

# Limit theorems for one-dimensional transient random walks in Markov environments

Eddy Mayer-Wolf\*    Alexander Roitershtein†    Ofer Zeitouni‡§

August 15, 2003; Revised April 21, 2004

## Abstract

We obtain non-Gaussian limit laws for one-dimensional random walk in a random environment in the case that the environment is a function of a stationary Markov process. This is an extension of the work of Kesten, M. Kozlov and Spitzer [13] for random walks in i.i.d. environments. The basic assumption is that the underlying Markov chain is irreducible and either with finite state space or with transition kernel dominated above and below by a probability measure.

*MSC2000:* primary 60K37, 60F05; secondary 60J05, 60J80.

*Keywords:* RWRE, stable laws, branching, stochastic difference equations.

## 1 Introduction and Statement of Results

Let  $\Omega = (0, 1)^{\mathbb{Z}}$  and let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $\Omega$ . A *random environment* is an element  $\omega = \{\omega_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$  of  $\Omega$  distributed according to a stationary and ergodic probability measure  $P$  on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ . The *random walk in the environment*  $\omega$  is a time-homogeneous Markov chain  $X = \{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  on  $\mathbb{Z}$  governed by the *quenched* law

$$P_\omega(X_0 = 0) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad P_\omega(X_{n+1} = j | X_n = i) = \begin{cases} \omega_i & \text{if } j = i + 1, \\ 1 - \omega_i & \text{if } j = i - 1. \end{cases}$$

Let  $(\mathbb{Z}^{\mathbb{N}}, \mathcal{G})$  be the canonical space for the paths of  $\{X_n\}$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{G}$  is the cylinder  $\sigma$ -algebra. The *random walk in random environment* (RWRE) associated with  $P$  is the process  $(X, \omega)$

---

\*Department of Mathematics, Technion - IIT, Haifa 32000, Israel (e-mail: emw@tx.technion.ac.il).

†Department of Mathematics, Technion - IIT, Haifa 32000, Israel (e-mail: roiterst@tx.technion.ac.il).

‡Departments of Electrical Engineering and Mathematics, Technion - IIT, Haifa 32000, Israel, and Department of Mathematics, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455, USA (e-mail: zeitouni@math.umn.edu)

§E. M-W. and A. R. thank the Department of Mathematics at the University of Minnesota for its hospitality during a visit in which part of this work was carried out. The work of O. Z. was partially supported by NSF grant number DMS-0302230.

on the measurable space  $(\Omega \times \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbb{N}}, \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{G})$  having the *annealed* probability law  $\mathbb{P} = P \otimes P_\omega$  defined by

$$\mathbb{P}(F \times G) = \int_F P_\omega(G) P(d\omega), \quad F \in \mathcal{F}, \quad G \in \mathcal{G}.$$

Since the process learns about the environment as time passes according to the Bayes rule,  $\{X_n\}$  is in general not a Markov chain under the annealed measure  $\mathbb{P}$ . The model goes back to [17, 23] and, in physics, to [8, 27]. In this introduction we briefly discuss some basic results on the one-dimensional RWRE. We refer the reader to [25, 28] for recent comprehensive surveys of the field.

Recurrence criteria and possible speed regimes for the one-dimensional RWRE were established by Solomon [23] in the case where  $\{\omega_n\}$  is an i.i.d. sequence and carried over to general ergodic environments by Alili [1]. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_n &= \frac{1 - \omega_n}{\omega_n}, \\ R(\omega) &= 1 + \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \rho_0 \rho_{-1} \cdots \rho_{-n}, \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

$T_0 = 0$ , and for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$T_n = \min\{k : X_k \geq n\} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_n = T_n - T_{n-1}. \tag{1.2}$$

$X_n$  is a.s. transient if  $E_P(\log \rho_0) \neq 0$  and is a.s. recurrent if  $E_P(\log \rho_0) = 0$ . Moreover, if  $E_P(\log \rho_0) < 0$  then (see [28, Sect 2.1])  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(X_n = +\infty) = 1$ ,  $T_n$  are a.s. finite,  $\{\tau_n\}$  is a stationary and ergodic sequence, and we have the following law of large numbers:

$$v_P := \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{X_n}{n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{n}{T_n} = \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}(\tau_1)} = \frac{1}{2E_P(R) - 1}, \quad \mathbb{P} - \text{a.s.} \tag{1.3}$$

Thus, the transient walk  $X_n$  has a deterministic speed  $v_P = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_n/n$  which may be zero.

Solomon's law of large numbers for the transient walks in i.i.d. environment was completed by limit laws in the work of Kesten, M. Kozlov, and Spitzer [13]. The limit laws for the RWRE  $X_n$  are deduced in [13] from stable limit laws for the hitting times  $T_n$ , and the index  $\kappa$  of the stable distribution is determined by the condition

$$E_P(\rho_0^\kappa) = 1.$$

In particular, under certain conditions the central limit theorem holds with the standard normalization  $\sqrt{n}$ , and this case was extended to stationary and ergodic environments by Alili [1], Molchanov [18] and Zeitouni [28, Sect 2.2], see also Bremont [7].

In this paper we obtain limit laws for  $X_n$  for environments which are pointwise transformations of a stationary ergodic Markov process which satisfies Assumption 1.5 below. These laws are related to stable laws of index  $\kappa \in (0, 2]$ , where, under the assumptions below,  $\kappa$  is determined by

$$\Lambda(\kappa) = 0, \quad \text{where} \quad \Lambda(\beta) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log E_P \left( \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \rho_i^\beta \right). \tag{1.4}$$

More precisely:

**Basic setup:** On a state space  $\mathcal{S}$  equipped with a countably generated  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{T}$ , let  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be a stationary Markov chain, such that  $\omega_{-n} = \omega(x_n)$  (and hence  $\rho_{-n} = \rho(x_n)$ ) for measurable functions  $\rho, \omega : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . We denote by  $H(x, \cdot)$  the transition probability measure of  $(x_n)$ , by  $\pi$  its stationary probability measure, and use the notation  $H(x, y)$  to denote  $H(x, \{y\})$  for a single state  $y \in \mathcal{S}$ . With  $P_x$  denoting the law of the Markov chain with  $x_0 = x$ , the reader should not confuse  $P_x$  and  $P_\omega$ .

We shall say that the process  $\log \rho_{-n}$  is  $\alpha$ -arithmetic (c.f. [22,2]) if  $\alpha > 0$  is the largest number for which there exists a measurable function  $\gamma : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [0, \alpha)$  such that

$$P(\log \rho_0 \in \gamma(x_{-1}) - \gamma(x_0) + \alpha\mathbb{Z}) = 1, \quad P - \text{a.s.}$$

The process will be said to be non-arithmetic if no such  $\alpha$  exists.

**Assumption 1.5.**

(A1) *Either*

$$\mathcal{S} \text{ is a finite set and the Markov chain } (x_n) \text{ is irreducible,} \quad (1.6)$$

*or, there exist a constant  $c_r \geq 1$  and a probability measure  $\psi$  on  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$  such that for some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,*

$$c_r^{-1} \psi(A) < H^m(x, A) < c_r \psi(A) \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{S}, A \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (1.7)$$

*where the kernel  $H^n(x, A)$  is defined inductively by  $H^0(x, A) = \mathbf{1}_A(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{S}, A \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $H^n(x, A) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} H^{n-1}(x, dy) H(y, A)$ ,  $n \geq 1$ .*

(A2)  $P(\epsilon < \omega_0 < 1 - \epsilon) = 1$  for some  $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$ .

(A3)  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log E_P \left( \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \rho_i^\beta \right) < 0$  and  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log E_P \left( \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \rho_i^{\beta'} \right) \geq 0$  for some constants  $\beta > 0$  and  $\beta' > 0$ .

(A4)  $\log \rho_0$  is non-arithmetic in the sense defined above.

Note that condition (A1) refers to the underlying Markov chain  $(x_n)$ , whereas conditions (A2)–(A4) refer to  $\omega$  itself. Assumption (1.6) is not a particular case of assumption (1.7) since under (1.6) the Markov chain  $(x_n)$  may be periodic. Under (A1), the environment  $\omega$  is an ergodic sequence (see e.g. [10, p. 338] or [19, Theorem 6.15]). Condition (A3) guarantees, by convexity, the existence of a unique  $\kappa$  in (1.4). Indeed it will be shown later that the lim sup is in fact a lim. It also follows from (A3), by Jensen's inequality, that  $E_P(\log \rho_0) < 0$ , so that  $X_n$  is transient to the right. For future reference we denote

$$c_\rho = \frac{1 - \epsilon}{\epsilon}, \quad (1.8)$$

and note that by the ellipticity condition (A2),  $P(c_\rho^{-1} < \rho_0 < c_\rho) = 1$ .

For  $\kappa \in (0, 2]$  and  $b > 0$  we denote by  $\mathcal{L}_{\kappa, b}$  the stable law of index  $\kappa$  with the characteristic function

$$\log \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{\kappa, b}(t) = -b|t|^\kappa \left( 1 + i \frac{t}{|t|} f_\kappa(t) \right), \quad (1.9)$$

where  $f_\kappa(t) = -\tan \frac{\pi}{2}\kappa$  if  $\kappa \neq 1$ ,  $f_1(t) = 2/\pi \log t$ . With a slight abuse of notation we use the same symbol for the distribution function of this law. If  $\kappa < 1$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_{\kappa,b}$  is supported on the positive reals, and if  $\kappa \in (1, 2]$ , it has zero mean [21, Chapter 1]. Our main result is:

**Theorem 1.10.** *Let Assumption 1.5 hold. Then there is a unique  $\kappa > 0$  such that (1.4) and the following hold for some  $b > 0$ :*

- (i) *If  $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ , then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(n^{-\kappa} X_n \leq \mathfrak{z}) = 1 - \mathcal{L}_{\kappa,b}(\mathfrak{z}^{-1/\kappa})$ ,*
- (ii) *If  $\kappa = 1$ , then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(n^{-1}(\log n)^2(X_n - \delta(n)) \leq \mathfrak{z}) = 1 - \mathcal{L}_{1,b}(-\mathfrak{z})$ , for suitable  $A_1 > 0$  and  $\delta(n) \sim (A_1 \log n)^{-1}n$ ,*
- (iii) *If  $\kappa \in (1, 2)$ , then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(n^{-1/\kappa}(X_n - nv_P) \leq \mathfrak{z}) = 1 - \mathcal{L}_{\kappa,b}(-\mathfrak{z})$ .*
- (iv) *If  $\kappa = 2$ , then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}((n \log n)^{-1/2}(X_n - nv_P) \leq \mathfrak{z}) = \mathcal{L}_{2,b}(\mathfrak{z})$ .*

In the setup of Theorem 1.10 it is not hard to check, and follows e.g. from [28, Theorem 2.2.1], that the standard CLT holds if  $\kappa > 2$ .

As in [13], stable laws for  $X_n$  follow from stable laws for the hitting times  $T_n$ , and we direct our efforts to obtaining limit laws for the latter. We have:

**Proposition 1.11.** *Let Assumption 1.5 hold. Then there is a unique  $\kappa > 0$  such that (1.4) and the following hold for some  $\tilde{b} > 0$ :*

- (i) *If  $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ , then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(n^{-1/\kappa} T_n \leq t) = \mathcal{L}_{\kappa,\tilde{b}}(t)$ ,*
- (ii) *If  $\kappa = 1$ , then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(n^{-1}(T_n - nD(n)) \leq t) = \mathcal{L}_{1,\tilde{b}}(t)$ , for suitable  $c_0 > 0$  and  $D(n) \sim c_0 \log n$ ,*
- (iii) *If  $\kappa \in (1, 2)$ , then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(n^{-1/\kappa}(T_n - nv_P^{-1}) \leq t) = \mathcal{L}_{\kappa,\tilde{b}}(t)$ .*
- (iv) *If  $\kappa = 2$ , then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}((n \log n)^{-1/2}(T_n - nv_P^{-1}) \leq t) = \mathcal{L}_{2,\tilde{b}}(t)$ .*

The proof that Theorem 1.10 follows from Proposition 1.11 is the same as in the i.i.d. case, and is based on the observation that for any positive integers  $\eta, \zeta, n$

$$\{T_\zeta \geq n\} \subset \{X_n \leq \zeta\} \subset \{T_{\zeta+\eta} \geq n\} \cup \left\{ \inf_{k \geq T_{\zeta+\eta}} X_k - (\zeta + \eta) \leq -\eta \right\}. \quad (1.12)$$

Because the random variables  $\inf_{k \geq T_{\zeta+\eta}} X_k - (\zeta + \eta)$  and  $\inf_{k \geq 0} X_k$  have the same annealed distribution, the probability of the last event in (1.12) can be made arbitrary small uniformly in  $n$  and  $\zeta$  by fixing  $\eta$  large (since the RWRE  $X_n$  is transient to the right). For  $\kappa = 1$ , the rest of the argument is detailed in [13, pp. 167–168], where no use of the i.i.d. assumption for  $\omega$  is made at that stage, and a similar argument works for all  $\kappa \in (0, 2]$ . All of our work in the sequel is directed toward the proof of Proposition 1.11.

