\rho \\ &= \frac{e^{x\lambda^\alpha - t\lambda}}{\pi} \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{e^{x\rho^\alpha \cos(\alpha\pi) - t\rho}}{\rho + \lambda} [\rho^\alpha \sin(\alpha\pi - x\rho^\alpha \sin(i\alpha\pi)) + \lambda^\alpha \cos(\alpha\pi) \sin(x\rho^\alpha \sin(i\alpha\pi))] d\rho, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows by simple algebraic manipulations. It is the integral representation of [32, Theorem 2.1] and thus, arguing as in [32, Proposition 2.1], we get the series representation

$$\begin{aligned} f_\phi(x, t) &= \frac{e^{\lambda^\alpha x}}{\pi} \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \frac{(-1)^j x^j}{j!} \lambda^{\alpha(j+1)} [\Gamma(1 + \alpha(j+1))\Gamma(-\alpha(j+1), \lambda t) \sin((j+1)\alpha\pi) \\ &\quad - \Gamma(1 + \alpha j)\Gamma(-\alpha j, \lambda t) \sin(j\alpha\pi)], \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

where $\Gamma(x, y)$ is the upper-incomplete Gamma function.

Let us also underline that, with the same arguments, we can use Proposition 3.19 to obtain the integral representation of the density of the inverse Gamma subordinator (i.e. the case $\phi(z) = \log(1+z)$), as in [33, Proposition 1].

In [13], the authors studied a special class of Thorin subordinators. Let us consider now an example taken from this paper. Indeed, fix $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, let us consider the subordinator σ whose Laplace exponent is given by $\phi(z) = \varphi(z) - \varphi(0) - z$, where $\varphi(z)$ is the unique solution of $\varphi(z) - (\varphi(z))^\alpha = z$ for $z \geq 0$. Clearly $\phi(0) = 0$ and then $q = 0$. Furthermore, by [13, Theorem 1], we know that $\mathfrak{b} = 0$. By [13, Proposition 5], we know that g_ϕ is well-defined. Furthermore, we can rewrite [13, Equation (21)] in the following form, for $x, t > 0$,

$$g_\phi(x, t) = \sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} \frac{x^j}{j!} (A_j(t) + B_j(t) + C_j(t)), \quad (3.29)$$

where

$$A_j(t) = j \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} (-1)^{n+1} \frac{\Gamma(1 + n\alpha)}{n!} \sin(\pi n\alpha) t^{-n\alpha+n}$$

$$B_j(t) = j(j-1) \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} (-1)^{n+1} \frac{(n+1)\Gamma(1+n\alpha)}{n!} \sin(\pi n\alpha) t^{-n\alpha+n-1}$$

$$C_j(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & j = 1, 2 \\ \sum_{k=0}^j \frac{j!}{(j-k)!} \sum_{n=k+1}^{+\infty} (-1)^{n+1} \binom{n+1}{k+2} \frac{\Gamma(1+n\alpha)}{n!} \sin(\pi n\alpha) t^{-n\alpha+n-2-k} & j \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

In particular, comparing (3.24) and (3.29), we get, by means of (3.26),

$$\frac{d^j}{dt^j} \bar{\mu}_\phi^{*j}(t) = A_j(t) + B_j(t) + C_j(t), \quad t > 0, \quad j \geq 1.$$

For $j = 1$, we get again [13, Equation (22)]. Furthermore, setting

$$\bar{A}_j(t) = j \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} (-1)^n \frac{\Gamma(1+n\alpha)}{n!(n-n\alpha+1)} \sin(\pi n\alpha) t^{-n\alpha+n+1}$$

$$\bar{B}_j(t) = j(j-1) \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} (-1)^n \frac{(n+1)\Gamma(1+n\alpha)}{n!(n-n\alpha)} \sin(\pi n\alpha) t^{-n\alpha+n}$$

$$\bar{C}_j(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & j = 1, 2 \\ \sum_{k=0}^j \frac{j!}{(j-k)!} \sum_{n=k+1}^{+\infty} (-1)^n \binom{n+1}{k+2} \frac{\Gamma(1+n\alpha)}{n!(n-n\alpha-1-k)} \sin(\pi n\alpha) t^{-n\alpha+n-1-k} & j \geq 3, \end{cases}$$

we have

$$\frac{d^j}{dt^j} \bar{\mu}_\phi^{*j+1}(t) = \bar{A}_{j+1}(t) + \bar{B}_{j+1}(t) + \bar{C}_{j+1}(t), \quad t > 0, \quad j \geq 0$$

and then we achieve the density of the inverse subordinator L_ϕ by means of (3.19).

Finally, we show a specific application of Theorem 3.18 to the context of time-nonlocal equations. For example, in [2] the following assumption is used to prove the main result:

- For any $0 < a \leq b$ there exists $\delta_{a,b} > 0$ and a function $F_{a,b} : (0, \delta_{a,b}) \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$ such that

$$\int_0^{\delta_{a,b}} x^{-\frac{1}{2}} F_{a,b}(x) dx < \infty$$

and, for any $x \in (0, \delta_{a,b})$ and $t \in [a, b]$,

$$\left| \frac{\partial f_\phi}{\partial x}(x, t) \right| \leq F_{a,b}(x).$$

It is clear that, since the limits in 3.18 are locally uniform in t , the latter condition is verified with $F_{a,b}$ being independent of x if ϕ satisfies (\mathbb{B}_1) and (\mathbb{B}_2) . In particular, the latter holds whenever (but not exclusively if) ϕ is a complete Bernstein function.

4. SMOOTHNESS OF THE DENSITIES AND THEIR INTEGRAL REPRESENTATION

In this section we prove that the densities f_ϕ and the distributions G_ϕ are smooth under either assumption (\mathbb{A}_1) or assumptions (\mathbb{B}_1) and (\mathbb{B}_2) . To do this we will provide some integral representations for them $f_\phi(x, t)$ obtained by means of Laplace inversion. These representations will be also used to obtain the main results, which are obtained differently depending on the fact that either assumption (\mathbb{A}_1) or assumptions (\mathbb{B}_1) and (\mathbb{B}_2) hold and thus we separate the two sets of assumptions.

4.1. Smoothness and Laplace inversion under (\mathbb{A}_1) . We first provide a general condition under which the density f_ϕ is smooth in \mathbb{D} for x large enough and by means of Laplace inversion we give an integral representation of f_ϕ .

Proposition 4.1. *Let ϕ be the Laplace exponent of a potentially killed subordinator. Assume that for $n \geq 0$ there exist $a > 0$ and $x_0 \geq 0$ such that, for any $x > x_0$,*

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |b|^n e^{-x \operatorname{Re} \phi(a+ib)} db < \infty. \quad (4.1)$$

Then, for any $k, l \geq 0$ with $k + l \leq n$, $\frac{\partial^k}{\partial x^k} \frac{\partial^l}{\partial t^l} f_\phi(x, t)$ is well defined for $(x, t) \in \mathbb{D}$ with $x > x_0$ and

$$\frac{\partial^l}{\partial t^l} \frac{\partial^k}{\partial x^k} f_\phi(x, t) = (-1)^k \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{\phi^\dagger(a+ib)(\phi(a+ib))^k}{(a+ib)^{1-l}} e^{t(a+ib)-x\phi(a+ib)} db, \quad (4.2)$$

where the integral is absolutely convergent.

Proof. By using (2.13) we compute the inverse Laplace transform as in [1, Item a), Theorem 4.2.21]. Precisely, we have, for all fixed $x > 0$ and for almost all $t > 0$, up to a subsequence,

$$f_\phi(x, t) = \text{C-} \lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{a-ir}^{a+ir} e^{zt} \frac{\phi^\dagger(z)}{z} e^{-x\phi(z)} dz, \quad (4.3)$$

where $x_0 > 0$ is arbitrary and we denote by C-lim the Cesaro limit, i.e.,

$$\text{C-} \lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{a-ir}^{a+ir} e^{zt} \frac{\phi^\dagger(z)}{z} e^{-x\phi(z)} dz := \lim_{R \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{R} \int_0^R \int_{a-ir}^{a+ir} e^{zt} \frac{\phi^\dagger(z)}{z} e^{-x\phi(z)} dz dr.$$

In particular it holds by [1, Theorem 4.1.2]

$$\text{C-} \lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{a-ir}^{a+ir} e^{zt} \frac{\phi^\dagger(z)}{z} e^{-x\phi(z)} dz = \lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{a-ir}^{a+ir} e^{zt} \frac{\phi^\dagger(z)}{z} e^{-x\phi(z)} dz \quad (4.4)$$

provided that the limit in the right-hand side exists. We set about to prove the latter by noting that

$$\int_{a-ir}^{a+ir} e^{zt} \frac{\phi^\dagger(z)}{z} e^{-x\phi(z)} dz = i \int_{-r}^r e^{(a+ib)t} \frac{\phi^\dagger(a+ib)}{a+ib} e^{-x\phi(a+ib)} db.$$

However, by Item 6 in Lemma 2.1, we know that the function $|\phi^\dagger(a+ib)|/|a+ib|$ is continuous and bounded and then by employing (4.1) we get

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{|\phi^\dagger(a+ib)|}{|a+ib|} \left| e^{t(a+ib)-x\phi(a+ib)} \right| db \leq C e^{ta} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-x \operatorname{Re} \phi(a+ib)} db < \infty.$$

Using (4.4) into (4.3) we get (4.2) for $k, l = 0$ and $(x, t) \in \mathbb{D}$ with $x > x_0$. Next, for any $k + l \leq n$ and any $(x, t) \in \mathbb{D}$ with $x > x_0$, we prove that $\frac{\partial^k}{\partial x^k} \frac{\partial^l}{\partial t^l} f_\phi(x, t)$ is well defined and given by (4.2). Let $t \in [t_1, t_2]$, $x \in [x_1, x_2]$. Without loss of generality we choose $x_1 > x_0$ and $x_2 < t_1/\mathfrak{b}$. Then we have

$$\left| \frac{\phi^\dagger(a+ib)(\phi(a+ib))^k}{(a+ib)^{1-l}} e^{t(a+ib)-x\phi(a+ib)} \right| \leq \left| \frac{\phi^\dagger(a+ib)(\phi(a+ib))^k}{(a+ib)^{1-l}} \right| e^{at_2 - x_1 \operatorname{Re} \phi(a+ib)}$$

since $\operatorname{Re} \phi(a+ib) \geq 0$ by Item 2 in Lemma 2.1. Furthermore, recall that by Item 6 in Lemma 2.1

$$\lim_{b \rightarrow \pm\infty} \left| \frac{\phi(a+ib)}{a+ib} \right| = \mathfrak{b}.$$

and then

$$\left| \frac{\phi^\dagger(a+ib)(\phi(a+ib))^k}{(a+ib)^{1-l}} \right| \leq C|a+ib|^{k+l} \leq C(a^n + |b|^{k+l}),$$

for some $C > 0$. Hence, (4.2) follows by noting that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \left| \frac{\phi^\dagger(a+ib)(\phi(a+ib))^k}{(a+ib)^{1-l}} \right| e^{at_2 - x_1 \operatorname{Re}\phi(a+ib)} db \leq C \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} (a^n + |b|^n) e^{at_2 - x_1 \operatorname{Re}\phi(a+ib)} db < \infty.$$

Since $k, l \geq 0$ with $k+l \leq n$ are arbitrary, the last inequality implies that we can differentiate under the integral k times in x and l times in t for $(x, t) \in \mathbb{D}$ with $x > x_0$, starting from (4.2) for $k = l = 0$. \square

To prove Theorem 3.1, it is clear that we have to show (4.1) for some $x_0 = x_0(n, L)$ when assumption (\mathbb{A}_1) holds. To do this, we need a preliminary result.

Proposition 4.2. *Let ϕ be the Laplace exponent of a potentially killed subordinator and (\mathbb{A}_1) holds for some $L > 0$. Then, $\phi(\infty) = \infty$ and we have, for any $M \in (0, L)$,*

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-x^2 \phi''(x)}{\ln(x)} > Me^{-1}, \quad \liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{x(\phi'(x) - \mathfrak{b})}{\ln(x)} > Me^{-1}. \quad (4.5)$$

Proof. We note from (3.16) that

$$-x^2 \phi''(x) \geq x^2 e^{-1} \Delta(x)$$

and the first claim of (4.5) is valid. The second follows by integration of the first and $\phi(\infty) = \infty$ is a consequence of the integration of the second statement in (4.5). \square

Now we are ready to show the smoothness of f_ϕ under assumption (\mathbb{A}_1) .

