

# MINIMUM-WEIGHT PATH IN A SPARSE ERDŐS–RÉNYI GRAPH WITH SIGNED WEIGHTS

HENG MA AND PASCAL MAILLARD

**ABSTRACT.** We consider a sparse Erdős–Rényi graph  $\mathcal{G}(n, \lambda/n)$  where each edge is independently assigned a random signed weight. For two uniformly chosen vertices, we study the joint distribution of the total weights and hopcounts (number of edges) of the near-minimum weight paths connecting them. Under certain conditions on the weight distribution, which ensure in particular that these paths are typically of positive weight, we prove that the point process formed by the rescaled pairs of total weight and hopcount, converges weakly to a Poisson point process with a random intensity. This random intensity is characterized by the product of two independent copies of the Biggins martingale limit of certain branching random walk. This result generalizes the work of Daly, Schulte, and Shneer (arXiv:2308.12149) from non-negative to signed weights.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Consider a sparse Erdős–Rényi graph  $\mathcal{G}_n = \mathcal{G}_{n, \lambda/n}$  on the vertex set  $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , where each edge exists independently with probability  $\lambda/n$  for some fixed constant  $\lambda > 1$ . Each edge  $e$  in  $\mathcal{G}_n$  is assigned an i.i.d. real-valued weight  $X(e) \in \mathbb{R}$ , distributed according to a random variable  $X$ . Let  $\psi_X(t) := \ln \mathbf{E}[e^{-tX}] \in (-\infty, \infty]$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  denote the log-Laplace transform of  $X$  and denote by  $\mathcal{D} = \{t \in \mathbb{R} : \psi_X(t) < \infty\}$  its domain of definition, which is an interval. In this paper, we investigate the minimum total weight of a simple path\* from vertex 1 to vertex  $n$ , denoted by:

$$\mathbb{X}_n^* := \min \{X(p) : p \in \mathcal{P}(1, n)\},$$

Here,  $\mathcal{P}(1, n)$  denotes the set of all paths from 1 to  $n$  in  $\mathcal{G}_n$ , and  $X(p) := \sum_{e \in p} X(e)$  represents the total weight of the path  $p$ . By convention, if vertices 1 and  $n$  are disconnected, i.e.,  $\mathcal{P}(1, n) = \emptyset$ , we define  $\min \emptyset = \infty$ . Let  $\mathcal{P}^*(1, n) = \{p \in \mathcal{P}(1, n) : X(p) = \mathbb{X}_n^*\}$  be the set of paths achieving this minimal total weight. We further define:

$$\mathbb{H}_n^* := \min \{H(p) : p \in \mathcal{P}^*(1, n)\}.$$

where  $H(p)$  denotes the hopcount (number of edges) of the path  $p$ . Our primary focus is on the asymptotic behavior of the pair  $(\mathbb{X}_n^*, \mathbb{H}_n^*)$ .

Throughout this paper, we require that there exists  $\alpha \in (0, \infty) \cap \text{int } \mathcal{D}$  (the interior of the interval  $\mathcal{D}$ ), such that

$$\lambda \mathbf{E}[e^{-\alpha X}] = \lambda e^{\psi_X(\alpha)} = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \psi'_X(\alpha) < 0. \quad (1.1)$$

Also, for simplicity, we assume that the distribution of  $X$  is non-arithmetic:

$$\mathbf{P}(X \in d\mathbb{Z}) \neq 1, \quad \forall d > 0. \quad (1.2)$$

We indicate in Remark 1.3 how to generalize our results to the arithmetic case.

For non-negative weights, i.e.,  $\mathbf{P}(X \geq 0) = 1$ , the condition  $\lambda \mathbf{P}(X = 0) < 1$  guarantees the existence of such an  $\alpha$  in (1.1). In that case, Daly, Schulte, and Shneer [DSS23] proved

---

*Date:* December 1, 2025.

*Key words and phrases.* First passage percolation; Erdős–Rényi graph; branching random walk; extremal process.

\*Henceforth, we use path to mean a simple path.

that the scaled variables  $(\mathbb{X}_n^* - \frac{1}{\alpha} \ln n, \frac{1}{\sqrt{\beta \ln n}}(\mathbb{H}_n^* - \gamma \ln n))$  converge jointly in distribution to a non-degenerate limit, where the constants  $\gamma$  and  $\beta$  are given by

$$\gamma := \frac{1}{\alpha |\psi'_X(\alpha)|} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta := \frac{\psi''_X(\alpha)}{\alpha |\psi'_X(\alpha)|^3} = \gamma \frac{\psi''_X(\alpha)}{|\psi'_X(\alpha)|^2}.$$

Moreover, using the method of moments, they further characterized the full extremal statistics of the minimal weight. They considered the *extremal process*

$$\mathcal{E}_n := \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}(1, n)} \delta_{(X(p) - \frac{1}{\alpha} \ln n, \frac{H(p) - \gamma \ln n}{\sqrt{\beta \ln n}})}$$

and showed that, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  it converges in distribution (in the space of random measures on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  endowed with the vague topology) to a limiting process  $\mathcal{E}_\infty$ . This process is a Cox process, i.e. a Poisson point process with a random intensity  $W\tilde{W}\Lambda(dx, dh)$ , where

$$\Lambda(dx, dh) := \gamma \cdot (\alpha e^{\alpha x} dx) \otimes \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{h^2}{2}} dh \right)$$

and  $W, \tilde{W}$  are i.i.d. copies of the Biggins martingale limit with parameter  $\alpha$  of the branching random walk with offspring distribution  $\text{Poi}(\lambda)$  and displacement distribution  $X$ , see (2.4) for a precise definition.

Our main theorem extends these results to cases with signed weights. We also slightly strengthen the notion of convergence, by considering  $\mathcal{E}_\infty$  and  $\mathcal{E}_n$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  as random elements in the space of measures on  $\mathbb{R}^{-\infty} \times \mathbb{R}^{-\infty, +\infty}$ , where  $\mathbb{R}^{-\infty} = \{-\infty\} \cup \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbb{R}^{-\infty, +\infty} = \{-\infty\} \cup \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  are extensions of the real line endowed with the usual topology (in particular, the space  $\mathbb{R}^{-\infty, \infty}$  is compact).

**Theorem 1.1.** *Under assumptions (1.1) and (1.2), the process  $\mathcal{E}_n$  converges in law to  $\mathcal{E}_\infty$  with respect to the vague topology on the space of measures on  $\mathbb{R}^{-\infty} \times \mathbb{R}^{-\infty, +\infty}$ . Moreover,  $\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{E}_n = \emptyset) \rightarrow \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{E}_\infty = \emptyset)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .*

**Corollary 1.2.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, we have the convergence*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \mathbb{X}_n^* - \frac{1}{\alpha} \ln n, \frac{\mathbb{H}_n^* - \gamma \ln n}{\sqrt{\beta \ln n}} \right) \mid \mathcal{P}(1, n) \neq \emptyset \\ = (X^*, H^*) \mid W\tilde{W} > 0 \quad \text{in distribution,} \end{aligned}$$

where  $(X^*, H^*) = \arg \min \{x : (x, h) \in \mathcal{E}_\infty\}$ .

*Proof.* We remark that the function  $\nu \mapsto \arg \min \{x : (x, h) \in \nu\}$  is continuous  $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{E}_\infty}(\cdot \mid W\tilde{W} > 0)$ -almost surely, since, on the event  $W\tilde{W} > 0$ , the process  $\mathcal{E}_\infty$  has a unique atom  $(x, h)$  which minimizes  $x$  almost surely, and since  $\nu \mapsto \nu([-\infty, x] \times \mathbb{R}^{-\infty, +\infty})$  is continuous  $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{E}_\infty}$ -almost surely, by [Kal17, Lemma 4.1]. The result follows from Theorem 1.1 by an application of the continuous mapping theorem and using the fact that  $\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{P}(1, n) \neq \emptyset) = \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{E}_n \neq \emptyset) \rightarrow \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{E}_\infty \neq \emptyset) = \mathbf{P}(W\tilde{W} > 0)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 1.3.** If the weight distribution  $X$  satisfies (1.1) but not (1.2), i.e., it is arithmetic, then  $\mathbb{X}_n^*$  is supported on the lattice so that one can not expect  $\mathbb{X}_n^* - \frac{1}{\alpha} \ln n$  still converges weakly. Instead, one can characterize its subsequential limits. For the case of non-negative weights, this was established in [DSS23, Theorem 1.1 (b)]. Assume that  $X \in \mathbb{R}$  is arithmetic with span  $d > 0$ . For any  $\vartheta \in [-d, 0]$ , let  $N_\vartheta \subset \mathbb{N}$  be a sequence such that  $\lim_{N_\vartheta \ni n \rightarrow \infty} d \left\lfloor \frac{\ln n}{d\alpha} \right\rfloor - \frac{\ln n}{\alpha} = \vartheta$ . Define the limiting intensity measure

$$\Lambda_d(dx, dh) = \gamma \cdot \left( \alpha d \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{\alpha j d} \delta_{jd}(dx) \right) \otimes \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{h^2}{2}} dh \right). \quad (1.3)$$

Then under assumption (1.1), along the subsequence  $N_\vartheta$ , the point process

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}(1, n)} \delta \left( X(p) - d \lfloor \frac{\ln n}{d\alpha} \rfloor, \frac{H(p) - \gamma \ln n}{\sqrt{\beta \ln n}} \right)$$

converges in law to the Cox process with intensity measure  $W\tilde{W}e^{\alpha\vartheta}\Lambda_d$ , and, furthermore,  $\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{P}(1, n) \neq \emptyset) \rightarrow \mathbf{P}(W\tilde{W} \neq 0)$ . The approach in this paper can be adapted straightforwardly to obtain this result. See also Remark 2.2.

**1.1. Motivations and related work.** Our motivation arises from the study of first-passage percolation (FPP) on random graphs, a classical probabilistic model used to analyze the spread of fluid flow or information through some (random) media. In this setting, the edges of a graph represent the possible pathways for the flow, and each edge is assigned a random passage time describing the duration required to traverse it. The first-passage distance (or time) between two vertices is defined as the minimal total passage time needed to travel from one vertex to the other. FPP investigates the geometric and probabilistic structures induced by these random distances. Since the pioneering work of Hammersley and Welsh [HW65], the model has been extensively studied, especially on the integer lattice  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ , and we refer to the survey [ADH17] for a comprehensive overview.

Beyond the lattice setting, understanding how fluids or information propagate through complex real-world networks naturally motivates the study of FPP on various random graphs. As early as 1999, Janson [Jan99] investigated the minimum-weight path on complete graph with random positive weights (including exponential and uniform edge weights.). Subsequent studies on the complete graph include [BvdH12, BvdHH13]. Bhamidi, van der Hofstad and Hooghiemstra further developed the theory by investigating FPP on the configuration model under both exponential and general positive edge weights with a density [BvdHH10a, BvdHH10b, BvdHH17a, BvdHH17b]. These authors extended their results to Erdős–Rényi graphs in [BvdHH11] for exponential weights, with subsequent generalizations to arbitrary non-negative weights by Daly, Schulte, and Shneer [DSS23]. Moreover Komjáthy and Vadon [KV16] studied FPP on the Newman–Watts small world model and Kistler, Schertzer and Schmidt [KSS20b, KSS20a] studied oriented FPP on the hypercube in the limit of large dimensions.

All the studies mentioned above deal with non-negative edge weights. However, in the general shortest path problem, the edge weights could be negative values, which could model a gain instead of a loss or cost. This leads us to consider random graphs with signed edge weights. This brings a natural difficulty: if a cycle with a negative total weight exists, one could keep going around it to make the total cost decrease without bound. To avoid this, we restrict attention to simple paths. Still, when negative edges become too abundant compared with non-negative edges, one should expect the behavior to be very different. For example, in the extreme case that the weights are equal to a negative constant, then the path with smallest weight is simply the longest path, which is known to be of length proportional to  $n$  [AKS81]. Our assumption (1.1) guarantees that locally around a point, the weight of all paths originating from that point are ultimately positive and in fact grow linearly in their length, see Section 2.3 for details. Under this assumption, we show that the minimum-weight path statistics still belongs to the same universality class as in [BvdHH17b] and [DSS23].

We now provide a glimpse into our method and compare it to previous methods to study FPP on sparse graphs. A classical approach, followed for example by Bhamidi, van der Hofstad and Hooghiemstra [BvdHH10a, BvdHH10b, BvdHH17a, BvdHH17b] or by Komjáthy and Vadon [KV16] is to describe the growth of the balls of radius  $t \geq 0$  for the first passage percolation distance around a given point by a coupling to a continuous-time branching process. The shortest distance between two points is then given by (twice) the

first time the two growing balls around the two points intersect. In order to use this idea effectively, it is convenient if the weights are exponentially distributed. In the general case, this method is more complicated to use, since the continuous-time branching process used in the coupling is not Markovian anymore. An additional difficulty is the need to couple to the branching process for a long time, at which cycles start to appear and which need to be taken care of.

