

POISSON–DIRICHLET BRANCHING RANDOM WALKS

BY LOUGI ADDARIO-BERRY¹ AND KEVIN FORD²

McGill University and University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

We determine, to within $O(1)$, the expected minimal position at level n in certain branching random walks. The walks under consideration have displacement vector (v_1, v_2, \dots) , where each v_j is the sum of j independent Exponential(1) random variables and the different v_i need not be independent. In particular, our analysis applies to the Poisson–Dirichlet branching random walk and to the Poisson-weighted infinite tree. As a corollary, we also determine the expected height of a random recursive tree to within $O(1)$.

1. Introduction. A branching random walk starts from an initial particle, the *root*, with position 0. The root produces some number of children, who are randomly displaced from their parent according to some displacement law. Each child in turn produces some number of children, who are displaced from the position of their parent according to the same law; and so on. In general, the displacements of siblings relative to their parent may be dependent, but for distinct particles v and w , the displacements of the children of v and of the children of w must be independent. When the displacements are nonnegative, this is often called an age-dependent branching process, and the displacements are thought of as “times to birth.”

There is a natural tree associated with a branching random walk, where the vertices correspond to particles, and an edge from parent to child is weighted with the child’s displacement from its parent. More precisely, let T be the *Ulam–Harris* tree, which has vertex set $V = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{N}^n$ (we think of elements of \mathbb{N}^n as concatenations of n integers, and take $\mathbb{N}^0 = \{\emptyset\}$), is rooted at \emptyset , and has an edge from v to vi for each $v \in V$ and each $i \in \mathbb{N}$. We call \mathbb{N}^n the n th generation of T , and for $v = v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{N}^n$, we say that v has *parent* $p(v) = v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}$ and *children* $vi, i \in \mathbb{N}$. (We will usually write T_n in place of \mathbb{N}^n for readability.)

Now suppose $\mathbf{X} = (X_i : i \in \mathbb{N})$ is a random vector, where each $X_i \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$. We do *not* require that the entries of \mathbf{X} are independent of one another—this will

Received February 2011; revised August 2011.

¹Supported by an NSERC Discovery Grant.

²Supported by NSF Grant DMS-09-01339. The research was conducted in part while the K. Ford was visiting the Institute for Advanced Study, supported by grants from the Ellentuck Fund and The Friends of the Institute For Advanced Study.

MSC2010 subject classifications. 60J80.

Key words and phrases. Branching random walk, random recursive tree, Pratt tree, heights of trees.

be important below. Then we form a branching random walk by marking each vertex $v \in V$ with an independent copy $\mathbf{X}^v = (X_i^v : i \in \mathbb{N})$ of \mathbf{X} . Write \mathcal{T} for the pair $(T, \{\mathbf{X}^v : v \in V\})$; then \mathcal{T} is our branching random walk. We call \mathbf{X} the *displacement vector* of \mathcal{T} .³ For each $v \in V$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we regard X_i^v as the displacement from v to vi , and let $S(v) = S(v, \mathcal{T})$ be the sum of the displacements on the path from the root to v [formally, if $v = v_1, \dots, v_n$, then $S(v) = \sum_{i=1}^n X_{v_i}^{p(v_1, \dots, v_i)}$, and this sum is taken to be $+\infty$ if any of its elements are $+\infty$]. We say \mathcal{T} has *finite branching* if almost surely all but finitely many coordinates of \mathbf{X} are equal to $+\infty$.

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $M_n = \inf\{S(v) : v \in \mathbb{N}^n\}$. In all situations we consider in this paper, this infimum is attained, so M_n is the minimal displacement of any individual in the n th generation. The minimal displacement is one of the most well-studied parameters associated with branching random walks. It has been known since the 1970s [7, 17, 20] that under quite general conditions, M_n grows asymptotically linearly with lower-order corrections. Recently there have been substantial developments in understanding the finer behavior of M_n on two fronts: first, convergence results for the lower order corrections [1, 3, 19]; and second, the concentration of M_n about its mean (or median) [1, 10, 11]. We refer to these as the global behavior and the local behavior of M_n , respectively. Under suitable conditions, M_n generally seems to exhibit the following behavior: for some constants $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\beta > 0$, $\text{median}(M_n) = \alpha n + \beta \log n + O(1)$, and, furthermore, $M_n/n \rightarrow \alpha$ almost surely and $(M_n - \alpha n)/\log n \rightarrow \beta$ in probability (but *not* almost surely [19]). Also, under sufficiently strong moment conditions for the displacements, $\mathbb{E}\{\exp(\gamma|M_n - \mathbb{E}M_n|)\} < \infty$ for some $\gamma > 0$ and all n . (In fact, in some cases the upper tail of $M_n - \mathbb{E}M_n$ is even known to decay doubly-exponentially quickly [5, 15].)

To date, however, all the results of the kind described in the preceding paragraph that we are aware of require that the branching random walk has finite branching. In this paper we study the global behavior of M_n for a class of branching random walks which *do not* have finite branching. The class we consider is rather restricted but nonetheless contains at least two interesting special cases, one related to the factorization of random integers, and one related to the analysis of algorithms. Say that \mathbf{X} has *exponential steps* if for all i , X_i is distributed as the sum of i independent Exponential(1) random variables. The main result of this paper is the following theorem. For short, we denote

$$\tilde{M}_n = \text{median}(M_n) := \sup\{x : \mathbb{P}\{M_n < x\} < 1/2\}.$$

THEOREM 1.1. *If \mathbf{X} has exponential steps, then*

$$\tilde{M}_n = \frac{n}{e} + \frac{3}{2e} \log n + O(1).$$

³For the formal details of a probabilistic construction of branching random walks, see, for example, [18].

REMARK 1. The $O(1)$ term is uniform over n and over all BRW for which \mathbf{X} has exponential steps.

REMARK 2. Independently of the current work, Élie Aïdékon [2] has recently proved, for a quite general family of random walks (including those considered in this paper), that $M_n - \widetilde{M}_n$ converges in distribution to a random variable M^* , and describes the distribution of M^* in terms of a functional of the limit of the derivative martingale associated to the branching random walk.

Using methods from [15], we can deduce from Theorem 1.1 uniform exponential tails for M_n . In the next theorem and at other points throughout the paper, we will use the Vinogradov notation $f \ll g$ which means $f = O(g)$, with subscripts indicating dependence on any parameter, for example, $f \ll_k g$ means the constant implied by the \ll symbol may depend on k but not on any other variable.

THEOREM 1.2. *If \mathbf{X} has exponential steps, then for any $c_1 < e$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\{M_n \leq \widetilde{M}_n - x\} \ll_{c_1} e^{-c_1 x} \quad (n \geq 1, x \geq 0)$$

and for any $c_2 < 1$,

$$\mathbb{P}\{M_n \geq \widetilde{M}_n + x\} \ll_{c_2} e^{-c_2 x} \quad (n \geq 1, x \geq 0).$$

Again, the above estimates are uniform over all BRW under consideration. Also, Theorem 1.2 implies that $\widetilde{M}_n = \mathbb{E}M_n + O(1)$, and so both Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 hold with \widetilde{M}_n replaced by $\mathbb{E}M_n$.

The simplest example of a displacement vector with exponential steps is obtained by taking $\mathbf{X} = (E_1, E_1 + E_2, \dots)$, where $\{E_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ are i.i.d. Exponential(1) random variables. In this case \mathcal{T} is called the *Poisson-weighted infinite tree* [4] and has been used very effectively in probabilistic combinatorial optimization. It also arises in the analysis of an important tree-based data structure in the following way. Order the elements of \mathcal{T} in increasing order of displacement as $\{w_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, so, in particular, we have $w_1 = \emptyset$, $w_2 = 1 \in \mathbb{N}^1$, and either $w_3 = 2 \in \mathbb{N}^1$ or $w_3 = 11 \in \mathbb{N}^2$. Now for each m let Z_m be the subtree of \mathcal{T} induced by w_1, \dots, w_m . By the memoryless property of the exponential, it follows that the parent of w_{m+1} is a uniformly random element of Z_m —in other words, Z_m is a *random recursive tree* for all m . This connection is well known [22].

Z_m is also the subtree of \mathcal{T} induced by the set of nodes of displacement at most $S(w_m)$. [Also, it is straightforwardly shown by induction and the memoryless property of the exponential that the families $(Z_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(S(w_m))_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ are independent, but we will not need this.] Let H_m be the *height* of Z_m —the largest generation containing a node of Z_m . In other words, $H_m = \max\{n : M_n \leq S(w_m)\}$, which is the representation that will be useful below. Devroye [12] showed that $H_m / \log m \rightarrow e$ almost surely and in expectation, and Pittel [22] provided a different proof of the almost sure convergence. As a straightforward consequence of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, we obtain the following more precise information.

COROLLARY 1.3. *The height H_m of a random recursive tree on m nodes satisfies $\mathbb{E}H_m = e \log m - \frac{3}{2} \log \log m + O(1)$. Furthermore, for all $c' < \frac{1}{2e}$, all $m \geq 1$, $k \geq 1$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\{|H_m - \mathbb{E}H_m| \geq k\} \ll_{c'} e^{-c'k}.$$

Since the proof of this corollary is very short, we include it in the [Introduction](#). In the proof we write $\text{har}(s) = \sum_{i=1}^s 1/i$.