Proof of Theorem 3.1. First observe that integrability in (4.1) needs to be established only in neighbourhood of infinity. We have from the inequality $1 - \cos(y) \geq cy^2, y \in [0, 1], c > 0$, that

$$\operatorname{Re}(\phi(a+ib)) - \phi(a) = \int_0^\infty (1 - \cos(by)) e^{-ay} \mu_\phi(dy) \geq cb^2 e^{-\frac{a}{b}} \int_0^{\frac{1}{b}} y^2 \mu_\phi(dy).$$

Clearly, from Proposition 4.2, for any $M \in (0, L)$, we have, for all $|b| > |b_0| > 1$, that

$$\int_{|b| > |b_0|} |b|^n e^{-x \operatorname{Re}(\phi(a+ib))} db \leq e^{-x\phi(a)} \int_{|b| > |b_0|} |b|^n e^{-x c e^{-\frac{a}{|b_0|}} b^2 \Delta(b)} db \leq e^{-x\phi(a)} \int_{|b| > |b_0|} |b|^n e^{-x c e^{-\frac{a}{|b_0|}} M \ln |b|} db.$$

The latter is finite for $x c e^{-\frac{a}{|b_0|}} M > n + 1$. Since $|b_0|$ and $M \in (0, L)$ are arbitrary we have integrability of (4.1) for $x > \frac{n+1}{cL} =: x_0(n, L)$ with $\frac{\theta}{\infty} = 0$. Theorem 3.1 then follows by Proposition 4.1. \square

4.2. Smoothness and Laplace inversion under (\mathbb{B}_1) and (\mathbb{B}_2) . To prove both Theorems 3.14 and 3.15, we will make use of the following integral representation, which is a consequence of a Laplace inversion formula, as Proposition 4.1.

Proposition 4.3. *Let ϕ be the Laplace exponent of a potentially killed subordinator satisfying Assumptions (\mathbb{B}_1) and (\mathbb{B}_2) for some $\theta \in (0, \pi)$. Fix any $\varepsilon > 0$ and let $\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ be the circle arc in \mathbb{C} parametrized as $\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta} : z = \varepsilon e^{i\xi}$ for $\xi \in [\frac{\theta}{2} - \pi, \pi - \frac{\theta}{2}]$. Then, on \mathbb{D} ,*

$$f_\phi(x, t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_\varepsilon^{+\infty} \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{\phi^\dagger \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right)}{\rho} e^{-x\phi \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) + t\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} \right) d\rho + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}} \frac{\phi^\dagger(z)}{z} e^{-x\phi(z) + tz} dz. \quad (4.6)$$

Proof. Again, by (4.3) and (4.4) for fixed $a > 0$ and for almost any $(x, t) \in \mathbb{D}$, up to a subsequence

$$f_\phi(x, t) = \lim_{b \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{a-ib}^{a+ib} e^{zt} \frac{\phi^\dagger(z)}{z} e^{-x\phi(z)} dz,$$

provided that the limit in the right-hand side exists. Here, we compute the limit by using Cauchy's Theorem. For $R \geq a$, let $b(R) = \sqrt{R^2 - a^2}$. Set $A(R) := a - ib(R)$, $B(R) := a + ib(R)$ and observe that $|A(R)| = |B(R)| = R$. In particular, note that

$$\lim_{b \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{a-ib}^{a+ib} e^{zt} \frac{\phi^\dagger(z)}{z} e^{-x\phi(z)} dz = \lim_{R \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{A(R)}^{B(R)} e^{zt} \frac{\phi^\dagger(z)}{z} e^{-x\phi(z)} dz. \quad (4.7)$$

Now define $C(R) := Re^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}$ and $F(R) := Re^{i(\pi + \frac{\theta}{2})}$. Furthermore, let $\varepsilon > 0$ and define $D(\varepsilon) := \varepsilon e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}$ and $E(\varepsilon) := \varepsilon e^{i(\pi + \frac{\theta}{2})}$. We let Γ_R^+ be the anticlockwise oriented circular arc joining $B(R)$ to $C(R)$, while we define Γ_R^- the anticlockwise oriented circular arc joining $F(R)$ to $A(R)$. Denote also ℓ_1 to be the oriented segment connecting $A(R)$ to $B(R)$, ℓ_2 the oriented segment connecting $C(R)$ to $D(\varepsilon)$ and ℓ_3 the oriented segment connecting $E(\varepsilon)$ to $F(R)$. Finally, let $-\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ be the clockwise oriented circular arc joining $D(\varepsilon)$ to $E(\varepsilon)$. Let $\partial \mathfrak{D}$ be the closed contour obtained by connecting, in this order, $\ell_1, \Gamma_R^+, \ell_2, -\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}, \ell_3, \Gamma_R^-$ (see Figure 1). Such a contour is the boundary of an open set \mathfrak{D} of the complex plane in which

$$\mathfrak{D} \ni z \mapsto F(z; x, t) := \frac{\phi^\dagger(z)}{z} e^{zt-x\phi(z)} \in \mathbb{C}, \quad x > 0, t > 0,$$

is holomorphic by assumption. Hence, we can apply Cauchy's Theorem to get

$$\int_{\partial \mathfrak{D}} F(z; x, t) dz = 0.$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{A(R)}^{B(R)} e^{zt} \frac{\phi^\dagger(z)}{z} e^{-x\phi(z)} dz \\ &= - \int_{\Gamma_R^+} F(z; x, t) dz - \int_{\ell_2} F(z; x, t) dz + \int_{\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}} F(z; x, t) dz - \int_{\ell_3} F(z; x, t) dz - \int_{\Gamma_R^-} F(z; x, t) dz. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$




FIGURE 1. Sketch of the keyhole-type contour.




FIGURE 2. Sketch of the keyhole contour.

Now we deal with various terms separately. To deal with the first integral, let $M^+(R) = Ri$ and split the curve Γ_R^+ into Γ_R^1 connecting $B(R)$ to $M^+(R)$ and Γ_R^2 connecting $M^+(R)$ to $C(R)$ so that

$$\int_{\Gamma_R^+} F(z; x, t) dz = \int_{\Gamma_R^1} F(z; x, t) dz + \int_{\Gamma_R^2} F(z; x, t) dz. \quad (4.9)$$

We begin with Γ_R^1 . Note that, by the Estimation Lemma [25, Theorem 5.24]

$$\left| \int_{\Gamma_R^1} F(z; x, t) dz \right| \leq \text{length}(\Gamma_R^1) \max_{z \in \Gamma_R^1} |F(z; x, t)|, \quad (4.10)$$

where, with an abuse of notation, we denote by Γ_R^1 also the support of the oriented curve. To evaluate the maximum appearing in (4.10) we parametrize Γ_R^1 as follows

$$\Gamma_R^1 = \left\{ z \in \mathbb{C} : z = Re^{i\xi}, \xi \in \left[\xi_B(R), \frac{\pi}{2} \right] \right\},$$

where $\xi_B(R) = \arctan\left(\frac{r(R)}{a}\right)$. Then, for $z = Re^{i\xi} \in \Gamma_R^1$, it holds

$$|F(z; x, t)| = \frac{|\phi^\dagger(Re^{i\xi})|}{R} e^{Rt \cos \xi - x \operatorname{Re} \phi(Re^{i\xi})}.$$

Without loss of generality we can assume $\xi_B(R) > \frac{\pi}{4}$. First, observe that $\operatorname{Re}(Re^{i\xi}) = R \cos \xi \geq 0$, for any $\xi \in [\xi_B(R), \frac{\pi}{2}]$, and thus, by Item 2 of Lemma 2.1, we have that $\operatorname{Re} \phi(Re^{i\xi}) \geq 0$. Furthermore, it holds that $R \cos \xi \leq R \cos \xi_B(R) = a$, for any $\xi \in [\xi_B(R), \frac{\pi}{2}]$. Hence, we get

$$\max_{z \in \Gamma_R^1} |F(z; x, t)| \leq e^{ta} \max_{\xi \in [\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{2}]} \left| \frac{\phi^\dagger(Re^{i\xi})}{Re^{i\xi}} \right|$$

and thus by Item 6 of Lemma 2.1 it holds

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow +\infty} \max_{z \in \Gamma_R^1} |F(z; x, t)| = 0. \quad (4.11)$$

Furthermore, it is not difficult to check that

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow +\infty} \text{length}(\Gamma_R^1) = a. \quad (4.12)$$

By combining (4.11) and (4.12) with (4.10) we have that

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Gamma_R^1} F(z; x, t) dz = 0. \quad (4.13)$$

Now we deal with the second term in (4.9), i.e. the one on Γ_R^2 . Recalling that $(x, t) \in \mathbb{D}$, let $\delta = t - \mathfrak{b}x > 0$ and choose $p > 1$ such that $\frac{t}{p} - \mathfrak{b}x > \frac{\delta}{2}$, that exists since $\lim_{p \rightarrow 1} \frac{t}{p} - \mathfrak{b}x = \delta$. Let also $p' > 1$ be the conjugate exponent of $p > 1$, i.e. $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\Gamma_R^2} F(z; x, t) dz \right| &\leq R \left(\max_{z \in \Gamma_R^2} \left| \frac{\phi^\dagger(z)}{z} e^{\frac{t}{p} z - x \phi(z)} \right| \right) \left(\int_0^{\frac{\pi-\theta}{2}} e^{-(Rt \sin \xi)/p'} d\xi \right) \\ &\leq \frac{p' \pi}{t} \left(\max_{z \in \Gamma_R^2} \left| \frac{\phi^\dagger(z)}{z} e^{\frac{t}{p} z - x \phi(z)} \right| \right) = \frac{p' \pi e^{-xq}}{t} \left(\max_{z \in \Gamma_R^2} \left| \frac{\phi^\dagger(z)}{z} e^{(\frac{t}{p} - \mathfrak{b}x)z - x \phi^\dagger(z)} \right| \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

where in the second inequality we have used Jordan's inequality [12, eq (2), page 262]. Now, consider $g(z) = e^{(\frac{t}{p} - \mathfrak{b}x)z - x \phi^\dagger(z)}$ and observe that, by hypothesis, g is holomorphic on $\mathbb{C}(\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi - \frac{\theta}{2})$ and continuous on $\overline{\mathbb{C}(\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}$. Furthermore, for $z = iR$ we have

$$|g(iR)| = e^{-x \text{Re} \phi^\dagger(iR)} \leq 1,$$

since $\text{Re} \phi^\dagger(iR) \geq 0$ by Item 2 of Lemma 2.1. For $z = R e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}$ we have instead

$$\left| g \left(R e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \right| = e^{-R(\frac{t}{p} - \mathfrak{b}x) \cos(\frac{\theta}{2}) - x \text{Re} \phi^\dagger \left(R e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right)}.$$

Now let us show that for R big enough, $\left| g \left(R e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \right| \leq 1$. Indeed,

$$\left| g \left(R e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \right| = \exp \left(-R \cos \left(\frac{\theta}{2} \right) \left(\frac{t}{p} - \mathfrak{b}x + \frac{x}{\cos(\frac{\theta}{2})} \frac{\text{Re} \phi^\dagger \left(R e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right)}{R} \right) \right).$$

Once we observe that

$$\left| \frac{\text{Re} \phi^\dagger \left(R e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right)}{R} \right| \leq \left| \frac{\phi^\dagger \left(R e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right)}{R} \right|$$

and we use (B₂) to state that $\lim_{R \rightarrow +\infty} \left| \frac{\phi^\dagger \left(R e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right)}{R} \right| = 0$, we know that there exists a constant $C(t, x, p)$ such that for $R > C(t, x, p)$

$$\frac{t}{p} - \mathfrak{b}x + \frac{x}{\cos(\frac{\theta}{2})} \frac{\text{Re} \phi^\dagger \left(R e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right)}{R} \geq \frac{\delta}{4}.$$

Hence, for $R > C(t, x, p)$,

$$\left| g \left(R e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \right| \leq \exp \left(-\frac{\delta R \cos(\frac{\theta}{2})}{4} \right) \leq 1.$$

On the other hand, $R \in [0, +\infty) \mapsto \left| g \left(R e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \right| \in \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and then the latter inequality implies that there exists $M = M(x, t, p)$ such that $|g(z)| \leq M$ for any $z \in \partial\mathbb{C} \left(\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)$. Furthermore, observe that, for $z = R e^{i\xi}$ with $\xi \in \left(\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)$ we have, by (\mathbb{B}_2) , $|\operatorname{Re}\phi(z)| \leq |\phi(z)| \leq C|z|$, for $|z| \geq 1$. Hence, for $|z| \geq 1$

$$|g(z)| = e^{\frac{t}{p}\operatorname{Re}z + q - x\operatorname{Re}(\phi(z))} \leq e^{q+x|\operatorname{Re}(\phi(z))|} \leq e^{q+xC|z|}.$$

The continuity of the function $z \in \overline{\mathbb{C} \left(\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)} \mapsto |g(z)|e^{xC|z|} \in \mathbb{R}$ guarantees that there exists a constant $M_1 = M_1(x, t, p) > 0$ such that

$$|g(z)| \leq M_2 e^{xC|z|}, \quad \forall z \in \overline{\mathbb{C} \left(\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)}.$$

Since $\pi - \frac{\theta}{2} - \frac{\pi}{2} < \frac{\pi}{2}$, we can use Phragmen-Lindelöf Theorem (see [54, Chapter 4, Exercise 9, Item (b)]) to obtain $|g(z)| \leq M$ for any $z \in \mathbb{C} \left(\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi - \frac{\theta}{2} \right)$.