Following [13], the analysis of  $T_n$  is best understood in terms of certain regeneration times  $\nu_n$ , with excursion counts between regenerations forming a branching process  $Z_n$  with immigration in a random environment (see Section 2.2 for precise definitions). In the i.i.d. setup, the total population of the branching process between regenerations, denoted  $W_n$ , forms an i.i.d. sequence, and much of the work in [13] is to establish accurate enough tail estimates on them to allow for the application of the i.i.d. stable limit law for partial sums of  $W_n$ . The limit laws for  $T_n$  then easily follow from those for  $W_n$ .

In our case, the sequence  $W_n$  a-priori is not even stationary. However, using the regeneration property of the underlying Markov chain  $(x_n)$  (see Section 2.1), we introduce in Section 2.2 modified regeneration times  $\bar{\nu}_n$  (a random subsequence of  $\nu_n$ ) such that the total population of the branching process between times  $\bar{\nu}_n$  and  $\bar{\nu}_{n+1}$ , denoted by  $\bar{W}_{n+1}$ , is a one-dependent stationary sequence. This sequence is i.i.d. if either (1.7) with  $m = 1$  or (1.6) hold. Again following the proof in [13], we obtain tails estimates for the random variables  $\bar{W}_{n+1}$  yielding the stable limit laws for  $T_n$  stated in Proposition 1.11. Similarly to the i.i.d. case, the key to the proof is the derivation of tails estimates obtained in Section 2.3 for the random variable  $R$  defined in (1.1).

We conclude the introduction with a characterization of the speed  $v_P$  under Assumption 1.5, which will not be used in the sequel. Recall that  $\rho_n = \rho(x_n)$  for a measurable function  $\rho : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . If  $\kappa \leq 1$ , then  $v_P = 0$ , and if  $\kappa > 1$ , then  $v_P^{-1} = E_P(\rho(x_0)\xi(x_0))$ , where the function  $\xi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  is the unique positive and bounded solution of the equation

$$\xi(x) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} H(x, dy)\rho(y)\xi(y) + 1 + 1/\rho(x). \quad (1.13)$$

This formula is essentially due to Takacs [26], who considered finite-state Markov environments. The proof in the general Markov case is included at the end of Section 2.1.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2, divided into three subsections, contains the proof of Theorem 1.10, except for the proofs of two propositions which are deferred to the Appendix. In Subsection 2.1 some basic properties of Markov chains that satisfy Assumption 1.5 are described. In particular, Condition B is introduced and shown to hold under Assumption 1.5. In Subsection 2.2, Condition  $C_\kappa$  is introduced and Proposition 1.11 is derived from it and Condition B, making use of the above mentioned branching process and a regeneration structure it possesses. Finally, Subsection 2.3 is devoted to the proof that Condition  $C_\kappa$  holds under Assumption 1.5.

## 2 Proofs

### 2.1 Some properties of the underlying Markov chain and their consequences

We summarize here, using the framework of the Athreya-Ney and Nummelin theory of positive recurrent kernels (cf. [5, 6, 19]), some properties of the Markov chain  $(x_n)$  that follow from Assumption 1.5. The main objectives here are to introduce the regeneration times  $N_k$  and to obtain the Perron-Frobenius type Lemmas 2.6 and 2.8. One immediate consequence of these lemmas is that Condition B introduced subsequently is satisfied under Assumption 1.5.

First, we define a sequence of regeneration times for the Markov chain  $(x_n)$ . If (1.6) holds, let  $x^* \in \mathcal{S}$  be any (recurrent) state of the Markov chain  $(x_n)$  and pick any  $r \in (0, 1)$ . Let  $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be a sequence of i.i.d. variables independent of  $(x_n)$  (in an enlarged probability space if needed) such that  $P(y_0 = 1) = r$  and  $P(y_0 = 0) = 1 - r$ , and let

$$N_0 = 0, \quad N_{n+1} = \min\{k > N_n : x_n = x^*, y_n = 1\}, \quad n \geq 0.$$

Then, the blocks  $(x_{N_n}, x_{N_n+1}, \dots, x_{N_{n+1}-1})$  are independent, and  $x_{N_n}$  are identically distributed for  $n \geq 1$ . Note that between two successive regeneration times, the chain evolves according to the sub-stochastic Markov kernel  $\Theta$  defined by

$$H(x, y) = \Theta(x, y) + r \mathbf{1}_{\{y=x^*\}} H(x, y), \quad (2.1)$$

that is

$$P_x(x_1 = y, N_1 > 1) = \Theta(x, y). \quad (2.2)$$

If (1.7) holds, then the random variables  $N_k$  can be defined by the following procedure (see [5, 19] and [3]). Given an initial state  $x_0$ , generate  $x_m$  as follows: with probability  $r < c_r^{-1}$  distribute  $x_m$  over  $\mathcal{S}$  according to  $\psi$  and with probability  $1-r$  according to  $1/(1-r) \cdot \Theta(x_0, \cdot)$ , where the kernel  $\Theta(x, \cdot)$  is defined by

$$H^m(x, A) = \Theta(x, A) + r\psi(A), \quad x \in \mathcal{S}, A \in \mathcal{T}. \quad (2.3)$$

Then, (unless  $m = 1$ ) sample the segment  $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{m-1})$  according to the chain's conditional distribution, given  $x_0$  and  $x_m$ . Generate  $x_{2m}$  and  $x_{m+1}, x_{m+2}, \dots, x_{2m-1}$  in a similar way, and so on. Since the “ $r$ -coin” is tossed each time independently, the event “the next move of the chain  $(x_{mn})_{n \geq 0}$  is according to  $\psi$ ” occurs i.o. Let  $N_0 = 0$  and  $\{N_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  be the successful times of its occurrence multiplied by  $m$ . By construction, the blocks  $(x_{N_n}, x_{N_n+1}, \dots, x_{N_{n+1}-1})$  are one-dependent (if  $m = 1$  they are actually independent), and for  $n \geq 1$  they are identically distributed ( $x_{N_n}$  is distributed according to  $\psi$ ).

Let us summarize the most important property of the regeneration times  $N_n$  as follows. For  $n \geq 0$ , let

$$D_n = (x_{N_n}, x_{N_n+1}, \dots, x_{N_{n+1}-1}). \quad (2.4)$$

Then:

- The random blocks  $D_n$  are identically distributed for  $n \geq 1$ .
- If (1.6) or (1.7) with  $m = 1$  hold,  $D_n$  are independent for  $n \geq 0$ .
- If (1.7) holds with  $m > 1$ ,  $D_n$  are one-dependent for  $n \geq 0$ .

In both cases under consideration (either of (1.6) or of (1.7)), there exist constants  $l, \delta > 0$ , such that (cf. [5])

$$\inf_{x \in \mathcal{S}} P_x(N_1 \leq l) > \delta > 0. \quad (2.5)$$

The regeneration times  $N_n$  will be used in Section 2.2 for the construction of an auxiliary sequence  $\overline{W}_n$  of stationary and one-dependent random variables playing a central role in the proof of Proposition 1.11.

We now turn to a Perron-Frobenius type theorem for positive finite kernels, having in mind applications to the kernels of the form  $K(x, A) = E_x \left( \prod_{i=0}^n \rho_{-i}^\beta; x_n \in A \right)$ . In the following two lemmas, we consider separately the cases of non-finite (assumption (1.7)) and

finite (assumption (1.6)) state space  $\mathcal{S}$ . In particular, the properties of the positive kernels described in these lemmas imply Condition B introduced below and are essential for the proof of the crucial Proposition 2.38.

Let  $B_b$  be the Banach space of bounded measurable real-valued functions on  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$  with the norm  $\|f\| = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{S}} |f(x)|$ . A positive and finite kernel  $K(x, A)$  (a measurable function of  $x$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{T}$  and a finite positive measure on  $\mathcal{T}$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{S}$ ) defines a bounded linear operator on  $B_b$  by setting  $Kf(x) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} K(x, dy)f(y)$ . We denote by  $r_K$  the spectral radius of the operator corresponding to the kernel  $K$ , that is

$$r_K = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n]{\|K^n \mathbf{1}\|} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n]{\|K^n\|_{B_b \rightarrow B_b}},$$

where  $\mathbf{1}(x) \equiv 1$ .

Although the results stated in the following lemma are certainly well-known and appear elsewhere, their proofs are provided for the sake of completeness.

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let  $K(x, A)$  be a positive kernel on  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$  such that for some constant  $c \geq 1$  and probability measure  $\psi$ ,*

$$c^{-1}\psi(A) \leq K(x, A) \leq c\psi(A), \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{S}, A \in \mathcal{T}. \quad (2.7)$$

*Then,*

- (a) *There exists a function  $f \in B_b$  such that  $\inf_x f(x) > 0$  and  $Kf = r_K f$ . There exists a constant  $c_K \geq 1$  such that  $c_K^{-1} r_K^n \leq K^n \mathbf{1} \leq c_K r_K^n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .*
- (b) *If  $K = K_1^m$  for a positive finite kernel  $K_1(x, A)$  and some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $r_{K_1} = r_K^{1/m}$  and there exists a function  $f_1 \in B_b$  such that  $\inf_x f_1(x) > 0$  and  $K_1 f_1 = r_{K_1}^{1/m} f_1$ .*

*Proof.*

- (a) The existence of a function  $f : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  and a constant  $\lambda > 0$  such that  $Kf = \lambda f$  follows from the Example in [19, p. 96]. It follows from (2.7) that  $f(x)$  is bounded away from zero and infinity, i.e.  $c_K^{-1} \leq f(x) \leq c_K$  for some  $c_K > 0$ . Hence, for any  $n > 0$ ,  $K^n \mathbf{1} < c_K K^n f = c_K \lambda^n f < c_K^2 \lambda^n$ . Similarly,  $K^n \mathbf{1} > c_K^{-2} \lambda^n$ . That is,  $\lambda = r_K$ .
- (b) Set  $f_1 = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} (1/r_K)^{j/m} K_1^j f$ . □

The finite-state counterpart of the previous lemma is stated as follows:

**Lemma 2.8.** *Let  $\mathcal{S} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  and  $K(i, j)$  be an irreducible  $n \times n$  matrix with nonnegative entries. For some constants  $r \in (0, 1)$  and  $j^* \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  define the matrix  $\tilde{\Theta}(i, j)$  by*

$$K(i, j) = \tilde{\Theta}(i, j) + r \mathbf{1}_{\{j=j^*\}} K(i, j), \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq n. \quad (2.9)$$

*Then,*

- (a) *Assertion (a) of Lemma 2.6 holds for the matrix  $K$ .*
- (b) *There exists a function  $g \in B_b$  such that  $\inf_x g(x) > 0$  and  $\tilde{\Theta}g = r_{\tilde{\Theta}}g$ .*

(c)  $r_{\tilde{\Theta}} \in (0, r_K)$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\tilde{\Theta}$  and  $K$  have the same adjacency matrices ( $K(i, j) = 0$  iff  $\tilde{\Theta}(i, j) = 0$ ),  $\tilde{\Theta}$  is irreducible as well. Assertions of (a) and (b) follow then from the Perron-Frobenius theorem. Clearly  $r_{\tilde{\Theta}} \leq r_K$ . Since  $r_K f \geq \tilde{\Theta}f$ , the equality  $r_{\tilde{\Theta}} = r_K$  would imply [19, Theorem 5.1] that  $f = g$  and  $\tilde{\Theta}f = r_K f = Kf$ , that is impossible since  $f > 0$  everywhere. Hence  $r_{\tilde{\Theta}} < r_K$ .  $\square$

Since for any  $\beta \geq 0$ ,

$$E_x \left( \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (\rho_{-k})^\beta \right) = \rho(x)^\beta H_\beta^{n-1} \mathbf{1}(x), \quad (2.10)$$

where  $H_\beta(x, dy) = H(x, dy)\rho(y)^\beta$ , it follows from Lemmas 2.6 and 2.8 that for some constant  $c_\beta \geq 1$  which depends on  $\beta$  only,

$$c_\beta^{-1} r_\beta^n \leq E_x \left( \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (\rho_{-k})^\beta \right) \leq c_\beta r_\beta^n, \quad x \in \mathcal{S}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (2.11)$$

where  $r_\beta = r_{H_\beta}$ . Therefore, the following Condition B is satisfied under Assumption 1.5. With future applications in mind, we make the formulation suitable for non-Markovian ergodic environments. Let

$$\mathcal{F}_0 = \sigma(\omega_n : n > 0) \quad (2.12)$$

be the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by the “past” of the sequence  $\{\omega_{-n}\}$ .

