

Almost sure growth of integrated supOU processes

Danijel Grahovac^{*1} and Péter Kevei^{†2}

¹*School of Applied Mathematics and Informatics, J. J. Strossmayer University of Osijek, Trg Ljudevita Gaja 6, 31000 Osijek, Croatia*

²*Bolyai Institute, University of Szeged, Aradi vértanúk tere 1, 6720 Szeged, Hungary*

Abstract

Superpositions of Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes allow a flexible dependence structure, including long range dependence for OU-type processes. Their complex asymptotic is governed by three effects: the behavior of the Lévy measure both at infinity and at zero, and the behavior at zero of the measure governing the dependence. We establish almost sure rates of growth depending on the characteristics of the process and prove a Marcinkiewicz–Zygmund type SLLN for the integrated process.

AMS 2010 Subject Classifications: 60G17, 60F15, 60G55, 60G57

Keywords: supOU processes, infinitely divisible random measure, Marcinkiewicz–Zygmund type strong law of large numbers, almost sure properties, rate of growth

1 Introduction

A superposition of Ornstein-Uhlenbeck type processes (*supOU process*) [1] is a strictly stationary process $\{X(t), t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ given by

$$X(t) = \iint_{(0,\infty) \times (-\infty,t]} e^{-x(t-s)} \Lambda(dx, ds), \quad (1)$$

^{*}dgrahova@mathos.hr

[†]kevei@math.u-szeged.hu

where Λ is a homogeneous infinitely divisible independently scattered random measure on $(0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}$ such that for $A \in \mathcal{B}((0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R})$

$$\begin{aligned} & \log \mathbf{E} e^{i\theta\Lambda(A)} \\ &= (\pi \times \text{Leb})(A) \left(i\theta a - \frac{\theta^2}{2} b + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(e^{i\theta y} - 1 - i\theta y \mathbf{1}(|y| \leq 1) \right) \lambda(dy) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

π is a measure on $(0, \infty)$ such that $\int_{(0, \infty)} x^{-1} \pi(dx) < \infty$, and (a, b, λ) is a Lévy-Khintchine triplet of some infinitely divisible distribution such that $\int_{|z| > 1} \log |z| \lambda(dz) < \infty$. The *generating quadruple* (a, b, λ, π) completely determines the distribution of the supOU process.

The one-dimensional marginal distributions of the supOU processes are self-decomposable and correspond to Lévy driven Ornstein–Uhlenbeck processes with (a, b, λ) being the characteristic triplet of the driving Lévy process. However, supOU processes have more complex dependence structure than Lévy driven Ornstein–Uhlenbeck processes. Indeed, if $\mathbf{E}X(t)^2 < \infty$, the correlation function of X is the Laplace transform of π . See [1, 2, 3] for more details.

In this paper we investigate the almost sure behavior of the *integrated supOU process*

$$X^*(t) = \int_0^t X(u) du. \quad (3)$$

The motivation for studying the almost sure rate of growth comes from limiting properties established recently in a series of papers [15, 18, 20] that we partly review now.

Depending on the generating quadruple (a, b, λ, π) , four types of limiting processes may appear as the limit of normalized integrated supOU process. Suppose that π has a density p which is regularly varying at zero

$$p(x) \sim \alpha \ell(x^{-1}) x^\alpha, \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow 0, \quad (4)$$

for some $\alpha > 0$ and ℓ slowly varying at infinity. This implies that the correlation function is $(-\alpha)$ -regularly varying at infinity. In particular, for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ the correlation function is non-integrable which is typically referred to as *long-range dependence*. If for the finite variance integrated supOU process (4) holds, then for some slowly varying function $\widehat{\ell}$

$$\left\{ \frac{X^*(Tt) - \mathbf{E}X^*(Tt)}{T^H \widehat{\ell}(T)} \right\} \xrightarrow{\text{fdd}} \{Z(t)\}, \quad \text{as } T \rightarrow \infty, \quad (5)$$

if one of the following holds:

- (i) $\alpha > 1$, in which case $H = 1/2$ and Z is Brownian motion,
- (ii) $b = 0$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\int_{|z| \leq 1} |z|^{1+\alpha} \lambda(dz) < \infty$, in which case $H = 1/(1 + \alpha)$ and Z is stable Lévy process,
- (iii) $b = 0$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\lambda(\{x \in \mathbb{R} : |x| > z\}) \sim cz^{-\beta}$ as $z \rightarrow 0$ with $1 + \alpha < \beta < 2$, in which case $H = 1 - \alpha/\beta$ and Z is β -stable process with dependent increments,
- (iv) $b > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, in which case $H = 1 - \alpha/2$ and Z is fractional Brownian motion.