Thus, from (4.14), we have

$$\left| \int_{\Gamma_R^2} F(z; x, t) dz \right| \leq \frac{M(x, t, p)q\pi e^{-xq}}{t} \left(\max_{z \in \Gamma_R^2} \left| \frac{\phi^\dagger(z)}{z} \right| \right).$$

Taking the limit as $R \rightarrow +\infty$ we finally have

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Gamma_R^2} F(z; x, t) dz = 0, \quad (4.15)$$

that, combined with (4.13), leads to

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Gamma_R^+} F(z; x, t) dz = 0. \quad (4.16)$$

In the same spirit it is possible to see that

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Gamma_R^-} F(z; x, t) dz = 0. \quad (4.17)$$

We consider now the integral on ℓ_2 . We have that

$$\int_{\ell_2} F(z; x, t) dz = - \int_{\varepsilon}^R \frac{\phi^\dagger \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right)}{\rho} e^{-x\phi \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) + t\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} d\rho. \quad (4.18)$$

Choose $p, p' > 1$ as above so that, recalling that $\left| \frac{\phi^\dagger \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right)}{\rho} \right| \leq C$ for $\rho \geq \varepsilon$ by (\mathbb{B}_2) , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty} \left| \frac{\phi^\dagger \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right)}{\rho} e^{-x\phi \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) + t\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} \right| d\rho \\ &= e^{-qx} \int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty} \frac{|\phi^\dagger \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right)|}{\rho} \exp \left\{ -\rho \cos \left(\frac{\theta}{2} \right) \left(\frac{t}{p} - \mathfrak{b}x + x \frac{\operatorname{Re}\phi^\dagger \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right)}{\rho \cos \left(\frac{\theta}{2} \right)} \right) \right\} e^{-\rho \frac{t}{p'} \cos \frac{\theta}{2}} d\rho \\ &\leq CM \int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{\rho t}{p'} \cos \left(\frac{\theta}{2} \right)} d\rho < +\infty. \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

Hence we can take the limit in (4.18) to get

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\ell_2} F(z; x, t) dz = - \int_{\varepsilon}^{+\infty} \frac{\phi^\dagger \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right)}{\rho} e^{-x\phi \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) + t\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} d\rho =: -I_1(\varepsilon).$$

Analogously, on ℓ_3 , we have that

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\ell_3} F(z; x, t) dz = \int_{\varepsilon}^{+\infty} \frac{\phi^\dagger \left(\rho e^{i(\pi + \frac{\theta}{2})} \right)}{\rho} e^{-x\phi \left(\rho e^{i(\pi + \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) + t\rho e^{i(\pi + \frac{\theta}{2})}} d\rho =: I_2(\varepsilon). \quad (4.20)$$

Furthermore, by using the fact that $\overline{\phi(z)} = \phi(\bar{z})$ by Schwartz reflection principle (see [54, Theorem 5.6]), we know that $I_2(\varepsilon) = \overline{I_1(\varepsilon)}$. Hence, taking the limit as $R \rightarrow +\infty$ in (4.8) and using (4.16), (4.17), (4.20) and (4.20), we get

$$\lim_{b \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{a-ib}^{a+ib} e^{zt} \frac{\phi^\dagger(z)}{z} e^{-x\phi(z)} dz = I_1(\varepsilon) - \overline{I_1(\varepsilon)} + \int_{\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}} F(z; x, t) dz = 2iI_3(\varepsilon) + \int_{\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}} F(z; x, t) dz,$$

where we denote

$$I_3(\varepsilon) := \int_{\varepsilon}^{+\infty} \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{\phi^\dagger \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right)}{\rho} e^{-x\phi \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) + t\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} \right) d\rho. \quad (4.21)$$

This proves (4.6). \square

Remark 4.4. Under the hypotheses of Proposition 4.3, if furthermore

$$\int_0^1 \frac{|\operatorname{Im} \phi^\dagger \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right)|}{\rho} d\rho < +\infty \quad (4.22)$$

then we can send $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ in (4.6), getting

$$f_\phi(x, t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{+\infty} \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{\phi^\dagger \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right)}{\rho} e^{-x\phi \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) + t\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} \right) d\rho.$$

A similar integral representation holds also for $\bar{\mu}_\phi^{*n}$. The proof is similar to the one of Proposition 4.3, where we substitute the term $\frac{\phi^\dagger(z)}{z} e^{-x\phi(z)}$ with $\left(\frac{\phi^\dagger(z)}{z} \right)^n$. For such a reason, we only underline the parts of the proof that are actually different.

Proposition 4.5. With the same notation of Proposition 4.3, under (\mathbb{B}_1) and (\mathbb{B}_2) , for $n \geq 0$, it holds that, for any $t > 0$,

$$\bar{\mu}_\phi^{*n}(t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\varepsilon}^{+\infty} \operatorname{Im} \left[\left(\frac{\phi^\dagger \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right)}{\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} \right)^n e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} e^{t\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} \right] d\rho + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}} e^{tz} \left(\frac{\phi^\dagger(z)}{z} \right)^n dz. \quad (4.23)$$

Proof. Setting $F_n(z; t) = \left(\frac{\phi^\dagger(z)}{z} \right)^n e^{tz}$ the proof follows as the one in Proposition 4.3. The main differences concern integrals over Γ_R^2 and ℓ_2 . First, by Jordan's inequality [12, eq. (2), page 262],

$$\left| \int_{\Gamma_R^2} F_n(z; t) dz \right| \leq \frac{\pi}{t} \left(\max_{z \in \Gamma_R^2} \left| \frac{\phi^\dagger(z)}{z} \right|^n \right) \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } R \rightarrow \infty,$$

where the limit holds by assumption (\mathbb{B}_2) . Concerning the integral over ℓ_2 , observe that

$$\int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty} |F_n(\rho e^{i(\pi-\frac{\theta}{2});t};t)| dz \leq \int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty} e^{-\rho t \cos(\frac{\theta}{2})} \left| \frac{\phi^\dagger(\rho e^{i(\pi-\frac{\theta}{2})})}{\rho} \right|^n d\rho \leq C \int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty} e^{-\rho t \cos(\frac{\theta}{2})} d\rho < +\infty,$$

where we have used the fact that $\left| \frac{\phi^\dagger(\rho e^{i(\pi-\frac{\theta}{2})})}{\rho} \right|^n$ is bounded for $\rho \geq \varepsilon$ by assumption (\mathbb{B}_2) . \square

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 3.14 by using the previously obtained integral representations.

Proof of Theorem 3.14. Let us first prove that $\bar{\mu}_\phi^{*n} \in C^\infty(0, +\infty)$. To do this, fix $\varepsilon > 0$, let $l \geq 1$ and $[t_1, t_2] \subset (0, +\infty)$. Let $F_n(z; t) = \left(\frac{\phi^\dagger(z)}{z}\right)^n e^{tz}$. Then $\frac{\partial^l}{\partial t^l} F_n(z, t) = z^l \left(\frac{\phi^\dagger(z)}{z}\right)^n e^{tz}$ is continuous for $(z, t) \in \gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta} \times [t_1, t_2]$, where, with an abuse of notation, $\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ is the support of the parametrized curve defined in Proposition 4.3. Then we have

$$\left| \frac{\partial^l}{\partial t^l} F_n(z, t) \right| \leq \max_{(z,t) \in \gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta} \times [t_1, t_2]} \left| z^l \left(\frac{\phi^\dagger(z)}{z}\right)^n e^{tz} \right| \quad (4.24)$$

where the right-hand side is constant, hence integrable over $\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}$. Next, let

$$G_n(\rho, t) = \text{Im} \left[\left(\frac{\phi^\dagger(\rho e^{i(\pi-\frac{\theta}{2})})}{\rho e^{i(\pi-\frac{\theta}{2})}} \right)^n e^{i(\pi-\frac{\theta}{2})} e^{t\rho e^{i(\pi-\frac{\theta}{2})}} \right]$$

and observe that

$$\frac{\partial^l}{\partial t^l} G_n(\rho, t) = \text{Im} \left[\left(\frac{\phi^\dagger(\rho e^{i(\pi-\frac{\theta}{2})})}{\rho e^{i(\pi-\frac{\theta}{2})}} \right)^n \rho^l e^{i(l+1)(\pi-\frac{\theta}{2})} e^{t\rho e^{i(\pi-\frac{\theta}{2})}} \right].$$

For $\rho \geq \varepsilon$ and $t \in [t_1, t_2]$, we have

$$\left| \frac{\partial^l}{\partial t^l} G_n(\rho, t) \right| \leq C e^{-t_1 \rho \cos \frac{\theta}{2}} \rho^l, \quad (4.25)$$

since $\left| \frac{\phi^\dagger(\rho e^{i(\pi-\frac{\theta}{2})})}{\rho} \right|^n$ is bounded for $\rho \geq \varepsilon$ by assumption (\mathbb{B}_2) . Observe that the right-hand side of (4.25) is integrable over $(\varepsilon, +\infty)$. Hence, by (4.24) and (4.25) and the fact that $l \geq 1$ is arbitrary, we can differentiate l times inside the integrals in (4.23), getting

$$\frac{d^r}{dt^r} \bar{\mu}_\phi^{*n}(t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\varepsilon}^{+\infty} \text{Im} \left[\frac{\left(\phi^\dagger(\rho e^{i(\pi-\frac{\theta}{2})})\right)^n}{\rho^{n-r} e^{i(n-r)(\pi-\frac{\theta}{2})}} e^{t\rho e^{i(\pi-\frac{\theta}{2})}} \right] d\rho + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}} e^{tz} \frac{\left(\phi^\dagger(z)\right)^n}{z^{n-r}} dz. \quad (4.26)$$

This ends the first part of the proof.

Now let us prove that $f_\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{D})$. To do this, fix any $k, l \geq 0$, $0 < t_1 < t_2$ and $0 < x_1 < x_2 < t_1/b$, recalling that any $(x, t) \in \mathbb{D}$ admits a compact neighbourhood of the form $[x_1, x_2] \times [t_1, t_2]$ specified before. Let $F(z; x, t) = \frac{\phi^\dagger(z)}{z} e^{-x\phi(z)+tz}$ and observe that

$$\frac{\partial^k}{\partial x^k} \frac{\partial^l}{\partial t^l} F(z; x, t) = (-1)^k \frac{z^l \phi^\dagger(z) (\phi(z))^k}{z} e^{-x\phi(z)+tz}.$$

The latter is continuous over $\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta} \times [x_1, x_2] \times [t_1, t_2]$ and then

$$\left| \frac{\partial^k}{\partial x^k} \frac{\partial^l}{\partial t^l} F(z; x, t) \right| \leq \max_{(z, x, t) \in \gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta} \times [x_1, x_2] \times [t_1, t_2]} \left| \frac{z^l \phi^\dagger(z) (\phi(z))^k}{z} e^{-x\phi(z) + tz} \right|, \quad (4.27)$$

where the right-hand side is a constant and then it is integrable over $\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}$. Now set

$$G(\rho; x, t) = \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{\phi^\dagger \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right)}{\rho} e^{-x\phi \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) + t\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} \right)$$

and observe that

$$\frac{\partial^k}{\partial x^k} \frac{\partial^l}{\partial t^l} G(\rho; x, t) = (-1)^k \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{\phi^\dagger \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \left(\phi \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \right)^k}{\rho^{k+1}} \rho^{l+k} e^{il(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} e^{-x\phi \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) + t\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} \right).$$

Recalling that $\left| \frac{\phi^\dagger \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \left(\phi \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \right)^k}{\rho^{k+1}} \right|$ is bounded as $\rho \geq \varepsilon$ and setting $p, p' > 1$ and $M > 0$ as in the proof of Proposition 4.3 with respect to t_2 and x_1 , we have

$$\left| \frac{\partial^k}{\partial x^k} \frac{\partial^l}{\partial t^l} G(\rho; x, t) \right| \leq CM e^{-\frac{\rho t_1}{p'} \cos \frac{\theta}{2}}, \quad (4.28)$$

where the right-hand side is integrable on $(\varepsilon, +\infty)$. Hence, since $k, l \geq 0$ are arbitrary, we can differentiate k times in x and l times with respect to t in (4.6), to get that $f_\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{D})$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^k}{\partial x^k} \frac{\partial^l}{\partial t^l} f_\phi(x, t) &= \frac{(-1)^k}{\pi} \int_\varepsilon^{+\infty} \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{\phi^\dagger \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \left(\phi \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \right)^k}{\rho^{1-l} e^{-il(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} e^{-x\phi \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) + t\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} \right) d\rho \\ &\quad + \frac{(-1)^k}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}} \frac{\phi^\dagger(z) (\phi(z))^k}{z^{1-l}} e^{-x\phi(z) + tz} dz. \end{aligned} \quad (4.29)$$

□

A slight modification of the previous arguments lead to the proof of Proposition 3.19.