PROOF OF COROLLARY 1.3. The random variable $S(w_m)$ is distributed as the sum, $F_1 + \dots + F_{m-1}$, of independent random variables with F_i having Exponential(i) distribution for $i = 1, \dots, m - 1$. Equivalently, $S(w_m)$ is distributed as the maximum of $m - 1$ i.i.d. Exponential(1) random variables. Thus, $\mathbb{E}S(w_m) = \text{har}(m - 1)$ and for all $x > 0$,

$$(1.1) \quad \mathbb{P}\{S(w_m) \geq \text{har}(m - 1) + x\} \leq (m - 1)e^{-(\text{har}(m-1)+x)} \leq e^{-x},$$

$$(1.2) \quad \mathbb{P}\{S(w_m) \leq \text{har}(m - 1) - x\} = (1 - e^{-(\text{har}(m-1)-x)})^{m-1} \leq e^{-e^{-x-1}}.$$

Now write

$$d(m) = \max\{n : \widetilde{M}_n \leq \text{har}(m - 1)\} = e \log m - \frac{3}{2} \log \log m + O(1)$$

and note that $\widetilde{M}_{d(m)} = \text{har}(m - 1) + O(1)$ by [Theorem 1.1](#). It follows that for $k \geq 1$, if $H_m \geq d(m) + k$, then either

$$M_{d(m)+k} \leq \text{har}(m - 1) + \frac{k}{2e} \leq \widetilde{M}_{d(m)+k} - \frac{k}{2e} + O(1),$$

or

$$S(w_m) \geq \text{har}(m - 1) + \frac{k}{2e}.$$

By [Theorem 1.2](#) and (1.1), it follows that $\mathbb{P}\{H_m \geq d(m) + k\} \ll_{c_1} e^{-c_1 k/(2e)}$ for each $c_1 < e$. A similar argument using [Theorem 1.2](#) and (1.2) shows the bound $\mathbb{P}\{H_m \leq d(m) - k\} \ll_{c_2} e^{-c_2 k/(2e)}$ for each $c_2 < 1$. \square

Another important example of a displacement vector with exponential steps arises from a discrete time random fragmentation process. Let U_1, U_2, \dots be independent uniform $[0, 1]$ random variables. Set $G_1 = U_1$ and for $i > 1$ set $G_i = (1 - U_1) \cdot \dots \cdot (1 - U_{i-1})U_i$. The distribution of the sequence

$$\mathbf{G} = (G_1, G_2, \dots)$$

was first studied, in greater generality, in [\[16\]](#). (One motivation for Halmos' paper was a problem about loss of energy of neutrons after many collisions; after each collision the neutron loses a random fraction of its current energy.) \mathbf{G} is

also a special case of the *Griffiths–Engen–McCloskey* GEM distribution. Further, $(G_{\sigma(1)}, G_{\sigma(2)}, \dots)$ has the Poisson–Dirichlet (or PD) distribution, where $\sigma : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is the permutation that arranges the terms of (G_1, G_2, \dots) in decreasing order. (We remark that both the GEM and the PD distributions as defined above are in fact special cases from a more general two-parameter family of distributions [21]—in the standard notation, we are considering the GEM(0, 1) and PD(0, 1) distributions.) The PD distribution arises in a number of natural decomposition situations, such as factorization of large random integers [9, 13] and cycle lengths of random permutations [21].

Letting $X_k = -\log G_k$ for each k yields a vector (X_1, X_2, \dots) with exponential steps. We refer to the resulting branching random walk as a *Poisson–Dirichlet branching random walk*. This example has more complicated dependence between the X_i than the first example. Since $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} G_i = 1$ almost surely, there is another way to think of the branching random walk. Imagine that an object of mass m is placed at the root \emptyset . The root divides this mass into pieces according to the vector \mathbf{G}^\emptyset and sends the pieces to its children, sending a mass mG_k^\emptyset to its k th child. This rule is repeated recursively, so each node v sends proportion G_k^v of the mass it receives to its k th child vk . This structure is variously called a *multiplicative cascade* or, more commonly at the moment, a *fragmentation process* [6]. The special case of Theorem 1.1 when \mathcal{T} is a Poisson–Dirichlet branching random walk is used in [15] to analyze a tree model related to primality testing, proving heuristic evidence for the behavior of the distribution of tree heights. In this special case of a PD branching random walk, a much stronger estimate for the right tail of M_n was proved in [15], namely, for any $c_3 < 1$,

$$\mathbb{P}\{M_n \geq \widetilde{M}_n + x\} \leq \exp\{-e^{c_3x - c_4}\} \quad (n \geq 1, x \geq 0),$$

where c_4 is a constant depending on c_3 . Such a right tail bound cannot hold in general; for example, for the case of \mathcal{T} being a Poisson-weighted infinite tree, we have $\mathbb{P}\{M_1 \geq x\} = e^{-x}$. (It seems likely that among branching random walks with exponential steps, the Poisson-weighted infinite tree and the Poisson–Dirichlet branching random walk are extremal examples, with the former having the heaviest tails for $M_n - \widetilde{M}_n$ and the latter the strongest tail bounds for $M_n - \widetilde{M}_n$. However, we do not have a precise conjecture in this direction.)

The *Pratt tree* for a prime p has root p whose children are the prime factors of $p - 1$; the subtrees of the children of the root are recursively constructed in the same fashion (stopping when $p = 2$). We let $H(p)$ be the height of the Pratt tree for p . It is easily seen that the height is always at most $(\log p)/(\log 2) + 1$. Such trees were used by Pratt [23] to show that if p is prime, then there exists a certificate (formal proof) of the primality of p , of length $O(H(p) \log p) = O((\log p)^2)$. It is then of interest to understand the “typical” behavior of $H(p)$. [15] uses Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 to support the following conjecture.

CONJECTURE 1.4 ([15], Conjecture 3). *There exist constants $c, c' > 0$ and real numbers $\{E(p) : p \text{ prime}\}$ such that*

- $H(p) = e \log p - \frac{3}{2} \log \log p + E(p)$,
- for all $z \geq 0$, and $x \geq 0$,

$$e^{-c'z} \pi(x) \ll |\{\text{primes } p \leq x : E(p) \geq z\}| \ll e^{-cz} \pi(x)$$

and

$$|\{\text{primes } p \leq x : E(p) \leq -z\}| \ll \exp(-e^{cx}) \pi(x).$$

Here $\pi(x)$ is the number of primes which are at most x .

The structure of the remainder of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we introduce a little additional notation. In Section 3 we use straightforward calculations to prove weak bounds on the likely value of M_n , and to “reduce the search space” of nodes in T_n which have a chance of attaining the minimal displacement M_n . Section 4 studies the sample path properties of a uniformly random element of certain “homogeneous” subsets of T_n , and forms a key step of the proof. In Section 5 we prove the lower bound of Theorem 1.1, and in Section 6 we prove the upper bound. Finally, the details of the proof of Theorem 1.2 are found in Section 7.

2. Notation. Given $v = v_1 v_2, \dots, v_n \in V$, we let $h(v) = \sum_{i=1}^n v_i$, and remark that $S(v)$ has distribution $\text{Gamma}(h(v))$. If $v \in T_n$, we write $k(v) = h(v) - n$, and write $T_{n,k}$ for the set of nodes $v \in T_n$ with $k(v) = k$. We denote by $T_n(x)$ [resp., $T_{n,k}(x)$] the set of nodes of T_n (resp., $T_{n,k}$) with displacement at most x .

The Bachmann–Landau notation $o(\cdot)$ and $O(\cdot)$ have their usual meaning. As mentioned earlier, we use the Vinogradov notation $f \ll g$ which means $f = O(g)$. We also use the Hardy notation $f \asymp g$ which means $f = O(g)$ and $g = O(f)$. Constants implied by these symbols are absolute unless otherwise indicated, for example, by a subscript.

3. Some basic expectations. In order to restrict the set of nodes, we need to consider when searching for the precise location of M_n , we first assert the following two straightforward facts, whose proofs are forthcoming.

- LEMMA 3.1. (a) *The expected number of nodes $v \in T_n$ with $|h(v) - (1 + 1/e)n| \leq \sqrt{n}$ and with $S(v) \leq n/e + \log n/(2e)$ is $\gg 1$.*
 (b) *The expected number of nodes $v \in T_n$ with $S(v) \leq n/e + (2/e) \log n$ and with $|h(v) - (1 + 1/e)n| > \sqrt{6n \log n}$ is $O(n^{-1/2})$.*

Together, (a) and (b) suggest that in order to find M_n , it should suffice to look at nodes in T_n satisfying $h(v) = (1 + 1/e)n + O(\sqrt{n})$, as will indeed be the case. In proving (a) and (b), we will in fact prove more general bounds that will be useful throughout the paper.

We first remark that for $v \in V$ with $h(v) = h$, $S(v)$ has density function

$$\gamma_h(x) = \frac{x^{h-1} e^{-x}}{(h-1)!} \quad (x \geq 0).$$

For all $n \geq 1, k \geq 0$, we have

$$(3.1) \quad |T_{n,k}| = \binom{n+k-1}{k},$$

so the sum of the density functions for nodes $v \in T_{n,k}$ is

$$f_{n,k}(x) = \binom{n+k-1}{k} \gamma_{n+k}(x) = \frac{x^{n+k-1} e^{-x}}{k!(n-1)!} = \frac{x^k}{k!} \cdot \frac{x^{n-1} e^{-x}}{(n-1)!}.$$

This function will play a significant role, and we now derive bounds on its value for a variety of ranges of k and x . We remark that assertions (a) and (b), above, state, in particular, that to find M_n we should take both k and x near n/e . Thus, writing $k = (n+r)/e$ and $x = (n+y)/e$, by Stirling’s formula, we have

$$(3.2) \quad f_{n,k}(x) = \frac{(1 + O(1/n + 1/k)) \sqrt{\frac{n}{n+r}} e^{(r-y)/e} \left(1 - \frac{r-y}{n+r}\right)^{(n+r)/e}}{n+y} \times \left(1 + \frac{y}{n}\right)^n \frac{e^{3/2}}{2\pi}.$$

When $r = O(\sqrt{n}), y = O(\sqrt{n})$, we have $(1 + y/n)^n \asymp e^y$ and

$$\left(1 - \frac{r-y}{n+r}\right)^{(n+r)/e} \asymp e^{-(r-y)/e}$$

and so obtain the simpler approximation

$$f_{n,k}(x) \asymp \frac{e^y}{n}.$$

Consequently,

$$(3.3) \quad \mathbb{E} \left| \left\{ v \in T_{n,k} : S(v) \leq \left(n + \frac{1}{2} \log n\right) / e \right\} \right| \asymp \int_0^{(\log n)/2} \frac{e^y}{n} \asymp n^{-1/2}$$

for any fixed $k = n/e + O(\sqrt{n})$ —where the constants implicit in $O(\sqrt{n})$ and in (3.3) may depend on each other—and so we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \left\{ v \in T_{n,k} : S(v) \leq \left(n + \frac{1}{2} \log n\right) / e, |k - n/e| \leq \sqrt{n} \right\} \right| \gg 1.$$

This justifies claim (a) of Lemma 3.1, and we now turn to Lemma 3.1(b). The next lemma is [15, Lemma 5.1], and we give a different proof below.