The convergence in (5) is in the sense of convergence of finite dimensional distributions, however, the weak convergence can be shown in some cases [18, Theorem 3.5]. For the infinite variance case, the type of the limit depends additionally on the regular variation index of the marginal distribution [19].

In addition to interesting limit theorems, integrated supOU processes exhibit somewhat unexpected behavior of moments. Indeed, if, in addition to the assumptions of the limit theorem (5), the supOU process is not purely Gaussian and has finite exponential moments, then ([18, Theorems 4.1-4.4]; see also [15])

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \mathbf{E}|X^*(t) - \mathbf{E}X^*(t)|^q}{\log t} = \begin{cases} Hq, & 0 \leq q \leq \frac{\alpha}{1-H}, \\ q - \alpha, & q \geq \frac{\alpha}{1-H}, \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where H is the self-similarity parameter of the limiting process Z in (5). Such behavior of moments is termed *intermittency* (see [15, 16]) and resembles a similar phenomenon appearing in solutions of some stochastic partial differential equations (SPDE) (see e.g. [6, 7, 8, 14, 26, 29, 44]). For self-similar processes the moments always grow as t^{Hq} , hence a self-similar process can never be intermittent. Intermittency in limit theorems of the form (5) implies that higher order moments do not converge (see [15]). We note that the moment assumption simplifies the analysis, but for proving intermittency it is enough to assume moments are finite up to some finite order [15, p. 2043].

To gain some intuition behind (6), it is instructive to consider a sequence of independent random variables $\{Y(n), n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, with $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$, given by

$$Y(n) = \begin{cases} n^H, & \text{with probability } 1 - n^{-\alpha}, \\ n, & \text{with probability } n^{-\alpha}, \end{cases}$$

that has the same behavior of moments as in (6). Another similarity between the two is that one can show using the Paley–Zygmund inequality [26, Lemma 7.3] (see also [21]) that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ we eventually have

$$\mathbf{P}(|X^*(t) - \mathbf{E}X^*(t)| > ct^{1-\varepsilon}) \geq t^{-\alpha-\delta}. \quad (7)$$

Therefore, the probability that the normalized integrated supOU process exhibits increasingly large values decreases as a power function of time. This small fraction of probability space where $X^*(t)$ is unduly large provides the main contribution to higher order moments resulting in moment intermittency (6). In particular, classical large deviation results with exponentially decaying probabilities do not typically hold in limit theorems for supOU processes [21].

For $\alpha < 1$, the normalized sequence $\{Y(n)/n^H, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a textbook example of a sequence converging in probability but not almost surely. Namely, the probabilities $\mathbf{P}(Y(n) \geq n)$ are not summable and by the second Borel–Cantelli lemma $Y(n) \geq n$ happens infinitely often.

In this paper we answer the question whether the same is true for paths of integrated supOU processes. Namely, we wonder whether the normalized integrated supOU process exhibits *physical intermittency*, meaning that at large times it exhibits increasingly tall peaks (see e.g. [6, 27, 28, 44]). We show that this not so and prove a Marcinkiewicz–Zygmund type strong law of large numbers for the integrated process. In contrast to the classical Marcinkiewicz–Zygmund SLLN, our moment condition depends on both the Lévy measure λ and the measure governing the dependence, π . The precise results are given in Section 2. In particular, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|X^*(t) - \mathbf{E}X^*(t)|}{t^{H+\varepsilon}} = 0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

We conclude that the paths of normalized integrated supOU process do not exhibit increasingly large values infinitely often, even though (6) and (7) would suggest differently at first. This can be compared with the recently observed phenomenon of *dissipation* in SPDEs [27, 28].

Our results provide a rare example of a law of the iterated logarithm type and limsup type results for processes with strong dependence. Such results are typically known only for Gaussian [35, 43] or self-similar processes, like, for example, the law of iterated logarithm for fractional Brownian motion, limsup results for α -stable Lévy processes [39], linear fractional stable processes [40], or for general self-similar processes (see [30, 40]). Beyond the class of self-similar processes, let us mention that for the Lévy processes the

rate of growth depends on the regular variation index of the Lévy measure at infinity (see [39, Section 48] and the references therein).

One may view supOU processes as aggregation of Lévy driven Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes with random mean reverting parameter. Such models have been extensively studied ever since the seminal paper [22] when it was realized that by aggregating simpler processes one may obtain complex dependence properties like long-range dependence (see e.g. [32, 34, 37] and the references therein). However, pathwise behavior of such processes has been unknown so far. Moreover, limiting behavior of supOU processes is similar to that of trawl processes [2, 17, 36, 41]. Hence, our results may pave the way for establishing similar pathwise results for similar classes of processes.