Proof of Proposition 3.19. Since ϕ is a complete Bernstein function that can be extended by continuity over $\overline{\mathbb{C}(0, \pi)}$ with extension ϕ_+ , then, by using the relation $\overline{\phi(z)} = \phi(\bar{z})$, it is clear that it can be also extended by continuity over $\overline{\mathbb{C}(-\pi, 0)}$. If we denote such an extension ϕ_- , for any $z \in \overline{\mathbb{C}(0, \pi)}$ we get

$$\overline{\phi_+(z)} = \phi_-(\bar{z}).$$

The proof is then carried on exactly as in Propositions 4.3 and 4.5, by setting $\theta = 0$ (see Figure 2), where we use ϕ^\dagger when we integrate over ℓ_1 , Γ_R^+ , Γ_R^- and $-\gamma_\varepsilon$, ϕ_+^\dagger over ℓ_2 and ϕ_-^\dagger over ℓ_1 . □

Let us give, for completeness, the integral representations for G_ϕ and g_ϕ , whose proof is identical to the one of Proposition 4.3.

Proposition 4.6. *Let ϕ be the Laplace exponent of a potentially killed subordinator satisfying assumptions \mathbb{B}_1 and (\mathbb{B}_2) for some $\theta \in (0, \pi)$. Fix any $\varepsilon > 0$ and let $\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}$ be defined as in Proposition 4.3. Then, on \mathbb{D} ,*

$$G_\phi(x, t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_\varepsilon^{+\infty} \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{e^{-x\phi(\rho e^{i(\pi-\frac{\theta}{2}})}) + t\rho e^{i(\pi-\frac{\theta}{2})}}{\rho} \right) d\rho + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}} \frac{e^{-x\phi(z)+tz}}{z} dz. \quad (4.30)$$

In particular, $G_\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{D})$, $g_\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{D})$ is well defined and for any $k, l \geq 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^k}{\partial x^k} \frac{\partial^l}{\partial t^l} g_\phi(x, t) &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_\varepsilon^{+\infty} \operatorname{Im} \left(\left(\phi \left(\rho e^{i(\pi-\frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \right)^k \rho^l e^{il(\pi-\frac{\theta}{2})} e^{-x\phi(\rho e^{i(\pi-\frac{\theta}{2}})}) + t\rho e^{i(\pi-\frac{\theta}{2})}} \right) d\rho \\ &+ \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}} (\phi(z))^k z^l e^{-x\phi(z)+tz} dz. \end{aligned} \quad (4.31)$$

5. PROOFS

5.1. Proofs for Subsection 3.1. In this part we provide proofs for for subsection 3.1. We start with some preliminary results.

Proposition 5.1. *Let ϕ be the Laplace exponent of a potentially killed subordinator and (\mathbb{A}_1) holds for some $L > 0$. Let $t = t(x)$ be such that $t/x \downarrow \mathfrak{b}$ and $a_* = a_*(x)$ be the unique solution of $\phi'(a_*) = \frac{t}{x} \in (\mathfrak{b}, \phi'(0))$. Then $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} a_* = \infty$ and, for x large enough,*

$$a_* > \frac{Me^{-1}}{\frac{t}{x} - \mathfrak{b}}. \quad (5.1)$$

Proof. First of all, observe that, since $t/x \downarrow \mathfrak{b}$ and ϕ' is decreasing with $\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} \phi'(z) = \mathfrak{b}$, we have $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} a_* = \infty$. Furthermore, for any $M < L$, using the second inequality of (4.5), we get

$$Me^{-1} < \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_*(\phi'(a_*) - \mathfrak{b})}{\ln(a_*)} = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_* \left(\frac{t}{x} - \mathfrak{b} \right)}{\ln(a_*)}.$$

This shows that for all x and therefore a_* large enough

$$\frac{a_*}{\ln(a_*)} > \frac{Me^{-1}}{\frac{t}{x} - \mathfrak{b}}.$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Now we are ready to prove the main theorem concerning the asymptotic behaviour.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Fix $k, l \geq 0$ and assume that $x > x_0(k+l, L)$, see Theorem 3.1. Then, for any $a > 0$, by (3.2) it holds

$$\frac{\partial^k \partial^l}{\partial x^k \partial t^l} f_\phi(x, t) = \frac{(-1)^k}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\phi^\dagger(a+ib)\phi^k(a+ib)}{(a+ib)^{1-l}} e^{-x\phi(a+ib)+t(a+ib)} db =: I(x, t). \quad (5.2)$$

Let $t = t(x)$ be as in the statement of the theorem and $a_* := a(x)$ be the solution to the equation

$$\phi'(a_*) = \frac{t}{x} \in (\mathfrak{b}, \phi'(0^+)),$$

which exists and is unique thanks to the fact $\phi'(x)$ is decreasing with $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \phi'(x) = \mathfrak{b}$, see Item (3) of Lemma 2.1. Choosing this a_* for the line of inversion we get

$$I(x, t) = \frac{(-1)^k}{2\pi} e^{a_* t - x\phi(a_*)} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\phi^\dagger(a_* + ib)\phi^k(a_* + ib)}{(a_* + ib)^{1-l}} e^{ibt - x(\phi(a_* + ib) - \phi(a_*))} db, \quad (5.3)$$

where the choice of a_* minimizes the function $a \in (0, +\infty) \mapsto (at - x\phi(a)) \in \mathbb{R}$. Recalling that $t(x)/x \downarrow \mathfrak{b}$, we get that $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} a_* \rightarrow \infty$ by Proposition 5.1. From now on, each time we write $o(\cdot)$ or $O(\cdot)$, we imply that $x \rightarrow \infty$. We split the region of integration. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, which will subsequently be chosen to depend on a_* , we set $\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon := [-a_*\varepsilon, a_*\varepsilon]$, $\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon := \mathcal{I}_\varepsilon^c$. Put

$$I_\varepsilon(x, t) := \frac{(-1)^k}{2\pi} e^{a_* t - x\phi(a_*)} \int_{\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon} \frac{\phi^\dagger(a_* + ib)\phi^k(a_* + ib)}{(a_* + ib)^{1-l}} e^{ibt - x(\phi(a_* + ib) - \phi(a_*))} db \quad (5.4)$$

and

$$J(a_*, b) := \frac{\phi^\dagger(a_* + ib)\phi^k(a_* + ib)}{(a_* + ib)^{1-l}}. \quad (5.5)$$

Using Taylor's formula we get

$$\phi(a_* + ib) - \phi(a_*) = ib\frac{t}{x} - \frac{b^2}{2}\phi''(a_*) - i\frac{b^3}{3!}\phi'''(a_* + ib\theta(a_*, b)), \quad (5.6)$$

where we have used the definition of a_* in (3.4) and note that $0 \leq \theta(a_*, b) \leq 1$. Hence, with

$$U(a_*, b) := ibt - x(\phi(a_* + ib) - \phi(a_*)) - x\frac{b^2}{2}\phi''(a_*) = -ix\frac{b^3}{3!}\phi'''(a_* + ib\theta(a_*, b)),$$

we have for the integral in (5.4)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon} J(a_*, b) e^{ibt - x(\phi(a_* + ib) - \phi(a_*))} db &= \int_{\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon} J(a_*, b) e^{\frac{b^2}{2}x\phi''(a_*) \left(1 + 2\frac{U(a_*, b)}{x b^2 \phi''(a_*)}\right)} db \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} \int_{-\varepsilon a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}}^{\varepsilon a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} J\left(a_*, \frac{u}{\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}}\right) e^{-\frac{u^2}{2} \left(1 - 2\frac{U(a_*, u/\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x})}{u^2}\right)} du, \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

where we have used that $\phi''(y) < 0$, for $y > 0$, see Item (3) of Lemma 2.1. Here, we need (A₂), that is $\overline{\lim}_{y \rightarrow \infty} y\phi'''(y)/(-\phi''(y)) = K < \infty$. Indeed, due to this and since $|\phi'''(z)| \leq \phi'''(\operatorname{Re}(z))$, for $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 0$, see Item 5 in Lemma 2.1, we have thanks to the definition of $U(a_*, b)$ that for all x and henceforth for all a_* large enough the inequality

$$\sup_{|u| \leq \varepsilon a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} \frac{2}{u^2} \left| U\left(a_*, \frac{u}{\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}}\right) \right| \leq \sup_{|u| \leq \varepsilon a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} \frac{x|u|}{3x^{\frac{3}{2}} (-\phi''(a_*))^{\frac{3}{2}}} \phi'''(a_*) \leq \frac{2K}{3} \varepsilon$$

holds true. Next, we choose

$$\varepsilon(a_*) := \varepsilon(a_*, x) = \frac{g(a_*, x)}{a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} \quad (5.8)$$

for some $g(y, x)$ going as slowly to infinity, as $x, y \rightarrow \infty$, as we wish. Then, we get

$$\sup_{|u| \leq \varepsilon(a_*)} \frac{2}{u^2} \left| U\left(a_*, \frac{u}{\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}}\right) \right| \leq \frac{2K}{3} \frac{g(a_*)}{a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}}.$$

Since from Proposition 4.2 $\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} -y^2 \phi''(y) = \infty$ then, for any $g(a_*, x) = o\left(a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}\right)$, we have

$$\sup_{|u| \leq g(a_*, x)} \frac{2}{u^2} \left| U\left(a_*, \frac{u}{\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}}\right) \right| = O\left(\frac{g(a_*, x)}{a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}}\right). \quad (5.9)$$

Next, setting

$$\tilde{J}(a_*, u) = J(a_*, u) - J(a_*, 0), \quad (5.10)$$

we get that from (5.7)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon} J(a_*, b) e^{ibt-x(\phi(a_*+ib)-\phi(a_*))} db &= \frac{J(a_*, 0)}{\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} \int_{-g(a_*, x)}^{g(a_*, x)} e^{-\frac{u^2}{2} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{g(a_*, x)}{a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}}\right)\right)} du \\ &+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} \int_{-g(a_*, x)}^{g(a_*, x)} \tilde{J}\left(a_*, \frac{u}{\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}}\right) e^{-\frac{u^2}{2} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{g(a_*, x)}{a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}}\right)\right)} du \\ &=: H_1(a_*, x) + H_2(a_*, x). \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned} H_1(a_*, x) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} \frac{\phi^\dagger(a_*) \phi^k(a_*)}{a_*^{1-l}} \int_{-g(a_*, x)}^{g(a_*, x)} e^{-\frac{u^2}{2} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{g(a_*, x)}{a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}}\right)\right)} du \\ &= \frac{\left(1 + O\left(\frac{g(a_*, x)}{a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}}\right)\right)}{\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} \frac{\phi^\dagger(a_*) \phi^k(a_*)}{a_*^{1-l}} \int_{-g(a_*, x)}^{g(a_*, x)} e^{-\frac{u^2}{2}} du. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lim_{y, x \rightarrow \infty} g(y, x) = \infty$ we get further that

$$H_1(a_*, x) = \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} \frac{\phi^\dagger(a_*) \phi^k(a_*)}{a_*^{1-l}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{g(a_*, x)}{a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}}\right) + O\left(\frac{e^{-\frac{g^2(a_*, x)}{2}}}{g(a_*, x)}\right)\right), \quad (5.12)$$

where we have used the well-known

$$\int_{u>y} e^{-\frac{u^2}{2}} du \approx C \frac{1}{y} e^{-\frac{y^2}{2}}.$$

From the definition of J , see (5.5), used in (5.10) we easily get that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{J}(a_*, b) &= \frac{\phi^\dagger(a_* + ib) \phi^k(a_* + ib) - \phi^\dagger(a_*) \phi^k(a_*)}{(a_* + ib)^{1-l}} + \phi^\dagger(a_*) \phi^k(a_*) \left(\frac{1}{(a_* + ib)^{1-l}} - \frac{1}{a_*^{1-l}}\right) \\ &= \tilde{J}_1(a_*, b) + \tilde{J}_2(a_*, b). \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