LEMMA 3.2. *For all n and $x \geq 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}|T_n(x)| = \frac{x^n}{n!}.$$

PROOF. We have

$$\mathbb{E}|T_n(x)| = \sum_{k \geq 0} \sum_{v \in T_{n,k}} \mathbb{P}\{S(v) \leq x\} = \sum_{k \geq 0} \int_0^x f_{n,k}(t) dt = \frac{x^n}{n!}. \quad \square$$

It follows immediately from Lemma 3.2 and Stirling's formula that the median of M_n is $\geq \frac{n}{e} + \frac{1}{2e} \log n + O(1)$.

We next obtain bounds on the probability that k is very different from x when $x \geq n/(2e)$. First we quote easy bounds for the tails of the Poisson distribution.

PROPOSITION 3.3. *If $z > 0$ and $0 < \alpha \leq 1 \leq \beta$, then*

$$\sum_{k \leq \alpha z} \frac{z^k}{k!} < \left(\frac{e}{\alpha}\right)^{\alpha z}, \quad \sum_{k \geq \beta z} \frac{z^k}{k!} < \left(\frac{e}{\beta}\right)^{\beta z}.$$

PROOF. We have

$$\sum_{k \leq \alpha z} \frac{z^k}{k!} = \sum_{k \leq \alpha z} \frac{(\alpha z)^k}{k!} \left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)^k \leq \left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)^{\alpha z} \sum_{k \leq \alpha z} \frac{(\alpha z)^k}{k!} < \left(\frac{e}{\alpha}\right)^{\alpha z}.$$

The second inequality follows in the same way. \square

An easy corollary is the following.

LEMMA 3.4. *For $0 \leq t \leq x^{1/6}$,*

$$\sum_{\{k: |k-x| \geq t\sqrt{x}\}} f_{n,k}(x) \ll e^{-t^2/2} \frac{x^{n-1}}{(n-1)!}.$$

Taking $t = \lceil \sqrt{5 \log n} \rceil$ and integrating the above bound over $n/e \leq x \leq n/e + (2/e) \log n$, we obtain the bound

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \left\{ v \in T_n : \frac{n}{e} \leq S(v) \leq \frac{n + 2 \log n}{e}, |h(v) - S(v)| \geq \sqrt{5n \log n} \right\} \right| = O\left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\right).$$

Since $\sqrt{5n \log n} + (2/e) \log n < \sqrt{6n \log n}$ for n large, combining the preceding expectation bound with Lemma 3.2 (applied with $x = n/e$) and Stirling's formula, it follows that

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \left\{ \bigcup_{\{k: |k-n/e| \geq \sqrt{6n \log n}\}} T_{n,k}((n + 2 \log n)/e) \right\} \right| = O\left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\right),$$

which establishes Lemma 3.1(b).

4. Randomly sampled random walk. For integers $n \geq 1, k \geq 0$ and a vertex $v = v_1, \dots, v_n \in T_{n,k}$, let $h_i(v) = h(v_1, \dots, v_i)$ and $W_i(v) = S(v_1, \dots, v_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$, and write $\mathbf{W}(v) = (W_1(v), \dots, W_n(v))$. We write \mathbf{W}, W_i and h_i in place of $\mathbf{W}(v), W_i(v)$ and $h_i(v)$ when v is clear from context. We will always write $\mathbf{v}_{n,k}$ for a uniformly random element of $T_{n,k}$, independent of $\mathbf{v}_{n',k'}$ for $(n, k) \neq (n', k')$, and write $\mathcal{W}_{n,k}$ for the distribution of the sequence $\mathcal{W}(\mathbf{v}_{n,k}) = (W_1(\mathbf{v}_{n,k}), \dots, W_n(\mathbf{v}_{n,k}))$. Although the sequence $0, W_1, \dots, W_n$ is not a random walk, it is useful to think of it as such for the purposes of estimating various probabilities.

Denote by $\mathcal{H}_{n,k}$ the set of vectors (h_1, \dots, h_n) of positive integers with $0 < h_1 < \dots < h_n = n + k$ and note that $|\mathcal{H}_{n,k}| = \binom{n+k-1}{k}$. The sequence $(h_1(\mathbf{v}_{n,k}), \dots, h_n(\mathbf{v}_{n,k}))$ is distributed as a uniformly random element of $\mathcal{H}_{n,k}$.

For $v \in T_n$, let $L_a = L_a(v)$ denote the event $\{W_i \geq (i/n)W_n - a (i \leq n)\}$. A vertex v is called *leading* if $L_0(v)$ holds, and—informally—*near-leading* if $L_a(v)$ holds for some small a . [We also will need to consider the event $R_a(v) = \{W_i \leq (i/n)W_n + a (i \leq n)\}$, and when this event occurs we say v is “near trailing.”]

If M_n is not much larger than normal, v is the vertex at level n with minimal $S(v)$ and $W_i \leq (i/n)W_n - c$ for a large c , then M_i will be smaller than normal and this is rare. Hence, with high probability v will be a near-leading vertex. On the other hand, near-leading vertices are rare—a given vertex in T_n is near leading with probability $O(f(a)/n)$ for some function f . It will turn out, as in prior work [1], that $\mathbb{E}M_n$ is within $O(1)$ of the smallest x such that the expected number of leading nodes with displacement at most x is at least 1.

In this section we develop estimates for the probability that vertices of $T_{n,k}$ are near leading. As in [1], we also show that for a near-leading vertex v , it is rare for $W_i(v) - (i/n)W_n(v)$ to be small if i is far away from 0 and far from n . This useful fact will play an important role in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

The next proposition, stated without proof, follows from the well-known fact that a Poisson sample becomes a uniform sample once conditioned on the position of the n th point.

PROPOSITION 4.1. *For any positive real numbers b_1, \dots, b_n and B , and any $v \in T_n$,*

$$(4.1) \quad \mathbb{P}(W_i \geq b_i (i < n) | W_n = B) = \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{W_i}{W_n} \geq \frac{b_i}{B} (i < n)\right),$$

$$(4.2) \quad \mathbb{P}(W_i \leq b_i (i < n) | W_n = B) = \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{W_i}{W_n} \leq \frac{b_i}{B} (i < n)\right).$$

Proposition 4.1 allows us to rescale the values W_i to choose a convenient value for W_n : for given B' , letting $b'_i = b_i \cdot B'/B$, the proposition implies that

$$\mathbb{P}\{W_i \geq b_i (i < n) | W_n = B\} = \mathbb{P}\{W_i \geq b'_i (i < n) | W_n = B'\}.$$

We will use this fact rather casually in what follows. We will also use the following variant of a well-known fact about cyclically exchangeable sequences.

PROPOSITION 4.2. *For any $S > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\{L_0(\mathbf{v}_{n,k})|W_n = S\} = \mathbb{P}\{R_0(\mathbf{v}_{n,k})|W_n = S\} = \frac{1}{n}.$$

PROOF. For $0 \leq l < n$, let $W_{n+l} = W_n + W_l$. Then, for each $0 \leq l < n$ and all $0 < j \leq n$, let $W_j^{(l)} = W_{j+l} - W_l$. Then for all l , $W_n^{(l)} = W_n$. Furthermore, each sequence $\mathbf{W}^{(l)} = (W_1^{(l)}, \dots, W_n^{(l)})$ has distribution $\mathcal{W}_{n,k}$ and a.s. exactly one of them is leading by the Cycle lemma [14]. Similarly, exactly one of the sequences $\mathbf{W}^{(l)}$ is “trailing.” \square

The following straightforward fact essentially says that conditioning on any subset of the differences $h_1 - h_0, \dots, h_n - h_{n-1}$ breaks the sequence into independent subsequences with distributions from the same family. The proof is omitted.

FACT 4.3. Fix integers $n \geq 1, k \geq 0$, and let (W_1, \dots, W_n) have law $\mathcal{W}_{n,k}$. Then for any integers $1 \leq i \leq m \leq n$, and $1 = n_0 < n_1 < \dots < n_m = n$, conditional upon $h_i - h_{i-1}$, the sequence

$$(W_{n_{i-1}+1} - W_{n_{i-1}}, \dots, W_{n_i} - W_{n_{i-1}})$$

has law $\mathcal{W}_{n_i - n_{i-1}, (h_i - h_{i-1}) - (n_i - n_{i-1})}$, and is mutually independent of (h_1, \dots, h_n) , of $(W_1, \dots, W_{n_{i-1}})$, and of $(W_{n_{i+1}} - W_{n_i}, \dots, W_n - W_{n_{i-1}})$.

The next two lemmas are analogs of Lemmas 11 and 12 in [1], and are proved using some of the same ideas. Whereas lemmas in [1] use heavily the fact that a random walk $0, S_1, \dots, S_n$ can be broken into independent sub-walks $0, S_1, \dots, S_j$ and $0, S_{j+1} - S_j, \dots, S_n - S_j$, in our situation the analogous subsequences $0, W_1, \dots, W_j$ and $0, W_{j+1} - W_j, \dots, W_n - W_j$ are not independent. We circumvent the lack of independence by instead using Fact 4.3.

LEMMA 4.4. *Uniformly for $S > 0, 0 \leq k \leq n$ and $a \geq 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\{L_a(\mathbf{v}_{n,k})|W_n(\mathbf{v}_{n,k}) = S\} \ll \frac{(an/S)^6 + 1}{n},$$

$$\mathbb{P}\{R_a(\mathbf{v}_{n,k})|W_n(\mathbf{v}_{n,k}) = S\} \ll \frac{(an/S)^6 + 1}{n}.$$

REMARK. Most likely, the exponent “6” can be replaced with “2,” in analogy with results from [1] about ballot theorems for random walks.