We note also that supOU processes have been used in various applications, mainly in finance where they provide a model for stochastic volatility (see e.g. [4, 9, 13]). In this context, the integrated process (3) is the integrated volatility. SupOU processes have also been applied in other areas, like e.g. in astrophysics [24].

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains the main results. In Section 3 we give some preliminary facts needed for the proofs and also discuss moments and tail behavior of the integrated process. The proofs of the main results are given in Sections 4-6.

Throughout the paper c will denote a constant that may change from row to row and for any measure Q on \mathbb{R} we denote

$$m_p(Q) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} x^p Q(dx),$$

and for its tail $\bar{Q}(r) = Q((r, \infty))$, $r > 0$.

2 The almost sure growth

The random measure Λ in (1) has a modification with the Lévy-Itô decomposition ([3, Theorem 2.2]). We assume to work with this modification so that

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(dx, ds) &= a\pi(dx)ds + \Lambda^G(dx, ds) + \int_{|z| \leq 1} z(\mu - \nu)(dx, ds, dz) \\ &\quad + \int_{|z| > 1} z\mu(dx, ds, dz), \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where Λ^G is Gaussian random measure defined as in (2) with generating quadruple $(0, b, 0, \pi)$ and μ is a Poisson random measure on $(0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ with intensity measure

$$\nu(dx, ds, dz) = \pi(dx)ds \lambda(dz).$$

Remark 1. The supOU processes were introduced in [1] with a slightly different parametrization ($-xt + s$ in the exponent in (1)). Representation (1) is a moving average representation, which was first used in [11] (see also [12]). The conditions $\int_{(0, \infty)} x^{-1} \pi(dx) < \infty$ and $\int_{|z| > 1} \log |z| \lambda(dz) < \infty$ are necessary and sufficient for the existence of X by Theorem 3.1 in [1]. See also [12, Proposition 2.1] and [3] with the unnecessary assumption that π is a probability measure.

The integrated process (3) may be written in the form

$$X^*(t) = \int_0^t X(u) du = \iint_{(0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}} f_t(x, s) \Lambda(dx, ds),$$

where

$$f_t(x, s) = \begin{cases} x^{-1}(1 - e^{-xt})e^{xs}, & s \leq 0, \\ x^{-1}(1 - e^{-x(t-s)})\mathbb{1}(s \leq t), & s > 0. \end{cases}$$

The use of the stochastic Fubini theorem is justified in [20, Lemma 4.1]. By (8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} X^*(t) &= a \int_{(0, \infty)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_t(x, s) \pi(dx) ds + \int_{(0, \infty)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_t(x, s) \Lambda^G(dx, ds) \\ &\quad + \int_{(0, \infty)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{|z| \leq 1} z f_t(x, s) (\mu - \nu)(dx, ds, dz) \\ &\quad + \int_{(0, \infty)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{|z| > 1} z f_t(x, s) \mu(dx, ds, dz). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\int_{(0, \infty)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_t(x, s) \pi(dx) ds = tm_{-1}(\pi),$$

the behavior of the deterministic part is clear. Hence, in the following we assume that $a = 0$ whenever $\int_{|z| \leq 1} |z| \lambda(dz) < \infty$, and when $\int_{|z| \leq 1} |z| \lambda(dz) < \infty$ then $a = \int_{|z| \leq 1} z \lambda(dz)$, so that there is no centering. In particular, if $\int_{|z| > 1} |z| \lambda(dz) < \infty$, then

$$\mathbf{E}X^*(t) = \begin{cases} tm_{-1}(\pi) \int_{\mathbb{R}} z \lambda(dz), & \text{if } \int_{|z| \leq 1} |z| \lambda(dz) < \infty, \\ tm_{-1}(\pi) \int_{|z| > 1} z \lambda(dz), & \text{if } \int_{|z| \leq 1} |z| \lambda(dz) = \infty. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, we assume for the moment that there is no Gaussian component in the generating quadruple.

The technique of the proof depends on whether the Poisson random measure needs compensation or not. Hence, we split the results in these two cases.

