

# THE TOURNAMENT RATCHET'S CLICKTIME PROCESS, AND METASTABILITY IN A MORAN MODEL

JAN LUKAS IGELBRINK, CHARLINE SMADI, AND ANTON WAKOLBINGER

**ABSTRACT.** Muller's ratchet, in its prototype version, models a haploid, asexual population whose size  $N$  is constant over the generations. Slightly deleterious mutations are acquired along the lineages at a constant rate, and individuals carrying less mutations have a selective advantage. In the classical variant, an individual's selective advantage is proportional to the difference between the population average and the individual's mutation load, whereas in the ratchet with *tournament selection* only the signs of the differences of the individual mutation loads matter. In a parameter regime which leads to slow clicking (i.e. to a loss of the currently fittest class at a rate  $\ll 1/N$ ) we prove that the rescaled process of click times of the tournament ratchet converges as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  to a Poisson process. Central ingredients in the proof are a thorough analysis of the metastable behaviour of a two-type Moran model with selection and deleterious mutation (which describes the size of the fittest class up to its extinction time) and a lower estimate on the size of the new fittest class at a clicktime.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Model and main results	3
2.1. The tournament ratchet and its clicktime process	3
2.2. Metastability in a two-type Moran model with selection and deleterious mutations	5
3. Proof of Theorem 2.4	7
3.1. Properties of the potential function	7
3.2. Expected hitting times: Proof of Theorem 2.4.a)	11
3.3. Ornstein-Uhlenbeck fluctuations: Proof of Theorem 2.4.b)	15
3.4. Asymptotic normality of the Boltzmann-Gibbs distribution	17
3.5. Asymptotic normality of the quasi-equilibria: Proof of Theorem 2.4.c)	18
3.6. Asymptotic exponentiality of the extinction time: Proof of Theorem 2.4.d)	21
3.7. On the way to extinction: Proof of Theorem 2.4.e)	21
4. Proof of Theorem 2.3	24
4.1. Lower-bounding the size of the new fittest class at a clicktime	24
4.2. From one click to the next	26
References	27

## 1. INTRODUCTION

*Muller's ratchet* is a prototype model in population genetics; among the pioneering papers are [Hai78, SCS93, GC00]. Originally, this model was conceived to explain the ubiquity of sexual reproduction among eukaryotes despite its many costs [Mul64, Fel74]. In its bare-bones version, Muller's ratchet models a haploid asexual population whose size  $N$  is constant over generations. Slightly deleterious mutations are acquired along the lineages of descent at a constant rate, and

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 92D15; secondary 60K35, 60J80, 60J27, 60F17.

*Key words and phrases.* Muller's ratchet, click rate, tournament selection, Moran model, metastability.

an individual's mutational load (i.e. the number of mutations that was accumulated along the individual's ancestral lineage) compared to the mutational loads of its contemporaries is decisive for the individual's success in the selective part of the reproduction dynamics.

With the type of an individual being its current mutational load, the population dynamics leads to a type frequency profile that is "driven upwards" by the effect of mutation and "kept tight" by the effect of selection. Due to mutation and randomness in the individual reproduction, the currently fittest class, i.e. the subpopulation of individuals carrying the currently smallest mutational load, will eventually get extinct; this is a *click of the ratchet*.

**Tournament versus fitness proportionate selection.** For quantifying the effect of an individual mutational load within a population there are two prototypic ways: in the so-called *fitness proportionate selection*, the *value* of the individual mutational load is compared to the *mean value* of the mutational loads in the population, and the individual's selective advantage is proportional to the resulting difference. In the so-called *tournament selection*, the selective advantage of an individual is determined by the *rank* of its mutational load within the contemporary population. We will work with the (continuous-time) Moran model for Muller's ratchet with tournament selection, and refer to it as the *tournament ratchet* for short. Here we give a brief verbal description of the individual-based, Poisson-process driven dynamics of the tournament ratchet as specified by the graphical representation in [GSW23], which is in line with the definition of the type frequency process given at the beginning of Section 2.

- For each ordered pair of individuals, neutral reproduction events come at rate  $\frac{1}{2N}$ , resulting in a binary reproduction of the first and the death of the second individual.

- For each pair of individuals carrying different mutational loads, selective reproduction events come at rate  $s_N/N$ , resulting in a binary reproduction of the fitter and the death of the less fit individual.

- Each individual's mutation load is increased by 1 at rate  $m_N$ .

An appealing feature of the tournament ratchet is that for each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  the dynamics of the  $k$  fittest classes is autonomous up to the time of extinction of the fittest class. In particular, the size of the currently fittest class is described by a two-type Moran model with selection and deleterious mutation. This "hierarchical autonomy" of the fitness classes does not hold true for Muller's ratchet with fitness proportionate selection, and to the best of our knowledge the asymptotic analysis of the click rate of the latter so far has resisted a complete and rigorous solution despite several attacks, among them [EPW09, NS12, MPV20]. Links between the two ratchet models are established in [IGSW24], showing that under an appropriate transformation of the mutation-selection ratio  $\rho_N := m_N/s_N$  in the *near-critical parameter regime*  $\rho_N \uparrow 1$  the dynamics of the size of the fittest class of the tournament ratchet becomes what is called in [EPW09] the Poisson profile approximation of the size of the fittest class of Muller's ratchet with fitness proportionate selection.

**Brief summary of results.** We focus on a parameter regime of moderate mutation and selection, with<sup>1</sup>  $1 \gg s_N > m_N \gg 1/N$ ,  $m_N/s_N = \rho_N$  being convergent as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , and satisfying the condition  $\alpha_N/\epsilon_N \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $\alpha_N := N(1 - \rho_N)$  is the center of attraction of the size of the fittest class and  $\epsilon_N := (s_N - m_N)^{-1}$  is the critical size below which the fittest class (then similar to a slightly supercritical branching process) experiences quick extinction. Specifically, it turns out that, after a click followed by a relaxation time of duration  $O(\epsilon_N \log \alpha_N)$ , the size of the fittest class performs (asymptotically Ornstein-Uhlenbeck) fluctuations on the  $\epsilon_N$ -timescale, and goes extinct after an asymptotically exponentially distributed time on a much larger timescale, then with the next-fittest class taking over. In this sense, under the condition  $\epsilon_N \ll \alpha_N$ , the model exhibits a metastable

<sup>1</sup>As usual, for two positive sequences  $(a_N), (b_N)$ , the notation  $a_N \gg b_N$  means that  $a_N/b_N \rightarrow \infty$ , and  $a_N \sim b_N$  means that the two sequences are *asymptotically equivalent*, i.e.  $a_N/b_N \rightarrow 1$ .

behaviour. (For more background on the concept of metastability, see e.g. the monograph [BDH16, Chapter 8].)

Thus our main result concerning the tournament ratchet (Theorem 2.3) is the convergence of the rescaled clicktime process to a standard Poisson process, with the expected time between clicks being given up to asymptotic equivalence as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  by an explicitly computed quantity  $e_N$ . This quantity appeared in [IGSW24] via a Green function analysis as the asymptotic equivalent of the expected extinction time of the fittest class when started from large sizes, see eq. (2.12) below.

Theorem 2.3 constitutes also a substantial improvement compared to [GSW23, Theorem 2.2], where convergence of the rescaled clicktime process to a standard Poisson process was proved in the special case of the mutation-selection ratio  $m_N/s_N$  not depending on  $N$ , and where the click rate was determined only up to logarithmic equivalence. The methods applied in the present paper are fundamentally different from those of [GSW23]: while that paper pursued a backward-in-time strategy (relying on the duality of the tournament ratchet with a hierarchy of decorated ancestral selection graphs), the present paper takes a forward-in-time approach. As indicated above, a key role is played by the metastable behaviour of a two-type Moran model with one-way mutation; our corresponding results are subsumed in Theorem 2.4.

While the present work focusses on the evolution of the fittest class of the tournament ratchet, it is also of interest to study the type frequency profile of the entire population. This was achieved in [GSW23] for  $\rho < 1$  not depending on  $N$ . In a forthcoming paper we will extend this to the more delicate case  $\rho \uparrow 1$ . Like in [GSW23], a central tool for analysing the empirical type frequency profile will be a hierarchy of decorated ancestral selection graphs, which extends the decorated ASG of the Moran model with selection and (one-way) mutation (for the latter see e.g. [BW18] and references therein).

## 2. MODEL AND MAIN RESULTS

**2.1. The tournament ratchet and its clicktime process.** We start by defining the state space and the transition rates of the type frequency process which result from the individual-based dynamics described in the Introduction.

**Definition 2.1.** For given parameters  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $m_N, s_N > 0$ , let  $\mathfrak{N}^{(N)} = (\mathfrak{N}_\kappa^{(N)}) = (\mathfrak{N}_\kappa^{(N)}(t))$ ,  $\kappa \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ,  $t \geq 0$ , be a Markovian jump process with state space  $E_N := \{(n_0, n_1, \dots) \mid n_0, n_1, \dots \in \mathbb{N}_0, n_0 + n_1 + \dots = N\}$  and with the following transition rates:

- Neutral reproduction: for  $\kappa \neq \kappa'$ ,  
 $(\mathfrak{N}_\kappa, \mathfrak{N}_{\kappa'})$  jumps to  $(\mathfrak{N}_\kappa + 1, \mathfrak{N}_{\kappa'} - 1)$  at rate  $\frac{1}{2N} \mathfrak{N}_\kappa \mathfrak{N}_{\kappa'}$
- Selective reproduction: for  $\kappa < \kappa'$ ,  
 $(\mathfrak{N}_\kappa, \mathfrak{N}_{\kappa'})$  jumps to  $(\mathfrak{N}_\kappa + 1, \mathfrak{N}_{\kappa'} - 1)$  at rate  $\frac{s_N}{N} \mathfrak{N}_\kappa \mathfrak{N}_{\kappa'}$ ,
- Mutation: for  $\kappa$ ,  
 $(\mathfrak{N}_\kappa, \mathfrak{N}_{\kappa+1})$  jumps to  $(\mathfrak{N}_\kappa - 1, \mathfrak{N}_{\kappa+1} + 1)$  at rate  $m_N \mathfrak{N}_\kappa$ .

As in this definition with  $\mathfrak{N}_\kappa = \mathfrak{N}_\kappa^{(N)}$ , we will often suppress the dependence on  $N$  to ease the notation. As motivated in the Introduction, we will refer to a process following the dynamics specified in Definition 2.1 as the *(type frequency process of the) tournament ratchet with population size  $N$ , selection parameter  $s_N$  and mutation rate  $m_N$* . Even though the space  $E_N$  is infinite, it is easy to see (e.g. from the graphical construction provided in [GSW23]) that the process  $\mathfrak{N}^{(N)}$  is well-defined. We will address  $\kappa$  as the *type* or *mutation load* carried by an individual; consequently,  $\mathfrak{N}_\kappa^{(N)}(t)$  is the size of the subpopulation (or *class*) of the individuals of type  $\kappa$  that live at time  $t$ . According to Definition 2.1, individuals carrying a smaller mutation load are selectively favoured. The *type of the fittest class at time  $t \geq 0$*  is denoted by

$$K_N^*(t) := \min \left\{ \kappa : \mathfrak{N}_\kappa^{(N)}(t) > 0 \right\}. \quad (2.1)$$

The times  $\mathcal{T}_N^{(i)}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots$ , when the currently fittest class is lost forever,

$$\mathcal{T}_N^{(i)} := \inf \{t : K_N^*(t) = i\}, \quad (2.2)$$

are called the *clicktimes* of the ratchet. For  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and  $t \geq 0$  we put

$$\mathfrak{N}_\ell^*(t) := \mathfrak{N}_\ell^{(N)*}(t) := \mathfrak{N}_{K_N^*(t)+\ell}^{(N)}(t). \quad (2.3)$$

In words,  $\mathfrak{N}_\ell^*(t)$  is the size of the subpopulation of individuals that live at time  $t$  and carry  $\ell$  mutations more than those in the fittest class at time  $t$ .

*Remark 2.2.* As observed in [GSW23], for each  $\ell = 0, 1, \dots$  the dynamics of  $(\mathfrak{N}_0^*, \dots, \mathfrak{N}_\ell^*)$  is *autonomous* up to the next clicktime (at which the “old” fittest class goes extinct and  $\mathfrak{N}_0^*$  re-starts as the size of the “new” fittest class). In particular,  $\mathfrak{N}_0^*$ , the *size of the currently fittest class*, has between click times  $\mathcal{T}^{(i)}$  and  $\mathcal{T}^{(i+1)}$  (and with  $\mathcal{T}^{(i)}$  shifted to the time origin) the same distribution as a birth-death process  $Y_0$  up to the time of its extinction, with  $Y_0(0) = \mathfrak{N}_1^*(\mathcal{T}^{(i)} -)$  for  $i \geq 1$ , and  $Y_0(0) \gg \mathfrak{c}_N$  for  $i = 0$  under assumption (2.15). The upward and downward jump rates of  $Y_0$  from state  $n \leq N$  are given by

$$\lambda_n := \lambda_n^{(N)} := n \left( \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{n}{N} \right) + s \left( 1 - \frac{n}{N} \right) \right), \quad (2.4)$$

$$\mu_n := \mu_n^{(N)} := n \left( \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{n}{N} \right) + m \right). \quad (2.5)$$

This is the dynamics of the number of type-0 individuals in a two-type Moran model with one-way mutation (from type 0 to type 1) at rate  $m$  per individual, and with individual selective advantage  $s/N$  of type 0 against type 1; we will come back to this in the next subsection.