In order to deal with completely general (non-negative) weights, Daly, Schulte, and Shneer [DSS23] used a radically different method, based on a method of moments. They were able to calculate moments of quantities counting the number of extremal paths and their hopcount and showed that these moments satisfy a certain recurrence. They were then able to identify this recurrence in terms of the Cox process  $\mathcal{E}_\infty$ , based on a recurrence of the moments of  $W$ . It is worth to point out that their moment calculations work *vanilla*, i.e. without any truncation. One reason for this is that, in the case of non-negative weights, the Biggins martingale limit  $W$  of the branching random walk has exponential tails [Rös92]. This is not true in the case of signed weights, in fact, under common assumptions,  $W$  has a polynomial tail [Liu00]. One could still hope to adapt the method of moments by truncating paths which become negative, or smaller than some constant  $-c$ . Indeed, if one does this for the branching random walk, one recovers exponential tails for  $W$ , as was recently shown by the authors [MM25]. However, it seems not clear how to establish a recurrence for the moments, because of the need to keep track of the starting point of the branching random walk.

In this paper, we therefore propose a method which is closer in spirit to classical methods, but with several twists. First, we explore clusters locally around points, but not as balls with respect to the FPP distance, but rather with respect to graph distance, describing them by a branching random walk instead of a continuous-time branching process. This in particular allows to easily handle signed weights. Second, we do not insist on coupling the clusters to the branching random walk until they meet, but only up to a certain *graph distance* growing slowly with  $n$ . This allows us not to be bothered with cycles at this stage, which otherwise is a major source of difficulty. Third, we patch the two clusters together by intermediate paths. These paths will be almost independent from each other, so that they will account for the Poisson process. To prove this, we use the Chen-Stein method, which reduces the problem to the calculation of some (truncated) first and second moments.

Our approach is partly inspired by Kistler, Schertzer and Schmidt [KSS20b, KSS20a] on oriented FPP on the hypercube (with exponentially distributed weights). This is a dense setting and the underlying graph is deterministic, whereas we work on a random, sparse graph. While the results and scalings are different, the underlying idea of conditioning on neighborhoods around the two vertices and using the Chen-Stein method to deal with the paths connecting the two neighborhoods still works in our setting. One difference is that we do not apply the Chen-Stein method as is, since we restrict to a certain good set for the second moment calculations. We therefore derive a variant of the method that incorporates a certain global dependency and which is possibly of independent interest.

To conclude, *we believe that the method in this article paves the way to effectively studying first passage percolation with general, possibly signed weights on other sparse, locally tree-like graphs, such as the configuration model*. We also believe that they allow to deal with dense settings, if the FPP distances can be locally approximated by a branching random walk (with infinite number of offspring). Indeed, the method is very robust, relying mainly on (truncated) first- and second-moment computations. It should also extend to the study of more complicated quantities, such as the vector of FPP distances between three or more points.

**1.2. Roadmap of the proof.** The starting point of our proof is the following lemma, which indicates that to establish weak convergence of a sequence of point processes, it suffices to verify the convergence of the number of points contained in each rectangle.

**Lemma 1.4.** *Consider the set of rectangles of the form*

$$\mathcal{R} = \{(x, x'] \times (h, h'] : x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^{-\infty}, x \leq x', h, h' \in \mathbb{R}^{-\infty, +\infty}, h \leq h'\}.$$

*Then  $\mathcal{E}_n$  converges in law to  $\mathcal{E}_\infty$  with respect to the vague topology on measures on  $\mathbb{R}^{-\infty} \times \mathbb{R}^{-\infty, +\infty}$  if and only if  $\mathcal{E}_n(R)$  converges in law to  $\mathcal{E}_\infty(R)$  for every  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ .*

*Proof.* We aim to apply Theorem 4.15 in Kallenberg [Kal17]. Define the class

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{R}} = & \left( \{(x, x'] : x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^{-\infty}, -\infty < x \leq x'\} \cup \{[-\infty, x] : x \in \mathbb{R}^{-\infty}\} \right) \\ & \times \left( \{(h, h'] : h, h' \in \mathbb{R}^{-\infty, +\infty}, -\infty < h \leq h'\} \cup \{[-\infty, h] : h \in \mathbb{R}^{-\infty, \infty}\} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Then  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$  is, in the language of that reference, a dissecting semi-ring of the Borel sets on  $\mathbb{R}^{-\infty} \times \mathbb{R}^{-\infty, +\infty}$  and we have for every  $R \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ ,  $\mathbf{E}[\mathcal{E}_\infty(\partial R)] = \mathbf{E}[W\tilde{W}\Lambda(\partial R)] = 0$ . Theorem 4.15 in Kallenberg [Kal17] (or the remark that precedes it) then implies the statement with  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$  in place of  $\mathcal{R}$ . Now notice that  $\mathcal{E}_n$  and  $\mathcal{E}_\infty$  do not contain points  $(x, h)$  with  $x = -\infty$  or  $h = -\infty$ , so that the statement also holds with  $\mathcal{R}$  instead.  $\square$

Notice that the law of  $\mathcal{E}_\infty(R)$  is a Poisson distribution, but with a *random* intensity  $W\tilde{W}\Lambda(R)$ . Inspired by the previous study [BvdHH11] and [KSS20a], the randomness in the intensity, namely  $W$  and  $\tilde{W}$ , comes from the random evolution within the local neighborhood of the vertices 1,  $n$ . Thus, to establish the weak convergence of  $\mathcal{E}_n(R)$ , we therefore first reveal or explore the local neighborhood of  $\{1, n\}$ . Then conditionally on this local information, the limiting distribution should be a Poisson random variable. There exist various tools for proving Poisson convergence; here the Chen–Stein method seems to be simple and elegant.

We now give a precise description of the framework, starting with the relevant notation. For any vertex subset  $A \subset [n]$  and a radius  $\rho \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\mathcal{S}_\rho(A)$  denote the set of vertices at a distance of  $\rho$  from  $A$ . The  $\rho$ -neighborhood of  $A$  in  $G_n$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{S}_{\leq \rho}(A)$ , is the (weighted) subgraph induced by the union of the  $k$ -spheres  $\mathcal{S}_k(A)$  for  $k$  from 0 to  $\rho$ . Throughout this paper, we let  $(r_n)_{n \geq 1}$  be a sequence of natural numbers such that<sup>†</sup>

$$r_n \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{and} \quad r_n = o(\sqrt{\log n}). \quad (1.4)$$

Moreover, we introduce a good event  $\mathbf{G}_n^1$  for the  $r_n$ -neighborhoods of vertices 1 and  $n$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{G}_n^1 := & \{ \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1) \text{ and } \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(n) \text{ are both trees, and } |\mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1)| \vee |\mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(n)| \leq (2\lambda)^{r_n} \} \\ & \cap \{ \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n) \text{ is a forest of two trees} \}. \end{aligned}$$

For technical reasons, we'll introduce two additional good events  $\mathbf{G}_n^2, \mathbf{G}_n^3$  in §3.1; and our analysis will always assume the occurrence of  $\mathbf{G}_n := \mathbf{G}_n^1 \cap \mathbf{G}_n^2 \cap \mathbf{G}_n^3$ . Lemma 3.1 shows that the good event  $\mathbf{G}_n$  happens with high probability. It makes use of the fact that the neighborhood of vertex 1 in  $\mathcal{G}_n$  converges in the local weak sense to a Galton–Watson tree with  $\text{Poisson}(\lambda)$  offspring distribution. In the following, let

$$\pi_\lambda(k) = \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} e^{-\lambda} \quad \text{for all } \lambda > 0 \text{ and } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Notice that for  $\lambda, \mu > 0$ ,

$$\sup_{k \geq 0} |\pi_\lambda(k) - \pi_\mu(k)| \leq \mathbf{P}(\text{Poi}(|\lambda - \mu|) \geq 1) \leq |\lambda - \mu|. \quad (1.5)$$

<sup>†</sup>We could in fact allow  $r_n \leq \delta \log n$  for some small  $\delta > 0$ , at the expense of some more complicated arguments. In particular, we would need to extend Lemma 2.1 to a wider range of  $x$ .

Given  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ , we bound the difference of the probability distribution function of  $\mathcal{E}_n(R)$  with  $\mathcal{E}_\infty(R)$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{E}_n(R) = k) - \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{E}_\infty(R) = k)| \\ & \leq \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{G}_n^c) + \mathbf{E} \left[ \left| \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{E}_n(R) = k, \mathbf{G}_n \mid \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n)) - \pi_{\lambda_n(R)}(k) \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{G}_n\}} \right| \right] \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

$$+ \left| \mathbf{E} \left[ \pi_{\lambda_n(R)}(k) \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{G}_n\}} \right] - \mathbf{E} \left[ \pi_{W\tilde{W}\Lambda(R)}(k) \right] \right| \quad (1.7)$$

where

$$\lambda_n(R) := \mathbf{E}[\mathcal{E}_n(R) \mid \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n)] \geq 0.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 1.4, to establish the weak convergence  $\mathcal{E}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_\infty$ , it suffices to show that the error terms in (1.6) and (1.7) vanish as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

We first explain the idea for proving that (1.7) vanishes. Notice that when  $\mathbf{G}_n^1$  occurs, for any vertex  $u \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1)$ , there exists a unique path from 1 to  $u$  within the subgraph  $\mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n)$ . We refer to this path as  $[1, u]_{r_n}$  or just  $[1, u]$  for simplicity if there's no risk of confusion. Similarly, for any  $v \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(n)$ ,  $[v, n]$  denotes the unique path from  $v$  to  $n$  in  $\mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n)$ . Hence the following two quantities are well-defined:

$$W_{r_n} := \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{G}_n^1\}} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1)} e^{-\alpha X([1, u])} \text{ and } \tilde{W}_{r_n} := \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{G}_n^1\}} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(n)} e^{-\alpha X([v, n])}.$$

A simple computation yields that the (conditional) expectation of  $\mathcal{E}_n(R)$  is related to the (truncated) exponential renewal function of the random walk with step distribution  $X$  (see Lemma 2.3). By using the renewal theory for random walk with positive jumps (see Lemma 2.1), in Lemma 2.7 we will show that

$$|\lambda_n(R) - W_{r_n} \tilde{W}_{r_n} \Lambda(R)| \rightarrow 0 \text{ in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then (1.5) and bounded convergence theorem imply that

$$|\mathbf{E}[\pi_{\lambda_n(R)}(k) \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{G}_n\}}] - \mathbf{E}[\pi_{W_{r_n} \tilde{W}_{r_n} \Lambda(R)}(k)]| \rightarrow 0$$

Since the local weak limit of the weighted graph  $\mathcal{G}(n, \lambda/n)$  is a branching random walk, Corollary 2.5 shows that

$$(W_{r_n}, \tilde{W}_{r_n}) \text{ converges weakly to } (W, \tilde{W}) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

In particular  $|\mathbf{E}[\pi_{W_{r_n} \tilde{W}_{r_n} \Lambda(R)}(k)] - \mathbf{E}[\pi_{W\tilde{W}\Lambda(R)}(k)]| \rightarrow 0$ , which establishes (1.7).

The proof of (1.6) is based on the Chen–Stein method for Poisson approximation, originally developed by Chen [Che75] and subsequently refined and simplified by Arratia, Goldstein, and Gordon [AGG89]. This work provides a robust framework for approximating sums of dependent indicator random variables with a Poisson distribution, with broad applications across various models (see, e.g., [CCH15, CCH16, KSS20b, KSS20a, ST20, FTWY24]; the list is by no means exhaustive). Compared with the formulations in [Che75, Theorem 4.1], [AGG89, Theorem 1] or [Ros11, Theorem 4.7], in the following version, we have an additional indicator variable  $\chi$  in the covariance terms, see (1.8) (and we condition on a  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{F}$ , but this is a trivial generalization). For completeness we provide a proof in Appendix A.