**Condition B.**  $\{\omega_{-n}\}$  is a stationary and ergodic sequence such that

(B1) *Ellipticity condition:*  $P(\epsilon < \omega_0 < 1 - \epsilon) = 1$  for some  $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$ .

(B2) For any  $\beta > 0$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log E_P \left( \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \rho_{-k}^\beta \mid \mathcal{F}_0 \right) = \Lambda(\beta), \quad a.s., \quad (2.13)$$

with uniform (in  $\omega$ ) rate of convergence, with  $\Lambda(\beta)$  as in (1.4). Further, there exists a unique  $\kappa > 0$  such that  $\Lambda(\kappa) = 0$ , and  $\Lambda(\beta)(\beta - \kappa) \geq 0$  for all  $\beta > 0$ .

The last statement follows since  $\Lambda(\beta)$  is a convex function of  $\beta$  in  $[0, \infty)$ , taking both negative and positive values by Assumption (A3), with  $\Lambda(0) = 0$ .

We conclude this subsection with the proof of (1.13). It follows from (1.3), (1.1) and (2.11) that  $v_P = 0$  for  $\kappa \leq 1$ . Assume that  $\kappa > 1$  and consider the following decomposition for the hitting time  $\tau_1$  defined in (1.2)):

$$\tau_1 = \mathbf{1}_{\{X_1=1\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{X_1=-1\}}(1 + \tau_0'' + \tau_1'),$$

where  $1 + \tau_0''$  is the first hitting time of 0 after time 1, and  $1 + \tau_0'' + \tau_1'$  is the first hitting time of 1 after time  $1 + \tau_0''$ . Taking expectations in both sides of the equation (first for a fixed environment and then integrating over the set of environments) gives

$$\mathbb{E}(\tau_1 | x_0 = x) = 1 + \rho(x) (1 + \mathbb{E}(\tau_0'' | x_0 = x)).$$

Since  $\mathbb{E}(\tau_0''|x_0 = x) = \mathbb{E}(\tau_1|x_1 = x) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}(\tau_1|x_0 = y)H(x, dy)$ , we obtain that the function  $\xi(x) := \mathbb{E}(\tau_1|x_1 = x)/\rho(x)$  solves equation (1.13). Recalling the operator  $H_1 : f(x) \rightarrow \int_{\mathcal{S}} H(x, dy)\rho(y)f(y)$  acting on  $B_b$ , it follows from identity (2.11) and Condition B, that its spectral radius is strictly less than one, and a simple truncation argument (by (1.13),  $\xi_M \leq H_1\xi_M + 1 + 1/\rho$ , where  $\xi_M(x) := \mathbb{E}(\min\{\tau_1, M\}|x_1 = x)/\rho(x)$  for a constant  $M > 0$ ) shows that  $\xi(x)$  is a bounded function of  $x$ , yielding that  $\mathbb{E}(\tau_1) = E_P(\rho(x_0)\xi(x_0))$ . This implies (1.13) by (1.3) (Lemmas 2.1.11 and 2.1.17 in [28]).

## 2.2 The branching model and its regeneration structure

We consider here a branching process  $\{Z_n\}$  in random environment with immigration closely related to the RWRE (see e.g., [1, 13, 28]). The random variables  $T_n$  are associated by (2.14) to the partial sums of the branching process  $Z_n$ . This leads us naturally to the variables  $\bar{W}_n$ , defined in (2.22), which are random partial sums of  $Z_n$ . The aim in introducing the branching process is to transform the limit problem of  $T_n$  into a limit problem for the partial sums of the sequence  $\bar{W}_n$ , which turns out to be a stationary and one-dependent sequence in a stable domain of attraction.

Let

$$U_i^n = \#\{k < T_n : X_k = i, X_{k+1} = i - 1\}, \quad i, n \in \mathbb{Z},$$

the number of moves to the left from site  $i$  up to time  $T_n$ . Then

$$T_n = n + 2 \sum_{i=-\infty}^n U_i^n. \quad (2.14)$$

When  $U_n^n = 0, U_{n-1}^n, \dots, U_{n-i+1}^n$  and  $\omega_n, \omega_{n-1}, \dots, \omega_{n-i}$  are given,  $U_{n-i}^n$  is the sum of  $U_{n-i+1}^n + 1$  i.i.d. geometric random variables that take the value  $k$  with probability  $\omega_{n-i}(1 - \omega_{n-i})^k$ ,  $k = 0, 1, \dots$ . Assuming that the RWRE is transient to the right we have:

$$\sum_{i \leq 0} U_i^n \leq \text{total time spent by } \{X_t\} \text{ in } (-\infty; 0] < \infty \text{ a.s.} \quad (2.15)$$

Therefore, in order to prove the limit laws for  $T_n$  it is sufficient to prove the corresponding result for the sums  $\sum_{i=1}^n U_i^n$ . These sums have the same distribution as

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} Z_k, \quad (2.16)$$

where  $Z_0 = 0, Z_1, Z_2, \dots$  forms a branching process in random environment with one immigrant at each unit of time.

Without loss of generality, we shall extend the underlying sample space  $(\Omega \times \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbb{N}})$  to  $(\Omega \times \Upsilon)$ , where  $\Upsilon$  is large enough to fit not only the random walk but also the branching process, and assume that  $P_\omega$  (and hence  $\mathbb{P}$ ) is suitably extended.

Thus, when  $\omega$  and  $Z_0, \dots, Z_n$  are given,  $Z_{n+1}$  is the sum of  $Z_n + 1$  independent variables  $V_{n,0}, V_{n,1}, \dots, V_{n,Z_n}$  each having the geometric distribution

$$P_\omega\{V_{n,j} = k\} = \omega_{-n}(1 - \omega_{-n})^k, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots \quad (2.17)$$

Extending (2.12), let for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(Z_0, Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_{n-1}, Z_n) \vee \sigma(\omega_j : j > -n), \quad (2.18)$$

that is, the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by the branching process  $\{Z_i\}_{i=0}^n$  and the environment  $\{\omega_i\}_{i=-n+1}^\infty$  before time  $n$ .

As in [13], the random variables

$$\nu_0 = 0, \quad \nu_n = \min\{k > \nu_{n-1} : Z_k = 0\}$$

are the successive stopping times at which the population becomes extinct, and the variables

$$W_n = \sum_{k=\nu_{n-1}}^{\nu_n-1} Z_k$$

measure the total number of individuals born between two such extinction times.

Recall the definition of the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{F}_0$  given in (2.12). The proof of the following proposition, which is a modification of Lemma 2 in [13] adapted to non-i.i.d. environments, is included in Appendix A.

**Proposition 2.19.** *Assume that Condition B holds. Then, there exist  $C_1, C_2 > 0$  such that  $P$  - a.s.,  $\mathbb{P}(\nu_1 > n | \mathcal{F}_0) \leq C_1 e^{-C_2 n}$ , for any  $n > 0$ .*

The following corollary is immediate since  $C_1, C_2$  above are deterministic.

**Corollary 2.20.** *Assume that Condition B holds. Then, with probability one,  $\mathbb{P}(\nu_{j+1} - \nu_j > n | \mathcal{F}_{\nu_j}) \leq C_1 e^{-C_2 n}$ , for any  $j \geq 0$  and  $n > 0$ , where the constants  $C_1, C_2 > 0$  are the same as in Proposition 2.19.*

Let  $\{N_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$  be the sequence of successive regeneration times for the chain  $(x_n)$  defined in Section 2.1, let  $\bar{\nu}_0 = 0$ , and for  $n \geq 0$  define the stopping times:

$$\bar{\nu}_{n+1} = \inf\{k > \bar{\nu}_n : k = \nu_i = N_j \text{ for some } i, j > 0\}, \quad (2.21)$$

and the random variables

$$\bar{W}_{n+1} = \sum_{k=\bar{\nu}_n}^{\bar{\nu}_{n+1}-1} Z_k. \quad (2.22)$$

By construction of the random times  $N_n$ , the segments of the environment between  $\bar{\nu}_n$  and  $\bar{\nu}_{n+1} - 1$  are one-dependent (see (2.4) and the subsequent summary), and hence the variables  $\{\bar{W}_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  form a one-dependent sequence, which is even independent if either (1.6) or (1.7) with  $m = 1$  hold.

**Lemma 2.23.** *Let Assumption 1.5 hold. Then,*

(a) The distribution of  $\bar{\nu}_1$ , conditioned on the “past” has exponential tails: there exist  $K_1, K_2 > 0$  such that  $P$  – a.s.,

$$\mathbb{P}(\bar{\nu}_1 > n | \mathcal{F}_0) \leq K_1 e^{-K_2 n}, \quad \forall n > 0, \quad (2.24)$$

and, more generally,

$$\mathbb{P}(\bar{\nu}_{j+1} - \bar{\nu}_j > n | \mathcal{F}_{\bar{\nu}_j}) \leq K_1 e^{-K_2 n} \quad (2.25)$$

for any  $j \geq 0$ .

(b) The law of large numbers holds for  $\bar{\nu}_n$  :  $\mathbb{P}\left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\bar{\nu}_n}{n} = \mu\right) = 1$ , where  $\mu = \mathbb{E}(\bar{\nu}_2 - \bar{\nu}_1) > 0$ .

(c) The central limit theorem holds for  $\bar{\nu}_n$  : there exists a constant  $b > 0$  such that the law of  $(\bar{\nu}_n - n\mu)/\sqrt{n}$  converges to  $\mathcal{L}_{2,b}$ .

*Proof.*

(a) Clearly, it is sufficient to prove (2.24), since the constants  $K_1$  and  $K_2$  are deterministic. Let  $F_1 = \{Z_1 = 0\}$ , and for  $2 \leq j \leq l$ , where  $l$  is defined in (2.5),

$$F_j = \{Z_1 = Z_2 = \dots = Z_{j-1} = 1, Z_j = 0\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{S}_j = \{x \in \mathcal{S} : P_x(N_1 = j) > \delta/l\}.$$

Then  $\bigcup_{j=1}^l \mathcal{S}_j = \mathcal{S}$ , and we have for  $x \in \mathcal{S}_j$  :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\nu_1 = N_1 \leq l | x_0 = x) &\geq \mathbb{P}(F_j \cap \{N_1 = j\} | x_0 = x) = \\ &= P_x(N_1 = j) \mathbb{P}(F_j | x_0 = x, N_1 = j) \geq \frac{\delta}{l} \mathbb{P}(F_j | x_0 = x, N_1 = j). \end{aligned}$$

Using the ellipticity condition (A2), we obtain that  $P$  – a.s.,  $P_\omega(F_1) = \omega_0 \geq \epsilon$ , and for  $2 \leq j \leq l$ ,

$$P_\omega(F_j) = \omega_0(1 - \omega_0) \prod_{k=1}^{j-2} (2\omega_{-k}^2(1 - \omega_{-k})) \omega_{-j+1}^2 \geq 2^{j-2} \epsilon^{2j-1} (1 - \epsilon)^{j-1} \geq \epsilon^{2l} (1 - \epsilon)^{l-1},$$

implying that  $\mathbb{P}(\nu_1 = N_1 \leq l | x_0 = x) \geq \delta/l \cdot \epsilon^{2l} (1 - \epsilon)^{l-1} > 0$  for  $P$ –almost every  $x \in \mathcal{S}$ . Thus, in view of Corollary 2.20,  $\bar{\nu}_1$  is stochastically dominated by a sum of a geometric random number of i.i.d. variables with exponential tails, yielding (2.24). We note in passing that, in view of the uniform bounds in the proof above, the same argument yields uniform exponential tails for the distribution of  $\bar{\nu}_{i+1} - \bar{\nu}_i$  conditioned on  $\sigma\{\omega_j, j > -\bar{\nu}_i\}$ .

(b) Follows from (2.24) and the ergodic theorem, since  $\bar{\nu}_{n+1} - \bar{\nu}_n$ ,  $n \geq 1$ , are one-dependent identically distributed variables.

(c) Follows e.g. from the CLT for stationary and uniformly mixing sequences [10, p. 427].  $\square$

Recall the function  $R(\omega)$  defined in (1.1). We shall prove in Subsection 2.3 that under Assumption 1.5 the following condition holds for some  $\kappa > 0$ .