Theorem 1. *Assume that $a = \int_{|z| \leq 1} |z| \lambda(dz) < \infty$ and $b = 0$.*

(i) *If for some $\gamma \in (0, 2)$*

$$\iint_{(0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}} \frac{|z|^\gamma}{x^\gamma} \mathbf{1}(|z| > x) \pi(dx) \lambda(dz) < \infty, \quad (9)$$

and if $\gamma = 1$ additionally $m_{-1-\delta}(\pi) < \infty$ for some $\delta > 0$, then

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{X^*(t) - \mathbf{1}(\gamma \geq 1) \mathbf{E}X^*(t)}{t^{1/\gamma}} = 0 \quad a.s.$$

(ii) *If (9) holds for $\gamma = 2$, then*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|X^*(t) - t \mathbf{E}X^*(t)|}{\sqrt{2t \log \log t}} = \sqrt{\mathbf{Var}X^*(1)} \quad a.s.$$

If $\int_{|z| \leq 1} |z| \lambda(dz) < \infty$ and $m_0(\pi) < \infty$, then for any $\gamma > 0$ the condition (9) is equivalent to the conditions $\int_{(0,1)} x^{-\gamma} \pi(dx) < \infty$ and $\int_{|z| > 1} |z|^\gamma \lambda(dz) < \infty$. Assuming that $\int_{|z| \leq 1} |z| \lambda(dz) < \infty$ and $m_0(\pi) = \infty$, the equivalence also holds if $\gamma \geq 1$, while for $\gamma < 1$, (9) is equivalent to the finiteness of the following three integrals: $\int_{(0,1)} x^{-\gamma} \pi(dx) < \infty$, $\int_{|z| > 1} |z|^\gamma \lambda(dz) < \infty$, and

$$\int_{(1, \infty)} \int_{|z| > x} \frac{|z|^\gamma}{x^\gamma} \lambda(dz) \pi(dx) < \infty.$$

The classical Marcinkiewicz–Zygmund theorem, see e.g. [23, Theorem 6.7.1], states that if iid random variables have finite moment of order $\gamma \in (1, 2)$, then the centered partial sum is $o(n^{1/\gamma})$ almost surely. It follows from Corollary 1 below that (9) implies that $\mathbf{E}|X^*(1)|^\gamma < \infty$. However, (9) is stronger than the moment assumption alone, as it is also affected by the behavior of π and λ near 0.

For the $\int_{|z|\leq 1} |z|\lambda(dz) = \infty$ case, we introduce the following indices

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_0 &= \inf \left\{ \beta \geq 0 : \int_{|z|\leq 1} |z|^\beta \lambda(dz) < \infty \right\}, \\ \eta_\infty &= \sup \left\{ \eta \geq 0 : \int_{|z|>1} |z|^\eta \lambda(dz) < \infty \right\}, \\ \alpha_0 &= \sup \left\{ \alpha \geq 0 : \int_{(0,1]} x^{-\alpha-1} \pi(dx) < \infty \right\}.\end{aligned}\tag{10}$$

The constant β_0 is the Blumenthal–Gettoor index of the Lévy measure λ and η_∞ is the tail index of the marginal distribution of the driving Lévy process. Assumption $\int_{|z|\leq 1} |z|\lambda(dz) = \infty$ implies that $\beta_0 \geq 1$, while $\beta_0 \leq 2$, as λ is a Lévy measure.

In what follows, we put $\beta = \beta_0$ if $\int_{|z|\leq 1} |z|^{\beta_0} \lambda(dz) < \infty$, otherwise $\beta > \beta_0$ arbitrarily close. Similarly, $\eta \leq \eta_\infty$, $\alpha \leq \alpha_0$ with equality if the corresponding quantity is finite. Following this notation, if $\beta \leq 1 + \alpha$, then (9) is equivalent to $\gamma \leq 1 + \alpha$ and $\gamma \leq \eta$.

Theorem 2. *Assume that $\int_{|z|\leq 1} |z|\lambda(dz) = \infty$, $a = 0$ and $b = 0$.*

(i) *If (9) holds for some $\gamma \in (0, 2]$ and if $\gamma = 1$ additionally $m_{-1-\delta}(\pi) < \infty$ for some $\delta > 0$, then*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|X^*(t) - \mathbf{1}(\gamma \geq 1)\mathbf{E}X^*(t)|}{t^{1/\gamma} \log t} \leq 1 \quad a.s.$$

(ii) *If $\beta \geq 1 + \alpha$, then for any $\gamma < 1/(1 - \alpha/\beta)$ and $\gamma \leq \eta$*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^{-1/\gamma} X^*(t) = 0 \quad a.s.$$

To summarize the main results, let $R(t) = \log |X^*(t)| / \log t$ denote the *rate of growth* of the integrated process. Then it follows from Theorems 1 and 2 that a.s.