Given that $L_a(\mathbf{v}_{n,k})$ holds, it is likely that $W_i - (i/n)W_n$ remains large when i is far from 1 and far from n . It is also likely that h_j is not too large when j is small, and, similarly, $h_n - h_j$ is not large when j is near n . The next two lemmas make this very precise.

For $v \in T_n$, define the events

$$B_a(v) = \{\exists m \in [a^{40}, n - a^{40}]: W_m(v) \leq (m/n)W_n(v) + \min(m, n - m)^{1/40}\}$$

and

$$D_a(v) = \{\exists j: h_j(v) > 3aj \text{ or } h_n(v) - h_j(v) > 3a(n - j)\}.$$

LEMMA 4.5. *Uniformly for $0 \leq k \leq n/2, n/10 \leq S \leq n$ and $a \geq 1$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\{L_a(\mathbf{v}_{n,k}), B_a(\mathbf{v}_{n,k}) | W_n(\mathbf{v}_{n,k}) = S\} \ll \frac{1}{na^7}.$$

LEMMA 4.6. *Uniformly for $0 \leq k \leq n/2, n/10 \leq S \leq n$ and $a \geq 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\{L_a(\mathbf{v}_{n,k}), D_a(\mathbf{v}_{n,k}) | W_n(\mathbf{v}_{n,k}) = S\} \ll \frac{e^{-a}}{n}.$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 4.4. It suffices to prove the lemma when $a \geq 10$. We also assume $a \leq n^{1/6}$, or else the conclusion is trivial. Finally, in light of Proposition 4.1, we may assume without loss of generality that $S = n + k$, so that $n \leq S \leq 2n$.

Let

$$\begin{aligned} m &= a^2, & l &= \lceil km/n \rceil, & n' &= n + 2m, & k' &= k + 2l, \\ \lambda &= \frac{n' + k'}{n'}, & a' &= \frac{an\lambda}{S}. \end{aligned}$$

We remark that $m, l \leq n^{1/3}, a\lambda/2 \leq a' \leq a\lambda$, and for n large enough $1 \leq \lambda \leq 3$.

By Proposition 4.2,

$$(4.3) \quad A := \mathbb{P}\{L_0(\mathbf{v}_{n',k'}) | W_{n'}(\mathbf{v}_{n',k'}) = \lambda n'\} = \frac{1}{n'}.$$

Now let $\mathbf{W}' = (W'_1, \dots, W'_{n'})$ be a sequence with law $\mathcal{W}_{n',k'}$. We bound A from below by counting only sequences with $h'_m = m + l$ and $h'_{n-m} = (n' + k') - (m + l)$. In this way, we can break \mathbf{W}' into three subsequences, namely,

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}, & \quad \text{where } \widetilde{W}_j = W'_j, \tilde{h}_j = h'_j \ (1 \leq j \leq m), \\ \mathbf{W}, & \quad \text{where } W_j = W'_{j+m} - W'_m, h_j = h'_{j+m} - h'_j \ (1 \leq j \leq n), \\ \widehat{\mathbf{W}}, & \quad \text{where } \widehat{W}_j = W'_{n'-j} - W'_{n'-j}, \hat{h}_j = n' + k' - h'_{n'-j} \ (1 \leq j \leq m). \end{aligned}$$

That is, $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}$ captures the first m steps, \mathbf{W} the next n steps, and $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}$ the last m steps taken in reverse order.

We'll work with four events:

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &= \{h'_m = m + l, h'_{n'-m} = (n' + k') - (m + l)\}, \\ E_2 &= \{\widetilde{W}_j \geq \lambda j (j \leq m), \widetilde{W}_m - \lambda m \in [a', 2a']\}, \\ E_3 &= \{\widehat{W}_j \leq \lambda j (j \leq m), \widehat{W}_m - \lambda m \in [-3a', -2a']\}, \\ E_4(x) &= \{W_j \geq \lambda j - x (j < n)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Given E_1 , $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}$ have law $\mathcal{W}_{m,l}$, and \mathbf{W} has law $\mathcal{W}_{n,k}$, and all three are independent. Also given E_1 , the events E_2 , E_3 and $E_4(x)$ are independent. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} (4.4) \quad A &\geq \mathbb{P}\{E_1|W'_{n'} = \lambda n'\} \mathbb{P}\{E_2|E_1, W'_{n'} = \lambda n'\} \mathbb{P}\{E_3|E_1, W'_{n'} = \lambda n'\} \\ &\quad \times \inf_{\substack{a' \leq x \leq 2a' \\ -3a' \leq y \leq -2a'}} \mathbb{P}\{E_4(x)|E_1, W'_{n'} = \lambda n', W_n = \lambda n - x - y\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $m + l = O(n^{1/3})$, if $k > 0$, then a slightly tedious but routine computation with Stirling's formula and (3.1) gives

$$\begin{aligned} (4.5) \quad \mathbb{P}\{E_1|W'_{n'} = \lambda n'\} &= \frac{\binom{m+l-1}{l}^2 \binom{n+k-1}{k}}{\binom{n+2m+2l+k-1}{k+2l}} \asymp \binom{m+l-1}{l}^2 \frac{k^{2l} n^{2m}}{(n+k)^{2m+2l}} \\ &\asymp \frac{1}{l}. \end{aligned}$$

When $k = 0$, trivially $\mathbb{P}\{E_1|W'_{n'} = \lambda n'\} = 1$. For the remainder of the proof we write $\mathbb{P}^c\{\cdot\}$ to mean $\mathbb{P}\{\cdot|E_1, W'_{n'} = \lambda n'\}$. Next,

$$\begin{aligned} (4.6) \quad \mathbb{P}^c\{E_2\} &= \mathbb{P}^c\{\widetilde{W}_j \geq \lambda j (j < m) | \widetilde{W}_m - \lambda m \in [a', 2a']\} \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{P}^c\{\widetilde{W}_m - \lambda m \in [a', 2a']\}. \end{aligned}$$

Given that $W'_{n'} = \lambda n'$ and $h'_m = m + l$, \widetilde{W}_m has distribution

$$\lambda n' \cdot \text{Beta}(m + l, n + k - m - l)$$

and, in particular, has mean

$$\lambda n'(m + l)/(n + k) = \lambda m + O\left(\frac{m^2}{n}\right) = \lambda m + O(1)$$

and variance

$$(\lambda n')^2 \frac{(m + l)(n + k - m - l)}{(n + k)^2(n + k + 1)} = O(m).$$

Since $a' \geq \frac{a}{2} \geq \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{m}$, it follows from the definition of a Beta random variable that the second probability on the right-hand side of (4.6) is $\gg 1$. Applying Proposition 4.1 followed by Proposition 4.2, the first factor on the right-hand side of (4.6) is

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq \inf_{a' \leq x \leq 2a'} \mathbb{P}^c \{ \widetilde{W}_j \geq \lambda j (j < m) | \widetilde{W}_m = \lambda m + x \} \\ &\geq \inf_{a' \leq x \leq 2a'} \mathbb{P} \{ L_0(\mathbf{v}_{m,l}) | W_m(\mathbf{v}_{m,l}) = \lambda m + x \} = \frac{1}{m}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$(4.7) \quad \mathbb{P}^c \{ E_2 \} \gg \frac{1}{m} = \frac{1}{a^2}.$$

Similarly,

$$(4.8) \quad \mathbb{P}^c \{ E_3 \} \gg \inf_{-3a' \leq y \leq -2a'} \mathbb{P} \{ L_0(\mathbf{v}_{m,l}) | W_m(\mathbf{v}_{m,l}) = \lambda m + y \} = \frac{1}{m} = \frac{1}{a^2}.$$

Last, for $a' \leq x \leq 2a'$ and $-3a' \leq y \leq -2a'$, Proposition 4.1 yields

$$\begin{aligned} (4.9) \quad \mathbb{P}^c \{ E_4(x) | W_n = \lambda n - x - y \} &= \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{W_j}{W_n} \geq \frac{\lambda j - x}{\lambda n - x - y} \ (j \leq n) \right\} \\ &\geq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{W_j}{W_n} \geq \frac{j}{n} - \frac{a}{S} \ (j \leq n) \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{P} \{ L_a(\mathbf{v}_{n,k}) | W_n(\mathbf{v}_{n,k}) = S \}. \end{aligned}$$

Together, (4.3)–(4.9) imply

$$\frac{1}{n} \gg \frac{1}{a^6} \mathbb{P} \{ L_a(\mathbf{v}_{n,k}) | W_n(\mathbf{v}_{n,k}) = S \},$$

which proves the first assertion of the lemma. The proof of the second part is identical. \square

PROOF OF LEMMA 4.5. Fix k, S and a as in the statement of the lemma. We write $W_m = W_m(\mathbf{v}_{n,k})$, $h_m = h_m(\mathbf{v}_{n,k})$ and so on. If $a^{40} > n/2$, then there is nothing to prove so we assume $a^{40} \leq n/2$. For $a^{40} \leq m \leq n - a^{40}$ and $l \geq 0$, let

$$A_{m,l} = \mathbb{P} \left\{ L_a(\mathbf{v}_{n,k}), W_m \leq \frac{m}{n} S + \min(m, n - m)^{1/40} | W_n = S, h_m = m + l \right\}.$$

Break (W_1, \dots, W_n) into two sequences: $\widetilde{W}_j = W_j$ for $j \leq m$, and $\widehat{W}_j = W_n - W_{n-j}$ for $j \leq n - m$ (the latter being the final $n - m$ steps taken in reverse). Given $h_m = h_m - h_0$, these sequences are independent by Fact 4.3. We write $\mathbb{P}^c \{ \cdot \}$ for the conditional probability measure $\mathbb{P} \{ \cdot | h_m = m + l \}$, and $\mathbb{E}^c \{ \cdot \}$ for the corresponding expectation operator. Also, let $\lambda = \frac{n+k}{n}$.