**Condition  $C_\kappa$ .** *There exists a strictly positive random variable function  $K(\omega)$  such that for some positive constants  $K_3, K_4, t_c$  the following hold  $P - a.s.$  :*

$$t^\kappa P(R > t | \mathcal{F}_0) > K_3 \quad \forall t > t_c \quad \text{and} \quad t^\kappa P(R > t | \mathcal{F}_0) < K_4 \quad \forall t > 0, \quad (2.26)$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^\kappa P(R > t | \mathcal{F}_0) = K(\omega). \quad (2.27)$$

It follows from (2.26) and (1.3) that the case  $\kappa \leq 1$  corresponds to zero speed, and the case  $\kappa > 1$  to a positive speed. Note that if Condition  $C_{\bar{\kappa}}$  and Condition B hold simultaneously, then  $\bar{\kappa} = \kappa$ .

For  $n \geq 1$  let

$$\widetilde{W}_n = \sum_{j=1}^n \overline{W}_j,$$

where the random variables  $\overline{W}_j$  are defined in (2.22). The next proposition is an analogue of [13, Lemma 6] for non-i.i.d environments and is applicable for non-Markov environments too.

**Proposition 2.28.** *Assume Conditions B and  $C_\kappa$ . Then, for any  $n \geq 1$  there exist constants  $t_n, L_n, J_n > 0$  and a strictly positive random variable  $\widetilde{K}_n(\omega)$  such that the following hold  $P - a.s.$  :*

$$J_n < t^\kappa \mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{W}_n > t | \mathcal{F}_0\right), \quad \forall t > t_n \quad \text{and} \quad t^\kappa \mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{W}_n > t | \mathcal{F}_0\right) < L_n, \quad \forall t > 0, \quad (2.29)$$

and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^\kappa \mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{W}_n > t | \mathcal{F}_0\right) = \widetilde{K}_n(\omega). \quad (2.30)$$

**Remark 2.31.**

- (i) *The proof in [13] of the i.i.d. analogue of Proposition 2.28 works nearly verbatim with Conditions B and  $C_\kappa$  compensating for the lack of independence of  $\omega$ . Nevertheless, since the proof is rather long and technical, its detailed modification is included in Appendix B.*
- (ii) *The proposition remains valid with the random variables  $\widetilde{W}_n$  replaced by the variables  $\widehat{W}_n = \sum_{j=1}^n W_n$ . The proof is essentially the same, the only (obvious) difference being that Proposition 2.19 can be applied directly instead of (2.24).*
- (iii) *Just as with Corollary 2.20 and Lemma 2.23 (a), Proposition 2.28 implies the corresponding uniform estimates for the tails  $\mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{W}_{m+n} - \widetilde{W}_m > t | \mathcal{F}_{\bar{v}_m}\right)$  as well, for every  $m \geq 1$ .*

By the bounded convergence theorem, (2.29) and (2.30) yield

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^\kappa \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{W}_n > t) = E_P(\widetilde{K}_n) \in (0, \infty). \quad (2.32)$$

Note that if either (1.6) or (1.7) holds with  $m = 1$ , the random variables  $\overline{W}_n$  are independent, and the limit laws for their partial sums follow from the standard i.i.d. limit laws [11, 21]. More generally, we have:

**Proposition 2.33.** *Let Assumption 1.5 hold.*

- (a) *Assume that  $\kappa \neq 1$ . Let  $B_n = n^{1/\kappa}$  if  $\kappa \in (0, 2)$ ,  $B_n = (n \log n)^{1/2}$  if  $\kappa = 2$ , and  $A_n = 0$  if  $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ ,  $A_n = n\mathbb{E}(\overline{W}_2)$  if  $\kappa \in (1, 2]$ . Then,  $(\widetilde{W}_n - A_n)/B_n$  converges in distribution to a stable law of the form (1.9).*
- (b) *Assume that  $\kappa = 1$ . Then, there exist a sequence  $\widetilde{D}(n) \sim \log n$  and a positive constant  $\tilde{c}_0$  such that the law of  $\frac{1}{n}(\widetilde{W}_n - \tilde{c}_0 n \widetilde{D}(n))$  converges to a stable law of the form (1.9).*

*Proof.* The random variables  $\overline{W}_n$  are identically distributed and one-dependent for  $n \geq 2$  (see the summary after (2.4), and note that we start from  $n = 2$  because the slightly different law of  $\overline{W}_1$ ). Clearly, it is sufficient to show that the appropriately normalized and centered sums  $S_n = \sum_{j=2}^n \overline{W}_j$  converge to a stable law of the form (1.9). For  $\kappa < 2$ , apply [16, Corollary 5.7], noting that the uniform estimates of Proposition 2.28 imply that

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0, \forall j \geq 3, \quad n\mathbb{P}(\overline{W}_2 \geq \varepsilon n^{1/\kappa}, \overline{W}_j \geq \varepsilon n^{1/\kappa}) \rightarrow_{n \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

which is the tail condition needed to apply Corollary 5.7 of Kobus [16].

In the case  $\kappa = 2$ , we note first that  $\overline{W}_2$  and  $\overline{W}_2 + \overline{W}_3$  both belong by Proposition 2.28 to the domain of attraction of a normal distribution. We seek to apply the limit theorem in [24, p. 328], for which we need to check that  $S_2 = \overline{W}_2$  and  $S_3 = \overline{W}_2 + \overline{W}_3$  have different parameters  $b_i = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t^\kappa \mathbb{P}(S_i > t)$ ,  $i = 2, 3$ . But,

$$\begin{aligned} b_3 &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^\kappa \mathbb{P}(\overline{W}_2 + \overline{W}_3 > t) \geq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^\kappa \mathbb{P}(\overline{W}_2 < t, \overline{W}_3 > t) + \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^\kappa \mathbb{P}(\overline{W}_3 < t, \overline{W}_2 > t) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^\kappa \mathbb{P}(\overline{W}_3 > t | \overline{W}_2 < t) \mathbb{P}(\overline{W}_2 < t) + \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^\kappa \mathbb{P}(\overline{W}_2 > t) \mathbb{P}(\overline{W}_3 < t | \overline{W}_2 > t) \\ &\geq J_1 + b_2 > b_2, \end{aligned} \quad (2.34)$$

where  $J_1$  is the constant appearing in (2.29), and we used the uniform exponential estimates of Proposition 2.28 and the fact that  $\mathbb{P}(\overline{W}_3 < t | \overline{W}_2 > t) \rightarrow_{t \rightarrow \infty} 1$  which is also implied by these estimates, as can be seen by conditioning on the environment to the right of  $-\bar{\nu}_2$ . Here and in the remainder of the proof, any reference to Proposition 2.28 actually includes Remark 2.31 (iii). We have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\overline{W}_3 < t | \overline{W}_2 > t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{P}(\overline{W}_3 < t | \mathcal{F}_{\bar{\nu}_2}) | \overline{W}_2 > t). \quad (2.35)$$

By Proposition 2.28,

$$\mathbb{P}(\overline{W}_3 < t | \mathcal{F}_{\bar{\nu}_2}) \geq 1 - L_1 t^{-\kappa}, \quad P - \text{a.s.},$$

implying that the limit in (2.35) exists and is equal to 1. Therefore, by (2.34) and since we know a-priori from (2.30) that  $b_3 = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^\kappa \mathbb{P}(\overline{W}_2 + \overline{W}_3 > t)$  is well-defined, the following limit exists and can be bounded below by using (2.29):

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t^\kappa \mathbb{P}(\overline{W}_3 > t | \overline{W}_2 < t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^\kappa \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{P}(\overline{W}_3 > t | \mathcal{F}_{\bar{\nu}_2}) | \overline{W}_2 < t) \geq J_1.$$

This completes the proof of the proposition.  $\square$

**Completion of the proof of Proposition 1.11.** The limit laws for  $T_n$  announced in Proposition 1.11 are obtained from stable laws for partial sums of  $\overline{W}_n$  in the same way as in [13], by a standard argument using Lemma 2.23. To illustrate the argument we consider here the case  $\kappa = 2$ , omitting the proof for  $\kappa \in (0, 2)$ . Let  $\zeta(n) = \max\{i : \bar{\nu}_i < n\}$  and  $\varsigma(n) = \lfloor n/\mu - C\sqrt{n} \rfloor$  for a constant  $C > 0$ . Using part (c) of Lemma 2.23, we obtain, with  $\mu = \mathbb{E}(\bar{\nu}_2 - \bar{\nu}_1)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\zeta(n) \geq n/\mu - C\sqrt{n}) &\geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\bar{\nu}_{\zeta(n)} \leq n) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\bar{\nu}_{\zeta(n)} - \varsigma(n)\mu}{\sigma\sqrt{\zeta(n)}} \leq \frac{n - \varsigma(n)\mu}{\sigma\sqrt{\zeta(n)}}\right) = \mathcal{L}_{2, \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{2}}}(C\mu^{3/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for all  $\epsilon > 0$  and some  $C = C(\epsilon) > 0$  and all  $n > N_2(\epsilon)$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(\zeta(n) \leq n/\mu - C\sqrt{n}) \leq \epsilon$ . It follows, letting  $a = \mathbb{E}(\overline{W}_2)$ , that for any  $n$  large enough,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i - na/\mu}{\sqrt{n \log n}} \leq x\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\zeta(n)} \overline{W}_i \leq x\sqrt{n \log n} + na/\mu\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/\mu - C\sqrt{n} \rfloor} \overline{W}_i \leq x\sqrt{n \log n} + na/\mu\right) + \epsilon \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{2, \tilde{b}}(x\sqrt{\mu}) + \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{L}_{2, \tilde{b}}$  is the limiting law for sums of  $\overline{W}_n$ . Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i - na/\mu}{\sqrt{n \log n}} \leq x\right) &\geq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{\zeta(n)+1} \overline{W}_k \leq x\sqrt{n \log n} + na/\mu\right) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{k < n/\mu + C\sqrt{n}} \overline{W}_k \leq x\sqrt{n \log n} + an/\mu\right) - \epsilon \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{2, \tilde{b}}(x\sqrt{\mu}) - \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\epsilon$  was arbitrary, Proposition 1.11 now follows from the limit laws for partial sums of  $Z_n$  by (2.14)–(2.16). Since the law defined by (1.9) has expectation zero,  $v_P = a/\mu = \mathbb{E}(\tau_1)$ , where  $\tau_1$  is defined by (1.2).  $\square$

As shown in the Introduction this completes the proof of Theorem 1.10.

## 2.3 Tails of distribution of the random variable $R$

The aim of this subsection is to prove that Condition  $C_\kappa$  holds for some  $\kappa > 0$ . Proposition 2.38 below extends the following theorem, valid in the i.i.d. setup, to some Markov-dependent variables.

**Theorem 2.36 (Kesten).** [14, Theorem 5] *Let  $(Q_n, M_n)$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , be independent copies of a  $\mathbb{R}^2$ -valued random vector  $(Q, M)$ , satisfying the following conditions:*

- (i)  $P(M > 0) = 1$  and  $P(Q > 0) = 1$ .
- (ii) For some  $\kappa > 0$ ,  $E(M^\kappa) = 1$ ,  $E(M^\kappa \log^+ M) < \infty$ , and  $E(Q^\kappa) < \infty$ .
- (iii) The law of  $\log M$  is non-lattice (its support is not contained in any proper sublattice of  $\mathbb{R}$ ) and  $P(Q = (1 - M)c) < 1$ ,  $\forall c \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Then there exists a constant  $\widehat{K} > 0$  such that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^\kappa P(\widehat{R} \geq t) = \widehat{K}, \quad (2.37)$$

where  $\widehat{R} := Q_1 + M_1(Q_2 + M_2(Q_3 \dots))$ .

We have:

**Proposition 2.38.** *Let Assumption 1.5 hold. Then Condition  $C_\kappa$  is satisfied for the  $\kappa > 0$  defined by (1.4).*

*Proof.* If either (1.6) or (1.7) with  $m = 1$  hold, this proposition can be deduced rather directly from Kesten's theorem. It will be convenient to give a separate proof for the case where the state space  $\mathcal{S}$  is finite, i.e. under assumption (1.6).