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} R(t) \leq \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}, & \text{if } \alpha \geq 1 \text{ and } \eta \geq 2, \\ \frac{1}{\eta}, & \text{if } \alpha \geq 1 \text{ and } \eta < 2, \text{ or } \alpha < 1 \text{ and } \eta \leq 1 + \alpha, \\ \frac{1}{1+\alpha}, & \text{if } \alpha < 1, \eta > 1 + \alpha \text{ and } \beta \leq 1 + \alpha, \\ 1 - \frac{\alpha}{\beta}, & \text{if } \alpha < 1, \eta > 1 + \alpha \text{ and } \beta > 1 + \alpha. \end{cases}$$

By comparing with the limit theorem in (5) and the limit theorems for the infinite variance case [19], one can see that the bounds are optimal, up to a slowly varying terms. We can conclude that the almost sure growth is of the same order as in the weak limits even though from (7) one would expect differently.

Finally, for completeness we consider the purely Gaussian case, that is when $a = 0$, $b > 0$, $\lambda \equiv 0$. In this case, the following law of iterated logarithm follows from general results on Gaussian processes and combined with asymptotic analysis of the variance.

Theorem 3. *Assume that $a = 0$, $b > 0$ and $\mu \equiv 0$,*

(i) *If $m_{-2}(\pi) < \infty$, then*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|X^*(t)|}{\sqrt{2bm_{-2}(\pi)t \log \log t}} = 1 \quad a.s.$$

(ii) *If π has a density p such that $p(x) \sim \alpha \ell(x^{-1})x^\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and ℓ slowly varying at infinity, then*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|X^*(t)|}{\tilde{\sigma} \ell(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} t^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \sqrt{2 \log \log t}} = 1 \quad a.s.$$

$$\text{where } \tilde{\sigma}^2 = b \frac{\Gamma(1+\alpha)}{(2-\alpha)(1-\alpha)}.$$

3 Preliminaries

As the positive and negative jumps are independent, for the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2, it will be enough to consider supOU processes for which the Poisson random measure has only positive jumps, i.e. $\lambda((-\infty, 0)) = 0$. Since we consider the Gaussian case separately, we assume that there is no Gaussian component.

The following statement is Theorem 4.1 in [1]. We state it because of the explicit form of the Lévy measure $\bar{\eta}_t^*$.

Lemma 1 ([1, Theorem 4.1]). *The random variable $X^*(t)$ is infinitely divisible with characteristic function*

$$\mathbf{E} e^{i\theta X^*(t)} = \exp \left\{ iA\theta + \int_{(0, \infty)} (e^{i\theta y} - 1 - i\theta y \mathbf{1}(y \leq 1)) \eta_t^*(dy) \right\},$$

with an explicit constant $A \in \mathbb{R}$, where

$$\eta_t^*(B) = \nu(\{(x, s, z) : f_t(x, s)z \in B\}).$$

Furthermore,

$$\bar{\eta}_t^*(r) = \eta_t^*((r, \infty)) = \int_{(0, \infty)} x^{-1} \pi(dx) \int_{\frac{xr}{1-e^{-xt}}}^{\infty} \bar{\lambda}(z) \frac{1}{z-xr} dz.$$

Proof. The first part follows from [38, Theorem 2.7]. Note that for $r > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} & \{(x, s, z) : f_t(x, s)z > r\} \\ &= \left\{ (x, s, z) : z > \frac{xr}{1-e^{-xt}}, x^{-1} \log \frac{xr}{z(1-e^{-xt})} < s \leq 0 \right\} \\ & \cup \left\{ (x, s, z) : z > \frac{xr}{1-e^{-xt}}, 0 < s < t + x^{-1} \log \left(1 - \frac{xr}{z}\right) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{\eta}_t^*(r) \\ &= \int_{(0, \infty)} \pi(dx) \int_{(\frac{xr}{1-e^{-xt}}, \infty)} \lambda(dz) \frac{1}{x} \left(\log \frac{z(1-e^{-xt})}{xr} + tx + \log \left(1 - \frac{xr}{z}\right) \right) \\ &= \int_{(0, \infty)} x^{-1} \pi(dx) \int_{(\frac{xr}{1-e^{-xt}}, \infty)} \lambda(dz) \log \left((e^{xt} - 1) \left(\frac{z}{xr} - 1\right) \right) \\ &= \int_{(0, \infty)} x^{-1} \pi(dx) \int_{\frac{xr}{1-e^{-xt}}}^{\infty} \bar{\lambda}(z) \frac{1}{z-xr} dz, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows after integration by parts. \square

Note that if $m_0(\pi) < \infty$, then $m_{-\beta}(\pi) < \infty$ for all $\beta \in [0, 1]$.