Suppose first that $a^{40} \leq m \leq n/2$. Put $b = m^{1/40} \frac{n+k}{S}$ and $a' = a \frac{n+k}{S}$. Note that $\mathbb{E}^c\{\widetilde{W}_m | W_n = S\} = S \cdot (m+l)/(n+k)$. Rescaling by $(n+k)/S$ (this is allowed by the comment just after Proposition 4.1), by the definitions of b and a' we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 A_{m,l} &\leq \mathbb{P}^c\{\widetilde{W}_m - \lambda m \in [-a', b] | W_n = \lambda n\} \\
 (4.10) \quad &\times \sup_{-a' \leq x \leq b} \mathbb{P}^c\{\widetilde{W}_j \geq \lambda j - a'(j < m) | \widetilde{W}_m = \lambda m + x\} \\
 &\times \sup_{-b \leq x \leq a'} \mathbb{P}^c\{\widehat{W}_j \leq \lambda j + a'(j < n-m) | \widehat{W}_{n-m} = \lambda(n-m) + x\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Given that $W_n = \lambda n$ and $h_m = m+l$, \widetilde{W}_m has distribution $\lambda n \cdot \text{Beta}(m+l, k+n-m-l)$ and so the first factor on the RHS of (4.10) is $O(b/\sqrt{m})$ uniformly in l and in n . Applying Proposition 4.1 and the first inequality of Lemma 4.4, the second factor on the RHS of (4.10) is

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\leq \mathbb{P}^c\left\{\frac{\widetilde{W}_j}{\widetilde{W}_m} \geq \frac{j}{m} - \frac{a' + bj/m}{m\lambda + b} \ (j < m)\right\} \\
 &\leq \mathbb{P}^c\left\{\frac{\widetilde{W}_j}{\widetilde{W}_m} \geq \frac{j}{m} - \frac{a' + b}{m\lambda + b} \ (j < m)\right\} \\
 &= \mathbb{P}\{L_{a'+b}(\mathbf{v}_{m,l}) | W_m(\mathbf{v}_{m,l}) = m\lambda + b\} \ll \frac{(a' + b)^6 + 1}{m} \ll \frac{b^6}{m},
 \end{aligned}$$

so the product of the first two factors on the right-hand side of (4.10) is $O(b^7 m^{-3/2})$. Similarly, by Proposition 4.1 and the second inequality of Lemma 4.4, the third factor on the RHS of (4.10) is

$$\leq \mathbb{P}\left\{\frac{\widehat{W}_j}{\widehat{W}_{n-m}} \leq \frac{j}{n-m} + \frac{a' + b}{\lambda(n-m) - b} \ (j < n-m)\right\} \ll \frac{b^6}{n-m} \ll \frac{b^6}{n}.$$

Combining these bounds, we obtain that when $a^{40} \leq m \leq n/2$, $A_{m,l} \ll b^{13}/(nm^{3/2})$. The estimation of $A_{m,l}$ with $m > n/2$ is identical, by reversing the roles of \widetilde{W} and \widehat{W} . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{P}(L_a(\mathbf{v}_{n,k}), B_a(\mathbf{v}_{n,k}) | W_n = S) &\ll \sum_{a^{40} \leq m \leq n/2} \sum_{l \geq 0} \mathbb{P}\{h_m = m+l\} A_{m,l} \\
 &\ll \frac{1}{n} \sum_{a^{40} \leq m \leq n/2} \frac{m^{13/40}}{m^{3/2}} \ll \frac{1}{na^7}. \quad \square
 \end{aligned}$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 4.6. As before, we write $W_n = W_n(\mathbf{v}_{n,k})$, $h_j = h_j(\mathbf{v}_{n,k})$ and so on. We may assume $a \geq 10$, or else the conclusion follows from Lemma 4.4. We also assume $k \geq 1$, or else $h_j = j$ for every j and $D_a(\mathbf{v}_{n,k})$ is impossible. For fixed j , given h_j , the sequence (W_1, \dots, W_n) breaks into two independent sequences \widetilde{W} , consisting of the first j steps, and \widehat{W} , consisting of the last $n-j$

steps taken in reverse. If $W_n = S$ and $L_a(\mathbf{v}_{n,k})$ holds, then there is an integer $b \geq -a - 1$ so that $\widetilde{W}_j - \frac{j}{n}S \in [b, b + 1]$. Consequently, $\widehat{W}_{n-j} - \frac{n-j}{n}S \in [-b - 1, -b]$.

Fix h such that $h > 3aj$ and suppose that $h_j = j$ —note that in this case $j < \frac{n+k}{3a} \leq \frac{n}{20}$. Given that $h_n = h$ and $W_n = S$, \widetilde{W}_j has distribution $S \cdot \text{Beta}(h, n + k - h)$. Since $k \leq n/2$ and $S \leq n$, it is then straightforward to check that $\mathbb{P}\{\widetilde{W}_j \geq b|h_n = h, W_n = S\} \leq e^{-b/4}$ for $b \geq 4h$. We also have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left\{\widehat{W}_i \geq \frac{i}{n}S - (a + b)(i \leq n - j) \mid \widehat{W}_{n-j} - \frac{n-j}{n}S \in [-b - 1, -b], \right. \\ & \qquad \qquad \qquad \left. h_j = h, W_n = S\right\} \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}\left\{L_{2a+b}(\mathbf{v}_{n-j, k-h+j}) \mid W_{n-j}(\mathbf{v}_{n-j, k-h+j}) - \frac{n-j}{n}S \in [-b - 1, -b]\right\} \\ & \ll \frac{(2a + b)^6}{n} \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 4.4 if $b \leq n^{1/6}$, and trivially otherwise. Summing on b , we find that

$$\mathbb{P}\{L_a(\mathbf{v}_{n,k})|h_j = h, W_n = S\} \ll \sum_{-a-1 \leq b \leq 4h} \frac{(2a + b)^6}{n} + \sum_{b > 4h} \frac{(2a + b)^6}{ne^{b/4}} \ll \frac{h^7}{n}.$$

Note that (h_1, \dots, h_n) is independent of W_n and so $\mathbb{P}\{h_j = h|W_n = S\} = \mathbb{P}\{h_j = h\}$. Since $h - j \leq k \leq n/2$, by Stirling’s formula,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{h_j = h\} &= \binom{h-1}{h-j} \frac{\binom{n+k-h-1}{k-h+j}}{\binom{n+k-1}{k}} \\ (4.11) \quad &\leq \frac{h^j}{j!} \cdot \frac{(n-1) \cdots (n-j) \cdot k \cdots (k-h+j+1)}{(n+k-1) \cdots (n+k-h)} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{eh}{j}\right)^j \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^{h-j} \leq (6ae)^{h/(3a)} 2^{-h} < e^{-h/2}, \end{aligned}$$

the last inequality holding at least for $a \geq 5$ (which we have assumed). Summing over $h > 3aj$, then over j , we find that

$$(4.12) \quad \mathbb{P}\{L_a(\mathbf{v}_{n,k}), \exists j : h_j > 3aj | W_n = S\} \ll \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \geq 1} \sum_{h > 3aj} h^7 e^{-h/2} \ll \frac{e^{-a}}{n}.$$

Next, suppose $h = h_n - h_j > 3a(n - j)$, in which case $n - j < \frac{n}{20}$. Let $b' = W_j - \frac{j}{n}S$. Since $W_{i+1} \geq W_i$ for all i , $W_j \leq S$ and so $b' \leq \frac{n-j}{n}S \leq n - j$. Also, in order for $L_{n,k}(a)$ to occur, we must have $b' \geq -a$. Thus, writing $\mathcal{I} = [-a, n - j]$,

and ignoring the last $n - j$ steps of W for an upper bound, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\{L_a(\mathbf{v}_{n,k})|h_n - h_j = h, W_n = S\} \\ & \leq \sup_{b' \in \mathcal{I}} \mathbb{P}\left\{\widetilde{W}_i \geq \frac{i}{n}S - a(i \leq j) \mid \widetilde{W}_j = \frac{j}{n}S + b', h_n - h_j = h\right\} \\ & \leq \sup_{b' \in \mathcal{I}} \mathbb{P}\left\{L_{a+b'}(\mathbf{v}_{j,n+k-h}) \mid W_j(\mathbf{v}_{j,n+k-h}) = \frac{j}{n}S + b'\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $a \leq n/2$ [or else $3a > 3n/2 > n + k$ and $D_a(\mathbf{v}_{n,k})$ is impossible]. Since $j \geq \frac{19}{20}n$ and $b' \geq -a \geq -n/2$, by Lemma 4.4 and straightforward manipulations, the last probability is $O(\frac{1}{n}(a + b')^6) = O(\frac{1}{n}(a + n - j)^6)$. Also, $\mathbb{P}\{h_n - h_j = h\} = \mathbb{P}\{h_{n-j} = h\} < e^{-h/2}$ by the same calculation as in (4.11). Summing over $h > 3a(n - j)$ and $j \leq n - 1$ gives

$$\mathbb{P}\{L_a(\mathbf{v}_{n,k}), \exists j : h_n - h_j > 3a(n - j) | W_n = S\} \ll \frac{e^{-a}}{n}.$$

Together with (4.12), this completes the proof. \square

5. The lower bound in Theorem 1.1. We continue to adopt the notational conventions from the previous section. Let c be a sufficiently large positive constant, and $b = e^{c/3}$. Let

$$Y_n = \bigcup_{|k-n/e| \leq \sqrt{6n \log n}} T_{n,k}$$

and put $m_n = \frac{n}{e} + \frac{3 \log n}{2e}$. If $M_n \leq m_n - c$, then one of the following must occur:

- (i) For some $v \in T_n$, $S(v) \leq m_n - \log n$;
- (ii) For some k satisfying $|k - n/e| > \sqrt{6n \log n}$ and some $v \in T_{n,k}$, $S(v) \leq m_n$;
- (iii) For some $v \in Y_n$, $m_n - \log n \leq S(v) \leq m_n$ and $W_i \leq (i/n)W_n - \log n$ for some i ;
- (iv) For some $v \in Y_n$, $m_n - \log n \leq S(v) \leq m_n - c$ and $W_i \geq (i/n)W_n - b$ for all i ;
- (v) For some $v \in Y_n$ and some integer $a \in [b, \log n + 1]$, $m_n - \log n \leq S(v) \leq m_n$, $W_i \geq (i/n)W_n - a$ for all i and $W_j < (j/n)W_n - (a - 1)$ for some j (write $F_{a,j}$ for the event that this occurs for a given a and j with j minimal, and note that these events are disjoint).