**Lemma 1.5** (Chen–Stein method for Poisson Approximation). *Let  $(X_i)_{i \in I}$  be a family of Bernoulli random variables with finite index set  $I$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a sub- $\sigma$ -algebra. For each  $i \in I$ , suppose that a conditionally dissociating neighborhood  $N_i \subset I$  is given, that is, conditionally on  $\mathcal{F}$ ,  $X_i$  is independent of  $\{X_j : j \notin \bar{N}_i\}$  where  $\bar{N}_i := N_i \cup \{i\}$ . Define*

$$Y := \sum_{i \in I} X_i, \text{ and } \lambda := \sum_{i \in I} \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{F}}[X_i] = \sum_{i \in I} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{F}}(X_i = 1).$$



Let  $\chi$  be another Bernoulli random variable (not necessarily  $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable). Then

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{TV}, \mathcal{F}}(\chi Y, \text{Poi}(\lambda)) &:= \sup_{A \subset \mathbb{N}} \left| \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{F}}(\chi Y \in A) - \sum_{k \in A} \pi_{\lambda}(k) \right| \\ &\leq 2\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{F}}(\chi = 0) + \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{j \in \bar{N}_i} \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{F}}[X_i] \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{F}}[X_j] + \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{j \in N_i} \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{F}}[X_i X_j \chi]. \end{aligned} \quad (1.8)$$

To apply this Lemma, we rewrite  $\mathcal{E}_n(R)$  as summation of Bernoulli random variables:

$$\mathcal{E}_n(R) = \sum_p I(p; R)$$

where  $p$  represents the potential paths starting from 1 to  $n$  (see (2.8) for the precise definition) and  $I(p, R)$  indicates that the potential path  $p$  contributes to  $\mathcal{E}_n(R)$ , i.e.,  $X(p)$  and  $H(p)$ , after rescaling, falls in set  $R$ . We will apply Lemma 1.5 with

$$Y = \mathcal{E}_n(R), \quad \chi = \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{G}_n\}}, \quad \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n);$$

and the dissociating neighborhood of for a potential path  $p$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{N}_p$ , consists of other potential paths that share at least one edge with  $p$  outside  $\mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n)$ .

In Lemma 3.3 we will show that  $\sum_p \sum_{p' \in \mathcal{N}_p} \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{F}}[I(p; R)] \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{F}}[I(p'; R)]$  vanishes as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . This first-moment estimate follows from a straightforward counting argument on  $|\mathcal{N}_p|$  together with a renewal-theoretic result (see Lemma 2.1). In Lemma 3.4 we further prove that the term  $\sum_p \sum_{p' \in \mathcal{N}_p} \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{F}}[I(p; R) I(p'; R)]$  also vanishes, based on a more refined counting of subclasses of  $p' \in \mathcal{N}_p$  with specific correlation structures between  $I(p'; R)$  and  $I(p; R)$ . We will see that the introduction of the good event  $\mathbf{G}_n$  within the correlation terms is necessary when  $\psi_X(2\alpha) \geq \psi_X(\alpha)$ . In contrast, when  $\psi_X(2\alpha) < \psi_X(\alpha)$ , which includes the case  $X \geq 0$ , we may simply take  $\chi = 1$ .

## 2. ASYMPTOTIC OF EXPECTATIONS

**2.1. Preliminary: Renewal function.** Let  $(S_n)_{n \geq 0}$  denote a random walk with step distribution  $X$  and initial position  $S_0 = 0$ . We define the renewal function

$$V(x) := \sum_{k \geq 1} \lambda^k \mathbf{P}(S_k \leq x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Furthermore, for  $h \in \mathbb{R}^{-\infty, +\infty}$ , let

$$k_n(h) := \lfloor \gamma \ln n + h \sqrt{\beta \ln n} \rfloor \vee 0.$$

**Lemma 2.1.** (i) *There exists  $C < \infty$  such that for all  $x \geq 0$ ,*

$$V(x) \leq C e^{\alpha x} \quad (2.1)$$

*Moreover, we have the following limits:*

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{V(x)}{e^{\alpha x}} = \gamma,$$

*and there exists  $\alpha' > \alpha$  such that*

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{V(x)}{e^{\alpha' x}} = 0.$$

(ii) *Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $h \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ . Let  $(\Gamma_n)_{n \geq 1}$  be any sequence of positive numbers such that  $\Gamma_n = o(\sqrt{\log n})$ . Then, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{|x| \leq \Gamma_n} \left| \frac{1}{n \Lambda((-\infty, x] \times (-\infty, h])} \sum_{k=1}^{k_n(h)} \lambda^k \mathbf{P}\left(S_k \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \ln n + x\right) - 1 \right| = 0.$$

*Proof of Lemma 2.1.* In the case  $X \geq 0$  the lemma is proven in [DSS23, Section 2.2], based on [IM10, Theorem 2.2] which essentially proves assertion (i) and covers the general case. For completeness, we provide a detailed proof.

Let us denote  $(\hat{S}_k)$  the random walk with initial position  $\hat{S}_0 = 0$  and step distribution  $\hat{X}$  given by

$$\mathbf{E}[f(\hat{X})] = \lambda \mathbf{E}[e^{-\alpha X} f(X)], \quad \forall f \in C_b(\mathbb{R}).$$

In particular,  $\mathbf{E}[f(\hat{S}_k)] = \lambda^k \mathbf{E}[e^{-\alpha S_k} f(S_k)]$  for any  $k \geq 1$  and

$$\mathbf{E}[\hat{S}_1] = \lambda \mathbf{E}[\hat{S}_1 e^{-\alpha S_1}] = -\psi'_X(\alpha) > 0. \quad (2.2)$$

using (1.1) for the last equality.

We now have

$$V(x) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \mathbf{E} \left[ e^{\alpha \hat{S}_k} \mathbf{1}_{\{\hat{S}_k \leq x\}} \right] = e^{\alpha x} \sum_{k \geq 0} \mathbf{E} \left[ e^{\alpha(\hat{S}_k - x)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\hat{S}_k \leq x\}} \right].$$

The first two statements of the first part now follow from the two-sided renewal theorem, together with the fact that the function  $y \mapsto e^{-\alpha y}$  is directly Riemann integrable, see Feller [Fel71, Sections XI.1 and XI.9]. For the third statement of the first part, by assumption (1.1), there exists  $\alpha' > \alpha$  such that  $\psi_X(\alpha') < \psi_X(\alpha)$  and  $\psi'_X(\alpha') < 0$ . Set  $\rho = e^{\psi_X(\alpha') - \psi_X(\alpha)} < 1$ . Denote by  $\tilde{S}_k$  the random walk with step distribution  $\tilde{X}$  where

$$\mathbf{E}[f(\tilde{X})] = e^{-\psi_X(\alpha')} \mathbf{E}[e^{-\alpha' X} f(X)] = \frac{1}{\rho} \mathbf{E}[e^{-(\alpha' - \alpha)\hat{X}} f(\hat{X})].$$

We then have

$$V(x) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \rho^k \mathbf{E} \left[ e^{\alpha' \tilde{S}_k} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{S}_k \leq x\}} \right] \leq \sum_{k \geq 0} \mathbf{E} \left[ e^{\alpha' \tilde{S}_k} \mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{S}_k \leq x\}} \right].$$

Since  $\mathbf{E}[\tilde{X}] = -\psi'_X(\alpha') > 0$ , the two-sided renewal theorem implies as above that

$$V(x) e^{-\alpha' x} \rightarrow 0, \quad x \rightarrow \infty,$$

which finishes the proof of point (i).

To prove assertion (ii), note that for  $h = +\infty$ , it follows from (i). Hence, by additivity, it is enough to show that for every  $h \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{|x| \leq \Gamma_n} \left| \frac{1}{n \Lambda((-\infty, x] \times (h, \infty))} \sum_{k=k_n(h)+1}^{\infty} \lambda^k \mathbf{P} \left( S_k \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \ln n + x \right) - 1 \right| = 0. \quad (2.3)$$

We have,

$$\sum_{k=k_n(h)+1}^{\infty} \lambda^k \mathbf{P} \left( S_k \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \ln n + x \mid S_{k_n(h)} \right) = \lambda^{k_n(h)} V \left( \frac{1}{\alpha} \ln n + x - S_{k_n(h)} \right).$$

Thus by using the change of measure, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=k_n(h)+1}^{\infty} \lambda^k \mathbf{P} \left( S_k \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \ln n + x \right) &= \lambda^{k_n(h)} \mathbf{E} \left[ V \left( \frac{1}{\alpha} \ln n + x - S_{k_n(h)} \right) \right] \\ &= n e^{\alpha x} \mathbf{E} \left[ \frac{V \left( \frac{1}{\alpha} \ln n + x - \hat{S}_{k_n(h)} \right)}{e^{\alpha \left[ \frac{1}{\alpha} \ln n + x - \hat{S}_{k_n(h)} \right]}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We set  $\xi_n = (\hat{S}_{k_n(h)} - \mathbf{E}[\hat{S}_1] k_n(h)) / \sqrt{\mathbf{Var}(\hat{S}_1) k_n(h)}$ , so that

$$\hat{S}_{k_n(h)} = \mathbf{E}[\hat{S}_1] k_n(h) + \xi_n \sqrt{\mathbf{Var}(\hat{S}_1) k_n(h)}$$

According to the central limit theorem,  $\xi_n$  converges in distribution to a standard normal random variable. Recall that  $\mathbf{E}[\hat{S}_1] = |\psi'_X(\alpha)|$  and  $\mathbf{Var}(\hat{S}_1) = \psi''_X(\alpha)$ , and  $k_n(h)$  is



the integer part of  $\frac{1}{\alpha|\psi'_X(\alpha)|} \ln n + h \left[ \frac{\psi''_X(\alpha)}{\alpha|\psi'_X(\alpha)|^3} \ln n \right]^{1/2}$ . Writing  $c_\alpha = \left[ \frac{\psi''_X(\alpha)}{\alpha|\psi'_X(\alpha)|} \right]^{1/2}$ , simple calculations yield

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\alpha} \ln n + x - \widehat{S}_{k_n(h)} &= \frac{1}{\alpha} \ln n + x - \left\lfloor \frac{1}{\alpha} \ln n + c_\alpha(\xi_n + h + o_n(1))\sqrt{\ln n} \right\rfloor \\ &= x - c_\alpha(\xi_n + h + o_n(1))\sqrt{\ln n}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (2.1) and the asymptotics of  $V(x)$  for  $x \rightarrow \pm\infty$  from point (i), we can apply the dominated convergence theorem to get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E} \left[ \frac{V\left(\frac{1}{\alpha} \ln n + x - \widehat{S}_{k_n(h)}\right)}{e^{\alpha\left[\frac{1}{\alpha} \ln n + x - \widehat{S}_{k_n(h)}\right]}} \right] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(\xi_n + h < 0) \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \frac{V(y)}{e^{\alpha y}} = (1 - \Phi(h))\gamma,$$

uniformly in  $|x| \leq \Gamma_n = o(\sqrt{\log n})$ , where  $\Phi(\cdot)$  denotes the c.d.f. of a standard Gaussian distribution. This completes the proof of (2.3) and therefore finishes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

**Remark 2.2.** As discussed in Remark 1.3, when the weight distribution  $X$  has a span  $d > 0$ , we should apply the key renewal theorem in arithmetic case. Then assertion (i) becomes  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} V(kd)/e^{\alpha kd} = \frac{\alpha d}{1 - e^{-\alpha d}} \gamma$ . Assertion (ii) becomes

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}, |j| \leq \Gamma_n} \left| \frac{1}{e^{d\lfloor \frac{\ln n}{d\alpha} \rfloor} \Lambda_d(R_{jd,h})} \sum_{k=0}^{k_n(h)} \lambda^k \mathbf{P} \left( S_k \leq d \lfloor \frac{\ln n}{d\alpha} \rfloor + dj \right) - 1 \right| = 0.$$

where  $\Lambda_d(R_{jd,h}) = \frac{\gamma \alpha d}{1 - e^{-\alpha d}} e^{\alpha jd} \Phi(h)$  by (1.3).

**2.2. First moment asymptotic.** In this subsection we study the asymptotic behavior of  $\mathbf{E}[\mathcal{E}_n(R)]$  by using the results on renewal function obtained above.

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ . Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[\mathcal{E}_n(R)] = \Lambda(R) = \gamma e^{\alpha x} \Phi(h).$$

We begin with some necessary notation. Let us denote by  $\mathcal{P}_f(1, n)$  all the free paths (or potential paths) from 1 to  $n$ :

$$\mathcal{P}_f(1, n) := \left\{ p = (v_i)_{i=0}^\ell : v_0 = 1, v_\ell = n; v_i \neq v_j \text{ for } i \neq j \right\}.$$

For  $p \in \mathcal{P}_f$  and  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ , set

$$I(p; R) := \mathbf{1} \left\{ p \in \mathcal{P}_f(1, n) \text{ and } \left( X(p) - \frac{1}{\alpha} \ln n, \frac{H(p) - \gamma \ln n}{\sqrt{\beta \ln n}} \right) \in R \right\}.$$

Then we can rewrite  $\mathcal{E}_n(R)$  as the sum of a family of dependent Bernoulli variables:

$$\mathcal{E}_n(R) = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_f(1, n)} I(p; R).$$

*Proof of Lemma 2.3.* By linearity of expectation, it is enough to consider  $R$  of the form

$$R = R_{x,h} = (-\infty, x] \times (-\infty, h],$$

for  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $h \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ . We have,

$$\mathbf{E}[\mathcal{E}_n(R_{x,h})] = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_f(1, n)} \mathbf{E}[I(p; R_{x,h})] = \sum_{\ell=1}^{k_n(h)} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_f(1, n), H(p)=\ell} \mathbf{E}[I(p; R_{x,h})].$$

Observe that, for any  $p \in \mathcal{P}_f(1, n)$  with  $H(p) = \ell$ , the expectation equals

$$\mathbf{E}[I(p; R_{x,h})] = \left( \frac{\lambda}{n} \right)^\ell \mathbf{P}(S_\ell \leq \alpha \ln n + x).$$

The number of free paths of hopcount  $\ell$  is given by

$$|\{p \in \mathcal{P}_f(1, n), H(p) = \ell\}| = \prod_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (n-2-j) = (n-2)_\ell,$$

using the Pochhammer symbol. Combining the previous formulas with the fact that  $\frac{(n-2)_\ell}{n^\ell} \rightarrow 1$  uniformly in  $1 \leq \ell \leq \ln^2 n$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , it follows that

$$\mathbf{E}[\mathcal{E}_n(R_{x,h})] = [1 + o_n(1)] \sum_{\ell=1}^{k_n(h)} \lambda^\ell \mathbf{P}(S_\ell \leq \alpha \ln n + x) = [1 + o_n(1)] \Lambda(R_{x,h}).$$

Above, we have used assertion (ii) of Lemma 2.1. We now complete the proof.  $\square$

**2.3. Local weak convergence to branching random walk.** A key result for our analysis is the local weak convergence of the sparse Erdős–Rényi graph  $\mathcal{G}(n, \lambda/n)$  to a  $\text{Poi}(\lambda)$  Galton–Watson tree, referred to as  $\text{PGW}(\lambda)$  tree. This has been a quite standard and widely-used technique. In the following we follow [RW10, Lemma 2.2].