Corollary 1. *Let $t > 0$ and $\beta > 0$. If $\beta \geq 1$, or $\beta \in (0, 1)$ and $m_{-\beta}(\pi) < \infty$, then $\mathbf{E}X^*(t)^\beta < \infty$ if and only if $\int_{(1, \infty)} z^\beta \lambda(dz) < \infty$. If $\beta \in (0, 1)$ and $m_{-\beta}(\pi) = \infty$, then $\mathbf{E}X^*(t)^\beta < \infty$ if*

$$\int_{(1, \infty)} x^{-\beta} \pi(dx) \int_x^\infty z^{\beta-1} \bar{\lambda}(z) dz < \infty.$$

Proof. By [39, Theorem 25.3], $\mathbf{E}X^*(t)^\beta < \infty$ if and only if $\int_1^\infty r^{\beta-1}\bar{\eta}_t^*(r)dr < \infty$. By Lemma 1,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_1^\infty \bar{\eta}_t^*(r)r^{\beta-1}dr \\ &= \int_1^\infty dr \int_{(0,\infty)} \pi(dx) \int_0^\infty dz \frac{r^{\beta-1}\bar{\lambda}(z)}{x(z-xr)} \mathbf{1}\left(z > \frac{xr}{1-e^{-xt}}\right) \\ &= \int_{(0,\infty)} x^{-1}\pi(dx) \int_{x/(1-e^{-xt})}^\infty dz \bar{\lambda}(z)z^{\beta-1}x^{-\beta} \int_{x/z}^{1-e^{-xt}} \frac{u^{\beta-1}}{(1-u)}du. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The integral with respect to u is an increasing function in z , therefore in each case $\mathbf{E}X^*(t)^\beta < \infty$ implies $\int_1^\infty z^{\beta-1}\bar{\lambda}(z)dz < \infty$, which further implies $\int_{(1,\infty)} z^\beta \lambda(dz) < \infty$.

For the converse, note that

$$\sup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} x^{-\beta} \int_0^{1-e^{-xt}} u^{\beta-1}(1-u)^{-1}du < \infty,$$

while

$$\int_0^{1-e^{-xt}} u^{\beta-1}(1-u)^{-1}du \leq \int_{e^{-xt}}^1 u^{-1}du = xt.$$

Substituting back into (11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_1^\infty \bar{\eta}_t^*(r)r^{\beta-1}dr &\leq c \int_{(0,1]} x^{-1}\pi(dx) \int_{1/t}^\infty \bar{\lambda}(z)z^{\beta-1}dz \\ &\quad + t \int_{(1,\infty)} x^{-\beta}\pi(dx) \int_x^\infty \bar{\lambda}(z)z^{\beta-1}dz, \end{aligned}$$

and the finiteness of the integral follows. \square

Thus, in most cases the behavior of π does not have effect on the existence of the moments. However, it does have effect on the existence of exponential moments.

Lemma 2. *Let $\varepsilon_0 = \sup\{s \geq 0 : \pi((0, s)) = 0\}$, and*

$$K_0(t) = \frac{1 - e^{-\varepsilon_0 t}}{\varepsilon_0},$$

with $K_0(t) = t$ for $\varepsilon_0 = 0$. If $\mathbf{E}e^{sX^(t)} < \infty$, for $s > 0$ then $\int_{(1,\infty)} e^{zy}\lambda(dz) < \infty$ for any $y < K_0(t)s$. On the other hand, if $\int_{(1,\infty)} e^{zK_0(t)s}\lambda(dz) < \infty$, then $\mathbf{E}e^{sX^*(t)} < \infty$.*

Proof. From [39, Theorem 25.3] we see that $\mathbf{E}e^{sX^*(t)} < \infty$ if and only if $\int_{(1,\infty)} e^{sr} \eta_t^*(dr) < \infty$, which holds if and only if $\int_1^\infty s e^{sr} \bar{\eta}_t^*(r) dr < \infty$. Using Lemma 1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_1^\infty e^{sr} \bar{\eta}_t^*(r) dr &= \int_1^\infty dr \int_{(0,\infty)} \pi(dx) \int_{\frac{xr}{1-e^{-xt}}}^\infty e^{sr} x^{-1} \bar{\lambda}(z) (z-xr)^{-1} dz \\ &= \int_{(0,\infty)} x^{-2} \pi(dx) \int_0^\infty dz \int_{x/z}^{1-e^{-xt}} e^{szu/x} \bar{\lambda}(z) (1-u)^{-1} du \mathbf{1}\left(\frac{x}{z} < 1-e^{-xt}\right) \\ &= \int_{(0,\infty)} x^{-2} \pi(dx) \int_0^1 (1-u)^{-1} du \int_0^\infty \bar{\lambda}(z) e^{zsu/x} dz \mathbf{1}\left(\frac{x}{z} < u < 1-e^{-xt}\right). \end{aligned}$$

From the last formula we see that if the integral on the left-hand side is finite, then $\int_1^\infty \bar{\lambda}(z) e^{zy} dz < \infty$ for $y < s(1-e^{-xt})/x$, where $x \in \text{supp}(\pi)$. Since $(1-e^{-xt})/x$ is decreasing in x , the first result follows.