**Assume first that (1.6) holds.** Then, it is sufficient to show that

$$K_x := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^\kappa P_x(R > t) \in (0, \infty)$$

exists for all  $x \in \mathcal{S}$ . For  $n \geq 0$ , let

$$Q_n = 1 + \mathbf{1}_{\{N_{n+1} \geq N_n + 2\}} \sum_{i=N_n}^{N_{n+1}-2} \prod_{j=N_n}^i \rho_{-j} \quad \text{and} \quad M_n = \prod_{i=N_n}^{N_{n+1}-1} \rho_{-i}. \quad (2.39)$$

Then,  $(M_n, Q_n)_{n \geq 1}$  is an i.i.d. sequence, and  $R = Q_0 + M_0(Q_1 + M_1(Q_2 + \dots))$ . First, we will show that Kesten's theorem is applicable to this sequence, that is the following limit

$$\widehat{K} := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^\kappa P_x(\widehat{R} > t) \in (0, \infty) \quad (2.40)$$

exists, where

$$\widehat{R} = Q_1 + M_1(Q_2 + M_2(Q_3 \dots)), \quad R = Q_0 + M_0 \widehat{R}. \quad (2.41)$$

Let  $f_\kappa$  be a strictly positive Perron-Frobenius eigenvector of the matrix  $H_\kappa(x, y) := H(x, y)\rho(y)^\kappa$ . By virtue of (2.10) and Condition B, it corresponds to the eigenvalue 1. Recall now the definitions of the state  $x^*$  and the matrix  $\Theta$  from (2.1). By Lemma 2.8, the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue (the spectral radius) of the matrix  $\Theta_\kappa(x, y) = \Theta(x, y)\rho(y)^\kappa$  is strictly less than one. So, the vector  $f_\kappa$  normalized by the condition  $f_\kappa(x^*)\rho^\kappa(x^*) = 1$  is the unique positive vector in  $\mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}|}$  solving the equation  $(I - \Theta_\kappa)f = s$ , where  $s(x) := H(x, x^*)$ . Hence (this is a very particular case of the results of [6] and [19, Theorem 5.1] )

$$f_\kappa(x) = \rho(x)^{-\kappa} E_x \left( \prod_{i=0}^{N_1-1} \rho_{-i}^\kappa \right) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Theta_\kappa^n s(x), \quad (2.42)$$

and

$$E_{x^*} \left( \prod_{i=0}^{N_1-1} \rho_{-i}^\kappa \right) = E_P(M_1^\kappa) = 1. \quad (2.43)$$

The second equality in (2.42) follows since the chain  $(x_i)$  evolves according to the kernel  $\Theta$  until  $N_1$  (see (2.2)), while (2.43) follows from the normalization condition  $f_\kappa(x^*)\rho^\kappa(x^*) = 1$ .

It is not hard to check that assuming (1.6), condition (A4) is equivalent to the fact that  $\log M_1$  is non-lattice, and that  $P(Q_1 = (1 - M_1)c) < 1$  for any  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  (since clearly  $P(M_1 > 1) > 0$ ), as required to apply Theorem 2.36. In order to prove (2.40), it remains to show that  $E_P(Q_1^\kappa) < \infty$  and  $E_P(M_1^\kappa \log^+ M_1) < \infty$ . Thus, it is sufficient to prove that there exists  $\beta > \kappa$  such that

$$E_x(Q_0^\beta) \text{ is a bounded function of } x. \quad (2.44)$$

Since for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and positive numbers  $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^n$  we have

$$(a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_n)^\beta \leq n^\beta (a_1^\beta + a_2^\beta + \dots + a_n^\beta),$$

we obtain for any  $\beta > 0$  and  $x \in \mathcal{S}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} E_x((Q_0 - 1)^\beta) &= E_x \left( \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} \rho_{-j} \mathbf{1}_{\{N_1=n\}} \right)^\beta = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} E_x \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} \rho_{-j} \mathbf{1}_{\{N_1=n\}} \right)^\beta \\ &\leq \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} (n-1)^\beta \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} E_x \left( \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} \rho_{-j}^\beta \mathbf{1}_{\{N_1 \geq n\}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.45)$$

But  $E_x \left( \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} \rho_{-j}^\beta \mathbf{1}_{\{N_1 \geq n\}} \right) = \rho(x)^\beta \Theta^{n-i} \Theta_\beta^{i-1} \mathbf{1}$ , where  $\Theta_\beta(x, y) := \Theta(x, y)\rho(y)^\beta$ . Since the spectral radius of the matrices  $\Theta_\kappa$  and  $\Theta$  are strictly less than one, it follows from (2.45) that (2.44) holds for some  $\beta > \kappa$ . This yields (2.40).

By (2.40) and the bounded convergence theorem, and since the random variables  $M_0$  and  $\widehat{R}$  are independent under the measure  $P_x$ , the following limit exists:

$$K_x := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^\kappa P_x(M_0 \widehat{R} > t) = \widehat{K} E_x(M_0^\kappa) \in (0, \infty).$$

Fix any  $\alpha \in (\frac{\kappa}{\beta}, 1)$ . It follows from (2.40) and (2.44) that for all  $t > 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} t^\kappa P_x(R > t) &\leq t^\kappa P_x(Q_0 + M_0 \widehat{R} > t, Q_0 < t^\alpha) + t^\kappa P_x(Q_0 \geq t^\alpha) \\ &\leq t^\kappa P_x(M_0 \widehat{R} > t - t^\alpha) + \frac{t^\kappa}{t^{\alpha\beta}} E_x(Q_0^\beta), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$t^\kappa P_x(R > t) = t^\kappa P_x(Q_0 + M_0 \widehat{R} > t) \geq t^\kappa P_x(M_0 \widehat{R} > t).$$

We conclude, by taking the limit in the above inequalities as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^\kappa P_x(R > t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^\kappa P_x(M_0 \widehat{R} > t) = K_x,$$

completing the proof of the proposition in the case (1.6).

**Assume now that (1.7) holds.** First, we will prove that (2.27) holds for some function  $K(\omega)$  and constant  $\widehat{K}$ . We follow Goldie's proof [12] of Kesten's Theorem 2.36. Let

$$\eta(x) := \log \rho(x),$$

$$\Pi_0 = 1, \quad \Pi_n = \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \rho_{-k}, \quad n \geq 1,$$

$$\eta_n = \log \rho_{-n}, \quad V_n = \log \Pi_n \quad n \geq 0,$$

$$R = R^0 = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Pi_n, \quad R_0 = 0, \quad R_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \Pi_k, \quad R^n = (R - R_n)/\Pi_n, \quad n \geq 1. \quad (2.46)$$

Following Goldie [12], we write for any numbers  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , and any point  $z \in \mathcal{S}$ ,

$$P_z(R > e^t) = \sum_{k=1}^n [P_z(e^{V_{k-1}} R^{k-1} > e^t) - P_z(e^{V_k} R^k > e^t)] + P_z(e^{V_n} R^n > e^t).$$

We have, by using the identity  $R^{k-1} = 1 + \rho_{-k+1} R^k$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &P_z(e^{V_{k-1}} R^{k-1} > e^t) - P_z(e^{V_k} R^k > e^t) = \\ &\int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathcal{S}} [P(R^{k-1} > e^{t-u} | x_{k-1} = x) - P(\rho_{-k+1} R^k > e^{t-u} | x_{k-1} = x)] P_z(V_{k-1} \in du, x_{k-1} \in dx) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathcal{S}} [P_x(R > e^{t-u}) - P_x(R - 1 > e^{t-u})] P_z(V_{k-1} \in du, x_{k-1} \in dx). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, letting  $\delta_n(z, t) = e^{\kappa t} P_z(e^{V_n} R^n > e^t)$  and  $f(x, t) = e^{\kappa t} [P_x(R > e^t) - P_x(R - 1 > e^t)]$ ,

$$r_z(t) := e^{\kappa t} P_z(R > e^t) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathcal{S}} f(x, t - u) e^{\kappa u} P_z(V_k \in du, x_k \in dx) + \delta_n(z, t). \quad (2.47)$$

By Lemma 2.6 and (2.10), there exists a positive measurable function  $h(x) : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  bounded away from zero and infinity such that:

$$h(x) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} H(x, dy) \rho^\kappa(y) h(y).$$

This implies, by [19, Theorem 5.2], that there is a probability measure  $\pi_\kappa$  invariant for the kernel  $H_\kappa(x, dy) = H(x, dy) \rho^\kappa(y)$ , namely (since  $r_{H_\kappa} = 1$  by (1.4) and (2.10))

$$\int_{\mathcal{S}} H_\kappa(x, A) \pi_\kappa(dx) = \pi_\kappa(A), \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{T}. \quad (2.48)$$

The measure  $\pi_h(dx) = h(x) \pi_\kappa(dx)$  is a finite invariant measure for the kernel

$$\tilde{H}(x, dy) := \frac{1}{h(x)} H_\kappa(x, dy) h(y).$$

The measure  $\pi_\kappa$  and hence  $\pi_h$  are equivalent to the original stationary distribution  $\pi$ . Indeed, by (2.48),

$$\int_{\mathcal{S}} H_\kappa^m(x, A) \pi_\kappa(dx) = \pi_\kappa(A), \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{T}.$$

Hence, by (1.7) and the ellipticity condition (A2),  $c_r^{-1} c_\rho^{-m} \pi_\kappa(A) \leq \pi(A) \leq c_r c_\rho^m \pi_\kappa(A)$ , where the constant  $c_\rho$  is defined in (1.8).

Let  $\tilde{P}$  be the probability measure under which the Markov chain  $(x_k)_{k \geq 0}$  is stationary and governed by the transition probability measure  $\tilde{H}(x, A)$ . As usual we denote the conditional probabilities  $\tilde{P}(\cdot | x_0 = x)$  by  $\tilde{P}_x(\cdot)$ . Then,

$$r_z(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathcal{S}} f(x, t-u) \frac{\rho^\kappa(z) h(z)}{\rho^\kappa(x) h(x)} \tilde{P}_z(V_k \in du, x_k \in dx) + \delta_n(z, t).$$

Since  $P - \text{a.s.}$ ,  $\Pi_n R^n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n$  goes to infinity,  $P(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_n(z, t) = 0) = 1$ , for any fixed  $t > 0$  and  $z \in \mathcal{S}$ . Therefore,  $P - \text{a.s.}$ ,

$$r_z(t) := e^{\kappa t} P_z(R > e^t) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathcal{S}} f(x, t-u) \frac{\rho^\kappa(z) h(z)}{\rho^\kappa(x) h(x)} \tilde{P}_z(V_k \in du, x_k \in dx).$$

We will use the following Tauberian lemma :

**Lemma 2.49.** [12, Lemma 9.3] *Let  $R$  be a random variable defined on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ . Assume that for some constants  $\kappa, K \in (0, \infty)$ ,  $\int_0^t u^\kappa P(R > u) du \sim Kt$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Then  $t^\kappa P(R > t) \sim K$ .*

It follows from Lemma 2.49 that in order to prove (2.27), it is sufficient to show that  $P - \text{a.s.}$  there exists

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \check{r}_z(t) \in (0, \infty),$$

where the smoothing transform  $\check{q}$  is defined, for a measurable function  $q : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  bounded on  $(-\infty, t]$  for all  $t$ , by

$$\check{q}(t) := \int_{-\infty}^t e^{-(t-u)} q(u) du.$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} g(x, t) &:= \frac{1}{e^{\kappa\eta(x)} h(x)} \int_{-\infty}^t e^{-(t-u)} f(x, u) du \\ &= \frac{1}{e^{\kappa\eta(x)} h(x)} \int_{-\infty}^t e^{-(t-u)} e^{\kappa u} [P_x(R > e^u) - P_x(R - 1 > e^u)] du \\ &= \frac{e^{-t}}{e^{\kappa\eta(x)} h(x)} \int_0^{e^t} v^\kappa [P_x(R > v) - P_x(R - 1 > v)] dv. \end{aligned} \quad (2.50)$$

Then, since  $\check{r}_z(t) = h(z)\rho^\kappa(z) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \tilde{E}_z(g(x_k, t - V_k))$ , it is sufficient to show that for any  $z \in \mathcal{S}$ ,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \tilde{E}_z(g(x_k, t - V_k)) \quad (2.51)$$

exists and belongs to  $(0, \infty)$ . So, our goal now is to prove (2.51).

Toward this end, note first that the kernel  $\tilde{H}$  satisfies condition (1.7) and hence the chain  $(x_n)$  is ergodic under the measure  $\tilde{P}$ . Further, the random walk  $V_n = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \eta_j$  has a positive drift under the measure  $\tilde{P}_x$ . Indeed, similarly to [12] and [14], we obtain for some  $c > 0$  and any  $\gamma > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P}_x \left( e^{V_n} \leq e^{-\gamma n^{1/4}} \right) &= \frac{e^{-\kappa\eta(x)}}{h(x)} E_x \left( e^{\kappa V_n} h(x_{n-1}); e^{V_n} \leq e^{-\gamma n^{1/4}} \right) \leq c E_x \left( e^{\kappa V_n}; e^{V_n} \leq e^{-\gamma n^{1/4}} \right) \\ &\leq c e^{-\kappa\gamma n^{1/4}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{P}_x(V_n \leq -\gamma n^{1/4}) = 0$ , implying  $\tilde{E}_{\pi_h}(\eta_0) > 0$  by the central limit theorem for bounded additive functionals of Doebelin recurrent Markov chains (see e.g. [19, p. 134]).