Given fixed vertices  $u, v \in \mathcal{G}_n$ , we explore their local neighborhoods up to a radius  $r_n$  using a two-stage breadth-first search (BFS). First, we run a BFS starting from the root  $u$ . Starting with  $\mathcal{S}_0(u) = \{u\}$  at level  $\rho = 0$ , to find  $\mathcal{S}_{\rho+1}(u)$ , we iterate through the vertices  $w \in \mathcal{S}_\rho(u) \subset [n]$  one by one in increasing order of their labels. For each  $w$ , we examine all edges from  $w$  to vertices not yet reached. If an edge  $(v, w)$  connects to an unvisited vertex  $w$ , we add  $w$  to  $\mathcal{S}_{\rho+1}(u)$  and call this edge ‘revealed.’ This process continues until we have identified all vertices in  $\mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(u)$ . Then we perform the same BFS procedure starting from  $v$ , but only exploring vertices that were not discovered in the first search. This second stage identifies the vertex set of  $\mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(v) \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(u)$ . The two sets of revealed edges from these searches constitute the graphs  $\mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}^{\text{BFS}}(u), \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}^{\text{BFS}}(v)$ . By construction, these are both trees. We treat them as rooted, ordered trees with respective roots  $u$  and  $v$ , where the children of any node are ordered by their increasing labels.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a  $\text{PGW}(\lambda)$ -tree up to height  $r_n$ . Let  $\Gamma_n$  be any sequence of positive numbers such that  $\Gamma_n = o(\sqrt{n})$ . Then for any rooted ordered trees  $\tau, \tilde{\tau}$  with  $|\tau|, |\tilde{\tau}| \leq \Gamma_n$ ,*

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1) = \tau, \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(n) = \tilde{\tau}, \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n+1}(1) \cap \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(n) = \emptyset) = (1 + o(1)) \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{T} = \tau) \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{T} = \tilde{\tau})$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $o(1)$  depends only on  $\Gamma_n$ .

*Proof.* Suppose before examining  $u$  we have reached  $k = k_u$  vertices in total so far. Then the probability of revealing  $\ell = \ell_u$  edges in the next step is  $\binom{n-k}{\ell} \left(\frac{\lambda}{n}\right)^\ell \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{n}\right)^{n-k-\ell}$ . In the  $\text{PGW}(\lambda)$  tree a vertex  $u$  produces  $\ell = \ell_u$  children has probability  $\frac{\lambda^\ell}{\ell!} e^{-\lambda}$ . The ratio of these probabilities is

$$\frac{(n-k)_\ell}{n^\ell} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{n}\right)^{n-k-\ell} e^{-\lambda} = \exp(O(k\ell/n) + O(k + \ell/n)).$$

Since  $\sum_{u \in \tau \cup \tilde{\tau}} k_u \ell_u \leq 2\Gamma_n \sum_{u \in \tau \cup \tilde{\tau}} \ell_u \leq 4\Gamma_n^2 = o(n)$ , we get

$$\frac{\mathbf{P}\left((\mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}^{\text{BFS}}(1), \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}^{\text{BFS}}(n)) = (\tau, \tilde{\tau})\right)}{\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{T} = \tau) \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{T} = \tilde{\tau})} = \exp\left(O(\Gamma_n^2/n)\right).$$

In addition, conditionally on  $(\mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}^{\text{BFS}}(1), \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}^{\text{BFS}}(n)) = (\tau, \tilde{\tau})$ , the event  $\{\mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1) = \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}^{\text{BFS}}(1)\} \cap \{\mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(n) = \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}^{\text{BFS}}(n)\} \cap \{\mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n+1}(1) \cap \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(n) = \emptyset\}$  occurs if and only if none of the unexamined edges between  $|\tau| + |\tilde{\tau}|$  vertices found is also present, which is of probability at most  $\exp\left(O(\Gamma_n^2/n)\right)$ . Then the desired result follows.  $\square$

Consequently, the weighted Erdős–Rényi graph converges locally to a weighted PGW( $\lambda$ ) tree, more commonly known as a branching random walk (BRW). Precisely, given a PGW( $\lambda$ ) tree  $\mathcal{T}$  with root  $\varrho$ , assign to each edge  $e$  an i.i.d. weight  $X(e)$  with common distribution  $X$ . For each  $u \in \mathcal{T}$ , let  $V(u)$  denote the sum of weights on the unique path from  $\varrho$  to  $u$ ; and let  $|u|$  denote its graph distance from the root. Define

$$W_{r_n}^{\text{BRW}} := \sum_{|u|=r_n} e^{-\alpha V(u)}.$$

Then  $(W_{r_n}^{\text{BRW}})_{r_n \geq 0}$  forms a non-negative martingale, and converges almost surely to a limit:

$$W = W_\infty^{\text{BRW}} := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} W_{r_n}^{\text{BRW}} \text{ a.s.} \quad (2.4)$$

Let  $(\tilde{W}_{r_n}^{\text{BRW}}, \tilde{W})$  be an independent copy of  $(W_{r_n}^{\text{BRW}}, W)$ .

**Corollary 2.5.** *As  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{G}_n^1) \rightarrow 1$ . As a consequence,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (W_{r_n}, \tilde{W}_{r_n}) = (W, \tilde{W}) \text{ in distribution.} \quad (2.5)$$

*In particular, the sequence  $(W_{r_n}, \tilde{W}_{r_n})_{n \geq 1}$  is tight. Moreover, for any  $\lambda > 1$ , with*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{G}_n^1\}} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1)} e^{-\alpha X([1, u])} \mathbf{1}_{\{|X([1, u])| > 2|\psi'_X(\alpha)|r_n\}} = 0 \text{ in probability.}$$

*Proof.* The assertion  $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{G}_n^1) \rightarrow 1$  follows from the Lemma 2.4, combined with the fact  $\mathbf{E}|\{u \in \mathcal{T} : |u| = r_n\}| = \lambda^{r_n}$ . For the second assertion (2.5), observe that for any rooted ordered trees  $\tau, \tilde{\tau}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E}[f(W_{r_n}, \tilde{W}_{r_n}) \mid \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1) = \tau, \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(n) = \tilde{\tau}, \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n+1}(1) \cap \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(n) = \emptyset] \\ &= \mathbf{E}[f(W_{r_n}^{\text{BRW}}, \tilde{W}_{r_n}^{\text{BRW}}) \mid \mathcal{T} = \tau, \tilde{\mathcal{T}} = \tilde{\tau}]. \end{aligned}$$

Then it follows from the law of total probability and Lemma 2.4. For the last assertion, recalling the definition of  $(\hat{S}_n)_{n \geq 0}$  from the proof of Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\mathbf{E} \left[ \sum_{|u|=r_n} e^{-\alpha V(u)} \mathbf{1}_{\{|V(u)| > 2|\psi'_X(\alpha)|r_n\}} \right] = \mathbb{P} \left( |\hat{S}_{r_n}| > 2|\psi'_X(\alpha)|r_n \right).$$

This goes to 0 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , because  $(\hat{S}_n)_{n \geq 0}$  is a random walk with  $\mathbf{E}[\hat{S}_1] = |\psi'_X(\alpha)| > 0$  by (2.2). This completes the proof.  $\square$

We will later need the following:

**Lemma 2.6** (Biggins, see e.g. Theorem 3.2 in Shi [Shi15]). *The events  $\{W = 0\}$  and  $\{|\mathcal{T}| < \infty\}$  coincide almost surely.*

**2.4. Conditioned first moment asymptotic.** Recall that  $\lambda_n(R) := \mathbf{E}[\mathcal{E}_n(R) \mid \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n)]$  for  $R \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ . In this subsection we show the asymptotic behavior of  $\lambda_n(R)$ .

**Lemma 2.7.** *We have for every  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ ,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \lambda_n(R) - W_{r_n} \tilde{W}_{r_n} \Lambda(R) \right| \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{G}_n^1\}} = 0 \text{ in probability.}$$

Before presenting the proof, we first introduce some necessary notation. Since on  $\mathbf{G}_n^1$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n)$  is a forest of two trees, whose leaves are, respectively,  $\mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1)$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{r_n}(n)$ , any path  $p$  from vertex 1 and to vertex  $n$  in  $\mathcal{G}_n$  can be viewed as a path from some vertex  $u \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1)$  to some vertex  $v \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(n)$ . Precisely, whenever  $\mathbf{G}_n^1$  occurs, we can decompose  $\mathcal{P}(1, n)$  as follows:

$$\mathcal{P}(1, n) = \bigcup_{\ell \geq 2} \bigcup_{u \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1)} \bigcup_{v \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(n)} \mathcal{P}_{u,v}(\ell; \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n)), \quad (2.6)$$




FIGURE 1. Illustration of a free path  $p = [1, u] \oplus (v_i)_{i=1}^{\ell-1} \oplus [v, n] \in \mathcal{P}_{u,v}(\ell)$ .

where for each  $u \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1)$  and  $v \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(n)$ ,

$$\mathcal{P}_{u,v}(\ell; \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n)) := \left\{ [1, v_0]_{\mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1)} \oplus (v_i)_{i=1}^{\ell-1} \oplus [v_{\ell}, n]_{\mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(n)} : \right. \\ \left. v_0 = u, v_{\ell} = v, v_i \in [n] \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n), v_i \neq v_j \text{ for } i \neq j \right\}. \quad (2.7)$$

For brevity, we write  $\mathcal{P}_{u,v}(\ell)$  instead of  $\mathcal{P}_{u,v}(\ell; \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n))$  when the context is clear. With this notation,  $\mathcal{E}_n(R)$  can be expressed as

$$\mathcal{E}_n(R) = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1)} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(n)} \sum_{\ell \geq 2} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{u,v}(\ell)} I(p; R) \quad \text{on } \mathbf{G}_n^1. \quad (2.8)$$

*Proof of Lemma 2.7.* As in the proof of Lemma 2.3, we can assume that  $R = R_{x,h} = (-\infty, x] \times (-\infty, h]$ , for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{-\infty}$  and  $h \in \mathbb{R}^{-\infty, +\infty}$ . First, we calculate the expectation  $\mathbf{E}[I(p; R_{x,h})]$  for any given  $p \in \mathcal{P}_{u,v}(\ell)$  where  $u \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1)$ ,  $v \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(n)$ , and  $\ell \geq 2$ . Note that by the choice of  $R_{x,h}$ , this expectation vanishes whenever  $\ell > k_n(h)$ . For notational convenience, define

$$\mathbf{X}_{u,v} := X([1, u]) + X([v, n]), \quad \text{and} \\ \mathbf{F}(\ell, n, y) := \mathbf{P} \left( S_{\ell} \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \ln n + x - y \right) \quad \text{for } y \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (2.9)$$

Then the conditional expectation is given by

$$\mathbf{E}[I(p; R_{x,h}) \mid \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n)] \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{G}_n^1\}} = \left( \frac{\lambda}{n} \right)^{\ell} \mathbf{F}(\ell, n, \mathbf{X}_{u,v}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{G}_n^1\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\ell \leq k_n(h)\}}. \quad (2.10)$$

Notice that for any  $u \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1)$ ,  $v \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(n)$  and  $\ell \geq 2$ ,

$$|\mathcal{P}_{u,v}(\ell)| = (n - |\mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n)|)_{\ell} = [1 + o_n(1)] n^{\ell} \quad \text{on } \mathbf{G}_n^1.$$

where  $o_n(1) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  uniformly in  $u, v$  and  $1 \leq \ell \leq \ln^2 n$ . Combined this with (2.8) and (2.10), we obtain

$$\lambda_n(R_{x,h}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{G}_n^1\}} = [1 + o_n(1)] \sum_{u \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1)} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(n)} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=2}^{k_n(h)} \lambda^{\ell} \mathbf{F}(\ell, n, \mathbf{X}_{u,v}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{G}_n^1\}}.$$