We shall use this to estimate for $|u| \leq g(a_*, x)$ the right-hand side of the inequality

$$\left| \tilde{J}\left(a_*, \frac{u}{\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}}\right) \right| \leq \left| \tilde{J}_1\left(a_*, \frac{u}{\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}}\right) \right| + \left| \tilde{J}_2\left(a_*, \frac{u}{\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}}\right) \right|. \quad (5.14)$$

Note that since $a_* = a_*(x)$, we choose $g(a_*, x) = \sqrt{2 \ln(a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x})}$, but keep g wherever it is more convenient, we have that

$$\sup_{|u| \leq g(a_*, x)} \left| \frac{u}{\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} \right| = \frac{g(a_*, x)}{\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}}. \quad (5.15)$$

Therefore, by Taylor's formula

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{|u| \leq g(a_*, x)} \left| \phi \left(a_* + i \frac{u}{\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} \right) - \phi(a_*) \right| \leq \frac{g(a_*, x)}{\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} \phi'(a_*) \\ &= \frac{g(a_*, x)}{a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} a_* \phi'(a_*) = o \left(\frac{\phi(a_*) \ln(x)}{\sqrt{x}} \right) \\ & \sup_{|u| \leq g(a_*, x)} \left| \phi^\dagger \left(a_* + i \frac{u}{\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} \right) - \phi^\dagger(a_*) \right| = o \left(\frac{\phi^\dagger(a_*) \ln(x)}{\sqrt{x}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $|\phi'(z)| \leq \phi'(\operatorname{Re}(z))$, provided $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 0$, see Item 5 of Lemma 2.1, $x\phi'(x) \leq \phi(x)$, see Item 4 of Lemma 2.1, $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)} = \infty$, see (4.5), and (5.15). From hence and (5.15), we get that as x and therefore a_* converge to infinity

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{|u| \leq g(a_*, x)} \left| \tilde{J}_1 \left(a_*, \frac{u}{\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} \right) \right| \leq \frac{2^k \left(\phi^\dagger(a_*) \phi^{k-1}(a_*) o \left(\frac{\phi(a_*) \ln(x)}{\sqrt{x}} \right) + \phi^k(a_*) o \left(\frac{\phi^\dagger(a_*) \ln(x)}{\sqrt{x}} \right) \right)}{\left(a_* + o \left(\frac{a_* \ln(x)}{\sqrt{x}} \right) \right)^{1-l}} \\ & \cong \frac{\phi^\dagger(a_*) \phi^k(a_*)}{a_*^{1-l}} o \left(\frac{\ln(x)}{\sqrt{x}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly using (5.15) and (5.13) we get that

$$\sup_{|u| \leq g(a_*, x)} \left| \tilde{J}_2 \left(a_*, \frac{u}{\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} \right) \right| \cong \frac{\phi^\dagger(a_*) \phi^k(a_*)}{a_*^{1-l}} \left| \frac{1}{1 + i o \left(\frac{\ln(x)}{\sqrt{x}} \right)} - 1 \right| \cong \frac{\phi^\dagger(a_*) \phi^k(a_*)}{a_*^{1-l}} o \left(\frac{\ln(x)}{\sqrt{x}} \right).$$

Therefore, from (5.13) and (5.14) we get that

$$\sup_{|u| \leq g(a_*, x)} \left| \tilde{J} \left(a_*, \frac{u}{\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} \right) \right| \cong \frac{\phi^\dagger(a_*) \phi^k(a_*)}{a_*^{1-l}} o \left(\frac{\ln(x)}{\sqrt{x}} \right).$$

Using this in (5.11) we arrive from (5.12) at

$$H_2(a_*, x) = H_1(a_*, x) o \left(\frac{\ln(x)}{\sqrt{x}} \right). \quad (5.16)$$

Combining (5.12) and (5.16) in (5.11) we deduct

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon} J(a_*, b) e^{ibt - x(\phi(a_* + ib) - \phi(a_*))} db \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} \frac{\phi^\dagger(a_*) \phi^k(a_*)}{a_*^{1-l}} \left(1 + o \left(\frac{g(a_*, x)}{a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} \right) + o \left(\frac{e^{-\frac{g^2(a_*, x)}{2}}}{g(a_*, x)} \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.17)$$

Plugging this in (5.4) we get

$$I_\varepsilon(x, t) = \frac{(-1)^k \phi^\dagger(a_*) \phi^k(a_*)}{\sqrt{2\pi} a_*^{1-l}} \frac{e^{a_* t - x \phi(a_*)}}{\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*) x}} \left(1 + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{g(a_*, x)}{a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*) x}} + \frac{e^{-\frac{g^2(a_*, x)}{2}}}{g(a_*, x)} \right) \right). \quad (5.18)$$

We proceed to investigate

$$\begin{aligned} J_\varepsilon(x, t) &:= \frac{(-1)^k}{2\pi} e^{a_* t - x \phi(a_*)} \int_{\mathcal{J}_\varepsilon} \frac{\phi^\dagger(a_* + ib) \phi^k(a_* + ib)}{(a_* + ib)^{1-l}} e^{ibt - x(\phi(a_* + ib) - \phi(a_*))} db \\ &= \frac{(-1)^k}{2\pi} e^{a_* t - x \phi(a_*)} \int_{\varepsilon(a_*) a_* \leq |b| \leq ca_*} \frac{\phi^\dagger(a_* + ib) \phi^k(a_* + ib)}{(a_* + ib)^{1-l}} e^{ibt - x(\phi(a_* + ib) - \phi(a_*))} db \\ &\quad + \frac{(-1)^k}{2\pi} e^{a_* t - x \phi(a_*)} \int_{|b| \geq ca_*} \frac{\phi^\dagger(a_* + ib) \phi^k(a_* + ib)}{(a_* + ib)^{1-l}} e^{ibt - x(\phi(a_* + ib) - \phi(a_*))} db \\ &=: \frac{(-1)^k}{2\pi} e^{a_* t - x \phi(a_*)} (J_1(a_*, x) + J_2(a_*, x)), \end{aligned} \quad (5.19)$$

where $c > 0$ will be chosen just beneath. First we estimate $J_1(a_*, x)$. We use the Taylor expansion (5.6) to the exponent in $J_1(a_*, x)$, $|\operatorname{Im} \phi'''(z)| \leq |\phi'''(z)| \leq \phi'''(\operatorname{Re}(z))$, $\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} y \phi'''(y) / (-\phi''(y)) = K < \infty$ and the choice $c = \frac{1}{K}$ to get after change of variables $b \rightarrow a_* b$, for all x and therefore a_* large enough

$$\begin{aligned} |J_1(a_*, x)| &\leq 2a_*^l \int_{\varepsilon(a_*)}^c \frac{|\phi^\dagger(a_*(1+ib)) \phi^k(a_*(1+ib))|}{|1+ib|^{1-l}} e^{\frac{xb^2 a_*^2}{2} \phi''(a_*) + \frac{xb^3 a_*^3}{6} \phi'''(a_*)} db \\ &\leq 2a_*^l \int_{\varepsilon(a_*)}^c \frac{|\phi^\dagger(a_*(1+ib)) \phi^k(a_*(1+ib))|}{|1+ib|^{1-l}} e^{\frac{xb^2 a_*^2}{2} \phi''(a_*) (1 - \frac{2Kc}{3})} db \\ &= 2a_*^l \int_{\varepsilon(a_*)}^c \frac{|\phi^\dagger(a_*(1+ib)) \phi^k(a_*(1+ib))|}{|1+ib|^{1-l}} e^{\frac{xb^2 a_*^2}{6} \phi''(a_*)} db. \end{aligned}$$

To carry on further we note from (2.15) that

$$\left| \frac{\phi(a_*(1+ib))}{\phi(a_*)} \right| \leq 3 \max \{1, b^2\}.$$

Then, we have with the form of $\varepsilon(a_*)$, see (5.8), that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{a_*^{1-l} \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*) x}}{\phi^\dagger(a_*) \phi^k(a_*)} J_1(a_*) \right| &\leq 3^{k+2} a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*) x} \int_{\varepsilon(a_*)}^c \max \{1, b^{2k+2+l}\} e^{\frac{xb^2 a_*^2}{6} \phi''(a_*)} db \\ &\leq 3^{k+2} a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*) x} \max \{1, c^{2k+2+l}\} \int_{\varepsilon(a_*)}^c e^{\frac{xb^2 a_*^2}{6} \phi''(a_*)} db \\ &\leq 3^{k+\frac{5}{2}} \max \{1, c^{2k+2+l}\} \int_{3^{-\frac{1}{2}} g(a_*, x)}^\infty e^{-\frac{u^2}{2}} du = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{e^{-\frac{g^2(a_*, x)}{2}}}{g(a_*, x)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.20)$$

For $J_2(a_*, x)$ we again change variables $b \rightarrow a_*b$, use (2.15) and without application of the Taylor expansion for the exponent to get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{a_*^{1-l} \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}}{\phi^\dagger(a_*)\phi^k(a_*)} J_2(a_*, x) \right| \\ & \leq 3^{k+1} a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x} \int_{|b| \geq c}^{\infty} \frac{\max\{1, b^{2k+2}\}}{|1+ib|^{-l+1}} e^{-x(\operatorname{Re}(\phi(a_*(1+ib))) - \phi(a_*))} db \\ & \leq C' a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x} \int_c^{\infty} b^{2k+1+l} e^{-x(\operatorname{Re}(\phi(a_*(1+ib))) - \phi(a_*))} db \\ & = C' c^{2k+2+l} a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x} \int_1^{\infty} b^{2k+1+l} e^{-x(\operatorname{Re}(\phi(a_*(1+ibc))) - \phi(a_*))} db, \end{aligned}$$

where $C' > 0$ is some constant. Then, with some absolute $c_0 > 0$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re}(\phi(a_*(1+ibc))) - \phi(a_*) &= \int_0^{\infty} (1 - \cos(bca_*y)) e^{-a_*y} \mu(dy) \\ &\geq c_0^2 b^2 c^2 a_*^2 e^{-\frac{1}{bc}} \int_0^{\frac{1}{bca_*}} y^2 \mu(dy) = c_0^2 b^2 c^2 a_*^2 e^{-\frac{1}{bc}} \Delta(bca_*). \end{aligned} \quad (5.21)$$

Since $\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} y^2 \Delta(y) / \ln(y) = L > 0$ we choose $M < L$. Set $M' = Mc_0^2 e^{-\frac{1}{c}}$. On $b \geq 1$ we get that for x and a_* large enough such that $M'x > 2k + 2 + l$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{a_*^{1-l} \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}}{\phi^\dagger(a_*)\phi^k(a_*)} J_2(a_*, x) \right| \leq C' c^{2k+2+l} a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x} \int_1^{\infty} b^{2k+1+l} e^{-M'x \ln(bca_*)} db \\ & = \frac{C' c^{2k+2+l}}{M'x - 2k - 2 - l} \frac{a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}}{(a_*c)^{M'x}} \\ & \leq \frac{C''}{(M'x - 2k - 2 - l) K^{2k+2+l}} \sqrt{x} K^{M'x} a_*^{\frac{1}{2} - M'x} = O\left(\frac{K^{M'x} a_*^{\frac{1}{2} - M'x}}{\sqrt{x}}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.22)$$

where $C'' > 0$ is some constant, we have fixed $c = K^{-1}$ and we have used $-y^2 \phi''(y) \leq 2\phi(y) = O(y)$, see Item (4) of Lemma 2.1. Collecting (5.18) and employing (5.20) and (5.22) in (5.19), we get that (5.3) has the following asymptotic form

$$I(x, t) = \frac{(-1)^k}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{a_*t - x\phi(a_*)} \frac{\phi^\dagger(a_*)\phi^k(a_*)}{a_*^{1-l} \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{g(a_*, x)}{a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} + \frac{e^{-\frac{g^2(a_*, x)}{2}}}{g(a_*, x)} + \frac{K^{M'x} a_*^{\frac{1}{2} - M'x}}{\sqrt{x}}\right) \right).$$