The limit in (2.51) follows from the version of the Markov renewal theorem as given in [2, Theorem 1] (see also [4, 15]) when applied to the Markov chain  $(x_{n+1}, \rho_{-n})$ , provided that we are able to show that the following holds:

$$g(x, \cdot) \text{ is a continuous function for } \pi_h - \text{almost all } x \in \mathcal{S}, \quad (2.52)$$

and

$$\int_{\mathcal{S}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \sup_{n\delta \leq t < (n+1)\delta} \{|g(x, t)|\} \pi_h(dx) < \infty \quad \text{for some } \delta > 0. \quad (2.53)$$

The assertion (2.52) follows from the continuity of  $\int_0^{e^t} v^\kappa [P_x(R > v) - P_x(R - 1 > v)] dv$  in  $t$  for every  $x \in \mathcal{S}$ . For some  $M > 0$  and any  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ , we get from (2.50):

$$\begin{aligned} g(x, t) &\leq M e^{-t} \int_0^{e^t} v^\kappa [P_x(R > v) - P_x(R - 1 > v)] dv \\ &\leq M e^{-\varepsilon t} \int_0^{e^t} v^{\kappa-1+\varepsilon} [P_x(R > v) - P_x(R - 1 > v)] dv \leq \frac{M}{\kappa} e^{-\varepsilon t} E_x[(R)^{\kappa+\varepsilon} - (R - 1)^{\kappa+\varepsilon}], \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from [12, Lemma 9.4]. Since for any  $\gamma > 0$  and  $R > 1$ ,  $(R)^\gamma - (R - 1)^\gamma \leq \max\{1, \gamma\} (R)^{\max\{1, \gamma\}-1}$ , we obtain by Condition B that

$$E_x[(R)^{\kappa+\varepsilon} - (R - 1)^{\kappa+\varepsilon}] \leq L,$$

for some constant  $L > 0$  independent of  $x$ , yielding (2.53) and consequently (2.27). In fact we have shown that the following limit exists  $\pi$  - a.s. :

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^\kappa P_x(R > t) = K_1(x) \in (0, \infty). \quad (2.54)$$

We now turn to the proof of (2.26). Fix any point  $x^* \in \mathcal{S}$  for which (2.54) holds. Using (1.8) and (1.7), we obtain for any  $x \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $t > 0$  :

$$P_x(R > t) \geq P_x(c_\rho^{-m} R^m > t) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} H^m(x, dz) P_z(c_\rho^{-m} R > t) \geq c_r^{-2} P_{x^*}(c_\rho^{-m} R > t),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} P_x(R > t) &\leq P_x(m c_\rho^m + c_\rho^m R^m > t) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} H^m(x, dz) P_z(m c_\rho^m + c_\rho^m R > t) \\ &\leq c_r^2 P_{x^*}(m c_\rho^m + c_\rho^m R > t). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, (2.26) follows from (2.54).  $\square$

**Remark 2.55.** *It should be mentioned that essentially the same proof leads to similar tail estimates for random variables of the form  $R = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} Q_n \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} M_j$  with a more general type of Markov-dependent coefficients  $(Q_n, M_n)$  (e.g.  $Q_n$  need not be deterministic and  $M_n$  need not be a.s. positive). This general result (under somewhat milder assumptions than those assumed in this paper, namely allowing for periodic Markov chains while relaxing the uniform bound (1.7) on the kernels  $H(x, \cdot)$ ) can be found in [20]. While preparing the final version of the article for publication, we were kindly informed by J. Bremont of the reference [9] where, by using different methods, a result similar to Proposition 2.38 is obtained for Markov chains in a finite state space.*

### 3 Summary and Final Remarks

We have dealt with the random walk  $(X_n)_{n \geq 0}$  in a random environment  $\omega \in [0, 1]^{\mathbb{Z}}$ , associating with it an auxiliary Galton–Watson process  $(Z_k)_{k \geq 0}$  with one immigrant at each instant and

random branching mechanism  $\text{Geom}(\omega_{-k})$ .

Without stating it explicitly the following theorem has in fact been proved. Let  $(\mathcal{G}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be an augmentation of  $(\sigma(\omega_j : j > -n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  which generates the original quenched law, namely  $\mathbb{P}(\cdot | \mathcal{G}_n) = P_\omega(\cdot)$ , a.s.. Accordingly, let  $(\overline{\mathcal{F}}_n = \sigma(Z_0, Z_1, \dots, Z_n) \vee \mathcal{G}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be  $(\mathcal{F}_n)$ 's induced augmentation.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Assume the environment  $\omega$  satisfies Conditions B and  $C_\kappa$  (for the  $\kappa > 0$  involved in Condition B) introduced in Section 2. Furthermore, assume the existence of an increasing sequence of stopping times  $\eta_m$ , with  $\eta_0 = 0$ , with respect to the filtration  $(\overline{\mathcal{F}}_n)_{n \geq 0}$  (defined in (2.12) and (2.18)) for which*

i) *the LLN and CLT hold: there exist  $\mu > 0$  and  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$  such that*

$$\frac{\eta_m}{m} \longrightarrow \mu \quad \text{a.s.} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\eta_m - m\mu}{\sqrt{m}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N(0, \sigma^2)$$

ii) *for some  $b > 0$ ,*  $\frac{1}{B_m} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\eta_m} Z_i - A_m \right) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{L}_{\kappa, b}$  (defined in (1.9))

$$\text{where } A_m \begin{cases} = 0 & \kappa \in (0, 1) \\ \sim c_1 m \log m & \kappa = 1 \\ = c_2 m & \kappa \in (1, 2] \end{cases} \quad \text{and } B_m = \begin{cases} m^{\frac{1}{\kappa}} & \kappa \in (0, 2) \\ (m \log m)^{\frac{1}{2}} & \kappa = 2 \end{cases}$$

*for suitable positive constants  $c_1, c_2$ .*

*Then the random walk  $X_n$  satisfies a stable limit law in the sense that the conclusions (i)–(iv) of Theorem 1.10 hold.*

In the Markov setup of this paper, and under Assumption 1.5, we have shown (see Lemma 2.23 and Proposition 2.33) that the environment  $\omega$  indeed satisfies the conditions of Theorem 3.1 (with respect to the stopping times  $\eta_n = \bar{\nu}_n$ ), thus obtaining the stable limit laws in this case.

It is easy to see that Theorem 1.10 can be extended for instance to the following setup of hidden Markov models. Let  $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be a Markov chain defined on a measurable space  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$  that satisfies (A1) and (A2) in Assumption 1.5. Assume that in the product space  $(\mathcal{S} \times \Omega, \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{F})$ ,

$$P((x_n, \omega_{-n}) \in A \times B | x_{n-1} = x, \sigma((x_i, \omega_{-i}) : i \leq n-1)) = \mathbb{H}(x, A \times B) \quad (3.2)$$

for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $A \in \mathcal{T}$ ,  $B \in \mathcal{F}$ ,  $x \in \mathcal{S}$ , where  $\mathbb{H}$  is a stochastic kernel on  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{B})$ . Note that the Markov chain  $(x_n, \omega_{-n})$  might not satisfy Assumption 1.5, so that Theorem 1.10 cannot be applied directly.

Let  $Q(x, y, B) = P(\omega_{-n} \in B | x_{n-1} = x, x_n = y)$ . Then, similarly to (2.10),

$$E_x \left( \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \rho_{-i}^\beta \right) = \rho_0^\beta H_\beta^{n-1} \mathbf{1}(x), \quad \beta \geq 0,$$

where the kernel  $H_\beta(x, \cdot)$  is now defined on  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$  by

$$H_\beta(x, dy) = H(x, dy) \int_{\Omega} Q(x, y, dz) \rho^\beta(z). \quad (3.3)$$

From the ellipticity condition (A2) it follows that  $\rho_0 \in (c_\rho^{-1}, c_\rho)$  for some constant  $c_\rho > 0$ , and we obtain that  $C_\beta^{-1}H(x, dy) \leq H_\beta(x, dy) \leq C_\beta H(x, dy)$ , for a suitable constant  $C_\beta > 0$ . Thus, Lemma 2.6 is in force for the kernel  $H_\beta$  defined by (3.3).

The non-arithmetic condition needed to apply a Markov renewal theorem ([2, Theorem 1]) now takes the form:

**Definition 3.4.** [22, 2] The process  $\log \rho_{-n}$  is called  $\alpha$ -arithmetic if  $\alpha \geq 0$  is the maximal number for which there exists a measurable function  $\gamma : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [0, \alpha)$  such that

$$P(\log \rho_0 \in \gamma(x) - \gamma(y) + \alpha \cdot \mathbb{Z} | x_{-1} = x, x_0 = y) = 1, \quad P - \text{a.s.}$$

The process is called non-arithmetic if no such  $\alpha$  exists.

We have:

**Theorem 3.5.** *Assume that the underlying model  $\omega_n = \omega(x_n)$  in Theorem 1.10 is replaced by (3.2) and that Assumption 1.5 holds. Then the conclusions (i)–(iv) of Theorem 1.10 remain valid.*

The proof is the same as that of Theorem 1.10 by using the regeneration times  $\bar{v}_n$  defined in (2.21). The only exception is that in the definition of  $f(x, t)$  (a line before (2.47)) we would condition on  $x_{-1}$  rather than on  $x_0$ . Correspondingly, in the definition of  $r_\lambda$  (cf. (2.47)), the integration would be with respect to the measure  $P_\lambda(V_k \in dv, x_{k-1} \in dx)$ .

## Appendix

Recall  $\mathcal{F}_0 = \sigma(\omega_k : k > 0)$ . For brevity, we denote the conditional probabilities  $P(\cdot | \mathcal{F}_0)$  and  $\mathbb{P}(\cdot | \mathcal{F}_0)$  by  $P_+$  and  $\mathbb{P}_+ = P_+ \otimes P_\omega$  respectively. We usually do not indicate the argument  $\omega$  of these functions meaning that the inequalities below hold  $P - \text{a.s.}$  We denote by  $\theta$  the shift on  $\Omega$ , given by  $(\theta\omega)_i = \omega_{i+1}$ . For an event  $A$ , the notation  $I(A)$  is used to denote the indicator function of  $A$ .

## A Proof of Proposition 2.19

The key to the proof is

**Lemma A.1.** [13, (2.12)] *Suppose that the environment  $\omega$  is stationary and ergodic, and  $a_P := E_P(\log \rho_0) < 0$ . Choose any  $\gamma \in (a_P, 0)$  and define*

$$\begin{aligned} U_n &= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \{\log \rho_{-i} - \gamma\} \quad (U_0 = 0), \\ \zeta_0 &= 0, \quad \zeta_{k+1} = \inf\{n > \zeta_k : U_n \leq U_{\zeta_k}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then there exist constants  $K_5, K_6 > 0$  such that  $P - a.s.$ ,

$$P_\omega(\nu_1 > \zeta_k) \leq K_5 e^{-K_6 k}, \quad k > 0.$$

**Remark A.2.** This lemma is proved in [13] for the special case  $\gamma = a_P/2$ , but an inspection of the proof reveals that  $a_P/2$  can be replaced by any constant between  $a_P$  and zero in the definition of the random walk  $U_n$ .

By virtue of Lemma A.1, it is sufficient to find  $\gamma \ll (a_P, 0)$  such that for some constants  $b > 0$  and  $K_7, K_8 > 0$

$$P_+(\zeta_k > bk) < K_7 e^{-K_8 k}, \quad k \geq 0.$$

Let  $\eta(n) = \max\{j : \zeta_j \leq n\}$  and recall  $c_\rho = (1 - \epsilon)/\epsilon$ . Since for any  $n > 0$ ,

$$U_n \geq \sum_{j=1}^{\eta(n)} (U_{\zeta_j} - U_{\zeta_{j-1}}) \geq -\eta(n)(\gamma + \log c_\rho),$$

for any  $k > 0$ , the event  $\{\zeta_{k+1} > n\} = \{\eta(n) \leq k\}$  is included in  $\{U_n \geq -k \log c_\rho - k\gamma\}$ . Therefore, for any  $\gamma \in (a_P, 0)$  and  $b \in \mathbb{N}$  we have

$$P_+(\zeta_{k+1} > bk) \leq P_+ \left( \sum_{i=0}^{bk-1} \log \rho_{-i} \geq -k \log c_\rho + k(b-1)\gamma \right).$$

Let  $\gamma = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \lim_{\beta \rightarrow +0} \frac{\Lambda(\beta)}{\beta}$ , where  $\Lambda(\beta)$  is as in (1.4), noting that since  $\Lambda(\beta)$  is convex,  $\gamma$  is negative by Condition B and is greater than  $a_P$  by Jensen's inequality. Hence, by Chebyshev's inequality and Condition B, we obtain for any fixed  $b > 0$  and  $\beta > 0$  small enough,

$$\limsup_k \frac{1}{k} \log [P_+(\zeta_{k+1} > kb)] \leq \beta \log c_\rho - (b-1)\gamma\beta + \frac{3b\gamma\beta}{2} = \beta \left( \log c_\rho + \gamma + \frac{b\gamma}{2} \right).$$

Taking  $b > -4 \log c_\rho / \gamma$  in the last inequality gives

$$\limsup_k \frac{1}{k} \log P_+(\zeta_{k+1} > kb) < \beta(-\log c_\rho + \gamma) < 0.$$

This completes the proof of Proposition 2.19.