With  $N, m_N, s_N$  as in Definition 2.1, we will write

$$\rho_N := m_N/s_N$$

for the *mutation-selection ratio*. The following will be assumed as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ :

$$\frac{1}{N} \ll m_N < s_N \ll 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_N \rightarrow \rho^* \in (0, 1]. \quad (2.6)$$

Loosely spoken, assumption (2.6) says that mutation is “moderate”, acting on a timescale that is intermediate between the ecological and the evolutionary timescale, and that selection acts on the same timescale as mutation. We now introduce (and interpret) two quantities  $\mathfrak{a}$  and  $\mathfrak{c}$  whose interplay will turn out to be relevant for the long-term behaviour of  $Y_0$ . With

$$\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}_N := N(1 - \rho_N) \quad (2.7)$$

the drift  $\lambda_n - \mu_n$  takes the form

$$\lambda_n - \mu_n = n(s_N - m_N) \left( 1 - \frac{n}{\mathfrak{a}} \right), \quad (2.8)$$

hence  $\mathfrak{a}$  is the *center of attraction* of  $Y_0$ . The quantity  $s_N - m_N$  is the supercriticality in the branching process that approximates  $Y_0$  as long as  $Y_0 \ll \mathfrak{a}$ ; consequently the quantity

$$\mathfrak{c} = \mathfrak{c}_N = \frac{1}{s_N - m_N} = \frac{\rho_N}{m_N(1 - \rho_N)} \quad (2.9)$$

is the *critical size* below which  $Y_0$  will quickly go to extinction. In this work we will focus on the condition

$$\mathfrak{c}_N \ll \mathfrak{a}_N \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.10)$$

Under condition (2.6), the requirement (2.10) is equivalent to

$$\mathfrak{u}_N := \frac{\mathfrak{a}_N}{\mathfrak{c}_N} \rho_N = N m_N (1 - \rho_N)^2 \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.11)$$

Following [IGSW24] we will refer to parameter constellations satisfying condition (2.11) as the *exponential regime*. For

$$T_0 := T_0^{(N)} := \text{the time of extinction of } Y_0^{(N)}$$

it was proved in [IGSW24, Theorem 3.4 part b)] that

$$\mathbf{E} \left[ T_0 \mid Y_0^{(N)}(0) = j_N \right] \sim e_N \quad \text{if } j_N \gg \mathfrak{c}_N, \quad (2.12)$$

where

$$e_N := \mathfrak{c}_N \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\mathfrak{u}_N}} \exp(2\mathfrak{u}_N \eta(m_N, \rho_N)), \quad (2.13)$$

and

$$\eta(m, \rho) := -\frac{1}{2m} \left[ \frac{1}{1-\rho} \log \left( \frac{1+2m}{1+2m/\rho} \right) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{(1+2m)^\ell} \right) \frac{(1-\rho)^{\ell-1}}{\ell(\ell+1)} \right]. \quad (2.14)$$

**Theorem 2.3.** *Assume the conditions (2.6) and (2.11). Then, with  $e_N$  as in (2.13), and with the initial condition*

$$\mathfrak{N}_0^{(N)}(0) \gg \mathfrak{c}_N \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad (2.15)$$

*the sequence of  $\mathbb{N}_0$ -valued processes  $(K_N^*(e_N t))_{t \geq 0}$  converges in distribution as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  to a rate 1 Poisson counting process. In particular, the sequence of time-rescaled clicktime processes*

$$\left( \mathcal{T}_N^{(i)}/e_N \right)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}, \quad N = 1, 2, \dots,$$

*converges in distribution as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  to a rate 1 Poisson point process on  $\mathbb{R}_+$ .*

Key ingredients in the proof of this theorem are parts a)-d) of Theorem 2.4 (stated in the next subsection and proved in Section 3) as well as Proposition 4.1 which shows that with high probability, shortly before the fittest class gets extinct, there are still enough mutations affecting this class so that, when the old fittest class disappears, the size of the new fittest class is large enough to escape quick extinction caused by random fluctuations. In the next subsection we will focus on the long-term behavior of the processes  $Y_0^{(N)}$  when started in a sufficiently large state  $j_N$ .

**2.2. Metastability in a two-type Moran model with selection and deleterious mutations.** Let  $Y_0 = Y_0^{(N)}$  be an  $\{0, 1, \dots, N\}$ -valued continuous-time birth-death process with jump rates given by (2.4), (2.5). As already observed,  $Y_0^{(N)}$  describes the number of individuals carrying the beneficial allele 0 in a two-type Moran model with mutation rate  $m = m_N$  from type 0 to type 1 and selection coefficient  $s = s_N$ . Our main result on this model (parts of which are instrumental also for the proof of Theorem 2.3) concerns the asymptotic normality of the quasi-equilibrium of  $Y_0^{(N)}$ , the asymptotic exponentiality of the extinction time of  $Y_0^{(N)}$ , and the convergence of the properly rescaled  $Y_0^{(N)}$  to an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. Recall (see e.g. [MV12]) that the *quasi-equilibrium* of  $Y_0 = Y_0^{(N)}$  is the (uniquely determined) probability distribution  $\alpha_N$  on  $\{1, \dots, N\}$  for which

$$\mathbf{P}_{\alpha_N}(Y_0(t) = k \mid Y_0(t) \neq 0) = \alpha_N(k), \quad 1 \leq k \leq N, t > 0. \quad (2.16)$$

The quantity

$$\sigma := \sigma_N := \sqrt{\rho_N \mathfrak{a}_N \mathfrak{c}_N} = \mathfrak{c}_N \sqrt{\mathfrak{u}_N} = \frac{\rho_N \mathfrak{a}_N}{\sqrt{\mathfrak{u}_N}} = \frac{1}{s_N} \sqrt{N m_N} \quad (2.17)$$

will emerge as a scale parameter of the fluctuations of  $Y_0^{(N)}$  around its center of attraction  $\mathfrak{a}_N$ , cf. Remark 3.9 for a quick explanation of the form of  $\sigma$ .

**Theorem 2.4.** *Assume the conditions (2.6) and (2.11). Then*

a) *With  $T_{\alpha}$  denoting the time at which  $Y_0^{(N)}$  first hits the state  $\lfloor \alpha_N \rfloor$ , all three of the expectations*

$$\mathbf{E}[T_{\alpha} \mid Y_0^{(N)}(0) = N], \mathbf{E}[T_{\alpha} \mid Y_0^{(N)}(0) = 1, T_{\alpha} < T_0], \mathbf{E}[T_0 \mid Y_0^{(N)}(0) = \lfloor \alpha \rfloor - 1, T_0 < T_{\alpha}]$$

*are  $O(\mathbf{c}_N \log \alpha_N)$ .*

b) *With  $Y_0^{(N)}$  started in  $\lfloor \alpha_N \rfloor$ , the sequence of processes*

$$\mathcal{H}_N := \left( \frac{1}{\sigma_N} \left( Y_0^{(N)}(t\mathbf{c}_N) - \alpha_N \right) \right)_{t \geq 0} \quad (2.18)$$

*converges in distribution to a standard Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process started in the origin, i.e. to the process  $\mathcal{H}$  satisfying the SDE*

$$d\mathcal{H} = -\mathcal{H} dt + d\mathcal{W}, \quad \mathcal{H}(0) = 0, \quad (2.19)$$

*with  $\mathcal{W}$  being a standard Wiener process.*

- c) *The sequence of quasi-equilibria  $\alpha_N$  of  $Y_0^{(N)}$  is asymptotically normal as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Specifically, the image of  $\alpha_N$  under the mapping  $n \rightarrow (n - \alpha_N)/\sigma_N$  converges weakly to  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1/2)$ , the centered normal distribution with variance 1/2.*
- d) *With  $Y_0^{(N)}$  started in  $j_N \gg c_N$ , the sequence  $T_0^{(N)}/e_N$ ,  $N = 1, 2, \dots$ , converges in distribution to a standard exponential random variable.*
- e) *For  $\varepsilon < 1/3$  let  $L = L_{\varepsilon}^{(N)}$  be the time at which  $Y_0$  (having started in  $j_N \gg \mathbf{c}$ ) visits  $\lfloor 2\varepsilon\alpha_N \rfloor$  for the last time before going extinct. Then with high probability the number of mutations affecting the “type 0” population (whose size is  $Y_0$ ) during period  $[L, T_0]$  is  $\gg \mathbf{c}$ .*

*Remark 2.5.* a) In [IGSW24, Theorem 3.4 part b)] it is shown that the factor  $v_N := \mathbf{c}_N \exp(2u_N \eta(m_N, \rho_N))$  in (2.13) is asymptotically equivalent to the expected number of returns of  $Y_0$  from  $\lfloor \alpha \rfloor$  to  $\lfloor \alpha \rfloor$ .

b) It follows from (2.17) that (2.13) can be written as

$$e_N = \frac{1}{\rho_N \alpha_N} \cdot \sqrt{\pi} \sigma_N \cdot \mathbf{c}_N \exp(2u_N \eta(m_N, \rho_N)). \quad (2.20)$$

The three factors in (2.20) can be interpreted as the asymptotics of the expected holding time of  $Y_0^{(N)}$  in states close to  $\alpha_N$  (see Remark 3.9 b)), the expected duration of an excursion of  $Y_0^{(N)}$  from  $\lfloor \alpha_N \rfloor$  in its quasi-equilibrium (cf. Theorem 2.4.a)) and the expected number of such excursions before  $Y_0^{(N)}$  escapes to 0 (see Lemma 3.3 A) with  $\mathfrak{d}_N = 1$ ).

c) Parts b) and c) of Theorem 2.4 together imply that the sequence of quasi-equilibria of  $\mathcal{H}_N$  converges weakly to the equilibrium distribution of the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process  $\mathcal{H}$ .

d) For proving part d), i.e. the asymptotic exponentiality of the extinction times  $T_0^{(N)}$ , there is also an alternative route which does not directly invoke the quasi-equilibria  $\alpha_N$  but instead uses [GR05, Theorem 1], see Remark 3.4. In the present work we take a route via the analysis of quasi-equilibria, also because we think that this is interesting in its own right.

*Remark 2.6.* Related results for processes similar to  $Y_0^{(N)}$  appear in the literature:

a) Consider, e.g., the case in which  $m$  and  $s$  (other than in (2.6)) do not depend on  $N$  (i.e. both mutation and selection act on the “generation timescale”). Then, with  $Y_0$  started in  $\alpha$ , the sequence of processes  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}(Y_0 - \alpha)$  converges in distribution to an OU process as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  (see [Cor17] and references therein).

b) The “drift” (2.8) is that of a logistic branching process with carrying capacity  $\alpha$  and intrinsic growth rate  $s - m$ . The “speed”  $\lambda_n + \mu_n$ , however, is different from that of a logistic branching process, which prevents an application of results from [Lam05] or [SaSha13].

c) The dynamics of  $Y_0$  also bears resemblance to the so-called *logistic birth-and-death processes*, see [Fox21] and references therein. However, in these processes the “resampling” terms  $\frac{1}{2}(1 - \frac{n}{N})$

are missing in the rates  $\lambda_n$  and  $\mu_n$ , which requires a control of their effects and also leads to subtle differences between the formulas for the expected extinction time in (2.13) and in [Fox21, Theorem 5.3].

d) For a class of processes containing the logistic birth-and-death processes and the logistic branching processes, a Gaussian approximation of the quasistationary distributions is obtained in [CCM16] by matching techniques reminiscent of the WKB method from Physics, see also the references at the end of the Introduction of [CCM16]. In [CCM23] the asymptotics of the spectrum of the rescaled generators of these processes is obtained as the superposition of the spectra of an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operator and of a continuous-time binary branching process conditioned in non-extinction. It is conceivable that similarly fine results also hold for the family  $Y_0^{(N)}$ , even though it does not quite fit into the scaling condition required in [CCM16] and in [CCM23]. Also, the techniques applied in the present work may shed additional light on the probabilistic background of the results of [CCM23].

*Remark 2.7.* Within the regime (2.6), [IGSW24] identifies two subregimes with regard to the expected extinction times of  $Y_0$ : the *exponential regime* (2.11) and the *polynomial regime* in which

$$u_N \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow 0.$$

An extended version of the asymptotics (2.12) is given in [IGSW24, eq. (3.13)]. In that equation the factor  $\frac{1}{1-\rho}$  is lacking in the journal publication. This (as well as details in the proof of [IGSW24, Theorem 3.4 part a]) concerning the polynomial regime) was amended in the arxiv version v3 of [IGSW24].

### 3. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.4

**3.1. Properties of the potential function.** The analysis of expected hitting times of the process  $Y_0 = Y_0^{(N)}$  relies on a study of functionals of the *oddsratio products*  $r_\ell := r_\ell^{(N)}$  given by

$$r_0 = 1, \quad r_\ell := \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} \frac{\mu_i}{\lambda_i}, \quad \ell \geq 1. \quad (3.1)$$

The *potential function*  $U := U^{(N)}$  is defined as

$$U(n) := \sum_{\ell=1}^n \log \frac{\mu_\ell}{\lambda_\ell} = \log r_n, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots, N, \quad (3.2)$$

see Figure 1 for an illustration. The function  $R = R^{(N)}$  defined as

$$R_k := \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} r_i = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} e^{U(i)}, \quad 0 \leq k \leq N, \quad (3.3)$$

is harmonic for the time-discrete birth-and-death chain associated with  $Y_0$ , cf. [IGSW24, Sec. 4.5].

**Proposition 3.1.** *With  $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}_N$ ,  $\sigma = \sigma_N$  and  $u_N$  defined in (2.7), (2.17) and (2.11) we have the following asymptotics as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ :*

$$U^{(N)}(\mathfrak{a} + K\sigma) - U^{(N)}(\mathfrak{a}) = K^2(1 + O(m_N + K/\sqrt{u_N})), \quad K \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (3.4)$$

To prove (3.4) we use a rescaling of  $U^{(N)}$  that takes  $\mathfrak{a}_N$  and  $2u_N$  as units of population size and potential depth, respectively. In [IGSW24] it is proved that the potential function can be represented as

$$U^{(N)}(n) = -2\mathfrak{u}_N H \left( (m_N, \rho_N), \frac{n}{\mathfrak{a}_N} \right), \quad (3.5)$$




FIGURE 1. A plot of the potential function  $U(n) = \sum_{\ell=1}^n \log \frac{\mu_\ell}{\lambda_\ell}$ ,  $n \in [N]$ , for  $N = 10^5$ ,  $m = N^{-0.6}$ ,  $\rho = 1 - N^{-0.1} = 0.68$ . The left panel shows the full domain and range of  $U$ , the right panel restricts to  $n \leq 6.5 \cdot 10^4$ . The quantities  $\mathfrak{a}$ ,  $\mathfrak{c}$  and  $\sigma$  are defined and explained in (2.7), (2.9) and (2.17).

with  $H((m, \rho), y)$  defined for  $y \in \left[0, \frac{1}{1-\rho}\right]$  as

$$H((m, \rho), y) := -\frac{y}{2m} \left[ \frac{1}{1-\rho} \log \left( \frac{1+2m}{1+2m/\rho} \right) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{(1+2m)^\ell} \right) \frac{(1-\rho)^{\ell-1} y^\ell}{\ell(\ell+1)} \right] > -\infty. \quad (3.6)$$

Several properties of the function  $y \mapsto H(y) := H((m, \rho), y)$  can be derived from [IGSW24] and will be key in showing (3.4) as well as in forthcoming proofs. We collect them in the next lemma:

**Lemma 3.2.** *a) For  $(m, \rho) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times (0, 1)$ ,*

- *H is strictly concave function with  $H'(1) = 0$  and its maximal value given by  $H((m, \rho), 1) = \eta(m, \rho)$  stated in (2.14).*
- *If  $\rho \leq 2/3$ , H is nonnegative on  $[0, 1/(1-\rho)]$ , and if  $\rho > 2/3$ , H is nonnegative on  $[0, y_0]$  and negative on  $(y_0, 1/(1-\rho)]$ , with  $y_0 = y_0(m, \rho)$  satisfying*

$$y_0 \sim \frac{2}{\rho} \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow 0.$$