Next, recall that $g(a_*, x) = \sqrt{2 \ln(a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x})}$ which converges to infinity thanks to Proposition 5.1 and we yield asymptotically

$$I(x, t) = \frac{(-1)^k}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{a_*t - x\phi(a_*)} \frac{\phi^\dagger(a_*)\phi^k(a_*)}{a_*^{1-l} \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{\sqrt{\ln(a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x})}}{a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} + \frac{K^{M'x} a_*^{\frac{1}{2} - M'x}}{\sqrt{x}}\right) \right).$$

However, since $-y^2 \phi''(y) \leq 2\phi(y) = O(y)$, see Item (4) of Lemma 2.1, we check that the first expression in the speed of convergence cannot be faster than $(xa)_*^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. The second expression though is of much

faster decay and we conclude that

$$I(x, t) = \frac{(-1)^k}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{a_* t - x\phi(a_*)} \frac{\phi^\dagger(a_*)\phi^k(a_*)}{a_*^{1-l}\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)}x} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{\ln(a_*\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)}x)}}{a_*\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)}x}\right) \right),$$

which establishes (3.3). The claim that $a_* \geq Me^{-1}(t/x - \mathfrak{b})^{-1}$ for any $M < L$ and for all x large enough follows immediately from (5.1) of Proposition 5.1. This concludes the proof of the main theorem. \square

We proceed with the proof of the next main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 3.6. Since by assumption $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} t(x)/x = \bar{x} \in (\mathfrak{b}, \phi'(0))$ then from $\phi'(a_*) = t(x)/x$ we derive that $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} a_* = \bar{a} \in (0, \infty)$. From Theorem 3.1 we can write for all x large enough

$$\frac{\partial^k \partial^l}{\partial x^k \partial t^l} f_\phi(x, t) = \frac{(-1)^k}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\phi^\dagger(\bar{a} + ib)\phi^k(\bar{a} + ib)}{(\bar{a} + ib)^{1-l}} e^{-x\phi(\bar{a} + ib) + t(\bar{a} + ib)} db =: I(x, t).$$

Changing variables we easily get

$$I(x, t) = \frac{(-1)^k}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \bar{a} e^{\bar{a}t - x\phi(\bar{a})} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\phi^\dagger(\bar{a}(1 + ib))\phi^k(\bar{a}(1 + ib))}{(\bar{a}(1 + ib))^{1-l}} e^{-x(\phi(\bar{a}(1 + ib)) - \phi(\bar{a})) + itb\bar{a}} db.$$

Next, we deal with the integral term. Taylor's formula of the exponent yields

$$\phi(\bar{a}(1 + ib)) - \phi(\bar{a}) = ib\bar{a} \frac{t}{x} - \frac{b^2 \bar{a}^2}{2} \phi''(\bar{a}) - i \frac{b^3 \bar{a}^3}{3!} \phi'''(\bar{a}(1 + ib\theta(\bar{a}, b))). \quad (5.23)$$

We set $\mathfrak{a} := \bar{a}\sqrt{-\phi''(\bar{a})}$ and choose $\varepsilon(x) = x^{-1/2}\sqrt{C\ln(x)}$, $x > 1, C > 1$, with $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon(x) = 0$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{x}\varepsilon(x) = \infty$. Then we split the range of integration on $[-\mathfrak{a}^{-1}\varepsilon(x), \mathfrak{a}^{-1}\varepsilon(x)]$ and its complement and apply (5.23) in the first case. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(x, t) &:= \int_{-\mathfrak{a}^{-1}\varepsilon(x)}^{\mathfrak{a}^{-1}\varepsilon(x)} \frac{\phi^\dagger(\bar{a}(1 + ib))\phi^k(\bar{a}(1 + ib))}{(\bar{a}(1 + ib))^{1-l}} e^{-x\frac{b^2}{2}\bar{a}^2(1 + i\frac{b\bar{a}^3}{3\bar{a}}\phi'''(\bar{a}(1 + ib\theta(\bar{a}, b))))} db \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathfrak{a}\sqrt{x}} \int_{-\varepsilon(x)\sqrt{x}}^{\varepsilon(x)\sqrt{x}} \frac{\phi^\dagger(\bar{a}(1 + i\frac{u}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{a}x}}))\phi^k(\bar{a}(1 + i\frac{u}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{a}x}}))}{(\bar{a}(1 + i\frac{u}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{a}x}}))^{1-l}} e^{-\frac{u^2}{2}(1 - i\frac{u\bar{a}^3}{\sqrt{x}\mathfrak{a}^3}\phi'''(\bar{a}(1 + i\frac{u}{\mathfrak{a}\sqrt{x}}\theta(\bar{a}, \frac{u}{\mathfrak{a}\sqrt{x}}))))} du. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly,

$$\sup_{|u| \leq \varepsilon(x)\sqrt{x}} \left| \frac{u\bar{a}^3}{\mathfrak{a}^3\sqrt{x}} \phi'''(\bar{a}(1 + i\frac{u}{\mathfrak{a}\sqrt{x}}\theta(\bar{a}, \frac{u}{\mathfrak{a}\sqrt{x}}))) \right| = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon(x)),$$

where we have used again that for $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 0$, $|\phi'''(z)| \leq \phi'''(\operatorname{Re}(z))$, see (3.11) of Item 5 of Lemma 2.1. Note that by Taylor's formula also

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{|u| \leq \varepsilon(x)\sqrt{x}} \left| \phi\left(\bar{a}\left(1 + i\frac{u}{\mathfrak{a}\sqrt{x}}\right)\right) - \phi(\bar{a}) \right| &\leq \bar{a}\varepsilon(x)\phi'(\bar{a}) \leq \varepsilon(x)\phi(\bar{a}) = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon(x)), \\ \sup_{|u| \leq \varepsilon(x)\sqrt{x}} \left| \phi^\dagger\left(\bar{a}\left(1 + i\frac{u}{\mathfrak{a}\sqrt{x}}\right)\right) - \phi^\dagger(\bar{a}) \right| &\leq \bar{a}\varepsilon(x)(\phi^\dagger)'(\bar{a}) \leq \varepsilon(x)\phi(\bar{a}) = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon(x)), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $|\phi'(z)| \leq \phi'(\operatorname{Re}(z))$, provided $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 0$, see Item 5 of Lemma 2.1, $x\phi'(x) \leq \phi(x)$, see Item 4 of Lemma 2.1, and $\phi^\dagger(\bar{a}) \leq \phi(\bar{a})$. Therefore, with an easier computation but similar to the one leading to (5.18), we get that

$$I_1(x, t) = \frac{\phi^\dagger(\bar{a})\phi^k(\bar{a})}{\bar{a}^{1-l}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{-\phi''(\bar{a})x}} (1 + O(\varepsilon(x))). \quad (5.24)$$

From (5.24) it remains to show that remaining part of the integral, namely

$$\sqrt{x}I_2(x, t) := \sqrt{x} \int_{|b| \geq \mathfrak{a}^{-1}\varepsilon(x)} \frac{\phi^\dagger(\bar{a}(1+ib))\phi^k(\bar{a}(1+ib))}{(\bar{a}(1+ib))^{1-l}} e^{-x(\phi(\bar{a}(1+ib))-\phi(\bar{a})) + itb\bar{a}} db$$

converges to zero and evaluate its speed of convergence. Since \bar{a} is a fixed number then as in (5.20) it suffices to prove that

$$\sqrt{x}|I_2(x, t)| \leq J(t, x) = \sqrt{x} \int_{|b| \geq \mathfrak{a}^{-1}\varepsilon(x)} \max\{1, |b|^{2k+2+l}\} e^{-x(\operatorname{Re}(\phi(\bar{a}(1+ib))) - \phi(\bar{a}))} db$$

goes to zero and evaluate its speed of convergence. We simplify to

$$\begin{aligned} J(t, x) &\leq \sqrt{x} \int_{1 \geq |b| \geq \mathfrak{a}^{-1}\varepsilon(x)} e^{-x(\operatorname{Re}(\phi(\bar{a}(1+ib))) - \phi(\bar{a}))} db \\ &\quad + \sqrt{x} \int_{|b| > 1} |b|^{2k+2+l} e^{-x(\operatorname{Re}(\phi(\bar{a}(1+ib))) - \phi(\bar{a}))} db =: J_1(t, x) + J_2(t, x). \end{aligned}$$

Choosing some $C' > 0$ large enough we can repeat the estimate in (5.21) to get, for $b \leq 1$,

$$\operatorname{Re}(\phi(\bar{a}(1+ib))) - \phi(\bar{a}) \geq e^{-\frac{1}{C'}} b^2 \int_0^{\frac{1}{\bar{a}C'}} y^2 \mu(dy) = C'' b^2$$

where C'' is a constant. Thus with $C > 3\mathfrak{a}^2/C''$ in the definition of $\varepsilon(x)$

$$J_1(t, x) \leq \sqrt{x} e^{-\frac{C''}{\mathfrak{a}^2} x \varepsilon^2(x)} \leq \sqrt{x} e^{-3 \ln(x)} = \frac{1}{x}. \quad (5.25)$$

For the other case, when $|b| > 1$ we directly apply (5.21) to get

$$\operatorname{Re}(\phi(\bar{a}(1+ib))) - \phi(\bar{a}) \geq c_0^2 b^2 \bar{a}^2 e^{-1} \Delta(b\bar{a}).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} J_2(t, x) &\leq \sqrt{x} \int_{|b| > 1} |b|^{2k+2+l} e^{-xc_0^2 b^2 \bar{a}^2 e^{-1} \Delta(b\bar{a})} db \\ &\leq \sqrt{x} A^{2k+3+l} e^{-xc_0^2 e^{-1} \min_{b \in [1, A]} \{b^2 \bar{a}^2 \Delta(b\bar{a})\}} + \sqrt{x} \int_{|b| > A} |b|^{2k+2+l} e^{-xM c_0^2 \ln(b\bar{a})} db, \end{aligned}$$

where A is chosen such that $(b\bar{a})^2 \Delta(b\bar{a}) / \ln(b\bar{a}) > M$ on $|b| > A$, for some $M < L$, which is possible due to condition (A₁), and $A\bar{a} > 1$. Clearly, for large x , we get that

$$J_2(t, x) \leq \frac{1}{x}.$$

This and (5.25) yield immediately with $\varepsilon(x) = \sqrt{C \ln(x)} x^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ that

$$I(x, t) = \frac{(-1)^k \phi^\dagger(\bar{a})\phi^k(\bar{a})}{\sqrt{2\pi}\bar{a}^{1-l}} \frac{e^{\bar{a}t - x\phi(\bar{a})}}{\sqrt{x}\sqrt{-\phi''(\bar{a})}} \left(1 + O\left(\sqrt{\ln(x)} x^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right)\right).$$

This concludes the proof of the theorem. \square

We will be economical with the next proof as it follows the main steps of the proof of Theorem 3.2.