## B Proof of Proposition 2.28

As mentioned in Remark 2.31 (i), this proof will follow the one of [13, Lemma 6] very closely, at times word by word, with the necessary changes made in annealed arguments to take the dependence of the environment into account. Quenched arguments, where no changes are needed, will be skipped.

Throughout we fix a number  $\tilde{n} \in \mathbb{N}$  and denote  $\widetilde{W} := \widetilde{W}_{\tilde{n}} = \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{n}} \overline{W}_j$ ,  $\tilde{\nu} := \tilde{\nu}_{\tilde{n}}$ . Recall the filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \geq 0}$  introduced in (2.12) and (2.18), and for all  $A > 0$  define its stopping time

$\varsigma_A = \inf\{n : Z_n > A\}$ . The random variable  $\widetilde{W}$  can be represented on the event  $\{\varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}\}$  in the following form:

$$\widetilde{W} = \sum_{n=0}^{\varsigma_A-1} Z_n + S_{\varsigma_A} + \sum_{\varsigma_A \leq n < \tilde{\nu}} Y_n, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{n,k} &= \text{number of progeny alive at time } k \text{ of the immigrant who entered at time } n < k, \\ Y_n &= \sum_{k>n} Z_{n,k} = \#\{\text{progeny of the immigrant at time } n, \text{ not including the immigrant}\} \\ S_n &= Z_n + \text{total progeny of the } Z_n \text{ particles present at } n. \end{aligned}$$

It will turn out that for large  $A$ , the main contribution to  $\widetilde{W}$  in (B.1) comes from the second term and  $\mathbb{P}_+(\widetilde{W} \geq t) \approx \mathbb{P}_+(S_{\varsigma_A} \geq t, \varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu})$ . If an environment  $\omega$  is fixed, then  $S_{\varsigma_A} - Z_{\varsigma_A}$  counts the progeny of  $Z_{\varsigma_A}$  independent particles, and thus with a large probability  $S_{\varsigma_A}$  is not very different from  $Z_{\varsigma_A}(1 + E_\omega(Y_{\varsigma_A})) = Z_{\varsigma_A}R(\theta^{-\varsigma_A}\omega)$ , where the random variable  $R$  is defined by (1.1). We will obtain

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^\kappa \mathbb{P}_+(\widetilde{W} \geq t) = \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^\kappa \mathbb{P}_+(S_{\varsigma_A} \geq t, \varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}) = \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_+(Z_{\varsigma_A}^\kappa K(\theta^{-\varsigma_A}\omega); \varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}),$$

where the random variable  $K(\omega)$  is defined by (2.27).

We shall then end the proof by showing that for all  $t$  and  $A$  large enough,  $\mathbb{E}_+(Z_{\varsigma_A}^\kappa; \varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu})$  and therefore  $t^\kappa \mathbb{P}_+(\widetilde{W} \geq t) \approx \mathbb{E}_+(Z_{\varsigma_A}^\kappa K(\theta^{-\varsigma_A}\omega); \varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu})$  is uniformly bounded away from zero and infinity by constants independent of  $\omega$ .

To carry out this outline, the three terms in the right-hand side of (B.1) are evaluated in the following series of lemmas, which are versions of the corresponding statements (Lemmas 2–5) in [13], and their proofs are deferred to the end of this Appendix.

We start with the following corollary to Proposition 2.19.

**Lemma B.2.** *Assume that Condition B is satisfied. Then,*

- (a) *There exist  $C_3, C_4 > 0$  such that  $P - a.s., \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\nu} > n | \mathcal{F}_0) \leq C_3 e^{-C_4 n}$ , for any  $n > 0$ .*
- (b) *There exists a deterministic function  $\eta_t > 0, t \geq 0$  such that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \eta_t = 0$  and  $\mathbb{P}_+(\varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}) \leq \eta_A$ .*

Fix now any  $\delta > 0$ . It follows from part (a) of Lemma B.2 that for any  $A > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_+\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\min\{\varsigma_A, \tilde{\nu}\}-1} Z_n \geq \delta t\right) \leq \mathbb{P}_+(A\tilde{\nu} \geq \delta t) \leq C_3 e^{-C_4 \delta t/A} = o(t^{-\kappa}), \quad t \rightarrow \infty,$$

and thus

$$\mathbb{P}_+(\widetilde{W} \geq \delta t, \varsigma_A \geq \tilde{\nu}) \leq \mathbb{P}_+(A\tilde{\nu} \geq \delta t) \leq C_3 e^{-C_4 \delta t/A} = o(t^{-\kappa}), \quad t \rightarrow \infty, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

$$\mathbb{P}_+\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\varsigma_A-1} Z_n \geq \delta t, \varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}\right) \leq \mathbb{P}_+(A\tilde{\nu} \geq \delta t) \leq C_3 e^{-C_4 \delta t/A} = o(t^{-\kappa}), \quad t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

**Lemma B.5.**

(i) *There exists a constant  $K_9 > 0$  such that  $\mathbb{P}_+(Y_0 \geq t) \leq K_9 t^{-\kappa}$  for all  $t > 0$ .*

(ii) *For all  $\delta > 0$  there exists an  $A_0 = A_0(\delta) < \infty$  such that*

$$\mathbb{P}_+ \left( \sum_{\varsigma_A \leq n < \tilde{\nu}} Y_n \geq \delta t \right) \leq \delta t^{-\kappa} \quad \text{for all } A \geq A_0. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

It follows from (B.1), taking estimates (B.3), (B.4) and (B.6) into account, that for any  $A > A_0(\delta)$  (where  $A_0$  is given by (B.6)) there exists  $t_A > 0$  such that

$$\mathbb{P}_+(\varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}, S_{\varsigma_A} \geq t) \leq \mathbb{P}_+(\widetilde{W} \geq t) \leq \mathbb{P}_+(\varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}, S_{\varsigma_A} \geq t(1 - 2\delta)) + 3\delta t^{-\kappa}, \quad (\text{B.7})$$

for all  $t > t_A$ . Thus,  $\widetilde{W}$  can be approximated by  $S_{\varsigma_A}$ .

Recall the random variable  $R$  defined by (1.1). Note that  $R(\omega) = E_\omega(Y_0)$ , and, denote (as in (2.46))  $R^{\varsigma_A} = R(\theta^{-\varsigma_A}\omega)$ . We have the following law of large numbers with random normalizing constant  $Z_{\varsigma_A}$ .

**Lemma B.8.**

(i) *There exist functions  $K_{10} = K_{10}(A) > 0$  and  $K_{11} = K_{11}(A) > 0$  independent of  $\omega$  such that*

$$K_{10}(A) < \mathbb{E}_+(Z_{\varsigma_A}^\kappa; \varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}) \leq K_{11}(A). \quad (\text{B.9})$$

(ii) *For all  $\delta > 0$  there exists an  $A_1 = A_1(\delta)$  such that*

$$\mathbb{P}_+(|S_{\varsigma_A} - Z_{\varsigma_A} R^{\varsigma_A}| \geq \delta t, \varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}) \leq \delta t^{-\kappa} \mathbb{E}_+(Z_{\varsigma_A}^\kappa; \varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}) \quad (\text{B.10})$$

for  $A \geq A_1$ .

It follows from (B.7) and (B.10) that for  $A$  and  $t$  sufficiently large,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_+(\varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}, Z_{\varsigma_A} R^{\varsigma_A} \geq (1 + \delta)t) - \delta t^{-\kappa} \mathbb{E}_+(Z_{\varsigma_A}^\kappa; \varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}) &\leq \mathbb{P}_+(\widetilde{W} \geq t) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_+(\varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}, Z_{\varsigma_A} R^{\varsigma_A} \geq (1 - 3\delta)t) + \delta t^{-\kappa} (3 + \mathbb{E}_+(Z_{\varsigma_A}^\kappa; \varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu})). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.11})$$

For a fixed  $A > 0$ , we obtain from Condition  $C_\kappa$  and the dominated convergence theorem that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^\kappa \mathbb{P}_+(\varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}, Z_{\varsigma_A} R^{\varsigma_A} \geq t) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^\kappa \mathbb{E}_+(I(\varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}) \cdot \mathbb{P}_+(Z_{\varsigma_A} R^{\varsigma_A} \geq t | \mathcal{F}_{\varsigma_A})) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_+(I(\varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}) \cdot Z_{\varsigma_A}^\kappa \cdot K(\theta^{-\varsigma_A}\omega)) = \mathbb{E}_+(Z_{\varsigma_A}^\kappa \cdot K(\theta^{-\varsigma_A}\omega); \varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.12})$$

and, with constants  $K_3$  and  $K_4$  defined in (2.26),

$$K_3 \mathbb{E}_+(Z_{\varsigma_A}^\kappa; \varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}) \leq t^\kappa \mathbb{P}_+(\varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}, Z_{\varsigma_A} R^{\varsigma_A} \geq t) \leq K_4 \mathbb{E}_+(Z_{\varsigma_A}^\kappa; \varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu})$$

for all  $t$  sufficiently large.

It follows from (B.11) and (B.12) that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^\kappa \mathbb{P}_+(\widetilde{W} \geq t) = \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_+(Z_{\varsigma_A}^\kappa \cdot K(\theta^{-\varsigma_A} \omega); \varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}),$$

where the last limit is finite by (2.26) and (B.9). The limit in the right-hand side exists since the limit in the left-hand side does not depend of  $A$ .

Furthermore, it follows from (B.11) and (2.26) that for some  $\delta_0 > 0, A_2 > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \left( \frac{K_3}{(1 + \delta_0)^\kappa} - \delta_0 \right) \cdot \mathbb{E}_+(Z_{\varsigma_A}^\kappa; \varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}) &\leq t^\kappa \mathbb{P}_+(\widetilde{W} \geq t) \\ &\leq \left( \frac{K_4}{(1 - 3\delta_0)^\kappa} + \delta_0 \right) \cdot \mathbb{E}_+(Z_{\varsigma_A}^\kappa; \varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}) + 3\delta_0, \end{aligned}$$

for all  $t > t_0$ . Therefore, by (B.9),

$$0 < K_{10}(A_2) \left( \frac{K_3}{(1 + \delta_0)^\kappa} - \delta_0 \right) \leq t^\kappa \mathbb{P}_+(\widetilde{W} \geq t) \leq K_{11}(A_2) \left( \frac{K_4}{(1 - 3\delta_0)^\kappa} + \delta_0 \right) + 3\delta_0,$$

completing the proof of Proposition 2.28.

## Proof of Lemma B.2

(a) Follows from part (a) of Lemma 2.23 (which itself is a corollary to Proposition 2.19).