- *The first derivative of H is*

$$H'(y) = -\frac{\rho}{2m(1-\rho)} \log \left( 1 + \frac{2m}{\rho} \frac{(1-\rho)(y-1)}{(1+2m/\rho)(1-(1-\rho)y)} \right). \quad (3.7)$$

*b) As  $m \rightarrow 0$  the function H satisfies the following asymptotics:*

$$\eta(m, \rho) = H(1) \sim \frac{1}{(1-\rho)^2} \left( \frac{1}{\rho} - 1 + \log \rho \right) > \frac{1}{2\rho}, \quad (3.8)$$

$$H'(y) \sim \frac{1-y}{\rho(1-(1-\rho)y)} \quad \text{for all } y \in [0, 1/(1-\rho)), \quad (3.9)$$

$$H''(1) \sim -1/\rho^2, \quad H'''(1) \sim -2(1-\rho)/\rho^3, \quad H''' \text{ is bounded close to 1}, \quad (3.10)$$

$$H(y) - H(1) + \frac{(1-y)^2}{2\rho^2} = O \left( (1-y)^2 m + (1-y)^3 \right) \quad \text{as } y \rightarrow 1. \quad (3.11)$$

*Proof.* Only (3.10) and (3.11) have to be proven, for the other statements see [IGSW24, p. 135]. From

$$H''(y) = \frac{1}{2m} \left[ \frac{1}{1+2m-(1-\rho)y} - \frac{1}{1-(1-\rho)y} \right]$$

(see [IGSW24, Sec. 4.7]), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} H'''(y) &= \frac{1-\rho}{2m} \left[ \frac{1}{(1+2m-(1-\rho)y)^2} - \frac{1}{(1-(1-\rho)y)^2} \right] \\ &= -\frac{2(1-\rho)(1+m-(1-\rho)y)}{(1+2m-(1-\rho)y)^2(1-(1-\rho)y)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Hence

$$H'''(1) \sim -\frac{2(1-\rho)}{\rho^3} \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{0 \leq y \leq 1} |H'''(y)| \leq \frac{2(1-\rho)(1+m)}{\rho^4}. \quad (3.13)$$

Now, from Taylor-Lagrange formula, we know that for  $y \in (0, 1)$ , there exists  $z \in (y, 1)$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} H(y) &= H(1) + (y-1)H'(1) + \frac{(y-1)^2}{2}H''(1) + \frac{(y-1)^3}{6}H'''(z) \\ &= H(1) + \frac{(y-1)^2}{2} \frac{1}{2m} \left[ \frac{1}{\rho+2m} - \frac{1}{\rho} \right] + \frac{(y-1)^3}{6}H'''(z). \end{aligned}$$

According to the second part of (3.13),

$$\left| \frac{(y-1)^3}{6}H'''(z) \right| \leq \frac{2(1-\rho)(1+m)}{\rho^4} \frac{(1-y)^3}{6}.$$

From the expression of  $H''$  we also get

$$\left| H''(1) + \frac{1}{\rho^2} \right| = \frac{2m}{\rho^2(\rho+2m)} \leq \frac{2m}{\rho^3}.$$

This ends the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 3.1.* As  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , Equations (2.17), (3.5) and (3.11) imply the asymptotics

$$\begin{aligned} U(\mathfrak{a} + K\sigma) - U(\mathfrak{a}) &= U(\mathfrak{a}(1 + K\sigma/\mathfrak{a})) - U(\mathfrak{a}) \\ &= U(\mathfrak{a}(1 + K\rho/\sqrt{\mathfrak{u}_N})) - U(\mathfrak{a}) \\ &= -2\mathfrak{u}_N(H(1 + K\rho/\sqrt{\mathfrak{u}_N}) - H(1)) \\ &= 2\mathfrak{u}_N(K\rho/\sqrt{\mathfrak{u}_N})^2/(2\rho^2) + u_N O\left(\frac{K^2}{u_N}m_N + \frac{K^3}{u_N^{3/2}}\right) \\ &= K^2(1 + O(m_N + K/\sqrt{u_N})). \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let us denote by  $T_\ell$  the first time at which  $Y_0 = Y_0^{(N)}$  reaches the state  $\ell$ .*

(A) *Let  $\mathfrak{d}_N \leq \mathfrak{a}_N$  such that  $\mathfrak{d}_N = o(\sigma_N)$ . Then*

$$\mathbf{P}_{[\mathfrak{a}_N - \mathfrak{d}_N]}(T_0 < T_{\mathfrak{a}_N}) \sim \frac{2}{\mathfrak{c}_N} \mathfrak{d}_N e^{-2\mathfrak{u}_N H(1)} \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

(B) *Let  $1 \ll \mathfrak{d}_N < \mathfrak{a}_N$ ,  $\mathfrak{f}_N > 2$ . Then for  $N$  large enough,*

$$\mathbf{P}_{[\mathfrak{a}_N - \mathfrak{d}_N]}(T_{\mathfrak{a}_N - \mathfrak{f}_N \mathfrak{d}_N} < T_{\mathfrak{a}_N}) \leq e^{-(\mathfrak{f}_N - 2)\mathfrak{d}_N^2 \mathfrak{u}_N / \mathfrak{a}_N^2}.$$

*Proof.* We begin with the proof of (A). As already observed the function  $R = R^{(N)}$  defined in (3.3) is harmonic for the time-discrete birth-and-death chain associated with  $Y_0$ , hence

$$\mathbf{P}_{\lfloor \mathfrak{a}-\mathfrak{d} \rfloor}(T_0 < T_{\mathfrak{a}}) = \frac{R_{\mathfrak{a}} - R_{\mathfrak{a}-\mathfrak{d}}}{R_{\lfloor \mathfrak{a} \rfloor}}. \quad (3.14)$$

Because of (3.2), (3.5) and Lemma 3.2, and as  $\mathfrak{d}_N = o(N/m)$  we have for every  $\mathfrak{a}_N - \mathfrak{d}_N \leq n \leq \mathfrak{a}_N$ ,

$$r_n \sim e^{-2\mathfrak{u}_N H(1)}.$$

According to [IGSW24, Lemma 4.6],

$$R_{\lfloor \mathfrak{a}_N \rfloor} \sim \frac{\rho_N}{2m_N(1 - \rho_N)} = \frac{\mathfrak{c}_N}{2}.$$

This concludes the proof of (A).

Now let  $1 \ll \mathfrak{d}_N < \mathfrak{a}_N$ ,  $\mathfrak{f}_N > 2$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_{\lfloor \mathfrak{a}-\mathfrak{d} \rfloor}(T_{\mathfrak{a}-\mathfrak{d}} < T_{\mathfrak{a}}) &= \frac{R_{\mathfrak{a}} - R_{\mathfrak{a}-\mathfrak{d}}}{R_{\mathfrak{a}} - R_{\mathfrak{a}-\mathfrak{d}}} \\ &\sim \frac{\int_{1-\mathfrak{d}/\mathfrak{a}}^1 e^{-2\mathfrak{u}_N H(z)} dz}{\int_{1-\mathfrak{f}_N/\mathfrak{a}}^1 e^{-2\mathfrak{u}_N H(z)} dz} \\ &\leq \frac{\int_{1-\mathfrak{d}/\mathfrak{a}}^1 e^{-2\mathfrak{u}_N H(z)} dz}{\int_{1-\mathfrak{f}_N/\mathfrak{a}}^{1-(\mathfrak{f}-1)\mathfrak{d}/\mathfrak{a}} e^{-2\mathfrak{u}_N H(z)} dz} \\ &\leq e^{-2\mathfrak{u}_N (H(1-\mathfrak{d}/\mathfrak{a}) - H(1-(\mathfrak{f}-1)\mathfrak{d}/\mathfrak{a}))} \\ &\leq e^{-2(\mathfrak{f}-2)(\mathfrak{d}/\mathfrak{a})\mathfrak{u}_N H'(1-\mathfrak{d}/\mathfrak{a})}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $H$  is non-decreasing and concave on  $[0, 1]$ . From (3.7) we see that for any  $y \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} H'(y) &\geq \frac{\rho}{2m(1-\rho)} \frac{2m}{\rho} \frac{(1-\rho)(1-y)}{(1+2m/\rho)(1-(1-\rho)y)} \\ &= \frac{1-y}{(1+2m/\rho)(1-(1-\rho)y)} \geq \frac{1-y}{1+2m/\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

We deduce that for  $m$  small enough

$$\mathbf{P}_{\lfloor \mathfrak{a}-\mathfrak{d} \rfloor}(T_{\mathfrak{a}-\mathfrak{d}} < T_{\mathfrak{a}}) \leq e^{-2(\mathfrak{f}-2)\mathfrak{d}^2\mathfrak{u}_N/((1+2m/\rho)\mathfrak{a}^2)} \leq e^{-(\mathfrak{f}-2)\mathfrak{d}^2\mathfrak{u}_N/\mathfrak{a}^2},$$

which ends the proof of (B).  $\square$

*Remark 3.4.* In a similar way as in the proof of Lemma 3.3 one can show, using (3.3) and Lemma 3.2, that for all  $K > 0$

$$\mathbf{P}_{\lfloor \mathfrak{a}_N - K\sigma_N \rfloor}(T_0 < T_{\mathfrak{a}_N}) \sim \frac{1}{e_N} \cdot c_N \cdot 2\sqrt{\pi} \int_0^K e^{y^2} dy \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.15)$$

The l.h.s. of (3.15) is the inverse of the expected number of excursions of  $Y_0^{(N)}$  from  $\mathfrak{a}_N$  that reach  $\lfloor \mathfrak{a}_N - K\sigma_N \rfloor$ , and the last of the three factors on the r.h.s (3.15) is the expected time it takes the process  $\mathcal{H}$  defined in (2.19) to visit  $-K$  and then travel back to 0, cf. [GR05, Lemma 3]. In the light of the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck approximation that will be proved in Sec. 3.3, the asymptotics (3.15) not only provides a factorisation of  $e_N$  that is similarly intuitive as (2.20), but also opens a route for an application of [GR05, Theorem 1] in order to prove Theorem 2.4.d). As already mentioned in Remark 2.5, in the next subsections we take a different route that leads via quasi-equilibria.

### 3.2. Expected hitting times: Proof of Theorem 2.4.a).

**Lemma 3.5.** *Under assumptions (2.6) and (2.11), for  $N$  large enough,*

$$\mathbf{E}_N[T_{\mathfrak{a}}] \leq (1 \vee 4\rho)\rho \mathfrak{c}_N \log \mathfrak{a}. \quad (3.16)$$

*Proof.* We are interested in the expectation of the first hitting time of  $\mathfrak{a}$  when the initial state is  $N$ . According to Equation (4.5) in [IGSW24], if we denote by  $T_j = T_j^{(N)}$  the first hitting time of  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_N[T_{\mathfrak{a}}] &= \mathbf{E}_N[T_0] - \mathbf{E}_{\mathfrak{a}}[T_0] = \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \frac{R_{n \wedge N} - R_{n \wedge \mathfrak{a}}}{\lambda_n r_n} + \frac{R_N - R_{\mathfrak{a}}}{\mu_N r_{N-1}} \\ &= \sum_{n=\mathfrak{a}+1}^{N-1} \frac{R_n - R_{\mathfrak{a}}}{\lambda_n r_n} + \frac{R_N - R_{\mathfrak{a}}}{\mu_N r_{N-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

1) Let us first consider integers  $n$  such that  $n \leq C\mathfrak{a}$  with  $C > 2/\rho$ . Following the proof of Lemma 4.6 in [IGSW24], we obtain for such  $n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{R_n - R_{\mathfrak{a}}}{\lambda_n r_n} &\sim \frac{2}{n(1-n/N)} \int_{\mathfrak{a}}^n e^{-2u_N(H(y/\mathfrak{a})-H(n/\mathfrak{a}))} dy \\ &= \frac{2N(1-\rho)}{n(1-n/N)} \int_1^{n/\mathfrak{a}} e^{-2u_N(H(z)-H(n/\mathfrak{a}))} dz \\ &\leq \frac{2N(1-\rho)}{n(1-n/N)} \int_1^{n/\mathfrak{a}} e^{2u_N H'(z)(n/\mathfrak{a}-z)} dz \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that  $H$  is concave (see [IGSW24, p. 135] and Lemma 3.2). For  $1 < z \leq C$ , we obtain from (3.9) that

$$H'(z) \sim -\frac{z-1}{\rho(1-(1-\rho)z)} \leq -\frac{z-1}{\rho^2}.$$

We deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{R_n - R_{\mathfrak{a}}}{\lambda_n r_n} &\leq \frac{2N(1-\rho)}{n(1-n/N)} \int_1^{n/\mathfrak{a}} e^{2u_N(z-1)(n/\mathfrak{a}-z)/\rho^2} dz \\ &= \frac{2N(1-\rho)}{n(1-n/N)} e^{-2u_N((n/\mathfrak{a}-1)/2)^2/\rho^2} \int_{-(n/\mathfrak{a}-1)/2}^{(n/\mathfrak{a}-1)/2} e^{2u_N u^2/\rho^2} dz \\ &= \frac{2N(1-\rho)}{n(1-n/N)} e^{-2u_N((n/\mathfrak{a}-1)/2)^2/\rho^2} \frac{\rho}{\sqrt{2u_N}} 2 \int_0^{(\sqrt{2u_N}/\rho)(n/\mathfrak{a}-1)/2} e^{u^2} dz. \end{aligned}$$

Using that for any  $A > 0$ ,

$$\int_0^A e^{x^2} dx \leq 2 \int_{A/2}^A \leq \frac{2}{2(A/2)} \int_{A/2}^A 2x e^{x^2} dx \leq \frac{2}{A} e^{A^2},$$

and that  $1 - n/N \sim 1$ , we get

$$\frac{R_n - R_{\mathfrak{a}}}{\lambda_n r_n} \leq 4\rho^2 \mathfrak{c}_N \frac{\mathfrak{a}}{n(n-\mathfrak{a})}.$$

2) Let us now consider  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfying  $2\mathfrak{a}/\rho \leq n \leq N(1 - \sqrt{m})$ . Then according to Lemma 4.6 in [IGSW24],

$$R_n \sim \frac{\rho(1-n/N)\mathfrak{c}_N}{2(n/\mathfrak{a}-1)} e^{-2u_N H(n/\mathfrak{a})}.$$

This implies that

$$\frac{R_n - R_{\mathfrak{a}}}{\lambda_n r_n} \sim \frac{2}{n(1-n/N)} \frac{\rho(1-n/N)}{2(n/\mathfrak{a}-1)} \mathfrak{c}_N = \rho \mathfrak{c}_N \frac{\mathfrak{a}}{n(n-\mathfrak{a})}$$