Assuming $\int_{(1,\infty)} e^{zK_0(t)s} \lambda(dz) < \infty$, we have

$$\int_1^\infty e^{sr} \bar{\eta}_t^*(r) dr \leq c \int_{(0,\infty)} x^{-2} \pi(dx) \int_0^{1-e^{-xt}} (1-u)^{-1} du = ct,$$

where here, and in the following c is a finite positive constant, not depending on relevant quantities, and its value may change from line to line. \square

Lemma 4.2 in [20] states that if $\bar{\lambda}$ is $(-\gamma)$ -regularly varying at infinity, which we denote by $\bar{\lambda} \in \mathcal{RV}_{-\gamma}$, then $\mathbf{E}X^*(t)^q = \infty$ for all $q > \gamma$, which suggests power-law tail. The following statement makes this observation precise, by obtaining the exact asymptotics of the tail.

Lemma 3. *Assume that $\bar{\lambda} \in \mathcal{RV}_{-\gamma}$ for some $\gamma > 0$. Further assume that there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that*

$$\int_{(0,1)} x^{-1-\varepsilon} \pi(dx) + \int_{(1,\infty)} x^{\varepsilon-\gamma} \pi(dx) < \infty. \quad (12)$$

Then as $r \rightarrow \infty$

$$\bar{\eta}_t^*(r) \sim \bar{\lambda}(r) \int_{(0,\infty)} x^{-\gamma-1} \int_0^{1-e^{-xt}} y^{\gamma-1} (1-y)^{-1} dy \pi(dx).$$

Note that the second integral (12) is automatically finite (i) for any $\gamma > 0$ and $\varepsilon < \gamma$ if $m_0(\pi) < \infty$, or (ii) for any $\gamma > 1$ and $\varepsilon < \gamma - 1$.

Proof. Assuming $\bar{\lambda}(z) = \ell(z)/z^\gamma$ for some ℓ slowly varying at infinity, we have

$$\int_{\frac{xr}{1-e^{-xt}}}^{\infty} \frac{\bar{\lambda}(z)}{z-xr} dz = (xr)^{-\gamma} \int_0^{1-e^{-xt}} y^{\gamma-1}(1-y)^{-1} \ell(xr/y) dy.$$

Note that

$$\lim_{x \downarrow 0} x^{-\gamma} \int_0^{1-e^{-xt}} y^{\gamma-1}(1-y)^{-1} dy = t^\gamma \gamma^{-1}.$$

Thus, by Lemma 1

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\eta}_t^*(r) &= \frac{\ell(r)}{r^\gamma} \int_{(0,\infty)} x^{-\gamma-1} \int_0^{1-e^{-xt}} y^{\gamma-1}(1-y)^{-1} \frac{\ell(xr/y)}{\ell(r)} dy \pi(dx) \\ &\sim \bar{\lambda}(r) \int_{(0,\infty)} x^{-\gamma-1} \int_0^{1-e^{-xt}} y^{\gamma-1}(1-y)^{-1} dy \pi(dx), \end{aligned}$$

where the last asymptotic equality follows from Potter bounds, the integrability assumption, and Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem. \square

4 Proof of Theorem 1

We will first consider the case when $\lambda((-\infty, 0)) = 0$. Note that through this section we assume that $\int_{(0,1]} z\lambda(dz) < \infty$ and that $a = \int_{(0,1]} z\lambda(dz)$, hence there is no centering. The integrated process then has the form

$$X^*(t) = \int_{(0,\infty)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{(0,\infty)} z f_t(x, s) \mu(dx, ds, dz),$$

and we can decompose it as

$$\begin{aligned} X^*(t) &= \int_{(0,\infty)} \int_{(-\infty,0]} \int_{(0,\infty)} zx^{-1}(1-e^{-xt})e^{xs} \mu(dx, ds, dz) \\ &\quad + \int_{(0,\infty)} \int_{(0,t]} \int_{(0,\infty)} zx^{-1} \mu(dx, ds, dz) \\ &\quad - \int_{(0,\infty)} \int_{(0,t]} \int_{(0,\infty)} zx^{-1} e^{-x(t-s)} \mu(dx, ds, dz) \\ &=: X_-^*(t) + X_{+,1}^*(t) - X_{+,2}^*(t). \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

We now consider each of the terms separately. We see that $X_{+,1}^*$ is a subordinator. In what follows we show that it is the main term, while X_-^* and $X_{+,2}^*$ are negligible.