By Lemma 3.2 and Stirling’s formula, the probability of (i) is at most $\mathbb{E}\{T_n(m_n - \log n)\} = O(n^{1-e})$. The probability of (ii) is $O(n^{-1/2})$ by Lemma 3.1(b). If (iii) occurs, then $M_i \leq (i/n)m_n - \log n$, and this happens with probability at most $\mathbb{E}\{T_i((i/n)m_n - \log n)\}$, which is $O(n^{3/2-e}i^{-1/2})$ by Lemma 3.2. Summing on i , we find that (iii) occurs with probability $O(n^{2-e})$.

To bound the probability of the event in (iv), we write E_k for the event that there is $v \in T_{n,k}$ for which $m_n - \log n \leq S(v) \leq m_n - c$ and $W_i \geq (i/n)W_n - b$ for all i , so that by a union bound and Lemma 4.4, the probability of (iv) is at most

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{|k-n/e| \leq \sqrt{6n \log n}} \mathbb{P}\{E_k\} \\
 & \leq \sum_{|k-n/e| \leq \sqrt{6n \log n}} |T_{n,k}| \mathbb{P}\{m_n - \log n \leq S(\mathbf{v}_{n,k}) \leq m_n - c, L_b(\mathbf{v}_{n,k})\} \\
 (5.1) \quad & \ll \sum_{|k-n/e| \leq \sqrt{6n \log n}} |T_{n,k}| \mathbb{P}\{m_n - \log n \leq S(\mathbf{v}_{n,k}) \leq m_n - c\} \cdot \frac{b^6}{n} \\
 & \leq \frac{b^6}{n} \cdot \mathbb{E}\{T_n(m_n - c)\} \\
 & \ll e^{(2-e)c}.
 \end{aligned}$$

[This line of argument will arise again in bounding (v), and we will omit the details.]

Finally, we bound (v). To do so, we are forced to separately treat j in three different ranges. First suppose $j \leq a^{40}$. If $F_{a,j}$ occurs, then $M_j \leq (j/n)m_n - a$, the probability of which is $O(j^{-1/2}e^{-ea})$ by Lemma 3.2. Summing on a and on $j \leq a^{40}$ gives a total probability of $O(e^{-2b})$ for this range of parameters.

Next suppose that $a^{40} < j < n - a^{40}$, so that $(\min(j, n - j))^{1/40} \geq a$. If $F_{a,j}$ occurs, then for some $v \in Y_n$, $L_a(v)$ and $B_a(v)$ both occur. Note that for n large enough $n/10 \leq m_n - \log n \leq m_n \leq n$, and for all k for which $T_{n,k} \subseteq Y_n$ we have $0 \leq k \leq n/2$. Thus, for such n, k and a , we may apply Lemma 4.5 to see that

$$\mathbb{P}\{L_a(\mathbf{v}_{n,k}), B_a(\mathbf{v}_{n,k}) | m_n - \log n \leq W_n(\mathbf{v}_{n,k}) \leq m_n\} \ll \frac{1}{na^7}.$$

Further, the expected number of $v \in Y_n$ with $S(v) \leq m_n$ is $O(n)$ by Lemma 3.2. By these two bounds and a reprise of the argument leading to (5.1), we see that for a given a , the probability of $\bigcup_{j \in [a^{40}, n - a^{40}]} F_{a,j}$ is $O(1/a^7)$ and summing over integers $a \in [b, \log n + 1]$ gives a total probability of $O(1/b^6) = O(e^{-2c})$.

Now suppose $F_{a,j}$ holds with $j \in [n - a^{40}, n]$ and $a \in [b, \log n + 1]$. By the definition of $F_{a,j}$, letting w be the unique ancestor of v in T_j , the event $L_{a-1}(w)$ also occurs. Since $j \geq n - (\log n + 1)^{40}$, for n sufficiently large $|m_j - (j/n)m_n| \leq 1$ and, hence, $S(w) \leq m_j + 1 - (a - 1)$. On the other hand, for any integer $k' \geq 1$, by Lemma 4.4 we have

$$\mathbb{P}\{W_j(\mathbf{v}_{j,k'}) \leq m_j + 2 - a, L_{a-1}(\mathbf{v}_{j,k'})\} \ll \frac{a^6}{j} \mathbb{P}\{W_j(\mathbf{v}_{j,k'}) \leq m_j + 2 - a\}.$$

By Lemma 3.2, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}\{F_{a,j}\} \ll \frac{a^6}{j} \mathbb{E}|T_j(m_j + 2 - a)| \ll a^6 e^{-ea}.$$

Summing first over $j \in [n - a^{40}, n]$, then over $a \in [b, \log n + 1]$, we see that the probability $F_{a,j}$ occurs for any a and j in this range is

$$\ll b^{46} e^{-eb} = \exp\{(46/3)c - e^{1+c/3}\} < e^{-2c}$$

as long as c is large enough. Combining the three ranges, we obtain that (v) occurs with probability $\ll e^{-2c}$. Altogether, the probability that one of (i)–(v) holds is $\ll e^{(2-e)c}$, which is less than $1/2$ if c is chosen large enough. Hence, $\widetilde{M}_n \geq m_n - c$.

6. The upper bound in Theorem 1.1. For the upper bound for median(M_n), we use a second-moment method. By the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, for any nonnegative random variable X ,

$$(6.1) \quad \mathbb{P}\{X > 0\} \geq \frac{[\mathbb{E}X]^2}{\mathbb{E}X^2}.$$

When X is the size of some random subset \mathcal{X} of a ground set V_0 , we may rewrite (6.1) using the fact that

$$\mathbb{E}X^2 = \sum_{v,w \in V_0} \mathbb{P}\{v \in \mathcal{X}, w \in \mathcal{X}\} = \sum_{v \in V_0} \mathbb{E}[X|v \in \mathcal{X}]\mathbb{P}\{v \in \mathcal{X}\},$$

so that

$$(6.2) \quad \mathbb{P}\{X > 0\} \geq \frac{[\mathbb{E}X]^2}{\sum_{v \in V_0} \mathbb{E}[X|v \in \mathcal{X}]\mathbb{P}\{v \in \mathcal{X}\}} \geq \frac{\mathbb{E}X}{\sup_{v \in V_0} \mathbb{E}[X|v \in \mathcal{X}]}.$$

Let a be a large positive constant. Let $V_0 = Y_n$, where Y_n is defined as in the previous section, and let \mathcal{X} be the set of nodes in $v \in Y_n$ satisfying

- (i) $m_n - 1 \leq S(v) \leq m_n$,
- (ii) $L_a(v)$,
- (iii) neither $B_a(v)$ nor $D_a(v)$.

Taking $X = |\mathcal{X}|$, by Lemma 3.1(b), plus Lemmas 4.2, 4.5 and 4.6, we have

$$(6.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}X &\geq \mathbb{E}[T_n(m_n) - T_n(m_n - 1)] \left(\frac{1}{n} - O\left(\frac{1}{a^7 n}\right) - O\left(\frac{e^{-a}}{n}\right) \right) - O\left(\frac{1}{n^{1/2}}\right) \\ &\gg 1 \end{aligned}$$

if a is chosen large enough.

Recall that for all $v \in Y_n$, $|k(v) - n/e| \leq \sqrt{6n \log n}$. For fixed $v \in Y_n$, we need to estimate $\mathbb{E}\{X|v \in \mathcal{X}\}$.

The definitions of the coming two paragraphs are for the most part depicted in Figure 1. Write $j = j(v, v')$ for the integer $0 \leq j < n$ such that v and v' are descendants of two distinct children of some node $w = w(v, v') \in T_j$ [and let $j(v, v') = n$ if $v = v'$]. In other words, $j(v, v')$ is the generation of the most recent common




FIG. 1. An illustration of some key definitions from the proof of the upper bound of Theorem 1.1.

ancestor of v and v' . Supposing $0 \leq j(v, v') \leq n - 1$, let x be the unique child of w on the path from w to v' .

Also, write $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{W}(v)$ and $\mathbf{W}' = (W'_1, \dots, W'_n) = \mathbf{W}(v')$. Let $g = n - (j(v, v') + 1)$, let $\tilde{W}_i = \tilde{W}_i(v, v') = W'_{j+i+1} - W'_{j+1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq g$, and let $\tilde{\mathbf{W}} = (\tilde{W}_1, \dots, \tilde{W}_g)$, so, in particular, $W'_n = W'_{j+1} + \tilde{W}_g$.

Finally, let $k' = k(v')$, let $k_1 = k_1(v, v') = k(x) - k(w)$ and let $k_2 = k' - k(x)$, so $k_1 + k_2 = k' - k(w)$. Note that once g and k_2 are fixed, $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}$ is independent of \mathbf{W} and has law \mathcal{W}_{g,k_2} .

For integers $j, 0 \leq j \leq n$, let $\mathcal{F}_j = \mathcal{F}_j(v) = \{v' \in \mathcal{X}, j(v, v') = j\}$ and let $F_j = F_j(v) = \mathbb{E}\{|\mathcal{F}_j| | v \in \mathcal{X}\}$. Clearly, $F_n = 1$, as $j = n$ implies $v = v'$.