Let  $\mathcal{S}^g$  denote the set of pairs  $(u, v) \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1) \times \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(n)$  satisfying  $|X([1, u])| \leq 2|\psi'_X(\alpha)|r_n$  and  $|X([v, n])| \leq 2|\psi'_X(\alpha)|r_n$ . Set  $\mathcal{S}^b = (\mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1) \times \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(n)) \setminus \mathcal{S}^g$ . By using part (ii)

of Lemma 2.1, since  $r_n = o(\sqrt{\log n})$  by (1.4), we have  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=2}^{k_n(h)} \lambda^\ell F(\ell, n, \mathbf{X}_{u,v}) = [1 + o_n(1)] e^{-\alpha \mathbf{X}_{u,v}} \Lambda(R_{x,h})$  uniformly in  $(u, v) \in \mathcal{S}^g$ . While for  $(u, v) \in \mathcal{S}^b$ , inequality (2.1) gives  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=2}^{k_n(h)} \lambda^\ell F(\ell, n, \mathbf{X}_{u,v}) \leq C e^{-\alpha \mathbf{X}_{u,v}} e^{\alpha x}$ . Employing these bounds, we deduce that on  $\mathbf{G}_n^1$ ,

$$\lambda_n(R_{x,h}) = [1 + o_n(1)] \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{S}^g} e^{-\alpha \mathbf{X}_{u,v}} \Lambda(R_{x,h}) + O\left(e^{\alpha x} \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{S}^b} e^{-\alpha \mathbf{X}_{u,v}}\right).$$

Note that  $\sum_{(u,v)} e^{-\alpha \mathbf{X}_{u,v}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{G}_n^1\}} = W_{r_n} \tilde{W}_{r_n}$ . So we can rewrite the previous expression as, on  $\mathbf{G}_n^1$ ,

$$\lambda_n(R_{x,h}) = [1 + o_n(1)] W_{r_n} \tilde{W}_{r_n} \Lambda(R_{x,h}) + e^{\alpha x} O\left(W_{r_n}^b \tilde{W}_{r_n} + W_{r_n} \tilde{W}_{r_n}^b\right).$$

where  $W_{r_n}^b := \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{G}_n^1\}} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1)} e^{-\alpha X([1,u])} \mathbf{1}_{\{|X([1,u])| > 2|\psi'_X(\alpha)|r_n\}}$  and  $\tilde{W}_{r_n}^b$  is defined analogously. According to Corollary 2.5,  $W_{r_n}, \tilde{W}_{r_n}$  are tight and  $W_{r_n}^b, \tilde{W}_{r_n}^b \rightarrow 0$  in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus the desired result follows.  $\square$

### 3. LIMITING EXTREMAL PROCESS

**3.1. Good events.** In this subsection we do some preparation work for the proof of Theorem 1.1. We introduce two additional good events. First, define the constant

$$s^* := -\inf_{t > \alpha} \frac{\psi_X(t) + \ln \lambda}{t} > 0. \quad (3.1)$$

The positivity of  $s^*$  is guaranteed by assumption (1.1). We then define the event

$$\mathbf{G}_n^2 := \left\{ \forall \text{ path } p \text{ in } \mathcal{G}_n \text{ starting from } 1 \text{ or } n, \text{ if } H(p) \geq r_n, \text{ then } X(p) \geq \frac{s^*}{2} H(p) \right\}.$$

Finally, with  $\alpha' > \alpha$  as in Lemma 2.1, define

$$\mathbf{G}_n^3 := \left\{ \forall \text{ path } p \text{ in } \mathcal{G}_n, X(p) > -\frac{1}{\alpha'} \ln n \right\}$$

and set

$$\mathbf{G}_n := \mathbf{G}_n^1 \cap \mathbf{G}_n^2 \cap \mathbf{G}_n^3.$$

**Lemma 3.1.** *The good event  $\mathbf{G}_n$  occurs with high probability. Precisely, we have*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{G}_n^c) = 0.$$

*Proof.* In Corollary 2.5 we have proved  $\mathbf{P}((\mathbf{G}_n^1)^c) \rightarrow 0$ . Now let us prove  $\mathbf{P}((\mathbf{G}_n^2)^c) \rightarrow 0$ . By applying the union bound, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}((\mathbf{G}_n^2)^c) &\leq 2 \sum_{j=2}^n \sum_{\ell \geq r_n} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_f(1,j), H(p)=\ell} \mathbf{P}(p \in \mathcal{P}(1,j), X(p) \leq s^* \ell / 2) \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{\ell \geq r_n} n n^{\ell-1} \left(\frac{\lambda}{n}\right)^\ell \mathbf{P}(S_\ell \leq s^* \ell / 2) = 2 \sum_{\ell \geq r_n} \lambda^\ell \mathbf{P}(S_\ell \leq s^* \ell / 2). \end{aligned}$$

Above we have used  $|\{p \in \mathcal{P}_f(1,j), H(p) = \ell\}| \leq n^{\ell-1}$ . By employing the Chernoff bound, it follows that for  $t > 0$

$$\lambda^\ell \mathbf{P}(S_\ell \leq s^* \ell / 2) \leq \exp(\ell[\psi_X(t) + \ln \lambda + s^* t / 2])$$

According to the definition (3.1) of  $s^*$ , there exist  $t_o > \alpha$  and a constant  $c_o$  such that

$$\psi_X(t_o) + \ln \lambda + s^* t_o / 2 < -c_o < 0.$$

Hence the required result  $\mathbf{P}((\mathbf{G}_n^2)^c) \leq 2 \sum_{\ell \geq r_n} e^{-c_o \ell} = O(e^{-c_o r_n}) = o(1)$  follows.

In order to bound  $\mathbf{P}((G_n^3)^c)$ , by applying the union bound again, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}((G_n^3)^c) &\leq \sum_{i,j} \sum_{\ell \geq 1} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_f(i,j), H(p)=\ell} \mathbf{P}\left(p \in \mathcal{P}(1,j), X(p) \leq -\frac{1}{\alpha'} \ln n\right) \\ &\leq n \sum_{\ell \geq 1} \lambda^\ell \mathbf{P}\left(S_\ell \leq -\frac{1}{\alpha'} \ln n\right) = nV\left(-\frac{1}{\alpha'} \ln n\right). \end{aligned}$$

Part (i) of Lemma 2.1 now implies that  $\mathbf{P}((G_n^3)^c) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

**3.2. Convergence of extremal process.** In this and the next subsection, we lay the groundwork for the proof of the main theorem by proving the following convergence result of the conditional avoidance function. Recall that

$$\pi_\lambda(k) = e^{-\lambda} \frac{\lambda^k}{k!}, \quad k \geq 0.$$

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ . Then for every  $k \geq 0$ ,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \mathbf{P}[G_n, \mathcal{E}_n(R) = k \mid \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n)] - \pi_{\lambda_n(R)}(k) \right| = 0 \text{ in probability.}$$

This lemma provides the final piece needed to establish the convergence of the extremal process.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1 admitting Lemma 3.2.* Combining Lemmas 2.7, 3.2 and 3.1, we have that  $\mathcal{E}_n(R)$  converges in law to  $\mathcal{E}_\infty(R)$  for every  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ . Lemma 1.4 then implies that  $\mathcal{E}_n$  converges in law to  $\mathcal{E}_\infty$ . For the second statement, the convergence just proven directly implies that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{E}_n = 0) \leq \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{E}_\infty = 0) = \mathbf{P}(W\tilde{W} = 0).$$

It therefore remains to show the reverse inequality. By Lemma 2.6, we have  $\mathbf{P}(W\tilde{W} = 0) = \mathbf{P}(|\mathcal{T}| < \infty, |\tilde{\mathcal{T}}| < \infty)$ , where  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$  are independent  $\text{Poi}(\lambda)$ -BGW trees. But by the local limit result (Lemma 2.4), we have that

$$\mathbf{P}(|\mathcal{T}| < \infty, |\tilde{\mathcal{T}}| < \infty) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{P}(1, n) = \emptyset) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{E}_n = 0).$$

This proves the second statement.  $\square$

We now turn to the proof of Lemma 3.2. Our strategy is to apply Lemma 1.5 with

$$Y = Y_n := \sum_{\substack{p \in \mathcal{P}(1, n) \\ H(p) \leq 2\gamma \ln n}} I(p; R), \quad \chi = \mathbf{1}_{\{G_n\}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n).$$

Note that we have

$$\mathcal{E}_n(R) = Y_n + \mathcal{E}_n(R \cap (\mathbb{R}^{-\infty} \times ((\gamma/\sqrt{\beta})\sqrt{\ln n}, +\infty])),$$

and the latter term vanishes in  $L^1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , by Lemma 2.3. Hence, setting  $\lambda'_n := \mathbf{E}[Y_n \mid \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}]$ , it suffices to prove that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \mathbf{P}[G_n, Y_n = k \mid \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n)] - \pi_{\lambda'_n}(k) \right| = 0 \text{ in probability.}$$

Since we will work on the good event  $G_n^1$  which is  $\mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n)$ -measurable, we may rewrite  $Y_n$  as follows:

$$Y_n = \sum_{\substack{p \in \mathcal{P}(1, n) \\ H(p) \leq 2\gamma \ln n}} I(p; R) \quad \text{on } G_n^1,$$



where  $\mathcal{P}(1, n)$  is defined in (2.6). Moreover for each  $p \in \mathcal{P}(1, n)$ , let us define the (conditioned) dissociating neighborhood of  $p$  as

$$\mathcal{N}_p := \left\{ p' \in \mathcal{P}(1, n) : p' \neq p, H(p') \leq 2\gamma \ln n, p' \text{ and } p \text{ share at least one (undirected) edge that is not contained in } \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n) \right\}.$$

Explicitly, if  $p = [1, v_0] \oplus (v_i)_{i=1}^{\ell-1} \oplus [v_\ell, n]$ ; and  $p' = [1, v'_0] \oplus (v'_i)_{i=1}^{\ell'-1} \oplus [v'_{\ell'}, n]$ , then  $p' \in \mathcal{N}_p$  if and only if there exists  $1 \leq i \leq \ell$  and  $1 \leq i' \leq \ell'$  such that

$$\text{either } (v_{i-1}, v_i) = (v'_{i'-1}, v'_{i'}) \text{ or } (v_i, v_{i-1}) = (v'_{i'}, v'_{i'-1}). \quad (3.2)$$

From the construction of  $\mathcal{G}_n$  it follows that conditionally on  $\mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n)$ ,  $I(p; R)$  is independent of  $I(p'; R)$ ,  $p' \notin \{p\} \cup \mathcal{N}_p =: \overline{\mathcal{N}}_p$ . By employing Lemma 1.5, we obtain that, for any  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ , on the event  $\mathcal{G}_n^1$ , for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{G}_n, \mathcal{E}_n(R) = k \mid \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n)) - \pi_{\lambda_n(R)}(k) \right| \\ & \leq \underbrace{\sum_{\substack{p \in \mathcal{P}(1, n) \\ H(p) \leq 2\gamma \ln n}} \sum_{p' \in \overline{\mathcal{N}}_p} \mathbf{E}[I(p; R) \mid \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n)] \mathbf{E}[I(p'; R) \mid \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n)]}_{\Sigma_{(3.3)}(n, r_n; R)} \\ & + \underbrace{\sum_{\substack{p \in \mathcal{P}(1, n) \\ H(p) \leq 2\gamma \ln n}} \sum_{p' \in \mathcal{N}_p} \mathbf{E}[I(p; R)I(p'; R)\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{G}_n\}} \mid \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n)]}_{\Sigma_{(3.4)}(n, r_n; R)} + 2\mathbf{P}[\mathcal{G}_n^c \mid \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n)]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Thus it suffices to show that  $\Sigma_{(3.3)}(n, r_n; R)$  and  $\Sigma_{(3.4)}(n, r_n; R)$  converges to zero in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

### 3.3. Vanishing of correlation terms.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ . Then we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Sigma_{(3.3)}(n, r_n; R)\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{G}_n\}} = 0 \text{ in probability.}$$