(b) It is enough to consider  $A \in \mathbb{N}$ . For any  $n > 0$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_+(\varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}) &= \mathbb{P}_+(\varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}, \tilde{\nu} > n) + \mathbb{P}_+(\varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}, \tilde{\nu} \leq n) \leq \mathbb{P}_+(\tilde{\nu} > n) + \mathbb{P}_+(\varsigma_A < n) \\ &\leq C_3 e^{-C_4 n} + \mathbb{P}_+(\varsigma_A < n). \end{aligned} \tag{B.13}$$

For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  let  $b_n = (1 - 1/n)^{1/n}$  and define a sequence of natural numbers  $\{a_{i,n}\}_{i=0}^n$  by the following rule:  $a_{0,n} = 0$  and

$$a_{i+1,n} = \min \left\{ j \in \mathbb{N} : j > \max \left\{ a_{n-1,n-1}; \frac{(a_{i,n} + 1)(1 - \epsilon)}{(1 - b_n)\epsilon} \right\} \right\}.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_+(Z_i > a_{i,n} | Z_j \leq a_{j,n}, j = 0, 1, \dots, i-1) &\leq \frac{1}{a_{i,n}} \mathbb{E}_+(Z_i | Z_{i-1} = a_{i-1,n}) \\ &= \frac{(a_{i-1,n} + 1)(1 - \omega_{-i+1})}{a_{i,n} \cdot \omega_{-i+1}} \leq \frac{(a_{i-1,n} + 1)(1 - \epsilon)}{a_{i,n} \cdot \epsilon} \leq 1 - b_n. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that

$$\mathbb{P}_+(Z_i \leq a_{i,n} | Z_j \leq a_{j,n}, j = 0, 1, \dots, i-1) \geq b_n,$$

and hence  $\mathbb{P}_+(\varsigma_A(a_{n,n}) > n) \geq \mathbb{P}_+(Z_i \leq a_{i,n}, i = 1, 2, \dots, n) \geq 1 - 1/n$ . By construction,  $a_{n,n}$  is a strictly increasing sequence and it follows from (B.13) that for any  $A > a_{n,n}$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_+(\varsigma_A(A) < \tilde{\nu}) \leq \mathbb{P}_+(\varsigma_A(a_{n,n}) < \tilde{\nu}) \leq C_3 e^{-C_4 n} + 1/n,$$

completing the proof.  $\square$

## Proof of Lemma B.5

(i) Recall  $R^n = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \prod_{j=n}^{n+i-1} \rho_{-j}$  and let  $A_n = Z_{0,n} - Z_{0,n-1}\rho_{-(n-1)}$ . Then,  $Y_0 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n R^n$ , and using the identity  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{-2} = \pi^2/6 < 2$ , we obtain from Condition  $C_\kappa$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_+(Y_0 \geq t) &= \mathbb{P}_+\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n R^n \geq 6\pi^{-2}t \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{-2}\right) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_+\left(|A_n|R^n \geq \frac{t}{2n^2}\right) \\ &\leq 2^\kappa t^{-\kappa} K_4 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{2\kappa} \mathbb{E}_+(|A_n|^\kappa). \end{aligned}$$

Since (cf. [13, pp. 158–159])  $\mathbb{E}_+(|A_n|^\kappa) \leq K_{12} E_P\left(\prod_{i=0}^{n-2} \rho_{-i}^{\kappa/2} \mid \mathcal{F}_0\right)$  for some constant  $K_{12} > 0$ , it follows from Condition B that  $\mathbb{P}_+(Y_0 \geq t) \leq K_9 t^{-\kappa}$ , for some  $K_9 > 0$ .

(ii) Recall the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{F}_n$  defined in (2.18). Using the first part of the proposition, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_+\left(\sum_{\varsigma_A \leq n < \tilde{\nu}} Y_n \geq \delta t\right) &= \mathbb{P}_+\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} Y_n I(\varsigma_A \leq n < \tilde{\nu}) \geq 6\delta t \pi^{-2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{-2}\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_+\left(I(\varsigma_A \leq n < \tilde{\nu}) \cdot \mathbb{P}(Y_n \geq 1/2 \cdot \delta t n^{-2} \mid \mathcal{F}_n)\right) \\ &\leq K_9 2^\kappa t^{-\kappa} \delta^{-\kappa} \mathbb{E}_+(\tilde{\nu}^{2\kappa+1}; \varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}) \leq K_9 2^\kappa t^{-\kappa} \delta^{-\kappa} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_+(\tilde{\nu}^{4\kappa+2})} \cdot \sqrt{\mathbb{P}_+(\varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu})}. \end{aligned}$$

The claim follows now from Lemma B.2, the first square root being bounded and the second one going to zero as  $A \rightarrow \infty$ , both uniformly in  $\omega$ .  $\square$

## Proof of Lemma B.8

(i) For the lower bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_+(Z_{\varsigma_A}^\kappa; \varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}) &\geq A^\kappa \mathbb{P}_+(\varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}) \geq A^\kappa \mathbb{P}_+(Z_1 = A + 1) = A^\kappa \omega_0 (1 - \omega_0)^{1+A} \\ &\geq A^\kappa \epsilon^{A+2} := K_5(A) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

We now turn to the upper bound. For a fixed environment  $\omega$  we obtain, by using the Markov property of  $Z_n$  in the second equality and the ellipticity condition (B1) in the last

two inequalities,

$$\begin{aligned}
E_\omega(Z_{\varsigma_A}^\kappa) &= \sum_{n \geq 1} \sum_{a=0}^A E_\omega(Z_n^\kappa \mid \varsigma_A = n, Z_n > A, Z_{n-1} = a) P_\omega(\varsigma_A = n, Z_{n-1} = a) = \\
&= \sum_{n \geq 1} \sum_{a=0}^A E_\omega(Z_n^\kappa \mid Z_n > A, Z_{n-1} = a) P_\omega(\varsigma_A = n, Z_{n-1} = a) \\
&\leq \sup_{\omega, n \in \mathbb{N}, a \leq A} E_\omega(Z_n^\kappa \mid Z_n > A, Z_{n-1} = a) \leq \sup_{\omega, n \in \mathbb{N}, a \leq A} \frac{E_\omega(Z_n^\kappa \mid Z_{n-1} = a)}{P_\omega(Z_n > A \mid Z_{n-1} = a)} \\
&\leq \sup_\omega \frac{E_\omega(Z_1^\kappa \mid Z_0 = A)}{P_\omega(Z_1 > A \mid Z_0 = 0)} \leq (A+1)^{\kappa+1} \epsilon^{-A-2} \sup_\omega E_\omega[(V_{0,0})^\kappa] < \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

where the random variables  $V_{n,j}$  are defined in (2.17). This completes the proof of part (i) of the Lemma.

(ii) The proof is similar to that of Lemma B.5. If  $\varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}$ , let

$S_{\varsigma_A, j}$  = number of progeny alive at time  $j$  of the  $Z_{\varsigma_A}$  particles present at time  $\varsigma_A$ ,

and  $B_j = S_{\varsigma_A, j} - S_{\varsigma_A, j-1} \cdot \rho_{-(j-1)}$ . We have  $\sum_{j=\varsigma_A}^\infty S_{\varsigma_A, j} - Z_{\varsigma_A} R^{\varsigma_A} = \sum_{j=\varsigma_A}^\infty B_j R^j$ , and obtain from Condition  $C_\kappa$  that on the set  $\{\varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_+ \left( \left| \sum_{j=\varsigma_A}^\infty S_{\varsigma_A, j} - Z_{\varsigma_A} R^{\varsigma_A} \right| \geq \delta t \mid \mathcal{F}_{\varsigma_A} \right) &\leq \sum_{j=\varsigma_A}^\infty \mathbb{E}_+ \left( \mathbb{P}_+ (|B_j| R^j \geq \frac{\delta t}{2(j - \varsigma_A + 1)^2} \mid B_j, \mathcal{F}_{\varsigma_A}) \right) \\
&\leq K_4 \left( \frac{2}{\delta t} \right)^\kappa \sum_{n=0}^\infty (n+1)^2 \cdot \mathbb{E}_+ (|B_{\varsigma_A+n}|^\kappa \mid \mathcal{F}_{\varsigma_A}).
\end{aligned}$$

Since (cf. [13, p. 164])  $\mathbb{E}_+ (|B_{\varsigma_A+n}|^\kappa \mid \mathcal{F}_{\varsigma_A}) \leq K_{13} Z_{\varsigma_A}^\kappa E_P \left( \prod_{i=\varsigma_A}^{j-2} \rho_{-i}^{\kappa/2} \right)$ , it follows from Condition  $C_\kappa$  that for some  $K_{14} > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_+ \left( \left| \sum_{j=\varsigma_A}^\infty S_{\varsigma_A, j} - Z_{\varsigma_A} \tilde{S}_{\varsigma_A} \right| \geq \delta t; \varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu} \right) &\leq \left( \frac{K_{14}}{t\delta} \right)^\kappa \mathbb{E}_+ (Z_{\varsigma_A}^{\kappa/2}; \varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}) \\
&\leq \left( \frac{K_{14}}{t\delta\sqrt{A}} \right)^\kappa \mathbb{E}_+ (Z_{\varsigma_A}^\kappa; \varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}) \leq \delta t^{-\kappa} \mathbb{E}_+ (Z_{\varsigma_A}^\kappa; \varsigma_A < \tilde{\nu}),
\end{aligned}$$

for  $A \geq A_2(\delta)$ . □

## Acknowledgment

We wish to thank Julien Bremont for his careful reading of a preliminary version of the paper and for several valuable suggestions.

## References

- [1] S. Alili, *Asymptotic behavior for random walks in random environments*, J. Appl. Prob. **36** (1999), 334–349.
- [2] G. Alsmeyer, *The Markov renewal theorem and related results*, Markov Proc. Rel. Fields. **3** (1997), 103–127.
- [3] S. Asmussen, *Applied Probability and Queues*, Wiley, N.Y., 1987.
- [4] K. B. Athreya, D. McDonald, and P. E. Ney, *Limit theorems for semi-Markov renewal theory for Markov chains*, Ann. Prob. **6** (1978), 809–814.
- [5] K. B. Athreya and P. E. Ney, *A new approach to the limit theory of recurrent Markov chains*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **245** (1978), 493–501.
- [6] ———, *A renewal approach to the Perron-Frobenius theory of nonnegative kernels on general state spaces*, Math. Z. **179** (1982), 507–529.
- [7] J. Bremont, *On some random walks on  $\mathbb{Z}$  in random medium*, Ann. Prob. **30** (2002), 1266–1312.
- [8] A. A. Chernov, *Replication of a multicomponent chain by the "lightning mechanism"*, Biophysics **12** (1967), 336–341.
- [9] B. de Saporta, *Tails of the stationary solution of the stochastic equation  $Y_{n+1} = a_n Y_n + b_n$  with Markovian coefficients*, to appear, Stoch. Proc. Appl., 2004.
- [10] R. Durrett, *Probability: Theory and examples, 2nd edition*, Duxbury Press, Belmont, 1996.
- [11] B. V. Gnedenko and A. N. Kolmogorov, *Limit Distributions for Sums of Independent Random Variables, 2nd edition*, Addison–Wesley, 1962.
- [12] C. M. Goldie, *Implicit renewal theory and tails of solutions of random equations*, Ann. Appl. Probab. **1** (1991), 126–166.
- [13] H. Kesten, M. V. Kozlov, and F. Spitzer, *A limit law for random walk in a random environment*, Comp. Math. **30** (1975), 145–168.
- [14] H. Kesten, *Random difference equations and renewal theory for products of random matrices*, Acta. Math. **131** (1973), 208–248.
- [15] ———, *Renewal theory for functionals of a Markov chain with general state space*, Ann. Prob. **2** (1974), 355–386.
- [16] M. Kobus, *Generalized Poisson distributions as limits of sums for arrays of dependent random vectors*, J. Multivariate Anal. **52** (1995), 199–244.

- [17] S. M. Kozlov, *A random walk on the line with stochastic structure*, Teoriya Veroyatnosti i Primeneniya **18** (1973), 406–408.
- [18] S. A. Molchanov, *Lectures on random media*, Lecture notes in Mathematics, vol. 1581, Springer, New York, 1994.
- [19] E. Nummelin, *General Irreducible Markov Chains and Non-negative Operators*, Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- [20] A. Roitershtein, *One-dimensional linear recursions with Markov-dependent coefficients*, in preparation, 2004.
- [21] G. Samorodnitsky and M. S. Taqqu, *Stable Non-Gaussian Random Processes*, Chapman & Hall, 1994.
- [22] V. M. Shurenkov, *On the theory of Markov renewal*, Theor. Probab. Appl **29** (1984), 247–265.
- [23] F. Solomon, *Random walks in random environments*, Annal. Probab. **3** (1975), 1–31.
- [24] Z. Szewczak, *On a central limit theorem for  $m$ -dependent sequences*, Bull. Polish Acad. Sci. **36** (1988), 327–331.
- [25] A. S. Sznitman, *Topics in random walks in random environment*, To appear in ICTP Lecture Notes Series for the School and Conference on Probability Theory, Trieste, 2002.
- [26] C. Takacs, *More randomness of environment does not always slow down a random walk*, J. Theor. Prob. **14(3)** (2001), 699–715.
- [27] D. E. Temkin, *One-dimensional random walks in two-component chain*, Soviet Math. Dokl. **13 (5)** (1972), 1172–1176.
- [28] O. Zeitouni, *Random walks in random environment*, XXXI Summer School in Probability, St. Flour (2001). Lecture Notes in Math. **1837**, Springer, 2004, 193–312.