Now fix v' . If $v' \in \mathcal{X}$, then by (i), (ii) and (iii), we have

$$k(x) \leq 3a(j + 1), \quad k' - k(w) \leq 3a(g + 1) = 3a(n - j)$$

and so

$$(6.4) \quad k_1 + k_2 \leq 3a(n - j), \quad k_1 \leq \min(3a(j + 1), 3a(g + 1))$$

and if $v \in \mathcal{X}$, then, with $j = j(v, v')$, we have

$$(6.5) \quad W_j \geq \frac{j}{n}(m_n - 1) + \begin{cases} (-a), & \text{whatever the value of } j, \\ \min(j, n - j)^{1/40}, & \text{if } a^{40} \leq j \leq n - a^{40}. \end{cases}$$

Consider separately four ranges of j . First, if $n - a^{40} \leq j \leq n - 1$, then for sufficiently large n , (6.4) implies that $k_1 + k_2 \leq 3a(n - j)$, so F_j is deterministically at most

$$\sum_{l \leq 3a(n-j)} |T_{n-j,l}| = \sum_{l \leq 3a(n-j)} \binom{n-j+l-1}{l} \leq 3a^{41}(a^{40} + 3a^{41})^{a^{40}}.$$

Hence, recalling that a is now a fixed, large constant,

$$(6.6) \quad \sum_{n-a^{40} \leq j \leq n} F_j \ll 1.$$

Next, let $r = (2 \log n)^{40}$. If $n - r < j \leq n - a^{40}$, then for n sufficiently large, $j \geq n - j = g + 1$, and (6.5) implies that in order to have $W'_n \leq m_n$ we must have

$$\widetilde{W}_g \leq \frac{g+1}{n} m_n - g^{1/40} + 1 \leq g/e - g^{1/40} + 2,$$

the second inequality holding for sufficiently large n . For fixed k_1 , by Lemma 3.2 we thus have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\{|\{v' \in \mathcal{X}, j(v, v') = j, k_1(v, v') = k_1\}||v \in \mathcal{X}\} &\leq \mathbb{E}T_g(g/e - g^{1/40} + 2) \\ &\ll \exp[-eg^{1/40}]. \end{aligned}$$

Using (6.4) to bound k_1 and summing over j yields

$$(6.7) \quad \sum_{n-r < j \leq n-a^{40}} F_j \ll \sum_{a^{40} \leq g \leq r} a(g+1) \exp[-eg^{1/40}] \ll 1.$$

Next, suppose $r \leq j \leq n - r$. By (6.5), in order to have $W'_n \leq m_n$, it must be that

$$\widetilde{W}_g \leq \frac{g+1}{n} m_n - \min(j, n-j)^{1/40} + 1 \leq \frac{g}{e} - \log n.$$

Since we also require $k_1(v, v') \leq 3an$ by (6.4), we have $F_j \leq 3an \mathbb{E}T_g(g/e - \log n) \ll 1/n^2$ for this range of j , and, hence,

$$(6.8) \quad \sum_{r \leq j \leq n-r} F_j \ll \frac{1}{n}.$$

Finally, suppose $0 \leq j \leq r$. Here $g \geq n - r - 1 = n + O((\log n)^{40})$, and since $L_a(v)$ holds by assumption, if $v \in \mathcal{X}$, then

$$W_j \geq \frac{j}{n} W_n - a > \frac{j}{n} m_n - (a + 1).$$

For each integer $b \in [-(a + 1), 2 \log n]$, let E_b be the event that $W_j - (j/n)m_n \in [b, b + 1)$. Also, let E^* be the event that $W_j - (j/n)m_n \geq [2 \log n]$. The events $\{E_b : -(a + 1) \leq b < 2 \log n\}$ and E^* together partition the event $\{v' \in \mathcal{F}_j(v)\}$, so

by conditioning

$$(6.9) \quad F_j \leq \max\left(\mathbb{E}\{|\mathcal{F}_j| \mid v \in \mathcal{X}, E^*\}, \max_{-(a+1) \leq b < 2 \log n} \mathbb{E}\{|\mathcal{F}_j| \mid v \in \mathcal{X}, E_b\}\right).$$

If $W_j \geq (j/n)m_n + 2 \log n$, then to have $v' \in \mathcal{F}_j$, we must have $\widetilde{W}_g(v') \leq g/e - \log n$ so, as in the case $r \leq j \leq n - r$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\{|\mathcal{F}_j| \mid v \in \mathcal{X}, E^*\} \ll \frac{1}{n^2}.$$

Now suppose $W_j - (j/n)m_n \in [b, b + 1]$, where b is an integer satisfying $-a - 1 \leq b \leq 2 \log n$. Note that if $b < (j^{1/40} - 2)$ and $a^{40} \leq j \leq r$, then $\mathcal{F}_j(v)$ is necessarily empty due to $B_a(v)$, so for such j and b , $\mathbb{E}\{|\mathcal{F}_j| \mid v \in \mathcal{X}, E_b\} = 0$. For the rest, we further subdivide \mathcal{F}_j , writing $\mathcal{F}_{j,l} = \{v' \in \mathcal{X}, j(v, v') = j, k_1(v, v') = l\}$. By (6.4) we have

$$\mathbb{E}\{|\mathcal{F}_j| \mid v \in \mathcal{X}, E_b\} = \sum_{l \leq 3a(j+1)} \mathbb{E}\{|\mathcal{F}_{j,l}| \mid v \in \mathcal{X}, E_b\}.$$

Suppose additionally that $W'_{j+1}(v') - W'_j(v') \in [\Delta, \Delta + 1]$, where Δ is a nonnegative integer. Since $W_j(v') = W_j(v)$, in order to have $v' \in \mathcal{F}_j$, by (i) we require⁴

$$\widetilde{W}_g - \frac{g}{n}m_n \in [m_n/n - (b + \Delta + 3), m_n/n - (b + \Delta)].$$

Since $0 \leq m_n/n < 1$ and, for n sufficiently large, $m_g - 1 \leq (g/n)m_n \leq m_g$, this implies that, writing $\mathcal{I} = [-(b + \Delta + 4), -(b + \Delta - 1)]$, we must have

$$\widetilde{W}_g - m_g \in \mathcal{I}.$$

By (i) and (ii), we also require

$$\widetilde{W}_i \geq \frac{i}{n}W_n - b - \Delta - a - 2 \geq \frac{i}{g}m_g - b - \Delta - a - 3 \quad (i \leq g).$$

This implies that for all $i \leq g$,

$$\widetilde{W}_i \geq \frac{i}{g}\widetilde{W}_g - \max(b + \Delta + a - 3, a - 2).$$

None of this depends on l , so for any $0 \leq l \leq 3a(j + 1)$, writing $m = \max(b + \Delta + a - 3, a - 2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\{|\mathcal{F}_{j,l}| \mid v \in \mathcal{X}, E_b\} \\ & \leq \sum_{\substack{1 \leq k_2 \leq 3a(j+1) \\ \Delta \geq 0}} \mathbb{E}\{|v \in T_{g,k_2} : S(v) - m_g \in \mathcal{I}, L_m(v)\}| \end{aligned}$$

⁴The m_n/n terms come from the “skipped step” from W'_j to W'_{j+1} , and the $(b + \Delta + 3)$ comes from $b + 1$, $\Delta + 1$, and the requirement that $S(v) \geq m_n - 1$.

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\leq \sum_{\substack{1 \leq k_2 \leq 3a(j+1) \\ \Delta \geq 0}} \left(\mathbb{E}\{T_{g,k_2}(m_g - (b + \Delta - 1))\} \right. \\
 &\quad \left. \times \sup_{x \in \mathcal{I}} \mathbb{P}\{L_m(\mathbf{v}_{g,k_2}) | W_g(\mathbf{v}_{g,k_2}) = m_g + x\} \right) \\
 &\ll \sum_{\Delta \geq 0} \mathbb{E}\{T_g(m_g - (b + \Delta - 1))\} \cdot j \cdot \frac{\max(b + \Delta + a - 3, a - 2)^6}{n} \\
 &\ll \sum_{\Delta \geq 0} n e^{-e(b+\Delta)} \cdot j \cdot \frac{\max(b + \Delta + a - 3, a - 2)^6}{n} \\
 &\ll j e^{-eb} (a + |b|)^6,
 \end{aligned}$$

the third-to-last line by Lemma 4.4 and the second-to-last by Lemma 3.2. Summing over $0 \leq l \leq 3a(j + 1)$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}\{|\mathcal{F}_j| | v \in \mathcal{X}, E_b\} \ll j^2 e^{-eb} (a + |b|)^6.$$

For $j \leq a^{40}$ this is $O(1)$ uniformly in b . When $j > a^{40}$ we also have $b \geq j^{1/40} - 2$ and for such j , the above bound is $O(j^3 e^{-ej^{1/40}})$. By (6.9) it follows that for such $0 \leq j \leq r$,

$$F_j \ll \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } j \leq a^{40}, \\ \max(n^{-2}, j^3 \exp(-ej^{1/40})), & \text{if } j > a^{40}. \end{cases}$$

Summing on j , we find that

$$(6.10) \quad \sum_{0 \leq j \leq r} F_j \ll 1.$$

Together, (6.6)–(6.8) and (6.10) imply that for every $v \in T$,

$$\mathbb{E}[X : v \in \mathcal{X}] = O(1).$$

Combining this estimate with (6.2) and (6.3) shows that $\mathbb{P}\{X > 0\} \gg 1$, and if $X > 0$, then $M_n \leq m_n$, so there exists an absolute constant $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for all n ,

$$\mathbb{P}\{M_n \leq m_n\} \geq \varepsilon.$$

From here it is straightforward to show that $M_n \leq \tilde{M}_n + O(1)$, and we now do so. The next two lemmas, taken from [15], are standard bounds for BRW. As the proofs are short, we include them here.