3) Let us now consider  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfying  $N(1 - \sqrt{m}) \leq n \leq N - 1$ . Then according to (3.7) (or Equation (4.37) in [IGSW24]),

$$\begin{aligned} H'(n/\mathfrak{a}) &= -\frac{\mathfrak{c}_N}{2} \log \left( 1 + \frac{2m}{\rho} \frac{(1-\rho)(n/\mathfrak{a}-1)}{(1+2m/\rho)(1-n/N)} \right) \\ &\sim -\frac{\mathfrak{c}_N}{2} \log \left( 1 + \frac{2m}{1-n/N} \right) = -\frac{\mathfrak{c}_N}{2} \log \left( 1 + \frac{2mN}{N-n} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$|H'(n/\mathfrak{a})| \geq \frac{\mathfrak{c}_N}{2} \log \left( 1 + \frac{2mN}{N\sqrt{m}} \right) \sim \sqrt{m} \mathfrak{c}_N.$$

In particular,

$$\frac{R_n - R_{\mathfrak{a}}}{r_n} \leq N(1-\rho) \int_1^{n/\mathfrak{a}} e^{2u_N(n/\mathfrak{a}-z)/(\sqrt{m}(1-\rho))} dz \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{m}}$$

and

$$\frac{R_n - R_{\mathfrak{a}}}{\lambda_n r_n} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}(N-n)}.$$

4) Finally, for  $n = N$ , as the  $r_k$ 's are increasing with  $k \geq \mathfrak{a}$ ,

$$\frac{R_N - R_{\mathfrak{a}}}{\mu_N r_{N-1}} \leq \frac{(N-\mathfrak{a})r_{N-1}}{mNr_{N-1}} \leq \frac{1}{m}.$$

Combining points 1) to 4) we may now conclude the proof:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_N[T_{\mathfrak{a}}] &= \sum_{n=\mathfrak{a}+1}^{N-1} \frac{R_n - R_{\mathfrak{a}}}{\lambda_n r_n} + \frac{R_N - R_{\mathfrak{a}}}{\mu_N r_{N-1}} \\ &= \sum_{n=\mathfrak{a}+1}^{3\mathfrak{a}/\rho} \frac{R_n - R_{\mathfrak{a}}}{\lambda_n r_n} + \sum_{n=3\mathfrak{a}/\rho+1}^{N(1-\sqrt{m})} \frac{R_n - R_{\mathfrak{a}}}{\lambda_n r_n} + \sum_{n=N(1-\sqrt{m})+1}^{N-1} \frac{R_n - R_{\mathfrak{a}}}{\lambda_n r_n} + \frac{R_N - R_{\mathfrak{a}}}{\mu_N r_{N-1}} \\ &\leq \sum_{n=\mathfrak{a}+1}^{N(1-\sqrt{m})} \rho \mathfrak{c}_N (1 \vee 4\rho) \frac{\mathfrak{a}}{n(n-\mathfrak{a})} + \sum_{n=N(1-\sqrt{m})+1}^{N-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}N} + \frac{1}{m} \\ &\leq \rho \mathfrak{c}_N (1 \vee 4\rho) \sum_{n=\mathfrak{a}+1}^{N(1-\sqrt{m})} \left( \frac{1}{n-\mathfrak{a}} - \frac{1}{n} \right) + 1 + \frac{1}{m} \sim (1 \vee 4\rho) \rho \mathfrak{c}_N \log \mathfrak{a}. \end{aligned}$$

This ends the proof.  $\square$

We will now consider a modification  $Y_*^{(N)}$  of  $Y_0^{(N)}$  which has the same dynamics as  $Y_0^{(N)}$  except in state 0, where, instead of being absorbed, it is “softly reflected”. The equilibrium distribution of  $Y_*^{(N)}$  will then serve as a proxy for the quasi-equilibrium distribution of  $Y_0^{(N)}$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Definition 3.6.** Let  $Y_* = Y_*^{(N)}$  be the  $\{0, 1, \dots, N\}$ -valued Markov chain whose jump rates  $\lambda_n^*$  and  $\mu_n^*$  are the same as the jump rates  $\lambda_n$  and  $\mu_n$  of  $Y_0^{(N)}$  except in the state 0, where we put  $\lambda_0^* = 1$  and  $\mu_0^* = 0$ . We write  $\pi_*^{(N)}(n)$  for the weight of the equilibrium distribution of  $Y_*^{(N)}$  in  $n$ .

**Lemma 3.7.** *With  $T_{\mathfrak{a}}^*$  defined as the first time when  $Y_*^{(N)}$  visits  $\lfloor \mathfrak{a}_N \rfloor$ , under assumptions (2.6) and (2.11) one has*

$$\mathbf{E}_0[T_{\mathfrak{a}}^*] := \mathbf{E}[T_{\mathfrak{a}}^* \mid Y_*^{(N)}(0) = 0] = O(\mathfrak{c} \log \mathfrak{a}). \quad (3.17)$$

*Proof.* Proceeding similarly as in [IGSW24, Section 4] we obtain (omitting the floor brackets around  $\mathfrak{a}$ ) with  $r_k$  as in (3.1)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_0[T_{\mathfrak{a}}^*] - \sum_{k=0}^{\mathfrak{a}-1} r_k &= \sum_{n=1}^{\mathfrak{a}-1} \frac{1}{\lambda_n} \sum_{k=n}^{\mathfrak{a}-1} \frac{r_k}{r_n} \\ &= \frac{2}{1/2 + m/\rho} \sum_{n=1}^{\mathfrak{a}-1} \frac{1}{n(1 - (1 - \rho)(n/\mathfrak{a}))} \sum_{k=n}^{\mathfrak{a}-1} e^{-2u_N(H(k/\mathfrak{a}) - H(n/\mathfrak{a}))} \\ &\sim 4 \sum_{n=1}^{\mathfrak{a}-1} \frac{1}{n(1 - (1 - \rho)(n/\mathfrak{a}))} \int_n^{\mathfrak{a}-1} e^{-2u_N(H(y/\mathfrak{a}) - H(n/\mathfrak{a}))} dy. \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

We will decompose the last sum in (3.18) into two parts. First notice that if  $\mathfrak{a} - \sigma \leq n \leq y \leq \mathfrak{a}$ ,

$$\frac{1}{n(1 - (1 - \rho)(n/\mathfrak{a}))} \sim \frac{1}{\rho \mathfrak{a}}.$$

Hence, as  $H$  is non-decreasing from 0 to 1,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{n=\mathfrak{a}-\sigma}^{\mathfrak{a}-1} \frac{1}{n(1 - (1 - \rho)(n/\mathfrak{a}))} \int_n^{\mathfrak{a}-1} e^{-2u_N(H(y/\mathfrak{a}) - H(n/\mathfrak{a}))} dy \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\rho \mathfrak{a}} \sum_{n=\mathfrak{a}-\sigma}^{\mathfrak{a}-1} (\mathfrak{a} - n) \\ &= \frac{1}{\rho \mathfrak{a}} \frac{\sigma(\sigma + 1)}{2} \\ &\sim \frac{1}{\rho \mathfrak{a}} \frac{\rho^2 N}{2m} = \frac{\rho \mathfrak{c}}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

Recall that  $H'' \leq 0$ . In particular, this implies that for any  $n \leq y \leq \mathfrak{a} - 1$ ,

$$H(y/\mathfrak{a}) \geq H(n/\mathfrak{a}) + \frac{y - n}{\mathfrak{a}} H'(y/\mathfrak{a}).$$

and according to (3.9)

$$2u_N(H(y/\mathfrak{a}) - H(n/\mathfrak{a})) \geq 2u_N \frac{y - n}{\mathfrak{a}} H'(y/\mathfrak{a}) \sim 2u_N \frac{y - n}{\mathfrak{a}} \frac{\mathfrak{a} - y}{\rho \mathfrak{a}}$$

We deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_n^{\mathfrak{a}} e^{-2u_N(H(y/\mathfrak{a}) - H(n/\mathfrak{a}))} dy &\leq \int_n^{\mathfrak{a}} e^{-\frac{2u_N}{\rho \mathfrak{a}^2}(y-n)(\mathfrak{a}-y)} dy \\ &= \int_{-(\mathfrak{a}-n)/2}^{(\mathfrak{a}-n)/2} e^{-\frac{2u_N}{\rho \mathfrak{a}^2}((\mathfrak{a}-n)^2/4 - z^2)} dz \\ &= \mathfrak{a} \sqrt{\frac{2\rho}{u_N}} e^{-\frac{2u_N}{\rho \mathfrak{a}^2}(\mathfrak{a}-n)^2/4} \int_0^{\sqrt{2u_N/\rho \mathfrak{a}^2}(\mathfrak{a}-n)/2} e^{-x^2} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Let us introduce the Dawson function, for  $x \geq 0$

$$F(x) := e^{-x^2} \int_0^x e^{t^2} dt.$$

Then it is known that  $F(x) \sim 1/2x$  for large  $x$  (see for instance [Wei, (1), (9)]). We have just proven that

$$\int_n^{\mathfrak{a}} e^{-2u_N(H(y/\mathfrak{a})-H(n/\mathfrak{a}))} dy \leq \mathfrak{a} \sqrt{\frac{2\rho}{u_N}} F\left(\frac{\mathfrak{a}-n}{\mathfrak{a}} \sqrt{\frac{u_N}{2\rho}}\right).$$

But  $\mathfrak{a}-n \geq \sigma$  implies

$$\frac{\mathfrak{a}-n}{\mathfrak{a}} \sqrt{\frac{u_N}{2\rho}} \geq \frac{\sigma}{\mathfrak{a}} \sqrt{\frac{u_N}{2\rho}} = \frac{\rho\sqrt{N}}{\sqrt{mN(1-\rho)}} \sqrt{\frac{mN(1-\rho)^2}{2\rho}} = \sqrt{\frac{\rho}{2}}.$$

As this last term is lower bounded by  $\sqrt{\rho^*}/2$  for  $N$  large enough, we deduce that there exists a positive constant  $C$  such that for  $N$  large enough and  $\mathfrak{a}-n \geq \sigma$ ,

$$F\left(\frac{\mathfrak{a}-n}{\mathfrak{a}} \sqrt{\frac{u_N}{2\rho}}\right) \leq \frac{C}{2} \frac{\mathfrak{a}}{(\mathfrak{a}-n)\sqrt{u_N}}$$

and thus

$$\int_n^{\mathfrak{a}} e^{-2u_N(H(y/\mathfrak{a})-H(n/\mathfrak{a}))} dy \leq C \frac{\mathfrak{a}^2}{(\mathfrak{a}-n)u_N}.$$

We thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=1}^{\mathfrak{a}-\sigma} \frac{1}{n(1-(1-\rho)(n/\mathfrak{a}))} \int_n^{\mathfrak{a}-1} e^{-2u_N(H(y/\mathfrak{a})-H(n/\mathfrak{a}))} dy \\ & \leq \frac{C\mathfrak{a}}{\rho u_N} \sum_{n=1}^{\mathfrak{a}-\sigma} \frac{\mathfrak{a}}{n(\mathfrak{a}-n)} \\ & = \frac{C\mathfrak{c}}{\rho^2} \sum_{n=1}^{\mathfrak{a}-\sigma} \left( \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{\mathfrak{a}-n} \right) \sim \frac{2C\mathfrak{c}}{\rho^2} \log \mathfrak{a}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (3.19), we see that the r.h.s. of (3.18) is  $O(\mathfrak{c} \log \mathfrak{a})$ . This readily implies the assertion of the lemma, since  $\sum_{k=0}^{\mathfrak{a}-1} r_k = O(\mathfrak{c})$  (see [IGSW24, Lemma 4.6]).  $\square$

Next we observe that

$$\mathbf{E}[T_{\mathfrak{a}} \mid Y_0^{(N)}(0) = 1 \text{ and } T_0 > T_{\mathfrak{a}}] \leq \mathbf{E}[T_{\mathfrak{a}}^* \mid Y_*^{(N)}(0) = 0]. \quad (3.20)$$

Indeed, decomposing  $(Y_*(t \wedge T_{\mathfrak{a}}^*))_{t \geq 0}$  into its excursions from 0 that remain below  $\lfloor \mathfrak{a} \rfloor$ , and the piece that goes from 0 to  $\lfloor \mathfrak{a} \rfloor$  without ever returning to 0, we see that the latter, when observed from the time at which it jumps from 0 to 1, has (up to a time shift) the same distribution as  $(Y(t \wedge T_{\mathfrak{a}}))_{t \geq 0}$  under  $\mathbf{P}_1(\cdot \mid T_{\mathfrak{a}} < T_0)$ . This proves the inequality (3.20). Combining (3.20) with Lemma 3.7 we see (always under assumptions (2.6) and (2.11)) that

$$\mathbf{E}[T_{\mathfrak{a}} \mid Y_0^{(N)}(0) = 1, T_0 > T_{\mathfrak{a}}] = O(\mathfrak{c} \log \mathfrak{a}). \quad (3.21)$$

To conclude the proof of Theorem 2.4.a), because of (3.16) and (3.21) it only remains to show

$$\mathbf{E}\left[T_0 \mid Y_0^{(N)}(0) = \lfloor \mathfrak{a} \rfloor - 1, T_0 < T_{\mathfrak{a}}\right] = O(\mathfrak{c} \log \mathfrak{a}). \quad (3.22)$$

This, however, is a direct consequence of (3.21) combined with the next lemma.