Proof of Theorem 3.8. Since $t/x \rightarrow \phi'(0^+)$ then from (3.4) we have that $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} a_* = 0$. Then, using (3.2) for $x > x_0(k+l, L)$ we write

$$\frac{\partial^k \partial^l}{\partial x^k \partial t^l} f_\phi(x, t) = \frac{(-1)^k}{2\pi} e^{a_* t - x\phi(a_*)} \left(\int_{\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon} + \int_{\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon^c} \right) J(a_*, b) e^{ibt - x(\phi(a_* + ib) - \phi(a_*))} db, \quad (5.26)$$

where $\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon = [-\varepsilon(a_*)a_*, \varepsilon(a_*)a_*]$, J defined as in (5.5) and $\varepsilon(a_*)$ as in (5.8). The latter makes sense due to the first assumption in (3.9). Absolutely the same estimates hinging on (A₁), (A₂') and (5.8) and employing $g(a_*, x) = \sqrt{2 \ln(a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x})}$ lead to

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon} J(a_*, b) e^{ibt - x(\phi(a_* + ib) - \phi(a_*))} db \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{\sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}} \frac{\phi^\dagger(a_*) \phi^k(a_*)}{a_*^{1-l}} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{g(a_*, x)}{a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{e^{-\frac{g^2(a_*, x)}{2}}}{g(a_*, x)}\right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.27)$$

We note that since $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} a_*(x) = 0$ and (3.9) hold then (5.16) is true with speed $\mathcal{O}\left((-a_*^2 \phi''(a_*)x)^{-\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon}\right)$ for any $\epsilon > 0$ small enough. Next, we again decompose the remaining term to

$$\begin{aligned} J_\varepsilon(x, t) &:= \frac{(-1)^k}{2\pi} e^{a_* t - x\phi(a_*)} \int_{\varepsilon(a_*)a_* \leq |b| \leq ca_*(a_* + ib)} \frac{\phi^\dagger(a_* + ib) \phi^k(a_* + ib)}{(a_* + ib)^{1-l}} e^{ibt - x(\phi(a_* + ib) - \phi(a_*))} db \\ &+ \frac{(-1)^k}{2\pi} e^{a_* t - x\phi(a_*)} \int_{|b| \geq ca_*} \frac{\phi^\dagger(a_* + ib) \phi^k(a_* + ib)}{(a_* + ib)^{1-l}} e^{ibt - x(\phi(a_* + ib) - \phi(a_*))} db \\ &=: \frac{(-1)^k}{2\pi} e^{a_* t - x\phi(a_*)} (J_1(a_*, x) + J_2(a_*, x)), \end{aligned} \quad (5.28)$$

and get the same way $J_1(a_*, x)$ estimated as in (5.20). Also, in the same fashion

$$\left| \frac{a_*^{1-l} \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}}{\phi^\dagger(a_*) \phi^k(a_*)} J_2(a_*, x) \right| = C' c^{2k+2+l} a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x} \int_1^\infty b^{2k+1+l} e^{-x(\operatorname{Re}(\phi(a_*(1+ibc))) - \phi(a_*))} db,$$

where $C' > 0$ is a constant. Here, however, there is a difference in that $a_* \rightarrow 0$ and we estimate the exponent in two different ways. Pick $A > 1$. Then on $b \leq A/(ca_*)$ the difference in the exponent is estimated by a constant as in the bound for $J_2(t, x)$ in the proof of Theorem 3.6. Thus, for some $a > 0$,

$$\int_1^{\frac{A}{ca_*}} b^{2k+1+l} e^{-x(\operatorname{Re}(\phi(a_*(1+ibc))) - \phi(a_*))} db \leq C e^{-ax}.$$

Then, for any $M < L$, see (A₁), choose A such that, for $b > A/(ca_*)$, as in (5.21),

$$\operatorname{Re}(\phi(a_*(1+ibc))) - \phi(a_*) \geq c_0^2 b^2 c^2 a_*^2 e^{-\frac{1}{bc}} \Delta(bca_*) \geq M c_0^2 e^{-\frac{a_*}{A}} \ln(bca_*).$$

Therefore, for all x large enough and hence a_* small enough we get with some M' as large as we wish

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\frac{A}{ca_*}}^\infty b^{2k+1+l} e^{-x(\operatorname{Re}(\phi(a_*(1+ibc))) - \phi(a_*))} db \leq \int_{\frac{A}{ca_*}}^\infty b^{2k+1+l} (bca_*)^{-M'x} db \\ &= a_*^{-2k-l-2} c^{-M'x} \int_{\frac{A}{c}}^\infty u^{2k+1+l} u^{-M'x} du = a_*^{-2k-l-2} c^{-2k-2-l} A^{-M'x} \frac{1}{M'x - 2k - l - 2}. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this and the estimate above we arrive thanks to the second and third requirement of (3.9), with some $C_0 > 0$ and $a' > 0$, at the bound which settles the claim

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{a_*^{1-l} \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}}{\phi^\dagger(a_*)\phi^k(a_*)} J_2(a_*) \right| &\leq C_0 a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x} \left(e^{-ax} + \frac{2}{M'x} e^{-M'x \ln(A) + (2k+l+2) \ln(\frac{1}{a_*})} \right) \\ &\leq \left| \frac{a_*^{1-l} \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x}}{\phi^\dagger(a_*)\phi^k(a_*)} J_2(a_*, x) \right| \leq 2C_0 a_* \sqrt{-\phi''(a_*)x} e^{-a'x} \leq 2C_0 e^{-a'x}. \end{aligned}$$

□

5.2. Proofs of the power series representation and the behaviour at zero.

Proof of Theorem 3.15. As in the (4.29), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^k}{\partial x^k} \frac{\partial^l}{\partial t^l} f_\phi(x, t) &= \frac{(-1)^k}{\pi} \int_\varepsilon^{+\infty} \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{\left(\phi^\dagger \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \left(\phi \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \right)^k \right)}{\rho^{1-l} e^{-il(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} e^{-x\phi \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) + t\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} \right) d\rho \\ &\quad + \frac{(-1)^k}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}} \frac{\phi^\dagger(z) (\phi(z))^k}{z^{1-l}} e^{-x\phi(z) + tz} dz. \end{aligned} \tag{5.29}$$

Writing $e^{-x\phi(z)}$ as a power series and assuming we can exchange the series with the integral, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^k}{\partial x^k} \frac{\partial^l}{\partial t^l} f_\phi(x, t) &= \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} (-1)^{k+j} \frac{x^j}{j!} \\ &\times \left[\frac{1}{\pi} \int_\varepsilon^{+\infty} \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{\left(\phi^\dagger \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \left(\phi \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \right)^{k+j} \right)}{\rho^{1-l} e^{-il(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} e^{t\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} \right) d\rho + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}} \frac{\phi^\dagger(z) (\phi(z))^{k+j}}{z^{1-l}} e^{tz} dz \right] \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \sum_{k_1+k_2+k_3=k+j} \frac{(k+j)!}{k_1!k_2!k_3!} (-1)^{k+j} \frac{x^j}{j!} q^{k_1} \mathfrak{b}^{k_2} \\ &\times \left[\frac{1}{\pi} \int_\varepsilon^{+\infty} \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{\left(\phi^\dagger \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \right)^{k_3+1}}{\rho^{1-l-k_2} e^{-i(l+k_2)(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} e^{t\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} \right) d\rho + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}} \frac{(\phi^\dagger(z))^{k_3+1}}{z^{1-l-k_2}} e^{tz} dz \right] \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \sum_{k_1+k_2+k_3=k+j} \frac{(k+j)!}{k_1!k_2!k_3!} (-1)^{k+j} \frac{x^j}{j!} q^{k_1} \mathfrak{b}^{k_2} \\ &\times \left[\frac{1}{\pi} \int_\varepsilon^{+\infty} \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{\left(\phi^\dagger \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \right)^{k_3+1}}{\rho^{k_3+1-(k_2+k_3+l)} e^{i(k_3-(l+k_2+k_3))(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} e^{t\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} \right) d\rho + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}} \frac{(\phi^\dagger(z))^{k_3+1}}{z^{k_3+1-(k_2+k_3+l)}} e^{tz} dz \right] \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \sum_{k_1+k_2+k_3=k+j} \frac{(k+j)!}{k_1!k_2!k_3!} (-1)^{k+j} \frac{x^j}{j!} q^{k_1} \mathfrak{b}^{k_2} \frac{d^{k_2+k_3+l}}{dt^{k_2+k_3+l}} \mu^{*(k_3+1)}(t), \end{aligned} \tag{5.30}$$

where we used (4.26) in the last equality. Now we only have to prove that we can exchange the series with the integrals. This is clear for the integral over $\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}$, thus let us only consider the one over $(\varepsilon, +\infty)$. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\varepsilon}^{+\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \left| (-1)^{k+j} \frac{\phi^{\dagger} \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \left(\phi \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \right)^{k+j}}{j! \rho^{1-l} e^{-il(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} x^j e^{t\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} \right| d\rho \\
&= \int_{\varepsilon}^{+\infty} \frac{\left| \phi^{\dagger} \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \right| \left| \phi \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \right|^k}{\rho^{k+1}} \rho^{l+k} e^{x \left| \phi \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \right| - t\rho \cos \frac{\theta}{2}} d\rho \\
&\leq e^{xq} \int_{\varepsilon}^{+\infty} \frac{\left| \phi^{\dagger} \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \right| \left| \phi \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \right|^k}{\rho^{k+1}} \rho^{l+k} e^{x \mathfrak{b} \rho \cos(\frac{\theta}{2}) - t\rho \cos \frac{\theta}{2} + \phi^{\dagger} \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right)} d\rho. \tag{5.31}
\end{aligned}$$

It is clear that we have to check integrability in the right-hand side of (5.31) only in a neighbourhood of infinity. To do this, set $\delta = t - \mathfrak{b}x$ and $p, p' > 1$ as in the proof of Proposition 4.3. By (B₂) we know that there exists K big enough such that $\frac{|\phi^{\dagger}(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})})| |\phi(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})})|^k}{\rho^{k+1}}$ is bounded and $\frac{|\phi^{\dagger}(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})})|}{\rho \cos(\theta/2)} < \frac{\delta}{4}$, whenever $\rho > K$. Hence we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_K^{+\infty} \frac{|\phi^{\dagger}(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})})| |\phi(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})})|^k}{\rho^{k+1}} e^{-\frac{t}{p'} \rho \cos(\frac{\theta}{2})} \exp \left(-\rho \cos \left(\frac{\theta}{2} \right) \left(\frac{t}{p} - x\mathfrak{b} - \frac{|\phi^{\dagger}(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})})|}{\rho \cos(\frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \right) d\rho \\
&\leq C \int_K^{+\infty} \rho^{k+l} e^{-\frac{t}{p'} \rho \cos(\frac{\theta}{2})} < +\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. \square

With the series representation, we can provide some results concerning the behaviour at 0.

Proof of Theorem 3.18. Let $[t_1, t_2] \subset (0, +\infty)$ and observe that for $t \in [t_1, t_2]$ we have by (4.26)

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{I}_{j,k,l}(t)| &\leq \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\varepsilon}^{+\infty} \frac{|\phi^{\dagger}(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})})| |\phi(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})})|^{j+k}}{\rho^{1-l}} e^{-t_1 \rho \cos(\frac{\theta}{2})} d\rho \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\gamma_{\varepsilon}} \frac{|\phi^{\dagger}(\rho)|}{\rho^{1-l}} |\phi(\rho)|^{j+k} e^{-t_1 \rho \cos \frac{\theta}{2}} d\rho. \tag{5.32}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $0 < x < \frac{t_1}{\mathfrak{b}}$ and $t \in [t_1, t_2]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{\partial^k \partial^l}{\partial x^k \partial t^l} f_{\phi}(x, t) - \mathcal{I}_{0,k,l} \right| &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} \frac{x^j}{j!} |\mathcal{I}_{j,k,l}(t)| \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} \frac{x^j}{j!} \left[\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\varepsilon}^{+\infty} \frac{|\phi^{\dagger}(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})})| |\phi(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})})|^{j+k}}{\rho^{1-l}} e^{-t_1 \rho \cos(\frac{\theta}{2})} d\rho \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\gamma_{\varepsilon}} \frac{|\phi^{\dagger}(\rho)|}{\rho^{1-l}} |\phi(\rho)|^{j+k} e^{-t_1 \rho \cos \frac{\theta}{2}} d\rho \right]. \tag{5.33}
\end{aligned}$$

where, in the last step, we used (5.32). The convergence of the series in (5.33) can be ascertained as in (5.31). The result then follows by letting $x \rightarrow 0$ in (5.33). \square

Finally, let us prove Theorem 3.20.