*Proof.* Since  $I(p; R)$  is increasing in  $R$ , it is enough to consider  $R$  of the form

$$R = (-\infty, x] \times \mathbb{R}^{-\infty, +\infty},$$

for some  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . We assume henceforth that this is the case. Recall from (2.10) that on the good event  $\mathcal{G}_n^1$  the conditional expectation for  $I(p; R)$  is given by

$$\mathbf{E}[I(p; R) \mid \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n)] \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{G}_n^1\}} = \left(\frac{\lambda}{n}\right)^\ell \mathbf{F}(\ell, n, \mathbf{X}_{u,v}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathcal{G}_n^1\}},$$

where  $\mathbf{X}_{u,v}$  and  $\mathbf{F}$  are defined in (2.9), note that  $\mathbf{F}$  depends on  $x$ . This yields that on  $\mathcal{G}_n^1$ ,  $\Sigma_{(3.3)}(n, r_n; R)$  is bounded from above by

$$\sum_{u, u' \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1)} \sum_{v, v' \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(n)} \sum_{\ell, \ell'=2}^{2\gamma \ln n} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{u,v}(\ell)} \sum_{p' \in \mathcal{P}_{u',v'}(\ell') \cap (\mathcal{N}_p \cup \{p\})} \frac{\lambda^\ell \lambda^{\ell'}}{n^\ell n^{\ell'}} \mathbf{F}(\ell, n, \mathbf{X}_{u,v}) \mathbf{F}(\ell', n, \mathbf{X}_{u',v'}).$$

Next, given any  $p \in \mathcal{P}_{u,v}(\ell)$ , we claim that the number of  $p' \in \mathcal{P}_{u',v'}(\ell')$  in  $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_p$  can be bounded from above as follows:

$$|\overline{\mathcal{N}}_p \cap \mathcal{P}_{u',v'}(\ell')| \leq \ell \times \ell' \times 2 \times n^{\ell'-2}. \quad (3.5)$$

In fact, according to (3.2), constructing such a path  $p'$  involves choosing an index  $1 \leq i \leq \ell$  for  $p$  ( $\ell$  options), an index  $1 \leq i' \leq \ell'$  for  $p'$  ( $\ell'$  options), the vertex  $v'_{i'} \in \{v_{i-1}, v_i\}$  (2

options), and the remaining vertices  $(v'_j)_{j=1}^{\ell'-1} \setminus \{v'_{i'-1}, v'_{i'}\}$  of  $p'$  (at most  $n^{\ell'-2}$  options—note that one might think there are at most  $n^{\ell'-3}$  options, but it might be the case that  $i' = 1$  so that  $v'_0 = u' = u = v_0$  has been fixed and similar for  $i' = n$ ).

Now combining (3.5) with the trivial bound  $|\mathcal{P}_{u,v}(\ell)| \leq n^{\ell-1}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \Sigma_{(3.3)}(n, r_n; R) \\ & \leq \sum_{u, u' \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1)} \sum_{v, v' \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(n)} \sum_{\ell, \ell'=2}^{2\gamma \ln n} n^{\ell-1} \times 2\ell\ell' n^{\ell'-2} \times \frac{\lambda^\ell}{n^\ell} \frac{\lambda^{\ell'}}{n^{\ell'}} F(\ell, n, \mathbf{X}_{u,v}) F(\ell', n, \mathbf{X}_{u',v'}) \\ & \leq \frac{(2\gamma \ln n)^2}{n} \left[ \sum_{u \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1), v \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(n)} \sum_{\ell \geq 2} \frac{\lambda^\ell}{n} F(\ell, n, \mathbf{X}_{u,v}) \right]^2. \end{aligned}$$

By applying part (i) in Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\sum_{\ell \geq 2} \frac{\lambda^\ell}{n} F(\ell, n, \mathbf{X}_{u,v}) \leq \frac{C}{n} e^{\alpha[\frac{1}{\alpha} \ln n + x - \mathbf{X}_{u,v}]} = C e^{\alpha x} e^{-\alpha X([1,u])} e^{-\alpha X([v,n])}.$$

Consequently, on the event  $G_n^1$ , we have

$$\Sigma_{(3.3)}(n, r_n; R) \leq C \frac{(2\gamma \ln n)^2}{n} e^{\alpha x} W_{r_n}^2 (\tilde{W}_{r_n})^2 \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

in probability. Above we have used the  $W_{r_n}, \tilde{W}_{r_n}$  are tight (Corollary 2.5). Combining with Lemma 3.1, this completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $r_n \geq 1$  and  $R \in \mathcal{R}$ . Then we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Sigma_{(3.4)}(n, r_n; R) \mathbf{1}_{\{G_n\}} = 0 \text{ in probability.}$$




FIGURE 2. Illustration of  $s'_i(p'|p)$  and  $e'_i(p'|p)$ .

*Proof.* As in the proof of Lemma 3.3, we can assume that  $R$  is of the form

$$R = (-\infty, x] \times \mathbb{R}^{-\infty, +\infty},$$

for some  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Fix any  $p \in \mathcal{P}_{u,v}(\ell)$  with  $u \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1)$ ,  $v \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(n)$  and  $2 \leq \ell \leq 2\gamma \ln n$ . For each path  $p' \in \mathcal{P}_{u',v'}(\ell')$  that belongs to  $\mathcal{N}_p$ , and  $i \geq 1$ , we define  $s'_i(p'|p)$ ,  $e'_i(p'|p)$  as the start and end indices of the  $i$ -th ‘‘journey’’ in which it shares its trajectory with  $p$ . Precisely, let

$p = (v_i)_{i=0}^\ell$  and  $p' = (v'_i)_{i=0}^{\ell'}$  be the corresponding representation of  $p, p'$  (2.7). We define, for  $i \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} s'_i(p'|p) &:= \inf \left\{ j \geq e'_{i-1} : v'_j \in \{v_i : 0 \leq i \leq \ell\} \right\}, \\ e'_i(p'|p) &:= \sup \left\{ j \geq s'_i : \text{the pattern } (v'_k)_{k=s'_i}^j \text{ appears in } (v_i)_{i=0}^\ell \text{ or in } (v_{\ell-i})_{i=0}^\ell \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

with the convention  $e'_0(p'|p) := -1$ . Denote by  $\ell_i(p'|p)$  the number of shared segments during the  $i$ -th journey, that is

$$\ell_i(p'|p) := e'_i(p'|p) - s'_i(p'|p), \quad \text{for } i \geq 1.$$

Define  $Q(p'|p)$  as the total number of journeys that  $p'$  moves along with (or opposite to)  $p$ :

$$Q(p'|p) := \sup \left\{ q : e'_q \leq \ell' \right\}.$$

Finally, set  $\ell(p'|p) := (\ell_i(p'|p))_{i=1}^{Q(p'|p)}$  and note that

$$|\ell(p'|p)| := \|\ell(p'|p)\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{Q(p'|p)} \ell_i(p'|p) \geq 1,$$

because  $p' \in \mathcal{N}_p$  shares at least one (undirected) edge with  $p$ .

Let  $(S_\bullet^{(i)})_{i \geq 1}$  be i.i.d. copies of the random walk  $S_\bullet$ . Using this notation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E} \left[ I(p; R) I(p'; R) \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{G}_n\}} \mid \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n) \right] \\ & \leq \left( \frac{\lambda}{n} \right)^{\ell + \ell' - |\ell(p'|p)|} \times \mathbf{E} \left[ \mathbf{F} \left( n, \ell - |\ell(p'|p)|, \sum_{i=1}^{Q(p'|p)} S_{\ell_i(p'|p)}^{(i)} + \mathbf{X}_{u,v} \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times \mathbf{F} \left( n, \ell' - |\ell(p'|p)|, \sum_{i=1}^{Q(p'|p)} S_{\ell_i(p'|p)}^{(i)} + \mathbf{X}_{u',v'} \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{S_{\ell_i(p'|p)}^{(i)} \geq -\frac{1}{\alpha'} \ln n, \forall 1 \leq i \leq Q(p'|p)\}} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Above,  $S_{\ell_i}^{(i)}$  comes from the weight of the  $i$ -th journey that  $p'$  follows the trajectory of  $p$ ; and we have an inequality not an equality as many constraints in  $\mathbf{G}_n$  were omitted.

The expectation of  $I(p; R) I(p'; R)$  above suggests a finer classification of  $\mathcal{N}_p$ . To this end, let  $\mathcal{L} := \{\ell = (\ell_i)_{i=1}^q : q \geq 1; \ell_i \geq 0, |\ell| := \sum_{i=1}^q \ell_i \geq 1\}$ . For  $\ell = (\ell_i)_{i=1}^q \in \mathcal{L}$ , define

$$\mathcal{P}_{u',v'}(\ell', \ell \mid p) := \{p' \in \mathcal{P}_{u',v'}(\ell') \cap \mathcal{N}_p : Q(p'|p) = q; \text{ and } \ell_i(p'|p) = \ell_i, 1 \leq i \leq q\}.$$

This allows us to express  $\mathcal{N}_p$  as the following disjoint union:

$$\mathcal{N}_p = \bigcup_{u' \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1), v' \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(n)} \bigcup_{\ell' \geq 2} \bigcup_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \mathcal{P}_{u',v'}(\ell', \ell \mid p). \quad (3.7)$$

Assuming  $p \in \mathcal{P}_{u,v}(\ell)$ , we partition  $\mathcal{N}_p$  into four disjoint subsets:  $\mathcal{N}_p^{\times, \times}$ ,  $\mathcal{N}_p^{\checkmark, \times}$ ,  $\mathcal{N}_p^{\times, \checkmark}$ , and  $\mathcal{N}_p^{\checkmark, \checkmark}$ . These subsets are the sub-unions of (3.7) defined by conditions on the indices  $u'$  and  $v'$ . The first superscript indicates if  $u' = u$  ( $\checkmark$ ) or  $u' \neq u$  ( $\times$ ), and the second does so analogously for  $v'$  and  $v$ .

Case 1. According to (3.7) and the definition of  $\mathcal{N}_p^{\times, \times}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{(3.8)} &:= \sum_{\substack{p \in \mathcal{P}(1, n) \\ H(p) \leq 2\gamma \ln n}} \sum_{p' \in \mathcal{N}_p^{\times, \times}} \mathbf{E} \left[ I(p; R) I(p'; R) \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{G}_n\}} \mid \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n) \right] \\ &= \sum_{\substack{u \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1) \\ v \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(n)}} \sum_{\ell=2}^{2\gamma \ln n} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{u,v}(\ell)} \sum_{\substack{u \neq u' \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1) \\ v \neq v' \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(n)}} \sum_{\ell'=2}^{2\gamma \ln n} \sum_{q \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{\ell = (\ell_i)_{i=1}^q \\ |\ell| \leq \ell \wedge \ell'}} \sum_{p' \in \mathcal{P}_{u',v'}(\ell', \ell | p)} \\ &\quad \mathbf{E} \left[ I(p; R) I(p'; R) \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{G}_n\}} \mid \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

Given any  $p \in \mathcal{P}_{u,v}(\ell)$ , we claim that for any  $u' \neq u$ ,  $v' \neq v$ ,  $\ell' \geq 2$  and  $\ell = (\ell_i)_{i=1}^q \in \mathcal{L}$ ,

$$|\mathcal{P}_{u',v'}(\ell', \ell | p)| \leq (\ell' \times \ell \times 2)^q \times n^{\ell'-1-\sum_{i=1}^q (\ell_i+1)}. \quad (3.9)$$

Moreover  $|\mathcal{P}_{u',v'}(\ell', \ell | p)| = 0$  if  $|\ell| > \ell$ . In fact, to construct a path  $p' \in \mathcal{P}_{u',v'}(\ell', \ell | p)$ , we first select, for each  $1 \leq i \leq q$ , the indices  $1 \leq s'_i = s'_i(p' | p) \leq \ell'$  (at most  $\ell'$  options), and then choose the corresponding vertex  $v'_{s'_i}$  in  $\{v_i\}_{i=0}^{\ell}$  (at most  $\ell$  options). If  $\ell_i \geq 1$ ; we may then determine  $(v'_{s'_i+1}, \dots, v'_{s'_i+\ell_i})$  to follow either the same direction as  $p$  or the opposite one (at most two choices). Finally, we choose the remaining vertices in  $(v'_j)_{j=1}^{\ell'-1} \setminus (\cup_{i=1}^q \cup_{s'_i \leq j \leq s'_i+\ell_i} \{v'_j\})$ , which gives at most  $n^{\ell'-1-\sum_{i=1}^q (\ell_i+1)}$  possibilities, since  $s'_1 \geq 1$  and  $e'_q \leq \ell' - 1$ .