**Lemma 3.8.** *The number of steps of the last excursion of  $Y_0$  from  $\lfloor \mathfrak{a} \rfloor$  has (when decreased by 1) the same distribution as the number of steps it takes  $Y_0$  to reach  $\lfloor \mathfrak{a} \rfloor$  when started in 1 and being conditioned on the event  $\{T_{\mathfrak{a}} < T_0\}$ .*

*Proof.* We consider the discrete-time Markov chain  $V$  on  $\{0, 1, \dots, \lfloor a \rfloor, \lfloor a \rfloor + 1\}$  with transition probabilities

$$P(n, n+1) := \frac{\lambda_n}{\lambda_n + \mu_n} \quad \text{and} \quad P(n, n-1) := 1 - P(n, n+1) \quad \text{for } n = 1, \dots, \lfloor a \rfloor,$$

and

$$P(0, 1) = P(\lfloor a \rfloor + 1, \lfloor a \rfloor) := 1.$$

The chain  $V$  has a reversible equilibrium distribution which assigns non-zero weights to both 0 and  $\lfloor a \rfloor$ . Let  $V_0$  (resp.  $V_{\lfloor a \rfloor}$ ) be the Markov chain with transition probability  $P$  starting in 0 (resp. in  $\lfloor a \rfloor$ ). Say that an excursion of  $V_{\lfloor a \rfloor}$  from  $\lfloor a \rfloor$  is successful if it ever reaches 0, and that an excursion of  $V_0$  from 0 is successful if it ever reaches  $\lfloor a \rfloor$ . Let  $\tilde{T}_{\lfloor a \rfloor \rightarrow 0}$  be the random number of steps which the first successful excursion of  $V_{\lfloor a \rfloor}$  from  $\lfloor a \rfloor$  needs to reach 0, and let  $\tilde{T}_{0 \rightarrow \lfloor a \rfloor}$  be the number of steps which the first successful excursion of  $V_0$  needs to reach  $\lfloor a \rfloor$ . We conclude from [BBF09, Proposition 4] that  $\tilde{T}_{\lfloor a \rfloor \rightarrow 0}$  has the same distribution as  $\tilde{T}_{0 \rightarrow \lfloor a \rfloor}$ . The claim follows by noting that  $\tilde{T}_{\lfloor a \rfloor \rightarrow 0}$  has the same distribution as the number of steps of the last excursion of  $V_0$  from  $\lfloor a \rfloor$ , and that  $\tilde{T}_{0 \rightarrow \lfloor a \rfloor} - 1$  has the same distribution as the number of steps it takes  $V_0$  to reach  $\lfloor a \rfloor$  when started in 1 and being conditioned on the event  $\{T_{\lfloor a \rfloor} < T_0\}$ .  $\square$

**3.3. Ornstein-Uhlenbeck fluctuations: Proof of Theorem 2.4.b).** We will prove the “convergence of generators” of the processes  $\mathcal{H}_N$  (defined in (2.18)) to the generator of the Ornstein Uhlenbeck processes  $\mathcal{H}$ , and check a compact containment condition. A reference in which results contained in [EK09] are nicely refined in a framework suitable for our purpose is [BW25, Proposition 2.5]. In view of the definitions (2.7), (2.17) and (2.9), the process  $\mathcal{H}_N$  jumps from  $x$  to  $x + \frac{1}{\sigma_N} = x + \sqrt{\frac{s}{\rho N}}$  at rate

$$\beta_N(x) = \frac{\rho}{m(1-\rho)} \left( \sqrt{\frac{\rho N}{s}} x + N(1-\rho) \right) \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{m}{\rho} \right) \left( \rho - \frac{x\sqrt{\rho}}{\sqrt{sN}} \right)$$

and from  $x$  to  $x - \sqrt{\frac{s}{\rho N}}$  at rate

$$\delta_N(x) = \frac{\rho}{m(1-\rho)} \left( \sqrt{\frac{\rho N}{s}} x + N(1-\rho) \right) \left( \frac{1}{2} \left( \rho - \frac{x\sqrt{\rho}}{\sqrt{sN}} \right) + m \right).$$

In particular,

$$\beta_N(x) - \delta_N(x) = -\frac{1}{1-\rho} \left( \sqrt{\frac{\rho N}{s}} x + N(1-\rho) \right) \frac{x\sqrt{\rho}}{\sqrt{sN}} \quad (3.23)$$

and

$$\beta_N(x) + \delta_N(x) = \frac{\rho}{m(1-\rho)} \left( \sqrt{\frac{\rho N}{s}} x + N(1-\rho) \right) \left( \rho + 2m - \frac{x\sqrt{\rho}}{\sqrt{sN}} \left( 1 + \frac{m}{\rho} \right) \right). \quad (3.24)$$

Applied to a function  $f$  with three bounded continuous derivatives, the generator of  $\mathcal{H}_N$  thus takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} G_N f(x) &= \beta_N(x) \left( f\left(x + \sqrt{\frac{s}{\rho N}}\right) - f(x) \right) + \delta_N(x) \left( f\left(x - \sqrt{\frac{s}{\rho N}}\right) - f(x) \right) \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{s}{\rho N}} (\beta_N(x) - \delta_N(x)) f'(x) + \frac{s}{2N\rho} (\beta_N(x) + \delta_N(x)) f''(x) + O\left(\frac{s}{N}\right)^{3/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (3.23) one obtains

$$\sqrt{\frac{s}{\rho N}} (\beta_N(x) - \delta_N(x)) = -\left(1 + \frac{\rho}{\sqrt{u_N}} x\right) x,$$

and (3.24) yields

$$\frac{s}{2N\rho}(\beta_N(x) + \delta_N(x)) = \frac{1}{2\rho} \left( 1 + \frac{\rho}{\sqrt{u_N}} x \right) \left( \rho + 2m - \frac{x\rho}{\sqrt{mN}} \left( 1 + \frac{m}{\rho} \right) \right). \quad (3.25)$$

We conclude that

$$G_N f(x) = \left( 1 + \frac{\rho}{\sqrt{u_N}} x \right) \left[ -x f'(x) + \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{2m}{\rho} - \frac{x}{\sqrt{mN}} \left( 1 + \frac{m}{\rho} \right) \right) f''(x) \right] + O\left(\frac{m}{N}\right)^{3/2}.$$

In particular, the “generator convergence” condition 3 of [BW25, Proposition 2.5] is satisfied with

$$Gf(x) = -x f'(x) + \frac{f''(x)}{2},$$

which is the generator of the standard Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. Now we will prove that the *compact containment condition* (condition 4 in [BW25, Proposition 2.5]) is fulfilled as well. For this we have to show that for any given (arbitrarily large)  $T > 0$  and (arbitrarily small)  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $K > 0$  such that

$$\mathbf{P} \left( \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} | \mathcal{H}_N(t) | \geq K \right) < \varepsilon. \quad (3.26)$$

We first prove that there exists a natural number  $n$  (independent of  $N$ ) such that

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{H}_N \text{ travels between times } 0 \text{ and } T \text{ more than } n \text{ times from } 0 \text{ to } -1) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \quad (3.27)$$

To this end we denote by  $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_N$  the process that arises by reflecting  $\mathcal{H}_N$  from below in 0, and by  $\mathcal{H}_N^*$  a “driftless version” of  $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_N$ . More precisely, for  $x < 0$  the jump rates  $\widehat{\beta}_N(x)$  and  $\widehat{\delta}_N(x)$  of  $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_N$  are the same as those of  $\mathcal{H}_N$ , while  $\widehat{\beta}_N(0) = 0$  and  $\widehat{\delta}_N(0) = \beta_N(0) + \delta_N(0)$ . The jump rates  $\beta_N^*(x)$  and  $\delta_N^*(x)$  of  $\mathcal{H}_N^*$  are the same as those of  $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_N$  for  $x = 0$ , and are

$$\beta_N^*(x) = \delta_N^*(x) = (\widehat{\beta}_N(x) + \widehat{\delta}_N(x))/2$$

for  $x < 0$ . Let  $\zeta_N$  (resp.  $\widehat{\zeta}_N$  resp.  $\zeta_N^*$ ) be the first time at which  $\mathcal{H}_N$  (resp.  $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_N$  resp.  $\mathcal{H}_N^*$ ) hits  $-1$  when started in 0. By construction these three stopping times are stochastically ordered in the sense that for all  $t > 0$

$$\mathbf{P}(\zeta_N > t) \geq \mathbf{P}(\widehat{\zeta}_N > t) \geq \mathbf{P}(\zeta_N^* > t). \quad (3.28)$$

To bound this from below, let  $\tau_N^*$  be the time at which  $\mathcal{H}_N^*$  first hits  $\{0, -1\}$  when started in  $-1/2$ . We observe that

$$\mathbf{P}(\zeta_N^* \leq t) \leq \mathbf{P}(\tau_N^* \leq t) = \mathbf{P}_{-\frac{1}{2}} \left( \sup_{0 \leq u \leq t} |\mathcal{H}_N^*(u) - (-\frac{1}{2})| \geq \frac{1}{2} \right) \quad (3.29)$$

According to (3.24) we have for  $x < 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\beta_N^*(x) + \delta_N^*(x)}{\sigma_N^2} &= \frac{\beta_N(x) + \delta_N(x)}{\sigma_N^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{N\rho(1-\rho)} \left( \sqrt{\frac{\rho N}{s}} x + N(1-\rho) \right) \left( \rho + 2m - \frac{x\sqrt{\rho}}{\sqrt{sN}} \left( 1 + \frac{m}{\rho} \right) \right) \\ &= \left( 1 + x \frac{\rho}{\sqrt{u_N}} \right) \left( 1 + \frac{2m}{\rho} - \frac{x}{\sqrt{mN}} \left( 1 + \frac{m}{\rho} \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Hence for any  $x \in [-1, 0]$ ,

$$\frac{\beta_N^*(x) + \delta_N^*(x)}{\sigma_N^2} \leq 1 + \frac{2m}{\rho} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{mN}} \left( 1 + \frac{m}{\rho} \right) \rightarrow 1, \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus for  $N$  large enough,

$$(\beta_N^*(x) + \delta_N^*(x)) \frac{1}{\sigma_N^2} \leq 2.$$

Consequently, the quadratic variation of the martingale  $\mathcal{H}_N^*(t \wedge \tau_N^*)$ ,  $t \geq 0$  is bounded from above by  $2t$ . Thus, by Doob's  $L^2$  inequality the r.h.s. of (3.29) is bounded from above by  $2t$ . Combining this with (3.28) and (3.29) we obtain

$$\mathbf{P}(\zeta_N > 1/4) \geq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (3.30)$$

With  $\zeta_N^{(1)}, \zeta_N^{(2)}, \dots$  independent copies of  $\zeta_N$ , we conclude from (3.30) that there exists a natural number  $n$  (not depending on  $N$ ) for which

$$\mathbf{P}(\zeta_N^{(1)} + \dots + \zeta_N^{(n)} \leq T) < \varepsilon/2.$$

By construction of  $\zeta_N$ , (3.27) is satisfied for this  $n$ .

Applying Lemma 3.3(B) we get that for any  $K > 2$ ,

$$\mathbf{P}_{\lfloor \mathfrak{a} - \sigma \rfloor}(T_{\mathfrak{a} - K\sigma} < T_{\mathfrak{a}}) \leq e^{-(K-2)}.$$

While this estimate deals with the large excursions of  $\mathcal{H}_N$  *below* 0, an analogous estimate is obtained for the excursions of  $\mathcal{H}_N$  *above* 0 by noting that the reverting drift of  $Y_0$  above  $\mathfrak{a}$  is not smaller than that below  $\mathfrak{a}$ . In order to satisfy (3.26) it thus suffices to choose  $K = K(\varepsilon, T)$  such that  $ne^{-(K-2)} < \varepsilon/2$ .

**3.4. Asymptotic normality of the Boltzmann-Gibbs distribution.** Let  $Y_*^{(N)}$  and its equilibrium distribution  $\pi_*^{(N)}$  be as in Definition 3.6.

*Remark 3.9.* a) It is well known (and readily checked) that the detailed balance equations for  $\pi_*^{(N)}$ , expressed in terms of the potential function  $U = U^{(N)}$  (defined in (3.2)) turn into the Boltzmann-Gibbs relations

$$\frac{\pi_*^{(N)}(j)}{\pi_*^{(N)}(i)} = \frac{\lambda_i}{\lambda_j} e^{-(U(j) - U(i))}, \quad 0 \leq i < j \leq N. \quad (3.31)$$

b) Under assumption (2.6) we have

$$\lambda_n \sim \mu_n \sim \rho \mathfrak{a}/2 \quad \text{provided } |n - \mathfrak{a}| = o(\mathfrak{a}) \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.32)$$

This is immediate because then the second summands in (2.4) and (2.5) are asymptotically negligible compared to the first ones. The asymptotics (3.32) together with the time change  $t \mapsto t \mathfrak{c}_N$  appearing in (2.18) also explains the role of  $\sigma = \sigma_N = \sqrt{\rho \mathfrak{a} \mathfrak{c}}$  defined in (2.17).

c) For the  $\sigma$ -scale around  $\mathfrak{a}$ , an inspection of (2.4) gives for all  $K \in \mathbb{R}$  and sufficiently large  $N$  the identity

$$\frac{\lambda_{\lfloor \mathfrak{a} + \sigma K \rfloor}}{\lambda_{\lfloor \mathfrak{a} \rfloor}} = \left(1 + \frac{\rho K}{\sqrt{u_N}}\right) \left(1 - \frac{(1 - \rho)K}{\sqrt{u_N}}\right) \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.33)$$

**Proposition 3.10.** *Under assumptions (2.6) and (2.11) the sequence of equilibrium distributions  $\pi_*^{(N)}$  is asymptotically normal (with mean  $\mathfrak{a}_N$  and variance  $\sigma_N^2/2$ ) in the following sense:*

$$\pi_*^{(N)}(\lfloor \mathfrak{a}_N + K\sigma_N \rfloor) \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}\sigma_N} e^{-K^2} \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.34)$$

and

the image of  $\pi_*^{(N)}$  under the transformation  $n \mapsto \frac{n - \mathfrak{a}}{\sigma}$  converges weakly to  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1/2)$ . (3.35)

*Proof.* From (2.12) we know that

$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathfrak{a}}[T_0^*] := \mathbf{E} \left[ T_0^* \mid Y_0^{(N)}(0) = \lfloor \mathfrak{a} \rfloor \right] \sim e_N$$

Using Corollary 2.8 on p.34 of [AF02] we get (suppressing the floors around  $\mathfrak{a}$  in the rest of this proof)

$$\pi_*^{(N)}(\mathfrak{a}) = \frac{1}{\mathbf{E}_{\mathfrak{a}}[T_0^*] + \mathbf{E}_0[T_{\mathfrak{a}}^*]} \frac{1}{\lambda_{\mathfrak{a}} + \mu_{\mathfrak{a}}} \frac{1}{\mathbf{P}_{\mathfrak{a}-1}(T_0 < T_{\mathfrak{a}})/2} \sim \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{\pi}}, \quad (3.36)$$

where for the last asymptotics we used (2.12) together with Lemma 3.7, as well as (3.32) and Lemma 3.3 A).

For  $K > 0$  we obtain from (3.31), (3.33) and Proposition 3.1 that

$$\frac{\pi_*^{(N)}(\mathfrak{a} + K\sigma)}{\pi_*^{(N)}(\mathfrak{a})} = \frac{\lambda_{\mathfrak{a} + K\sigma}}{\lambda_{\mathfrak{a}}} e^{-(U(\mathfrak{a} + K\sigma) - U(\mathfrak{a}))} \rightarrow e^{-K^2}. \quad (3.37)$$

Combining this with (3.36) we obtain (3.34) for  $K > 0$ . The proof of (3.34) for  $K < 0$  is completely analogous. Since Proposition 3.1 together with (3.33) ensures that the convergence in (3.37) is uniform on compacts as a function of  $K$ , the limit assertion (3.35) then follows by standard arguments.  $\square$

**3.5. Asymptotic normality of the quasi-equilibria: Proof of Theorem 2.4.c).** We first derive a rough ‘‘large deviation’’ bound for the quasi-equilibrium distribution.