Proof of Theorem 3.20. Let us first consider G_ϕ . Starting from (4.30), we have, assuming that we can exchange the order of the series and the integral,

$$\begin{aligned}
G_\phi(x, t) &= \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} (-1)^j \frac{x^j}{j!} \left[\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\varepsilon}^{+\infty} \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{\left(\phi \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \right)^j}{\rho} e^{t\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} \right) d\rho + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}} \frac{(\phi(z))^j}{z} e^{tz} dz \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\varepsilon}^{+\infty} \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \right) d\rho + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}} \frac{1}{z} dz \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} (-1)^j \frac{x^j}{j!} \left[\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\varepsilon}^{+\infty} \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{\left(\phi \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \right)^j}{\rho} e^{t\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} \right) d\rho + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}} \frac{(\phi(z))^j}{z} e^{tz} dz \right] \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} (-1)^j \frac{x^j}{j!} \left[\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\varepsilon}^{+\infty} \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{\left(q + b\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right)^j}{\rho} e^{t\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} \right) d\rho + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}} \frac{(q + bz)^j}{z} e^{tz} dz \right] \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} \sum_{k_1 + k_2 + k_3 = j-1} (-1)^j \frac{x^j}{k_1! k_2! (k_3 + 1)!} q^{k_1} \mathbf{b}^{k_2} \\
&\quad \times \left[\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\varepsilon}^{+\infty} \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{\left(\phi^\dagger \left(\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right) \right)^{k_3 + 1}}{\rho^{k_3 + 1 - (k_2 + k_3)} e^{i(k_3 - (k_2 + k_3))}} e^{t\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} \right) d\rho + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}} \frac{(\phi^\dagger(z))^{k_3 + 1}}{z^{k_3 + 1 - (k_2 + k_3)}} e^{tz} dz \right] \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} (-1)^j \frac{x^j}{j!} \left[\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\varepsilon}^{+\infty} \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{\left(q + b\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right)^j}{\rho} e^{t\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} \right) d\rho + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}} \frac{(q + bz)^j}{z} e^{tz} dz \right] \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{+\infty} \sum_{k_1 + k_2 + k_3 = j-1} (-1)^j \frac{x^j}{k_1! k_2! (k_3 + 1)!} q^{k_1} \mathbf{b}^{k_2} \frac{d^{k_2 + k_3}}{dt} \mu^{*(k_3 + 1)}(t).
\end{aligned}$$

Concerning the first series, it is not difficult to show that, by a simple application of Cauchy's theorem,

$$\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\varepsilon}^{+\infty} \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{\left(q + b\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right)^j}{\rho} e^{t\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} \right) d\rho + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}} \frac{(q + bz)^j}{z} e^{tz} dz = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_{\varepsilon}} \frac{(q + bz)^j}{z} e^{tz} dz = q^j,$$

where in the last integral we used the fact that $\frac{(q+bz)^j}{z} e^{tz}$ admits a simple pole in 0 with residue 1. The latter equality implies (3.23). The other two series (3.24) and (3.25) are obtained analogously, once one notices that for any $j \geq 0$

$$\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\varepsilon}^{+\infty} \operatorname{Im} \left(\left(q + b\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})} \right)^j e^{t\rho e^{i(\pi - \frac{\theta}{2})}} \right) d\rho + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_{\varepsilon, \theta}} (q + bz)^j e^{tz} dz = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_{\varepsilon}} (q + bz)^j e^{tz} dz = 0,$$

since $(q + bz)^j e^{tz}$ is holomorphic in the disc $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < \varepsilon\}$. Finally, the fact that one can actually exchange the series with the integral is proven exactly as in the proof of Theorem 3.15. \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Mladen Savov acknowledges - "This study is financed by the European Union-NextGenerationEU, through the National Recovery and Resilience Plan of the Republic of Bulgaria, project No BG-RRP-2.004-0008". The authors Giacomo Ascione and Bruno Toaldo are partially supported by Gruppo Nazionale per l'Analisi Matematica, la Probabilità e le loro Applicazioni (GNAMPA-INdAM).

REFERENCES

- [1] W. Arendt, C.J.K. Batty, M. Hieber and F. Neubrander. Vector valued Laplace transform and Cauchy problem. Second Edition. *Birkhäuser*, Berlin, 2010.
- [2] G. Ascione, P. Patie and B. Toaldo. Non-local heat equation with moving boundary and curve-crossing of delayed Brownian motion. *Submitted*, available at arXiv:2203.09850, 2022.
- [3] G. Ascione, E. Pirozzi and B. Toaldo. On the exit time from open sets of some semi-Markov processes. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 30(3): 1130 – 1163, 2020.
- [4] G. Ascione, and B. Toaldo. A semi-Markov leaky integrate-and-fire model. *Mathematics*, 7 (11): 1022, 2019.
- [5] B. Baeumer and P. Straka. Fokker-Planck and Kolmogorov backward equations for continuous time random walk limits. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 145: 399 – 412, 2017.
- [6] A. Barker and M. Savov. Bivariate Bernstein–gamma functions and moments of exponential functionals of subordinators. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 131: 454-497, 2021.
- [7] P. Becker Kern, M.M. Meerschaert and H. P. Scheffler. Limit theorems for coupled continuous time random walks, *Ann. Probab.*, 32: 730 – 756, 2004.
- [8] L. Beghin, C. Macci and C. Ricciuti. Random time-change with inverses of multivariate subordinators: Governing equations and fractional dynamics. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.*, 130(10): 6364 – 6387, 2020.
- [9] J. Bertoin. Lévy processes. *Cambridge University Press*, Cambridge, 1996.
- [10] J. Bertoin. Subordinators: examples and applications. *Lectures on Probability Theory and Statistics (Saint-Flour, 1997)*, 1 – 91. *Lectures Notes in Math.*, 1717, Springer, Berlin, 1999.
- [11] N.H. Bingham, C. M. Goldie and J. L. Teugels. Regular variation *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987
- [12] J. Brown, R. Churchill *Complex Variables and Applications* *McGraw Hill*, 2014
- [13] J. Burrige, A. Kuznetsov, M. Kwaśnicki, A. E. Kyprianou New families of subordinators with explicit transition probability semigroup. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* 124(10): 3480–3495, 2014.
- [14] S. Cho and P. Kim. Estimates on transition densities of subordinators with jumping density decaying in mixed polynomial orders. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 139: 229–279, 2021.
- [15] E. Cinlar. Markov additive processes and semi-regeneration. *Discussion Paper No. 118*, Northwestern University, 1974.
- [16] F. Colantoni and M. D’Ovidio. On the inverse gamma subordinator. *Stoch. Anal. Appl.*, in press, 2022.

- [17] R. Doney and V. Rivero. Asymptotic behaviour of first passage time distributions for Lévy processes. *Probab. Theor. Rel.*, 157.1-2: 1–45, 2013.
- [18] R. Doney and V. Rivero. Asymptotic behaviour of first passage time distributions for subordinators. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 20: 1-28, 2015.
- [19] L. Döring and M. Savov. (Non)Differentiability and Asymptotics for Potential Densities of Subordinators. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 16: 470-503, 2011.
- [20] W. Feller. *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications*. Vol. II, 2nd Ed., Wiley, New York, 1971.
- [21] B. Fridstedt and W.E. Pruitt. Lower functions for increasing random walks and subordinators *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete*, 18: 167–182, 1971.
- [22] R. Gorenflo, F. Mainardi, D. Moretti, G. Pagnini and P. Paradisi. Discrete random walk models for space–time fractional diffusion. *Chemical physics*, 284(1-2): 521-541, 2002.
- [23] T. Grzywny, L. Leżaj and B. Trojan. Transition densities of subordinators of positive order. *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu*, 1-61, 2021.
- [24] M. Hairer, G. Iyer, L. Korolov, A. Novikov, and Z. Pajor-Gyulai. A fractional kinetic process describing the intermediate time behaviour of cellular flows. *Ann. Probab.*, 46(2): 897 – 955, 2018.
- [25] J. M. Howie, Complex analysis. *Springer Science & Business Media*, 2003.
- [26] A. Jacquier and L. Torricelli, Anomalous Diffusions in Option Prices: Connecting Trade Duration and the Volatility Term Structure, *SIAM J. Financial Math.*, 11(4), 1137–1167, 2020.
- [27] N. C. Jain and W. E. Pruitt. Lower tail probability estimates for subordinators and non-decreasing random walks *Ann. Probab.*, 15: 75 – 101, 1987.
- [28] H. Kaspi and B. Maisonneuve. Regenerative systems on the real line. *Ann. Probab.*, 16: 1306 – 1332, 1988.
- [29] A.N. Kochubei, Y.G. Kondratiev and J.L. da Silva. From Random Times to Fractional Kinetics. *Interdisciplinary Studies of Complex Systems*, 16: 5 – 32, 2020.
- [30] A.N. Kochubei, Y.G. Kondratiev and J.L. da Silva. Random time change and related evolution equations. Time asymptotic behaviour. *Stochastics and Dynamics*, 20(5): 2050034, 2020.
- [31] M. Kovacs and M.M. Meerschaert. Ultrafast subordinators and their hitting times. *Publications de L’Institut Mathématique*, 94(71): 193 – 206, 2006.
- [32] A. Kumar and P. Vellaisamy. Inverse tempered stable subordinators. *Statistics and Probability Letters*, 103: 134 – 141, 2015.
- [33] A. Kumar, A. Wylomańska, A., R. Połoczański, and S. Sundar Fractional Brownian motion time-changed by gamma and inverse gamma process. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and Its Applications*, 468: 648–667, 2017.
- [34] A.E. Kyprianou. *Fluctuations of Lévy Processes with Applications*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2014.
- [35] M.M. Meerschaert and H.P. Scheffler. Limit theorems for continuous-time random walks with infinite mean waiting times. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 41.3: 623–638, 2004.
- [36] M.M. Meerschaert and H.P. Scheffler. Triangular array limits for continuous time random walks. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 118(9): 1606 – 1633, 2008.
- [37] M.M. Meerschaert and A. Sikorskii. *Stochastic Models for Fractional Calculus*. De Gruyter, Berlin, 2012.
- [38] M. M. Meerschaert, and P. Straka. Inverse stable subordinators. *Mathematical modelling of natural phenomena*, 8.2: 1 – 16, 2013.
- [39] M.M. Meerschaert and P. Straka. Semi-Markov approach to continuous time random walk limit processes. *Ann. Probab.*, 42(4) : 1699 – 1723, 2014.

- [40] R. Metzler and J. Klafter. The random walk's guide to anomalous diffusion: a fractional dynamics approach. *Phys. Rep.*, 339: 1 – 77, 2000.
- [41] R. Metzler, J.-H. Jeon, A.G. Chertsvy and E. Barkai. Anomalous diffusion models and their properties: non-stationarity, non-ergodicity, and ageing at the centenary of single particle tracking. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 16: 24128, 2014.
- [42] M. Minchev and M. Savov. Asymptotics for densities of exponential functionals of subordinators. *Bernoulli*, arXiv:2104.05381, accepted.
- [43] A. Mura and G. Pagnini. Characterizations and simulations of a class of stochastic processes to model anomalous diffusion. *J. Phys. A.: Math. Theor.*, 41: 285003, 2008.
- [44] P. Patie and M. Savov. Bernstein-gamma functions and exponential functionals of Lévy processes. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 23(75): 1 – 101, 2018.
- [45] P. Patie and M. Savov. Spectral expansions for generalized Laguerre semigroups. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 272(1336): 1 – 183, 2021.
- [46] P. Patie and A. Vaidyanathan. Non-classical Tauberian and Abelian type criteria for the moment problem. *Math. Nachr.*, 295(5): 970 - 990, 2022.
- [47] K. A. Penson and K. Górska. Exact and explicit probability densities for one-sided Lévy stable distributions. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 105.21: 210604, 2010.
- [48] C. Ricciuti and B. Toaldo. From semi-Markov random evolutions to scattering transport and superdiffusion. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 2023.
- [49] M. Savov and B. Toaldo. Semi-Markov processes, integro-differential equations and anomalous diffusion-aggregation. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 56(4): 2640 – 2671, 2020.
- [50] E. Scalas. Five years of continuous-time random walks in econophysics. The Complex Networks of Economic Interactions, *Lecture Notes in Econom. and Math. Systems*, 567: 3–16, Springer, Berlin, 2006.
- [51] E. Scalas and B. Toaldo. Limit theorems for prices of options written on semi-Markov processes. *Theory Probab. Math. Statist.*, 105: 3 – 33, 2021.
- [52] R.L. Schilling, R. Song and Z. Vondraček. Bernstein functions: theory and applications. 2nd edition. *Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Company KG*, Vol 37 of De Gruyter Studies in Mathematics Series, 2010.
- [53] J.L. da Silva and Y.G. Kondratiev. Random Time Dynamical Systems I: General Structures. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2012.15201>, 2020.
- [54] E. M. Stein and R. Shakarchi. Complex analysis. Vol. 2 *Princeton University Press*, 2010.
- [55] T. Tao. Analysis II, *Springer*, New York, 2015.
- [56] L. Torricelli. Volatility targeting using delayed diffusions. *Appl. Math. Finance*, 25(3): 213 – 246, 2018.
- [57] S. Umarov, M. Hahn and K. Kobayashi. Beyond the Triangle: Brownian Motion, Itô Calculus, and Fokker-Planck Equation-Fractional Generalizations. *World Scientific*, 2018.
- [58] M. Veillette and M.S. Taqqu. Using differential equations to obtain joint moments of first-passage times of increasing Lévy processes. *Statistics and Probability Letters*, 80: 697 – 705, 2010.

2: FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATICS, SOFIA UNIVERSITY "ST KLIMENT OHRIDSKI", BOUL. JAMES BOUCHER
5, SOFIA - 1164, BULGARIA

Email address: `msavov@fmi.uni-sofia.bg`

3: INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATICS, BULGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, STR. AKAD. GEORGI
BONCHEV, BLOCK 8, SOFIA - 1113, BULGARIA

Email address: `mladensavov@math.bas.bg`

4: DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA "GIUSEPPE PEANO" - UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO, VIA CARLO ALBERTO
10 - 10123, TORINO (ITALY)

Email address: `bruno.toaldo@unito.it`