Now, combining (3.6) and (3.8), together with the bounds  $|\mathcal{P}_{u,v}(\ell)| \leq n^{\ell-1}$  and (3.9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{(3.8)} &\leq \sum_{\substack{u, u' \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1) \\ v, v' \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(n)}} \sum_{2 \leq \ell, \ell' \leq 2\gamma \ln n} \sum_{q \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{\ell = (\ell_i)_{i=1}^q \\ |\ell| \leq \ell \wedge \ell'}} \left( \frac{\lambda}{n} \right)^{\ell + \ell' - |\ell|} n^{\ell-1} 2^q (2\gamma \ln n)^{2q} \times n^{\ell'-1-|\ell|-q} \\ &\quad \times \mathbf{E}_X \left[ \mathbf{F} \left( \ell - |\ell|, n, \sum_{i=1}^q S_{\ell_i}^{(i)} + \mathbf{X}_{u,v} \right) \mathbf{F} \left( \ell - |\ell|, n, \sum_{i=1}^q S_{\ell_i}^{(i)} + \mathbf{X}_{u',v'} \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{S_{\ell_i}^{(i)} \geq -\frac{1}{\alpha'} \ln n, \forall 1 \leq i \leq q\}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the part (i) of Lemma 2.1 yields

$$\sum_{\ell \geq |\ell|} \frac{\lambda^{\ell-|\ell|}}{n} \mathbf{F} \left( \ell - |\ell|, n, \sum_{i=1}^q S_{\ell_i}^{(i)} + \mathbf{X}_{u,v} \right) \leq C e^{\alpha x} \prod_{i=1}^q e^{-\alpha S_{\ell_i}^{(i)}} e^{-\alpha \mathbf{X}_{u,v}}.$$

Substituting this into the previous bound for  $\Sigma_{(3.8)}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{(3.8)} &\leq \sum_{\substack{u, u' \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1) \\ v, v' \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(n)}} \sum_{q \geq 1} \sum_{\ell = (\ell_i)_{i=1}^q} \lambda^{|\ell|} \left( \frac{4\gamma \ln n}{n} \right)^q \\ &\quad \times C^2 \mathbf{E}_X \left[ e^{2\alpha x} \prod_{i=1}^q e^{-2\alpha S_{\ell_i}^{(i)}} e^{-\alpha \mathbf{X}_{u,v}} e^{-\alpha \mathbf{X}_{u',v'}} \mathbf{1}_{\{S_{\ell_i}^{(i)} \geq -\frac{1}{\alpha'} \ln n, \forall 1 \leq i \leq q\}} \right] \\ &= C^2 e^{2\alpha x} \sum_{\substack{u, u' \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1) \\ v, v' \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(n)}} e^{-\alpha \mathbf{X}_{u,v}} e^{-\alpha \mathbf{X}_{u',v'}} \sum_{q \geq 1} \left( \frac{4\gamma \ln n}{n} \sum_{j \geq 1} \lambda^j \mathbf{E} \left[ e^{-2\alpha S_j} \mathbf{1}_{\{S_j \geq -\frac{1}{\alpha'} \ln n\}} \right] \right)^q. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 2.1, it follows that,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \geq 1} \lambda^j \mathbf{E} \left[ e^{-2\alpha S_j} \mathbf{1}_{\{S_j \geq -\frac{1}{\alpha'} \ln n\}} \right] &\lesssim \sum_{m \geq -\frac{1}{\alpha'} \ln n} e^{-2\alpha m} \sum_{j \geq 1} \lambda^j \mathbf{P}(S_j \in [m-1, m]) \\ &\leq \sum_{m \geq -\frac{1}{\alpha'} \ln n} e^{-2\alpha m} V(m) \lesssim \sum_{m \geq -\frac{1}{\alpha'} \ln n} e^{-(2\alpha - \alpha')m} \lesssim n^{\frac{(2\alpha - \alpha')}{\alpha'}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\frac{(2\alpha - \alpha')}{\alpha'} < 1$ , since  $\alpha' > \alpha$ . Therefore, we can find a constant  $c > 0$  such that

$$\sum_{q \geq 1} \left[ \frac{4\gamma \ln n}{n} \sum_{j \geq 1} \lambda^j \mathbf{E} \left[ e^{-2\alpha S_j} \mathbf{1}_{\{S_j \geq -\frac{1}{\alpha'} \ln n\}} \right] \right]^q \leq n^{-c}$$

for sufficiently large  $n$ . Moreover, note that

$$\sum_{\substack{u, u' \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1) \\ v, v' \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(n)}} e^{-\alpha \mathbf{X}_{u,v}} e^{-\alpha \mathbf{X}_{u',v'}} = W_{r_n}^2 (\tilde{W}_{r_n})^2$$

We conclude that  $\Sigma_{(3.8)} \leq n^{-c} W_{r_n}^2 (\tilde{W}_{r_n})^2$ . Thus as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\Sigma_{(3.8)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{G}_n\}}$  converges to zero in probability.

*Case 2.* Let us bound  $|\mathcal{N}_p^{\vee, \times}|$ , where  $p \in \mathcal{P}_{u,v}(\ell)$ . (The case for  $|\mathcal{N}_p^{\times, \vee}|$  is similar.) Observe that for  $p' \in \mathcal{N}_p^{\vee, \times}$  by definition we have  $s'_1(p'|p) = 0$  and  $e'_q(p'|p) \leq \ell' - 1$ . In this case we claim that

$$|\mathcal{P}_{u,v'}^{(p)}(\ell', q, (\ell_i)_{i=1}^q)| \leq (\ell' \times \ell \times 2)^{q-1} \times n^{\ell'-1 - \sum_{i=1}^q (\ell_i + 1) + 1} \quad (3.10)$$

Comparing with (3.9), the difference here is that there is no freedom to choose  $(v'_0, v'_1, \dots, v'_{\ell_1})$ , they must be exactly the same as  $(v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{\ell_1})$ . Consequently, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{(3.11)} &:= \sum_{\substack{p \in \mathcal{P}(1, n) \\ H(p) \leq 2\gamma \ln n}} \sum_{p' \in \mathcal{N}_p^{\vee, \times}} \mathbf{E} \left[ I(p; R) I(p'; R) \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{G}_n\}} \mid \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n) \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{u, u' \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1) \\ v, v' \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(n)}} \sum_{2 \leq \ell, \ell' \leq 2\gamma \ln n} \sum_{q \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{\ell = (\ell_i)_{i=1}^q \\ |\ell| \leq \ell \wedge \ell'}} \left( \frac{\lambda}{n} \right)^{\ell + \ell' - |\ell|} n^{\ell-1} 2^{q-1} (2\gamma \ln n)^{2(q-1)} \times n^{\ell'-1 - |\ell| - q + 1} \\ &\quad \times \mathbf{E}_X \left[ \mathbf{F} \left( \ell - |\ell|, n, \sum_{i=1}^q S_{\ell_i}^{(i)} + \mathbf{X}_{u,v} \right) \mathbf{F} \left( \ell - |\ell|, n, \sum_{i=1}^q S_{\ell_i}^{(i)} + \mathbf{X}_{u',v'} \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{\text{Con}_q^{\vee, \times}\}} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

where

$$\text{Con}_q^{\vee, \times} := \left\{ S_{\ell_1}^{(1)} + X([1, u]) \geq \frac{s^*}{2} (r_n + \ell_1) \right\} \cap \bigcap_{i=2}^q \left\{ S_{\ell_i}^{(i)} \geq -\frac{1}{\alpha'} \ln n \right\}.$$

Following the same argument as in Case 1, we bound  $\Sigma_{(3.11)}$  from above by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{u, u' \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1) \\ v, v' \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(n)}} \sum_{q \geq 1} \sum_{\ell = (\ell_i)_{i=1}^q} \lambda^{|\ell|} \left( \frac{4\gamma \ln n}{n} \right)^{q-1} C^2 \mathbf{E}_X \left[ e^{2\alpha x} \prod_{i=1}^q e^{-2\alpha S_{\ell_i}^{(i)}} e^{-\alpha X_{u,v}} e^{-\alpha X_{u,v'}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\text{Con}_q^{\vee, \times}\}} \right] \\ &= C^2 e^{2\alpha x} \sum_{\substack{u \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1) \\ v, v' \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(n)}} e^{-\alpha X([v, n]) - \alpha X(v', n)} \sum_{j \geq 1} \lambda^j \mathbf{E}_X \left[ e^{-2\alpha [X([1, u]) + S_j]} \mathbf{1}_{\{S_{\ell_1}^{(1)} + X([1, u]) \geq \frac{s^*}{2}(r_n + \ell_1)\}} \right] \\ & \quad \times \sum_{q \geq 1} \left[ \frac{4\gamma \ln n}{n} \sum_{j \geq 1} \lambda^j \mathbf{E} \left[ e^{-2\alpha S_j} \mathbf{1}_{\{S_j \geq -\frac{1}{\alpha} \ln n\}} \right] \right]^{q-1}. \end{aligned}$$

By using the fact  $\lambda^j \mathbf{E}[e^{-\alpha S_j}] = 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j \geq 1} \lambda^j \mathbf{E}_X \left[ e^{-2\alpha [X([1, u]) + S_j]} \mathbf{1}_{\{S_j + X([1, u]) \geq \frac{s^*}{2}(r_n + j)\}} \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{j \geq 1} e^{-\alpha s^*(r_n + j)} \lambda^j \mathbf{E}_X \left[ e^{-\alpha [X([1, u]) + S_j]} \right] \lesssim e^{-\alpha s^* r_n} e^{-\alpha X([1, u])}. \end{aligned}$$

Simplifying the expression for the upper bound, we finally conclude

$$\Sigma_{(3.11)} \lesssim e^{2\alpha x} e^{-\alpha s^* r_n} W_{r_n} (\tilde{W}_{r_n})^2.$$

Since  $(W_{r_n}, \tilde{W}_r)$  is tight by Corollary 2.5, it follows that as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\Sigma_{(3.11)} \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{G}_n\}}$  converges to zero in probability. Moreover the same argument yields

$$\Sigma_{(3.12)} := \sum_{\substack{p \in \mathcal{P}(1, n) \\ H(p) \leq 2\gamma \ln n}} \sum_{p' \in \mathcal{N}_p^{\vee, \vee}} \mathbf{E} \left[ I(p; R) I(p'; R) \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{G}_n\}} \mid \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n) \right] \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\text{in prob}} 0 \text{ on } \mathbf{G}_n. \quad (3.12)$$

*Case 3.* Let us bound  $|\mathcal{N}_p^{\vee, \vee}|$ . Observe that for any  $p' \in \mathcal{N}_p^{\vee, \vee}$ , there must hold  $Q(p'|p) \geq 2$ , otherwise  $p' = p$  which is absurd since  $p \notin \mathcal{N}_p$ . We claim that for  $\ell = (\ell_i)_{i=1}^q \in \mathcal{L}$  with  $q \geq 2$ ,

$$|\mathcal{P}_{u,v}(\ell', \ell|p)| \leq (\ell' \times \ell \times 2)^{q-2} \times n^{\ell'-1 - \sum_{i=1}^q (\ell_i + 1) + 2}$$

Comparing with (3.9) and (3.10), the differences here are that now  $s'_1(p'|p) = 0$  and  $e'_q(p'|p) = \ell'$ ; and there is no freedom to choose  $(v'_0, v'_1, v'_{\ell_1})$ , and  $(v'_{s'_q}, \dots, v'_{\ell'})$ : they must be exactly the same as  $(v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{\ell_1})$  and  $(v_{\ell-\ell_q}, \dots, v_{\ell})$  by definition. Consequently, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{(3.13)} &:= \sum_{\substack{p \in \mathcal{P}(1, n) \\ H(p) \leq 2\gamma \ln n}} \sum_{p' \in \mathcal{N}_p^{\vee, \vee}} \mathbf{E} \left[ I(p; R) I(p'; R) \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{G}_n\}} \mid \mathcal{S}_{\leq r_n}(1, n) \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{u \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(1) \\ v \in \mathcal{S}_{r_n}(n)}} \sum_{2 \leq \ell, \ell' \leq 2\gamma \ln n} \sum_{q \geq 2} \sum_{\substack{\ell = (\ell_i)_{i=1}^q \\ |\ell| \leq \ell \wedge \ell'}} \left( \frac{\lambda}{n} \right)^{\ell + \ell' - |\ell|} n^{\ell-1} 2^{q-2} (2\gamma \ln n)^{2(q-2)} \times n^{\ell'-1 - |\ell| - q + 2} \\ & \quad \times \mathbf{E} \left[ F\left(\ell - |\ell|, n, \sum_{i=1}^q S_{\ell_i}^{(i)} + X_{u,v}\right) F\left(\ell - |\ell|, n, \sum_{i=1}^q S_{\ell_i}^{(i)} + X_{u',v'}\right) \mathbf{1}_{\{\text{Con}_q^{\vee, \vee}\}} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

where  $\text{Con}_q^{\vee, \vee}$  is defined to be the intersection of the events  $\{S_{\ell_1}^{(1)} + X([1, u]) \geq \frac{s^*}{2}(r_n + \ell_1)\}$ ,  $\cap_{i=2}^{q-1} \{S_{\ell_i}^{(i)} \geq -\frac{1}{\alpha} \ln n\}$  and  $\{S_{\ell_q}^{(1)} + X([v, n]) \geq \frac{s^*}{2}(r_n + \ell_q)\}$ . Following the previous



calculation it can be verified that

$$\Sigma_{(3.13)} \lesssim e^{2\alpha x} e^{-2\alpha s^* r_n} W_{r_n} \tilde{W}_{r_n}.$$

Hence, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\Sigma_{(3.13)} \mathbf{1}_{\{G_n\}}$  converges to zero in probability.