**Lemma 3.11.** *The quasi-equilibrium  $\alpha_N$  of  $Y_0^{(N)}$  obeys*

$$\alpha_N(\{\lfloor \mathfrak{a}/2 \rfloor, \lfloor \mathfrak{a}/2 \rfloor + 1, \dots, N\}) \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.38)$$

*Proof.* Preparing for an application of Lemma 3.7 later in the proof, we define

$$t_N := \mathfrak{c}_N(\log \mathfrak{a}_N)^2. \quad (3.39)$$

Because of (2.16), the l.h.s. of (3.38) equals

$$\mathbf{P}_{\alpha_N} \left( Y_0(t_N) \geq \frac{\mathfrak{a}}{2} \mid T_0 > t_N \right) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_N(j) \mathbf{P}_j(Y_0(t_N) \geq \frac{\mathfrak{a}}{2})}{\sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_N(j) \mathbf{P}_j(Y_0(t_N) > 0)} =: \beta_N \leq 1. \quad (3.40)$$

The proof will be accomplished if we can show that  $\beta_N \rightarrow 1$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Now assume that  $\liminf \beta_N < 1$ , i.e. there exists an  $\varepsilon > 0$  and a sequence  $(N_k)$  converging to  $\infty$  for which  $\beta_{N_k} \leq 1 - \varepsilon$ . This implies that for all  $k$  there exists some  $i_k \in [N_k]$  for which

$$\mathbf{P}_{i_k} \left( Y_0^{(N_k)}(t_{N_k}) \geq \mathfrak{a}_{N_k}/2 \right) \leq (1 - \varepsilon) \mathbf{P}_{i_k} \left( Y_0^{(N_k)}(t_{N_k}) > 0 \right).$$

To lead this to a contradiction we will prove that for any sequence  $(j_N)$

$$\frac{\mathbf{P}_{j_N}(Y_0(t_N) \geq \frac{\mathfrak{a}}{2})}{\mathbf{P}_{j_N}(Y_0(t_N) > 0)} = \mathbf{P}_{j_N} \left( Y_0(t_N) \geq \frac{\mathfrak{a}}{2} \mid T_0 > t_N \right) \rightarrow 1. \quad (3.41)$$

To show (3.41) we consider the two subsequences of  $(j_N)$  that are above (respectively below)  $\mathfrak{a}_N$ :

(i) For  $j_N \geq \mathfrak{a}_N$ , the numerator (and hence also the denominator) of the l.h.s. of (3.41) converges to 1. To see this, note that the event  $\{T_{\mathfrak{a}} > t_N\}$  implies the event  $\{Y_0(t_N) \geq \mathfrak{a}/2\}$ , while the event  $\{T_{\mathfrak{a}} \leq t_N\}$  allows a re-start at time  $T_{\mathfrak{a}}$ . We claim that then  $Y_0$  remains with high probability above  $\mathfrak{a}/2$  until time  $t_N$ . To see this, recall from (3.30) that

$$\mathbf{E}_{\lfloor \mathfrak{a} \rfloor}[T_{\lfloor \mathfrak{a} - \sigma \rfloor}] \geq \mathfrak{c}/8.$$

We know from from Lemma 3.3(B), that

$$\mathbf{P}_{\lfloor \mathfrak{a} - \sigma \rfloor}(T_{\mathfrak{a}/2} < T_{\mathfrak{a}}) \leq e^{-\rho^2(\sqrt{u_N}/(2\rho) - 2)}. \quad (3.42)$$

The estimate (3.42) implies that

$$\mathbf{P}_{\lfloor \mathfrak{a} \rfloor}(T_{\mathfrak{a}/2} < t_N) \leq \frac{8t_N}{\mathfrak{c}} e^{-\rho^2(\sqrt{u_N}/(2\rho)-2)} = 8(\log \mathfrak{a}_N)^2 e^{-\rho^2(\sqrt{u_N}/(2\rho)-2)} = o(1) \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

(ii) For  $j_N < \mathfrak{a}_N$ , the process  $Y_0$  started in  $j_N$  and conditioned not to hit 0 by time  $t_N$  is stochastically lower-bounded by the process  $Y_*$  (started in  $j_N$ ) that was introduced in Definition 3.6. As proved in Lemma 3.7, we have  $\mathbf{E}_0[T_{\mathfrak{a}}^*] \ll t_N$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . This shows that

$$\mathbf{P}_{j_N} \left( T_{\mathfrak{a}} \leq \frac{t_N}{2} \mid T_0 > t_N \right) \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus, by a re-start of  $Y_0$  in time  $T_{\mathfrak{a}}$ , part (i) is applicable to ensure the convergence (3.41).  $\square$

Recall from Definition 3.6 the definition of the recurrent process  $Y_*^{(N)}$  and its equilibrium distribution  $\pi_*^{(N)}$ . In the spirit of a Doeblin coupling (cf [AF02, Sec. 14.1.1]), we define the joint distribution of  $(Y_0^{(N)}, Y_*^{(N)})$  as follows. Starting in the product distribution  $\alpha_N \otimes \pi_*^{(N)}$ , the two processes evolve independently up to their first meeting time, which we denote by  $T_{\text{meet}} = T_{\text{meet}}^{(N)}$ . As before,  $T_0 = T_0^{(N)}$  denotes the time at which  $Y_0^{(N)}$  hits 0 for the first time. On the event  $\{T_{\text{meet}} \leq T_0\}$ , the process  $(Y_0^{(N)}(t))_{T_{\text{meet}} \leq t \leq T_0}$  is taken as an identical copy of  $(Y_*^{(N)}(t))_{T_{\text{meet}} \leq t \leq T_0}$ . After time  $T_0$ , the process  $Y_0^{(N)}$  remains in 0, while  $Y_*^{(N)}$  continues to follow the dynamics specified in Definition 3.6.

As in the proof of Lemma 3.11 we set  $t_N := \mathfrak{c}_N(\log \mathfrak{a}_N)^2$ .

**Lemma 3.12.** *With  $t_N$  as in (3.39), the just defined meeting and absorption times satisfy*

$$\mathbf{P}(T_{\text{meet}}^{(N)} < t_N < T_0^{(N)}) \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.43)$$

*Proof.* Because of (3.38) it suffices to show that for all sequences  $(j_N)$  with  $j_N \geq \frac{\mathfrak{a}_N}{2}$  we have

$$\mathbf{P}(T_{\text{meet}}^{(N)} < t_N < T_0^{(N)} \mid Y_0^{(N)}(0) = j_N) \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.44)$$

With  $T_{\mathfrak{a}} = T_{\mathfrak{a}}^{(N)}$  denoting the time at which  $Y_0^{(N)}$  hits  $\mathfrak{a}$  for the first time, we know (under the specified starting conditions) from (3.16) and (3.21) that

$$T_{\mathfrak{a}}/t_N \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.45)$$

With  $\mathcal{H}_N^*$  being defined in terms of  $Y_*^{(N)}$  in the same way as  $\mathcal{H}_N$  was obtained from  $Y_0^{(N)}$  in (2.18), we define for each  $N$  two sequences of stopping times  $(\rho_{N,i})_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  and  $(\rho_{N,i}^*)_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  inductively as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{N,0} &:= T_{\mathfrak{a}}^{(N)}/\mathfrak{c}_N, \quad \rho_{N,0}^* := \min\{t \geq \rho_{N,0} \mid \mathcal{H}_N^*(t) = 0\}, \\ \rho_{N,i} &:= \min\{t > \rho_{N,i-1} \mid \mathcal{H}_N(t) = 0 \text{ and } \mathcal{H}_N(u) \leq -1 \text{ for some } u \in (\rho_{N,i-1}, t)\}, \\ \rho_{N,i}^* &:= \min\{t > \rho_{N,i-1}^* \mid \mathcal{H}_N^*(t) = 0 \text{ and } \mathcal{H}_N^*(u) \leq -1 \text{ for some } u \in (\rho_{N,i-1}^*, t)\}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, we define two sequences of random times  $(\tau_{N,i})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $(\tau_{N,i}^*)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  as follows:

$$\tau_{N,i} := \max\{t < \rho_{N,i} \mid \mathcal{H}_N(t-) = 0\}, \quad \tau_{N,i}^* := \max\{t < \rho_{N,i}^* \mid \mathcal{H}_N^*(t-) = 0\}.$$

Finally, we define

$$J^N := \min\{j \geq 1 \mid \exists i \text{ such that } \tau_{N,j} \leq \tau_{N,i}^* \leq \rho_{N,j} \leq \rho_{N,i}^*\}$$

We claim that

$$T_{\text{meet}}^{(N)} \leq \rho_{N,J^N}. \quad (3.46)$$

Indeed, if  $i$  is a natural number that obeys  $\tau_{N,J^N} \leq \tau_{N,i}^* \leq \rho_{N,J^N} \leq \rho_{N,i}^*$ , then the excursion of  $\mathcal{H}_N$  that happens between times  $\tau_{N,J^N}$  and  $\rho_{N,J^N}$  necessarily meets the excursion of  $\mathcal{H}_N^*$  that happens between times  $\tau_{N,i}^*$  and  $\rho_{N,i}^*$ .

Because of (3.46) (and (2.12)), the assertion of the Lemma follows if we can show

$$\mathbf{P}(\rho_{N,J^N} \leq t_N) \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.47)$$

To this purpose we observe that, as a consequence of Theorem 2.4.b),

the sequence of processes  $(\mathcal{H}_N(\rho_{N,0} + t))_{t \geq 0}$  converges, as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , in distribution to  $\mathcal{H}$ . (3.48)

The same assertion is true for the processes  $(\mathcal{H}_N^*(\rho_{N,0}^* + t))_{t \geq 0}$ .

In analogy to  $\rho_{N,i}$  and  $\rho_{N,i}^*$  we define a sequence of  $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable stopping times  $(\rho_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  inductively as follows:

$$\rho_0 := 0, \quad \rho_i := \min\{t > \rho_{i-1} \mid \mathcal{H}(t) = 0 \text{ and } \mathcal{H}(u) \leq -1 \text{ for some } u \in (\rho_{i-1}, t)\}. \quad (3.49)$$

Also, in analogy to  $\tau_{N,i}$  and  $\tau_{N,i}^*$ , we define the sequence of random times  $(\tau_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  as follows:

$$\tau_i := \max\{t < \rho_i \mid \mathcal{H}(t) = 0\}.$$

As a consequence of (3.48) we obtain that the sequence of random sequences

$$\mathcal{P}_N := (\tau_{1,N}, \rho_{1,N}, \tau_{2,N}, \rho_{2,N}, \tau_{3,N}, \rho_{3,N} \dots)$$

converges, after a backshift by  $\rho_{0,N}$ , as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  in distribution to the random sequence

$$\mathcal{P} := (\tau_1, \rho_1, \tau_2, \rho_2, \tau_3, \rho_3, \dots).$$

Likewise, we obtain that the sequence of random sequences

$$\mathcal{P}_N^* := (\tau_{1,N}^*, \rho_{1,N}^*, \tau_{2,N}^*, \rho_{2,N}^*, \tau_{3,N}^*, \rho_{3,N}^* \dots)$$

converges, now after a backshift by  $\rho_{0,N}^*$ , as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  in distribution to  $\mathcal{P}$ . Because of the independence of  $\mathcal{H}_N$  and  $\mathcal{H}_N^*$  up to their meeting time, we can consider a random sequence

$$\mathcal{P}^* = (\tau_1^*, \rho_1^*, \tau_2^*, \rho_2^*, \tau_3^*, \rho_3^*, \dots)$$

which arises from an i.i.d. copy of  $\mathcal{P}$  after a random shift that is independent of  $\mathcal{P}$ . The random variable

$$J := \min\{j \geq 1 \mid \exists i \text{ such that } \tau_j \leq \tau_i^* \leq \rho_j \leq \rho_i^*\}$$

thus figures as an asymptotic stochastic upper bound for the sequence  $(J^N)$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . (Note that on certain events  $J^N$  may remain strictly smaller than  $J$ , e.g. when the first meeting of  $\mathcal{H}_N$  and  $\mathcal{H}_N^*$  happens in excursions *above*  $\alpha$ .) It follows from basic properties of  $\mathcal{H}$  that the distribution of  $J$  has geometric tails. We thus obtain (3.47), because for each fixed  $N$  the increments  $\rho_{N,i} - \rho_{N,i-1}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots$  are (as long as  $\rho_{N,i} < T_0^{(N)}$ ) i.i.d. copies of  $\rho_{N,1} - \rho_{N,0}$ , which converges as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  in distribution to  $\rho_1$  defined in (3.49).  $\square$

*Remark 3.13.* The choice of  $(t_N)$  in (3.39) admits modifications. For specific choices of starting values  $j_N$  (like e.g.  $j_N = \frac{\lfloor \alpha_N \rfloor}{2}$ ) one might ask for sequences  $(t_N)$  that satisfy (3.44) and are “asymptotically as small as possible”. This points into the direction of questions studied e.g. in [BLB25], for which the sequences  $Y_0^{(N)}$  and  $Y_*^{(N)}$  might provide an interesting case.

*Completion of the proof of Theorem 2.4.c).* In the above-defined coupling we have as a consequence of (3.43) that

$$\mathbf{P}(Y_0^{(N)}(t_N) \neq Y_*^{(N)}(t_N)) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

This implies that the variation distance between  $\pi_*^{(N)}$  and the distribution of  $Y_0^{(N)}(t_N)$  tends to 0, provided  $Y_0^{(N)}$  is started in  $\alpha_N$ . Because of (2.16), and since  $\mathbf{P}(T_0 > t_N) \rightarrow 1$ , also the variation distance between  $\alpha_N$  and  $\mathbf{P}_{\alpha_N}(Y_0^{(N)}(t_N) \in (\cdot))$  tends to 0 as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Consequently, we have  $d_{\text{TV}}(\alpha_N, \pi_*^{(N)}) \rightarrow 0$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Combined with Proposition 3.10 b) this completes the proof of Theorem 2.4.c).  $\square$

**3.6. Asymptotic exponentiality of the extinction time: Proof of Theorem 2.4.d).** First we we will show

**Proposition 3.14.** *Let  $T_{(\alpha_N,0)}$  be the extinction time of  $Y_0^{(N)}$  when started in its quasi-equilibrium distribution  $\alpha_N$  (cf. eq. (2.16)). Then the sequence  $T_{(\alpha_N,0)}/e_N$  converges as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  in distribution to a standard exponential random variable.*

*Proof.* It is well known (see e.g. [MV12, Proposition 2]) that  $T_{(\alpha_N,0)}$  has an exponential distribution. All what remains to show is thus that

$$\mathbf{E}[T_{(\alpha_N,0)}] \sim e_N \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.50)$$

Part c) of Theorem 2.4 implies that

$$\alpha_N(\{1, 2, \dots, \lfloor \alpha/2 \rfloor\}) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

On the other hand we know from (2.12) that  $\mathbf{E}_{j_N}[T_0] \sim e_N$  for all sequences  $j_N$  with  $\alpha/2 < j_N \leq N$ . Since for any fixed  $N$  the mapping  $n \rightarrow \mathbf{E}_n[T_0]$  is increasing in  $n$ , this implies (3.50).  $\square$

For  $j_N \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  we denote by  $T_{(j_N,0)}$  the extinction time of  $Y^{(N)}$  when started in  $j_N$ . Let  $j_N \gg \alpha_N$  and  $T_{(\alpha_N,0)}$  be as in Proposition 3.14. The random times  $T_{(\alpha_N,0)}$  and  $T_{(j_N,0)}$  are stochastically dominated by  $T_{(N,0)}$ , i.e. there exist couplings

$$T_{(N,0)} = S_{(N,\alpha_N)} + T_{(\alpha_N,0)}, \quad T_{(N,0)} = S_{(N,j_N)} + T_{(j_N,0)} \quad (3.51)$$

with  $S_{(N,\alpha_N)}$  and  $S_{(N,j_N)}$  nonnegative.<sup>2</sup> From (2.12) and Lemma 3.11 we know that

$$\mathbf{E}[T_{(N,0)}] \sim \mathbf{E}[T_{(j_N,0)}] \sim e_N \sim \mathbf{E}[T_{(\alpha_N,0)}].$$

Thus, because of (3.51),

$$0 \leq \mathbf{E} \left[ \frac{S_{(N,\alpha_N)}}{e_N} \right] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty$$

which by Markov's inequality implies that the sequence  $(S_{(N,\alpha_N)}/e_N)$  converges to 0 in probability. A similar argument, again based on (3.51), shows that also the sequence  $(S_{(N,j_N)}/e_N)$  converges to 0 in probability as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . We know from Proposition 3.14 that the sequence  $(T_{(\alpha_N,0)}/e_N)$  converges in distribution to a standard exponential random variable. Together with (3.51), with the above argument and Slutski's theorem, this shows that also the sequence  $(T_{(j_N,0)}/e_N)$  is asymptotically standard exponential. This completes the proof of part d) of Theorem 2.4.