LEMMA 6.1. *For any BRW, positive integers m, n and positive real numbers M, N ,*

$$\mathbb{P}\{M_{m+n} \geq M + N\} \leq \mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{P}\{M_n \geq N\})^{T_m(M)}].$$

PROOF. Suppose $M_{m+n} \geq M + N$ and $T_m(M) = k$. For each of these k individuals, all of their descendants in generation $m + n$ are offset from their generation m ancestor by at least N . \square

LEMMA 6.2. *Let m, n be positive integers and let $M > 0, \varepsilon > 0$ be real. If $\mathbb{E}\{(1 - \varepsilon)^{T_m(M)}\} < \frac{1}{2}$, then $\mathbb{P}\{M_n < \widetilde{M}_{n+m} - M\} \leq \varepsilon$. In particular, the conclusion holds if $\mathbb{P}\{T_m(M) < 1/\varepsilon\} \leq \frac{1}{5}$.*

PROOF. Let $q = \sup\{x : \mathbb{P}\{M_n < x\} < \varepsilon\}$; then $\mathbb{P}\{M_n < q\} \leq \varepsilon$. By Lemma 6.1,

$$\mathbb{P}\{M_{m+n} \geq M + q\} \leq \mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{P}\{M_n \geq q\})^{T_m(M)}] < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Therefore, $M + q \geq \widetilde{M}_{m+n}$, and, thus, $\mathbb{P}\{M_n < \widetilde{M}_{m+n} - M\} \leq \mathbb{P}\{M_n < q\} \leq \varepsilon$. To prove the second part, assume that $\mathbb{P}\{T_m(M) < 1/\varepsilon\} \leq \frac{1}{5}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\{(1 - \varepsilon)^{T_m(M)}\} &\leq \mathbb{P}\left\{T_m(m) < \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right\} + \left(1 - \mathbb{P}\left\{T_m(M) < \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right\}\right)(1 - \varepsilon)^{1/\varepsilon} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{5} + \frac{4}{5e} < \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Now take A such that $\mathbb{P}\{T_1(A) < 1/\varepsilon\} \leq \frac{1}{5}$. By Lemma 6.2,

$$\mathbb{P}\{M_n \leq \widetilde{M}_n - A\} \leq \mathbb{P}\{M_n \leq \widetilde{M}_{n+1} - A\} \leq \varepsilon$$

and, hence, $\widetilde{M}_n \leq M_n + A$, which completes the proof of the upper bound in Theorem 1.1.

7. Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let $a > 1/e$ and $0 < \eta < ae/2$. By Biggins’ analog of Chernoff’s inequality for the BRW [8, Theorem 2], for large r we have $\mathbb{P}\{T_r(ar) \leq (ae - \eta)^r\} \leq \frac{1}{5}$. Let r_0 be large enough that, in addition, $\widetilde{M}_{n+r} \geq \widetilde{M}_n + (1/e - \eta)r$ for all $r \geq r_0$ and all n (such an r_0 exists by Theorem 1.1). Now fix $r \geq r_0$ and let $M = ar$, let $m = r$, and let $\varepsilon = (ae - \eta)^{-r}$. We then have $\mathbb{P}\{T_m(M) < 1/\varepsilon\} \leq 1/5$, so for all n , by the preceding bound for \widetilde{M}_{n+r} and by Lemma 6.2, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}\{M_n \leq \widetilde{M}_n - (a - 1/e + \eta)r\} \leq \mathbb{P}\{M_n \leq \widetilde{M}_{n+r} - ar\} \leq (ae - \eta)^{-r}.$$

The first estimate follows with $c_1 = \frac{\log(ae - \eta)}{(a - 1/e + \eta)}$. Fix a , let $\eta \rightarrow 0$, then let $a \rightarrow 1/e$, so that $c_1 \rightarrow e$. This proves the first part of Theorem 1.2.

For the second part, fix $0 < \varepsilon < 1/50$ and let $\delta = \varepsilon^2$, so that $\delta(1 + \log((1 - \varepsilon/5)/\delta)) < \varepsilon/5$. Then choose r_0 sufficiently large that for all $r \geq r_0$, we have $(1 - \varepsilon/5)r + 2\lceil \log(2r) \rceil < r$, and for all $s \geq \log(2r_0)$, we have $\mathbb{P}\{T_s(2s) \leq 4^s\} \leq e^{-1/\delta}$ (as in the first part, such an r_0 exists by [8, Theorem 2]).

Recall that if $h \in \mathbb{N}^1 = T_1$ is a child of the root in T , then $S(h)$ is Gamma(h) distributed. Thus, for any positive integer r , by a union bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{T_1((1 - \varepsilon/5)r) \leq \delta r - 1\} &\leq \sum_{h \leq \delta r} \mathbb{P}\{S(h) \geq (1 - \varepsilon/5)r\} \\ &= \sum_{h \leq \delta r} \frac{e^{-(1-\varepsilon/5)r} ((1 - \varepsilon/5)r)^h}{h!} \\ &\leq e^{-(1-\varepsilon/5)r} e^{(1+\log((1-\varepsilon/5)/\delta))\delta r} \\ &\leq e^{-(1-2\varepsilon/5)r}, \end{aligned}$$

the second-to-last inequality by Proposition 3.3.

Write $s = \lceil \log(2r) \rceil$, and let E be the event that there are at least 4^s nodes in T_{s+1} with displacement at most $(1 - \varepsilon/5)r + 2s < r$. If $T_1((1 - \varepsilon/5)r) > \delta r$, then either E occurs, or else for each $h \leq \lceil \delta r - 1 \rceil$, the number of $v \in T_{s+1}$ descending from $h \in T_1$ with $S(v) - S(h) \leq 2s$ is less than 4^s . The latter event has probability less than $(e^{-(1/\delta)})^{\delta r - 1} = e^{(1/\delta)-r}$. It follows that

$$\mathbb{P}\{E^c\} \leq e^{-(1-2\varepsilon/5)r} + e^{(1/\delta)-r} \leq e^{-(1-\varepsilon/2)r},$$

the last inequality holding for large r . Finally, if $M_n > \widetilde{M}_{n-(s+1)} + r$, then for each node $v \in T_{s+1}$ with $S(v) \leq (1 - \varepsilon/5)r + 2s$, for all $w \in T_n$ descending from v we must have $S(w) - S(v) \geq \widetilde{M}_{n-(s+1)}$. If E occurs, then there are at least $4^s \geq 2r$ such nodes v , and so

$$\mathbb{P}\{M_n > \widetilde{M}_{n-(s+1)} + r\} \leq e^{-(1-\varepsilon/2)r} + 2^{-2r} < e^{-(1-\varepsilon)r},$$

the last inequality holding for large r . Since $\widetilde{M}_{n-(s+1)} \leq \widetilde{M}_n$, the second part of Theorem 1.2 is proved by letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Acknowledgments. The authors thank Hugh Montgomery for bringing paper [16] to our attention. K. Ford thanks the IAS for its hospitality and excellent working conditions.

REFERENCES

[1] ADDARIO-BERRY, L. and REED, B. (2009). Minima in branching random walks. *Ann. Probab.* **37** 1044–1079. MR2537549
 [2] AĪDĒKON, E. (2011). Convergence in law of the minimum of a branching random walk. Available at arXiv:1101.1810v1 [math.PR].
 [3] AĪDĒKON, E. and SHI, Z. (2010). Weak convergence for the minimal position in a branching random walk: A simple proof. *Period. Math. Hungar.* **61** 43–54. MR2728431
 [4] ALDOUS, D. and STEELE, J. M. (2004). The objective method: Probabilistic combinatorial optimization and local weak convergence. In *Probability on Discrete Structures. Encyclopaedia Math. Sci.* **110** 1–72. Springer, Berlin. MR2023650

- [5] BACHMANN, M. (2000). Limit theorems for the minimal position in a branching random walk with independent logconcave displacements. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.* **32** 159–176. [MR1765165](#)
- [6] BERTOIN, J. (2006). *Random Fragmentation and Coagulation Processes. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics* **102**. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge. [MR2253162](#)
- [7] BIGGINS, J. D. (1976). The first- and last-birth problems for a multitype age-dependent branching process. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.* **8** 446–459. [MR0420890](#)
- [8] BIGGINS, J. D. (1977). Chernoff’s theorem in the branching random walk. *J. Appl. Probab.* **14** 630–636. [MR0464415](#)
- [9] BILLINGSLEY, P. (1972). On the distribution of large prime divisors. *Period. Math. Hungar.* **2** 283–289. [MR0335462](#)
- [10] BRAMSON, M. and ZEITOUNI, O. (2009). Tightness for a family of recursion equations. *Ann. Probab.* **37** 615–653. [MR2510018](#)
- [11] CHAUVIN, B. and DRMOTA, M. (2006). The random multisection problem, travelling waves and the distribution of the height of m -ary search trees. *Algorithmica* **46** 299–327. [MR2291958](#)
- [12] DEVROYE, L. (1987). Branching processes in the analysis of the heights of trees. *Acta Inform.* **24** 277–298. [MR0894557](#)
- [13] DONNELLY, P. and GRIMMETT, G. (1993). On the asymptotic distribution of large prime factors. *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)* **47** 395–404. [MR1214904](#)
- [14] DVORETZKY, A. and MOTZKIN, T. (1947). A problem of arrangements. *Duke Math. J.* **14** 305–313. [MR0021531](#)
- [15] FORD, K., KONYAGIN, S. V. and LUCA, F. (2010). Prime chains and Pratt trees. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **20** 1231–1258. [MR2746953](#)
- [16] HALMOS, P. R. (1944). Random alms. *Ann. Math. Statistics* **15** 182–189. [MR0010342](#)
- [17] HAMMERSLEY, J. M. (1974). Postulates for subadditive processes. *Ann. Probab.* **2** 652–680. [MR0370721](#)
- [18] HARRIS, T. E. (1963). *The Theory of Branching Processes*. Springer, Berlin. [MR0163361](#)
- [19] HU, Y. and SHI, Z. (2009). Minimal position and critical martingale convergence in branching random walks, and directed polymers on disordered trees. *Ann. Probab.* **37** 742–789. [MR2510023](#)
- [20] KINGMAN, J. F. C. (1975). The first birth problem for an age-dependent branching process. *Ann. Probab.* **3** 790–801. [MR0400438](#)
- [21] PITMAN, J. (2006). *Combinatorial Stochastic Processes. Lecture Notes in Math.* **1875**. Springer, Berlin. [MR2245368](#)
- [22] PITTEL, B. (1994). Note on the heights of random recursive trees and random m -ary search trees. *Random Structures Algorithms* **5** 337–347. [MR1262983](#)
- [23] PRATT, V. R. (1975). Every prime has a succinct certificate. *SIAM J. Comput.* **4** 214–220. [MR0391574](#)

MCGILL UNIVERSITY
1005-805 SHERBROOKE WEST
MONTREAL, QUEBEC
H3A 2K6, CANADA
E-MAIL: louigi@math.mcgill.ca

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
1409 WEST GREEN ST., URBANA
ILLINOIS 61801, USA
E-MAIL: ford@math.uiuc.edu