*Final step.* Recall the definition of  $\Sigma_{(3.4)}(n, r_n; R)$ , and that below (3.7), we have decomposed  $\mathcal{N}_p$  as the disjoint union of  $\mathcal{N}_p^{\times, \times}$ ,  $\mathcal{N}_p^{\check{\times}, \times}$ ,  $\mathcal{N}_p^{\times, \check{\times}}$ , and  $\mathcal{N}_p^{\check{\times}, \check{\times}}$ . Therefore, we have

$$\Sigma_{(3.4)}(n, r_n; R) \leq \Sigma_{(3.8)} + \Sigma_{(3.11)} + \Sigma_{(3.12)} + \Sigma_{(3.13)}.$$

The desired result then follows directly from the conclusions established in Cases 1–3. This completes the proof.  $\square$

#### APPENDIX A. PROOF OF LEMMA 1.5

*Proof of Lemma 1.5.* It suffices to prove for the unconditional measure  $\mathbb{P}$  and apply to the conditional probability measure  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}}$ .

According to the classical Stein lemma (see e.g. [Ros11, Lemma 4.2]), for each  $A \subset \mathbb{N}$  with function  $f_{\lambda, A}(n) := \mathbf{1}_{\{n \in A\}} - \sum_{k \in A} \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} e^{-\lambda}$ , the Stein equation

$$\lambda g(n+1) - ng(n) = f_{\lambda, A}(n) \quad \forall n \geq 0$$

has a unique solution  $g_{\lambda, A}(n) = -\frac{(n-1)!}{\lambda^n} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} f_{\lambda, A}(k)$  for  $n \geq 1$  and  $g_{\lambda, A}(0) = 1$ . Moreover, according to Lemma [Ros11, Lemma 4.4], the function  $g_{\lambda, A}$  satisfies

$$\sup_{n \geq 0} |g_{\lambda, A}(n+1) - g_{\lambda, A}(n)| \leq \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{\lambda} \right\}, \quad \sup_{n \geq 0} g_{\lambda, A}(n) \leq 1. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{TV}}(\chi Y, \text{Poi}(\lambda)) &= \sup_{g=g_{\lambda, A}} \left| \mathbf{E}[\chi Y g(\chi Y)] - \lambda \mathbf{E}[g(\chi Y + 1)] \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{g=g_{\lambda, A}} \underbrace{\left| \mathbf{E}[Y g(Y) \chi] - \lambda \mathbf{E}[g(Y + 1) \chi] \right|}_{\Sigma_{(A.2)}(g)} + \sup_{g=g_{\lambda, A}} \lambda g(1) \mathbf{P}(\chi = 0) \\ &=: \sup_{g=g_{\lambda, A}} \Sigma_{(A.2)}(g) + \mathbf{P}(\chi = 0). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Above, we have used  $\lambda g(1) \leq 1$  by (A.1). For brevity let us denote  $p_i := \mathbf{P}(X_i = 1) = \mathbf{E}[X_i]$ ,  $Y_i := \sum_{j \in N_i} X_j$  and  $Z_i := \sum_{j \notin N_i} X_j$ . Then on the one hand, we have

$$\mathbf{E}[\lambda g(Y + 1) \chi] = \sum_{i \in I} p_i \mathbf{E}[g(1 + X_i + Y_i + Z_i) \chi].$$

On the other hand, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[Y g(Y) \chi] &= \sum_{i \in I} \mathbf{E}[X_i g(X_i + Y_i + Z_i) \chi] = \sum_{i \in I} \mathbf{E}[X_i g(1 + Y_i + Z_i) \chi] \\ &= \sum_{i \in I} p_i \mathbf{E}[g(1 + Y_i + Z_i) \chi] + \sum_{i \in I} \mathbf{E}[(X_i - p_i) g(1 + Y_i + Z_i) \chi]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{(A.2)} &\leq \sum_{i \in I} p_i \mathbf{E}[|g(1 + X_i + Y_i + Z_i) - g(1 + Y_i + Z_i)| \chi] \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \in I} \left| \mathbf{E}[(X_i - p_i) |g(1 + Y_i + Z_i) - g(1 + Z_i)| \chi] \right| \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \in I} \left| \mathbf{E}[(X_i - p_i) g(1 + Z_i) \chi] \right|. \end{aligned}$$

To bound the first sum, we apply (A.1), which gives  $|g(1 + X_i + Y_i + Z_i) - g(1 + Y_i + Z_i)| \leq X_i$ . By simply dropping the indicator function  $\chi$ , it follows that the first sum is bounded above by  $\sum_{i \in I} p_i^2$ . Similarly, for the second one, since (A.1) yields  $|g(1 + Y_i + Z_i) - g(1 + Z_i)| \leq Y_i$  and  $|X_i - p_i| \leq X_i + p_i$ , it is bounded from above by

$$\sum_{i \in I} \mathbf{E}[(X_i + p_i)Y_i\chi] \leq \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{j \in N_i} (p_i p_j + \mathbf{E}[X_i X_j \chi]).$$

For the last sum, observing that by that conditionally on  $\mathcal{G}$ ,  $X_i$  and  $Z_i$  are independent, we have  $\mathbf{E}[(X_i - p_i)g(1 + Z_i)] = \mathbf{E}[X_i - p_i] \mathbf{E}[g(1 + Z_i)] = 0$ . Since  $|X_i - p_i| \leq 1$  and  $\|g\|_\infty \leq 1$  by (A.1) we finally get

$$\left| \mathbf{E}[(X_i - p_i)g(1 + Z_i) \mathbf{1}_{\{\chi=1\}}] \right| = \left| \mathbf{E}[(X_i - p_i)g(1 + Z_i) \mathbf{1}_{\{\chi=0\}}] \right| \leq \mathbf{P}(\chi = 0).$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We thank Omer Angel for a stimulating discussion. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DMS-1928930, while the authors were in residence at the Simons Laufer Mathematical Sciences Institute in Berkeley, California, during the Spring 2025 semester. Heng Ma is supported in part from a Lady Davis Fellowship at the Technion and further acknowledges partial support, during his visit to SLMATH, from the National Key R&D Program of China (No. 2023YFA1010103) and the NSFC Key Program (Project No. 12231002). Pascal Maillard further acknowledges partial support from Institut Universitaire de France, the MITI interdisciplinary program 80PRIME GEx-MBB and the ANR MBAP-P (ANR-24-CE40-1833) project.

#### REFERENCES

- [ADH17] Antonio Auffinger, Michael Damron, and Jack Hanson. *50 years of first-passage percolation*, volume 68. American Mathematical Soc., 2017. [3](#)
- [AGG89] R. Arratia, L. Goldstein, and L. Gordon. Two moments suffice for Poisson approximations: The Chen-Stein method. *Ann. Probab.*, 17(1):9–25, 1989. [6](#)
- [AKS81] Miklos Ajtai, Janos Komlos, and Endre Szemerédi. The longest path in a random graph. *Combinatorica*, 1:1–12, 1981. [3](#)
- [BvdH12] Shankar Bhamidi and Remco van der Hofstad. Weak disorder asymptotics in the stochastic mean-field model of distance. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 22(1):29–69, 2012. [3](#)
- [BvdHH10a] Shankar Bhamidi, Remco van der Hofstad, and Gerard Hooghiemstra. Extreme value theory, Poisson-Dirichlet distributions, and first passage percolation on random networks. *Adv. Appl. Probab.*, 42(3):706–738, 2010. [3](#)
- [BvdHH10b] Shankar Bhamidi, Remco van der Hofstad, and Gerard Hooghiemstra. First passage percolation on random graphs with finite mean degrees. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 20(5):1907–1965, 2010. [3](#)
- [BvdHH11] Shankar Bhamidi, Remco van der Hofstad, and Gerard Hooghiemstra. First passage percolation on the Erdős-Rényi random graph. *Comb. Probab. Comput.*, 20(5):683–707, 2011. [3](#), [5](#)
- [BvdHH13] Shankar Bhamidi, Remco van der Hofstad, and Gerard Hooghiemstra. Weak disorder in the stochastic mean-field model of distance. II. *Bernoulli*, 19(2):363–386, 2013. [3](#)
- [BvdHH17a] Shankar Bhamidi, Remco van der Hofstad, and Gerard Hooghiemstra. Erratum to: “First passage percolation on random graphs with finite mean degrees”. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 27(5):3246–3253, 2017. [3](#)
- [BvdHH17b] Shankar Bhamidi, Remco van der Hofstad, and Gerard Hooghiemstra. Universality for first passage percolation on sparse random graphs. *Ann. Probab.*, 45(4):2568–2630, 2017. [3](#)
- [CCH15] Alberto Chiarini, Alessandra Cipriani, and Rajat Subhra Hazra. A note on the extremal process of the supercritical Gaussian free field. *Electron. Commun. Probab.*, 20:10, 2015. Id/No 74. [6](#)
- [CCH16] Alberto Chiarini, Alessandra Cipriani, and Rajat Subhra Hazra. Extremes of the supercritical Gaussian free field. *ALEA, Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat.*, 13(2):711–724, 2016. [6](#)
- [Che75] Louis H. Y. Chen. Poisson approximation for dependent trials. *The Annals of Probability*, 3(3):534–545, 1975. [6](#)

- [DSS23] Fraser Daly, Matthias Schulte, and Seva Shneer. First passage percolation on erdős-rényi graphs with general weights, 2023. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [8](#)
- [Fel71] William Feller. *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications. Vol II*. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1971. [8](#)
- [FTWY24] Renjie Feng, Gang Tian, Dongyi Wei, and Dong Yao. Principal minors of gaussian orthogonal ensemble, 2024. [6](#)
- [HW65] J. M. Hammersley and D. J. A. Welsh. First-passage percolation, subadditive processes, stochastic networks, and generalized renewal theory. Bernoulli-Bayes-Laplace, Anniversary Vol., Proc. Int. Res. Semin., Berkeley 1963, 61-110 (1965)., 1965. [3](#)
- [IM10] Alexander Iksanov and Matthias Meiners. Exponential rate of almost-sure convergence of intrinsic martingales in supercritical branching random walks. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 47(2):513–525, 2010. [8](#)
- [Jan99] Svante Janson. One, two and three times  $\log n/n$  for paths in a complete graph with random weights. *Comb. Probab. Comput.*, 8(4):347–361, 1999. [3](#)
- [Kal17] Olav Kallenberg. *Random Measures, Theory and Applications*. Number 77 in Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling. Springer, Cham, 2017. [2](#), [5](#)
- [KSS20a] Nicola Kistler, Adrien Schertzer, and Marius A. Schmidt. Oriented first passage percolation in the mean field limit. *Brazilian Journal of Probability and Statistics*, 34(2):414 – 425, 2020. [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#)
- [KSS20b] Nicola Kistler, Adrien Schertzer, and Marius A. Schmidt. Oriented first passage percolation in the mean field limit, 2. The extremal process. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 30(2):788 – 811, 2020. [3](#), [4](#), [6](#)
- [KV16] Júlia Komjáthy and Viktória Vadon. First passage percolation on the Newman-Watts small world model. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 162(4):959–993, 2016. [3](#)
- [Liu00] Quansheng Liu. On generalized multiplicative cascades. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 86(2):263–286, April 2000. [4](#)
- [MM25] Heng Ma and Pascal Maillard. Exponential moments of truncated branching random walk martingales. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 30(none), January 2025. [4](#)
- [Rös92] Uwe Rösler. A fixed point theorem for distributions. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 42(2):195–214, September 1992. [4](#)
- [Ros11] Nathan Ross. Fundamentals of Stein’s method. *Probability Surveys*, 8(none):210 – 293, 2011. [6](#), [21](#)
- [RW10] Oliver Riordan and Nicholas Wormald. The diameter of sparse random graphs. *Comb. Probab. Comput.*, 19(5-6):835–926, 2010. [10](#)
- [Shi15] Zhan Shi. *Branching Random Walks*, volume 2151. Springer, Cham, 2015. [11](#)
- [ST20] Perla Sousi and Sam Thomas. Chen-stein method for the uncovered set of random walk on  $\mathbb{Z}_n^d$  for  $d \geq 3$ . *Electron. Commun. Probab.*, 25:11, 2020. Id/No 55. [6](#)

(Heng Ma) FACULTY OF DATA AND DECISION SCIENCES, TECHNION - ISRAEL’S INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, HAIFA, 32000, ISRAEL.

*Email address:* `hengmamath at gmail dot com`

*URL:* `https://hengmamath.github.io`

(Pascal Maillard) INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE TOULOUSE, CNRS UMR 5219, UNIVERSITÉ DE TOULOUSE, 118 ROUTE DE NARBONNE, 31062 TOULOUSE CEDEX 9, FRANCE AND INSTITUT UNIVERSITAIRE DE FRANCE.

*Email address:* `Pascal.Maillard at math dot univ-toulouse dot fr`

*URL:* `https://www.math.univ-toulouse.fr/~pmaillar/`