**3.7. On the way to extinction: Proof of Theorem 2.4.e).**

**Lemma 3.15.** *For all  $\varepsilon < 1/3$ , and for a suitably chosen  $C > 0$ , with high probability the process  $Y_0$ , after having left  $\lfloor 3\varepsilon\alpha \rfloor$  forever*

- (i) *will not return to  $\lfloor 2\varepsilon\alpha \rfloor$  after having visited  $\lfloor \varepsilon\alpha \rfloor$ , and*
- (ii) *makes at least  $C\varepsilon\frac{N}{m}$  steps between states  $2\varepsilon\alpha$  and 0.*

*Proof.* (i) Let us denote by  $W$  the discrete-time chain of a process whose law is that of the fittest class size conditioned to reach 0 before returning to  $3\varepsilon\alpha$ . Let  $1 \leq k \leq 2\varepsilon\alpha$  and consider the law of the next increment conditionally on the process staying below  $3\varepsilon\alpha$ :

$$\mathbf{P}_k(W(1) = k+1 | T_0 < T_{3\varepsilon\alpha}) = \frac{\lambda_k}{\lambda_k + \mu_k} \frac{\mathbf{P}_{k+1}(T_0 < T_{3\varepsilon\alpha})}{\mathbf{P}_k(T_0 < T_{3\varepsilon\alpha})}. \quad (3.52)$$

Using the harmonicity of the function  $R$  defined in (3.3) we have

$$\frac{\mathbf{P}_{k+1}(T_0 < T_{3\varepsilon\alpha})}{\mathbf{P}_k(T_0 < T_{3\varepsilon\alpha})} = \frac{r_{k+1} + r_{k+2} + \dots + r_{3\varepsilon\alpha-1}}{r_k + r_{k+1} + \dots + r_{3\varepsilon\alpha-1}}. \quad (3.53)$$

<sup>2</sup>For a distinguished coupling in which  $S_{N,\alpha_N}$  is a “time to quasi-equilibrium” that is independent of  $T_{(\alpha_N,0)}$ , see Proposition 5 and the remark at the end of Section 3 of [DM09].

Noticing that, for  $\ell \leq \mathfrak{a}$ , the oddratios  $r_\ell$  are decreasing with  $\ell$ , we obtain that

$$\inf_{k \leq i \leq 3\varepsilon\mathfrak{a}-1} \frac{r_{i+1}}{r_i} - \frac{1}{3\varepsilon\mathfrak{a}-k-1} \leq \frac{r_{k+1} + r_{k+2} + \dots + r_{3\varepsilon\mathfrak{a}-1}}{r_k + r_{k+1} + \dots + r_{3\varepsilon\mathfrak{a}-1}} \leq \sup_{k \leq i \leq 3\varepsilon\mathfrak{a}-1} \frac{r_{i+1}}{r_i} \quad (3.54)$$

and we can sandwich the bounds in (3.54) by observing that for  $1 \leq i \leq 3\varepsilon\mathfrak{a}$

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \frac{2m}{\rho}(1-\rho) &\leq \frac{r_{i+1}}{r_i} = 1 + \frac{2m}{\rho} \left( \frac{\rho}{1-(i+1)/N} - 1 \right) \leq 1 - 2m \left( \frac{1}{\rho} - 2 \frac{i+1}{N} - 1 \right) \\ &\leq 1 - \frac{2m}{\rho}(1-\rho) + 13\varepsilon(1-\rho)m, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $1/(1-x) \leq 1 + 2x$  for  $x \leq 1/2$ . Besides, we have, using the same inequality, for  $k \leq 2\varepsilon\mathfrak{a}$

$$\frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{m}{\rho}(1-\rho) \right) - 3\varepsilon\rho(1-\rho)m \leq \frac{\lambda_k}{\lambda_k + \mu_k} = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{m}{\rho} \left( 1 - \frac{\rho}{1-k/N} \right) \right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{m}{\rho}(1-\rho) \right).$$

Combining the previous two chains of inequalities with (3.52), (3.53) and (3.54) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{m}{\rho}(1-\rho) - 6\varepsilon\rho(1-\rho)m \right) \left( 1 - \frac{2m}{\rho}(1-\rho) - \frac{1}{\varepsilon\mathfrak{a}-1} \right) \\ \leq \mathbf{P}_k(W(1) = k+1 | T_0 < T_{3\varepsilon\mathfrak{a}}) \leq \\ \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{m}{\rho}(1-\rho) \right) \left( 1 - \frac{2m}{\rho}(1-\rho) + 13\varepsilon(1-\rho)m \right). \end{aligned}$$

As for large  $N$ ,

$$\left( \frac{m(1-\rho)}{\rho} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon\mathfrak{a}-1} = o(m(1-\rho)),$$

we deduce that for  $N$  large enough,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{m}{\rho}(1-\rho) - 7\varepsilon(1-\rho)m \right) &\leq \mathbf{P}_k(W(1) = k+1 | T_0 < T_{3\varepsilon\mathfrak{a}}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{m}{\rho}(1-\rho) + 14\varepsilon(1-\rho)m \right) \end{aligned}$$

In particular, focusing on the lower bound we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_{\varepsilon\mathfrak{a}}(T_{2\varepsilon\mathfrak{a}} < \infty | T_0 < T_{3\varepsilon\mathfrak{a}}) &\leq \left( \frac{1 - \frac{m}{\rho}(1-\rho)(1-7\varepsilon\rho)}{1 + \frac{m}{\rho}(1-\rho)(1-7\varepsilon\rho)} \right)^{\varepsilon\mathfrak{a}} \\ &= \left( 1 - 2 \frac{\frac{m}{\rho}(1-\rho)(1-7\varepsilon\rho)}{1 + \frac{m}{\rho}(1-\rho)(1-7\varepsilon\rho)} \right)^{\varepsilon\mathfrak{a}} \\ &\leq \left( 1 - \frac{m}{\rho}(1-\rho)(1-7\varepsilon\rho) \right)^{\varepsilon\mathfrak{a}} \\ &\leq \exp \left( - \frac{\varepsilon m N (1-\rho)^2 (1-7\varepsilon\rho)}{\rho} \right) \end{aligned}$$

which, again because of assumption (2.11), converges to 0 as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . This proves part (i) of the Lemma.

To show part (ii), note that, as a consequence of the previous computations, there exists a simple random walk  $W^{(-)}$  making up jumps with probability

$$\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\mu^{(-)}}{2} := \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{m}{\rho} (1 - \rho)(1 - 7\varepsilon\rho) \right) \quad (3.55)$$

such that with high probability, for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$W(n) \geq W^{(-)}(n).$$

Now, if we denote by  $T_i^X$  the hitting time of  $i$  by the random walk  $X$ , this coupling entails for any positive finite  $C$

$$\mathbf{P}_{\varepsilon(1-\rho)N} \left( T_0^W > C\varepsilon \frac{N}{m} \right) \geq \mathbf{P}_0 \left( T_{-\varepsilon(1-\rho)N}^{W^{(-)}} > C\varepsilon \frac{N}{m} \right).$$

We have the following equality of events:

$$\left\{ T_{-\varepsilon(1-\rho)N}^{W^{(-)}} < C\varepsilon \frac{N}{m} \right\} = \left\{ \inf_{0 \leq i \leq C\varepsilon \frac{N}{m}} W^{(-)}(i) < -\varepsilon(1 - \rho)N \right\}.$$

By assumption,

$$M(n) := W^{(-)}(n) + n\mu^{(-)}$$

is a simple symmetric random walk. We thus obtain for  $g \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathbf{P} \left( \inf_{0 \leq i \leq n} W^{(-)}(i) \leq -g - n\mu^{(-)} \right) = \mathbf{P} \left( \inf_{0 \leq i \leq n} M(i) \leq -g \right) \leq \exp \left( -\frac{g^2}{2n} \right), \quad (3.56)$$

where the last estimate follows from the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality. With the numbers of steps in (3.56) chosen as  $n := \frac{C\varepsilon N}{m}$  we obtain from (3.55) that

$$n\mu^{(-)} = \frac{C(1 - \rho)\varepsilon N}{\rho} (1 - 7\varepsilon\rho),$$

Since the starting point was  $\varepsilon(1 - \rho)N$ , the choice

$$g + n\mu^{(-)} = \varepsilon(1 - \rho)N \quad (3.57)$$

turns into

$$g = \varepsilon N(1 - \rho) \left( 1 - \frac{C}{\rho} (1 - 7\varepsilon\rho) \right). \quad (3.58)$$

Because of our assumption that  $\rho$  is bounded away from 0 we may choose

$$C = \frac{1}{2} \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \rho_N =: \frac{\rho_*}{2}.$$

Consequently,

$$\frac{g^2}{2n} = \varepsilon \left( 1 - \frac{C}{\rho} (1 - 5\varepsilon\rho) \right)^2 \frac{\mathbf{u}_N}{2C}$$

converges to  $\infty$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  under our standing assumption (2.11) and thus the right hand side of (3.56) converges to zero.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 2.4.d). We know from Lemma 3.15 that with high probability, after its last hitting of the state  $3\varepsilon\mathfrak{a}$  the process  $Y_0$  once it has reached  $\varepsilon\mathfrak{a}$

- Does not reach the state  $2\varepsilon\mathfrak{a}$  anymore
- Makes a number of jumps which is at least  $\varepsilon N \rho_*/(2m)$  and thus a number of downward jumps which is at least  $\varepsilon N \rho_*/(4m)$

Noticing that, when  $Y_0$  is in state  $k$ , an individual's "death" is due a mutation with probability

$$\frac{2m}{1 - k/N + 2m} \geq \frac{2m}{1 - \varepsilon},$$

we thus obtain that on  $Y_0$ 's way to extinction and while it is of size smaller than  $2\varepsilon a$ , the number of mutations affecting the "type 0" population is at least

$$\frac{\varepsilon N \rho_*}{4m} \cdot \frac{2m}{1 - \varepsilon} \gg \frac{1}{m(1 - \rho)}$$

where the last estimate follows because  $Nm(1 - \rho) \geq Nm(1 - \rho)^2 \gg 1$ , cf. our standing condition (2.11).  $\square$

#### 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.3

In this section we complete the proof of Theorem 2.3. The core idea is to proceed inductively and to show that with high probability the fittest class at the time of its disappearance has left a number  $\gg c$  of mutants, which helps establishing the "next fittest class".

**4.1. Lower-bounding the size of the new fittest class at a clicktime.** The following key proposition uses the hierarchical autonomy of the tournament ratchet stated in Remark 2.2; its proof builds on Theorem 2.4.e).

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $(Y_0^N, Y_1^N)$  be a bivariate birth-and-death process whose jump rates are the same as those of  $(\mathfrak{N}_\kappa^{(N)}, \mathfrak{N}_{\kappa+1}^{(N)})$  specified in Definition 2.1 on the event  $\{K_N^*(t) = \kappa\}$ . Assume there exists a sequence  $(j_N)$  with  $j_N \gg c_N$  such that*

$$\mathbf{P}(Y_0^{(N)}(0) \geq j_N) \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

*Then there exists a sequence  $(g_N)$  with  $g_N \gg c_N$  such that*

$$\mathbf{P}\left(Y_1^{(N)}(T_0) \geq g_N\right) \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad (4.1)$$

*where  $T_0 = T_0^{(N)}$  is the hitting time of 0 of the process  $Y_0^{(N)}$ .*

*Proof.* With regard to Remark 2.2 we consider a bivariate birth-and-death process  $(Y_0, Y_1)$  whose jump rates are the same as those of  $(\mathfrak{N}_\kappa, \mathfrak{N}_{\kappa+1})$  specified in Definition 2.1 on the event  $\{K^*(t) = \kappa\}$ . In particular, as long as  $(Y_0, Y_1)$  is in state  $(n_0, n_1)$  the upward jump rate of  $Y_1$  is

$$\mathfrak{b}(n_0, n_1) := mn_0 + n_1 \cdot \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{n_1}{N} \right) + \frac{m}{\rho} \left( 1 - \frac{n_0}{N} - \frac{n_1}{N} \right) \right]$$

and the downward jump rate is given by

$$\mathfrak{d}(n_0, n_1) := n_1 \cdot \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{n_1}{N} \right) + m + \frac{m}{\rho} \cdot \frac{n_0}{N} \right].$$

In accordance with Theorem 2.4.d) we denote by  $\mathfrak{P} = [L, T_0)$  the period between the time at which  $Y_0$  visits  $2\varepsilon a$  for the last time and the time of the extinction of  $Y_0$ . In the next arguments we will make use of the fact that this period cannot last too long; more specifically (see (3.22)),  $\mathbf{E}[T_0 - L] = O(c \log a)$ . We now claim:

(C) If during  $\mathfrak{P}$  the process  $Y_1$  ever reaches  $a/4$ , then with high probability it will not drop down below  $a/8 \gg c$  by the end of  $\mathfrak{P}$  (which corresponds to the time of the next click).

To prove claim (C) we introduce a birth-and-death process  $\tilde{Y}_1$  whose birth and death rates in state  $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$  are

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{b}(n_1) &:= n_1 \beta(n_1) = n_1 \cdot \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{n_1}{N} \right) + \frac{m}{\rho} \left( 1 - \frac{2\varepsilon\mathfrak{a}}{N} - \frac{n_1}{N} \right) \right], \\ \mathfrak{d}(n_1) &:= n_1 \delta(n_1) = n_1 \cdot \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{n_1}{N} \right) + m + \frac{m}{\rho} \cdot \frac{2\varepsilon\mathfrak{a}}{N} \right].\end{aligned}$$

Define  $T := \min(\mathfrak{P} \cap \{t \mid Y_1(t) \leq \lfloor \mathfrak{a} \rfloor / 4\})$ . Then on the event  $\{T < \infty\}$  the processes  $Y_1$  and  $\tilde{Y}_1$  can be coupled such that

$$Y_1(T) = \tilde{Y}_1(T) \text{ and } Y_1(t) \geq \tilde{Y}_1(t) \text{ a.s. for } t \in \mathfrak{P} \cap [T, \infty).$$

To ease notation, let us shift time and assume (again omitting the floor brackets for convenience) that

$$\tilde{Y}_1(0) = Y_1(0) = \frac{\mathfrak{a}}{4}.$$

Let us denote by  $W$  a discrete random walk making  $+1$  jumps with probability  $p$  and  $-1$  jumps with probability  $q = 1 - p$ . Then if we take  $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$  and denote by  $T_k^W$  the walk's  $W$  first hitting of  $K$ , we know that

$$\mathbf{P}(T_{-a}^W < T_b^W) = \frac{(p/q)^b - 1}{(p/q)^{a+b} - 1}.$$

Let  $\mathfrak{a}/6 \leq k \leq \mathfrak{a}/2$ . Then

$$\frac{\beta_k}{\beta_k + \delta_k} \geq \frac{\beta_{\mathfrak{a}/2}}{\beta_{\mathfrak{a}/2} + \delta_{\mathfrak{a}/2}} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{m}{2\rho} \left( \frac{(1 + \rho)/2 - 4\varepsilon(1 - \rho) - \rho}{1 + m/\rho + m} \right) \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{m}{8\rho}(1 - \rho)$$

for  $\varepsilon := 1/24$  and  $N$  large enough. In particular,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\beta_k}{\delta_k} &\geq 1 + \frac{m}{2\rho}(1 - \rho), \\ \frac{\beta_k}{\beta_k + \delta_k} - \frac{\delta_k}{\beta_k + \delta_k} &\geq \frac{m}{4\rho}(1 - \rho)\end{aligned}$$

and if we denote by  $\tilde{T}_k$  the hitting time of  $k$  by  $\tilde{Y}_1$  we obtain for  $N$  large enough

$$\mathbf{P}_0(\tilde{T}_{-\mathfrak{a}/12} < \tilde{T}_{\mathfrak{a}/4}) \leq \left( 1 + \frac{m}{2\rho}(1 - \rho) \right)^{-\mathfrak{a}/12} \leq e^{-(\mathfrak{a}/12)m(1 - \rho)/2\rho} = e^{-u_N/24\rho}.$$

Let us now consider the sequence  $(\mathcal{P}_i, i \in \mathbb{N})$  of successive parts of paths of the process  $\tilde{Y}_1$  with initial state  $\mathfrak{a}/4$  and which come back to  $\mathfrak{a}/4$  after having visited  $\mathfrak{a}/2$  and not  $\mathfrak{a}/6$ . According to the previous result, there are more than a geometric of parameter  $e^{-u_N/24\rho}$  of such paths before reaching  $\mathfrak{a}/6$ . Then each  $\mathcal{P}_i$  is made of at least  $\mathfrak{a}/12$  steps of independent exponential random variables of intensity at most  $2\mathfrak{a}$ . Let us denote by  $|\mathcal{P}_i|$  the duration of the path  $\mathcal{P}_i$ . We will prove that

$$\mathbf{P}(|\mathcal{P}_i| < 1/36) \leq e^{-\mathcal{Q}\mathfrak{a}}$$

where

$$\mathcal{Q} = 1/36 + \log 2 - \log 3 < 0.$$

For this, we denote by  $\mathcal{E}_i$  a sequence of independent exponential random variables with parameter  $2\mathfrak{a}$ . We get, using Markov inequality

$$\mathbf{P}\left(|\mathcal{P}_i| < \frac{1}{36}\right) \leq \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{a}/12} \mathcal{E}_i < \frac{1}{36}\right) = \mathbf{P}\left(e^{-\mathfrak{a} \sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{a}/12} \mathcal{E}_i} > e^{-\frac{\mathfrak{a}}{36}}\right)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq e^{\frac{a}{36}} \mathbf{E} \left[ e^{-a \sum_{i=1}^{a/12} \mathcal{E}_i} \right] \\ &\leq e^{\frac{a}{36}} \left( \frac{2}{3} \right)^{a/12} = e^{-\mathcal{Q}a}. \end{aligned}$$

We thus have the following properties:

- (1) The period  $\mathfrak{P}$  has an expected duration  $O(\mathfrak{c} \log a)$  (see (3.22)).
- (2) If during  $\mathfrak{P}$  the process  $Y_1$  ever reaches  $a/4$ , then with a probability larger than  $1 - e^{-u_N/30\rho}$  it will reach  $a/2$  and come back to  $a/4$  before reaching  $a/6$  and this excursion will take at least a time  $1/36$ .

Since

$$\mathfrak{c} \log a e^{-u_N/24\rho} \leq u_N e^{-u_N/24\rho} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty,$$

this concludes the proof of claim (C).

We now consider the events

$$G_1 := \{Y_1(L) > a/4\}, \quad G_2 := \{Y_1(L) \leq a/4\}, \quad F := \{Y_1(t) = a/4 \text{ for some } t \in \mathfrak{P}\}.$$

Because of Claim (C) we have  $Y_1(T_0) \gg \mathfrak{c}$  with high probability on the event  $F$ , and obviously we have  $Y_1(T_0) > a/4 \gg \mathfrak{c}$  on the event  $G_1 \cap F^c$ .

It remains to consider the event  $G_2 \cap F^c$ , on which  $Y_1$  does not exceed  $a/4$  during the period  $\mathfrak{P}$ .

We know from Theorem 2.4.e) that the number of mutants that “immigrate” into the second fittest class during period  $\mathfrak{P}$  is with high probability  $\gg \mathfrak{c}$ . The difference between the upward and the downward jump rates of the second fittest class is

$$\mathfrak{b}(n_0, n_1) - \mathfrak{d}(n_0, n_1) = mn_0 + \frac{mn_1}{\rho N} [N(1 - \rho) - 2n_0 - n_1]. \quad (4.2)$$

Thus for  $\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{8}$ , as long as the size of the fittest class is smaller than  $2\varepsilon a$  and the size of the second fittest class is  $\leq a/4$ , the supercriticality of the second fittest class is  $\geq \frac{1}{2}m(1 - \rho) = \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}$ . Hence on the event  $G_2 \cap F^c$  we can lower-bound  $Y_1$  by a branching process with supercriticality  $\geq \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}$  and a number of immigrants during period  $\mathfrak{P}$  that is  $\gg \mathfrak{c}$ . This process will reach a size  $\gg \mathfrak{c}$  with high probability, which allows to conclude the proof of the Proposition.  $\square$

**4.2. From one click to the next.** Let  $\mathcal{T}_N^{(i)}$ ,  $i \geq 1$ , be as in (2.2), with  $\mathcal{T}_N^{(0)} := 0$ .

(a) We show by induction: For all  $i \geq 0$  there exists a sequence  $(j_N)$  with  $j_N \gg \mathfrak{c}_N$  such that

$$\mathbf{P} \left( \mathfrak{N}_i^{(N)}(\mathcal{T}_N^{(i)}) \geq j_N \right) \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.3)$$

Indeed, for  $i = 0$  this follows from assumption (2.15), while the induction step is a direct corollary of Proposition 4.1 combined with Remark 2.2.

(b) By definition the times  $\mathcal{T}_N^{(i)}$  are the jump times of the process  $K_N^*$ . Since  $\mathfrak{N}_{i-1}^{(N)}(\mathcal{T}_N^{(i)}) = 0$  by construction, the events  $\{K_N^*(\mathcal{T}_N^{(i)}) = i\}$  and  $\{\mathfrak{N}_0^{(N)}(\mathcal{T}_N^{(i)}) = \mathfrak{N}_i^{(N)}(\mathcal{T}_N^{(i)}) \geq j_N\}$  are implied by the event appearing in (4.3). Again employing Remark 2.2, we can thus apply Theorem 2.4.d) combined with (4.3) to conclude by induction that  $(\mathcal{T}_N^{(i)} - T_N^{(i-1)})/e_N$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , converges in distribution as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  to a sequence of independent standard exponential random variables.

**Funding.** This work was partially funded by the Chair ”Modélisation Mathématique et Biodiversité” of VEOLIA-Ecole Polytechnique-MNHN-F.X. and by CNRS via an International Emerging Action (IEA) project.

## REFERENCES

[AF02] D. Aldous and J. A. Fill. Reversible markov chains and random walks on graphs, 2002. URL <https://www.stat.berkeley.edu/users/aldous/RWG/book.html>. Unfinished monograph, recompiled 2014.

[BBF09] J. Barrera, O. Bertoncini, and R. Fernández. Abrupt convergence and escape behavior for birth and death chains. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 137:595–623, 2009, doi:10.1007/s10955-009-9861-7.

[BBL25] A. Barbour, G. Brightwell, and M. Luczak. Convergence to equilibrium for density dependent markov jump processes, 2025, arXiv:2505.12926.

[BDH16] A. Bovier and F. Den Hollander. *Metastability: a potential-theoretic approach*, volume 351 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer, 2016. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-24777-9.

[BW18] E. Baake and A. Wakolbinger. Lines of descent under selection. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 172(1):156–174, 2018, doi:10.1007/s10955-017-1921-9.

[BW25] F. Boenkost and A.-L. Weinel. Ornstein-Uhlenbeck fluctuations for the line counting process of the ancestral selection graph, 2025, arXiv:2409.10360.

[CCM16] J. R. Chazottes, P. Collet, and S. Méléard. Sharp asymptotics for the quasi-stationary distribution of birth-and-death processes. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 164(1):285–332, 2016, doi:10.1007/s00440-014-0612-6.

[CCM23] J.-R. Chazottes, P. Collet, and S. Méléard. Large population limit of the spectrum of killed birth-and-death processes. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 285(9):110092, 2023, doi:10.1016/j.jfa.2023.110092.

[Cor17] F. Cordero. The deterministic limit of the Moran model: a uniform central limit theorem. *Markov Processes and Related Fields*, 23:313–324, 2017.

[DM09] P. Diaconis and L. Miclo. On times to quasi-stationarity for birth and death processes. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 22(3):558–586, 2009, doi:10.1007/s10959-009-0234-6.

[EK09] S. N. Ethier and T. G. Kurtz. *Markov processes: characterization and convergence*. John Wiley & Sons, 2009. doi:10.1002/9780470316658.

[EPW09] A. M. Etheridge, P. Pfaffelhuber, and A. Wakolbinger. *How often does the ratchet click? Facts, heuristics, asymptotics*, page 365–390. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, 2009. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139107020.016. arXiv:0709.2775.

[Fel74] J. Felsenstein. The evolutionary advantage of recombination. *Genetics*, 78(2):737–756, 10 1974, doi:10.1093/genetics/78.2.737.

[Fox21] E. Foxall. Extinction time of the logistic process. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 58(3):637–676, 2021, doi:10.1017/jpr.2020.112.

[GC00] I. Gordo and B. Charlesworth. The Degeneration of Asexual Haploid Populations and the Speed of Muller's Ratchet. *Genetics*, 154(3):1379–1387, 03 2000, doi:10.1093/genetics/154.3.1379.

[GR05] R. Grübel and M. Reich. Rarity and exponentiality: An extension of Keilson's theorem, with applications. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 42(2):393–406, 2005. URL 10.1239/jap/1118777178.

[GSW23] A. González Casanova, C. Smadi, and A. Wakolbinger. Quasi-equilibria and click times for a variant of Muller's ratchet. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 28:1–37, 2023, doi:10.1214/23-EJP1055.

[Hai78] J. Haigh. The accumulation of deleterious genes in a population—Muller's ratchet. *Theoretical Population Biology*, 14(2):251–267, 1978, doi:10.1016/0040-5809(78)90027-8.

[IGSW24] J. Igelbrink, A. González Casanova, C. Smadi, and A. Wakolbinger. Muller's ratchet in a near-critical regime: Tournament versus fitness proportional selection, 2024, arXiv:2306.00471v3. doi:10.1016/j.tpb.2024.06.001.

[Lam05] A. Lambert. The branching process with logistic growth. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 15(2):1506–1535, 2005, doi:10.1214/105051605000000098.

[MPV20] M. Mariani, E. Pardoux, and A. Velleret. Metastability between the clicks of the Muller ratchet, 2020, arXiv:2007.14715.

[Mul64] H. Muller. The relation of recombination to mutational advance. *Mutation Research/Fundamental and Molecular Mechanisms of Mutagenesis*, 1(1):2–9, 1964, doi:10.1016/0027-5107(64)90047-8.

[MV12] S. Méléard and D. Villemonais. Quasi-stationary distributions and population processes. *Probability Surveys*, 9:340–410, 2012, doi:10.1214/11-PS191.

[NS12] R. A. Neher and B. I. Shraiman. Fluctuations of fitness distributions and the rate of Muller's ratchet. *Genetics*, 191(4):1283–1293, 2012, doi:10.1534/genetics.112.141325.

[SaSha13] S. Sagitov and A. Shaimerdenova. Extinction times for a birth–death process with weak competition. *Lithuanian Mathematical Journal*, 53(2):220–234, 2013, doi:10.1007/s10986-013-9204-x.

[SCS93] W. Stephan, L. Chao, and J. G. Smale. The advance of Muller's ratchet in a haploid asexual population: approximate solutions based on diffusion theory. *Genetics Research*, 61(3):225–231, 1993, doi:10.1017/S0016672300031384.

[Wei] E. W. Weisstein. Dawson's integral. URL <https://mathworld.wolfram.com/DawsonIntegral.html>. Visited on February 21, 2024.

JAN LUKAS IGELBRINK

*Email address:* [igelbrin@math.uni-frankfurt.de](mailto:igelbrin@math.uni-frankfurt.de)

CHARLINE SMADI, UNIV. GRENOBLE ALPES, INRAE, LESSEM, 38000 GRENOBLE, FRANCE AND UNIV. GRENOBLE ALPES, CNRS, INSTITUT FOURIER, 38000 GRENOBLE, FRANCE

*Email address:* [charline.smadi@inrae.fr](mailto:charline.smadi@inrae.fr)

ANTON WAKOLBINGER, GOETHE-UNIVERSITÄT, INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK, 60629 FRANKFURT AM MAIN, GERMANY

*Email address:* [wakolbinger@math.uni-frankfurt.de](mailto:wakolbinger@math.uni-frankfurt.de)