Let $(\xi_k, \tau_k, \zeta_k)_{k \geq 0}$ denote the points of the Poisson random measure μ . Then

$$X_-^*(t) = \sum_{\tau_k \leq 0} \frac{\zeta_k}{\xi_k} (1 - e^{-\xi_k t}) e^{\xi_k \tau_k}.$$

Lemma 4. *Let $\gamma \in (0, 2]$. For $\gamma > 1$ suppose that $\int_{(0,1)} x^{-\gamma} \pi(dx) < \infty$ and $\int_{(0,\infty)} z \lambda(dz) < \infty$. Then*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{X_-^*(t)}{t^{1/\gamma}} = 0 \quad a.s.$$

Proof. Let first $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ and note that since $1 - e^{-x} \leq x$ we have

$$t^{-1} X_-^*(t) \leq t^{-1} \sum_{\tau_k < 0} \frac{\zeta_k}{\xi_k} e^{\tau_k \xi_k} \xi_k t \leq \sum_{\tau_k < 0} \zeta_k e^{\tau_k \xi_k}.$$

If the latter sum is finite a.s., then Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem gives the result. The latter sum exists if and only if

$$\iiint_{(0,\infty)^3} (ze^{-sx} \wedge 1) \nu(dx, ds, dz) < \infty.$$

Simple calculation gives that

$$\begin{aligned} & \iiint_{(0,\infty)^3} (ze^{-sx} \wedge 1) \nu(dx, ds, dz) \\ &= \int_{(0,\infty)} x^{-1} \pi(dx) \left(\int_{(0,1]} z \lambda(dz) + \int_{(1,\infty)} (1 + \log z) \lambda(dz) \right), \end{aligned}$$

thus the statement follows.

For $\gamma > 1$, since $X_-^*(t)$ is a Poisson integral, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} X_-^*(t) &= \iiint \frac{z}{x} (1 - e^{-tx}) e^{xs} \nu(dx, ds, dz) \\ &= m_1(\lambda) \int_{(0,\infty)} x^{-2} (1 - e^{-tx}) \pi(dx). \end{aligned}$$

By the assumption and Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{(0,\infty)} x^{-2} (1 - e^{-tx}) \pi(dx) &= t^{2-\gamma} \int_{(0,\infty)} x^{-\gamma} \frac{1 - e^{-tx}}{(tx)^{2-\gamma}} \pi(dx) \\ &= t^{2-\gamma} o(1), \quad t \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

as the fraction in the integrand is bounded and tends to 0. Summarizing, as $t \rightarrow \infty$

$$\mathbf{E}X_-^*(t) = t^{2-\gamma}o(1).$$

Therefore, by Markov's inequality

$$\mathbf{P}(X_-^*(t) > \varepsilon t^{1/\gamma}) \leq \frac{\mathbf{E}X_-^*(t)}{\varepsilon t^{1/\gamma}} \leq t^{2-\gamma-\gamma^{-1}}o(1),$$

and by the Borel–Cantelli lemma, for $a > 0$ such that $\gamma + \gamma^{-1} - 2 > 1/a$, with $t_n = n^a$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t_n^{-1/\gamma} X_-^*(t_n) = 0.$$

The convergence now follows by monotonicity, as for $t \in [t_n, t_{n+1}]$

$$t^{-1/\gamma} X_-^*(t) \leq t_n^{-1/\gamma} X_-^*(t_{n+1}) = t_{n+1}^{-1/\gamma} X_-^*(t_{n+1}) \left(\frac{t_{n+1}}{t_n} \right)^{1/\gamma} \rightarrow 0.$$

□

Remark 2. Under the stronger assumption

$$\iint_{(0, \infty)^2} \left(\mathbf{1}(z < x) \frac{z}{x^2} + \mathbf{1}(z \geq x) \frac{1}{x} \left(1 + \log \frac{z}{x} \right) \right) \pi(dx) \lambda(dz) < \infty, \quad (14)$$

$\sup_{t \geq 0} X_-^*(t) < \infty$ a.s. Indeed, $\sup_{t \geq 0} X_-^*(t) \leq \sum_{\tau_k \leq 0} \frac{\xi_k}{\xi_k} e^{\xi_k \tau_k}$, which is finite a.s. if and only if (14) holds.

Next we handle the main term.

Lemma 5. *Assume that for some $\gamma \in (0, 2)$*

$$\iint_{(0, \infty)^2} \left(\frac{z}{x} \right)^\gamma \mathbf{1}(z > x) \pi(dx) \lambda(dz) < \infty. \quad (15)$$

Then

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{X_{+,1}^*(t) - \mathbf{1}(\gamma \geq 1) t m_1(\lambda) m_{-1}(\pi)}{t^{1/\gamma}} = 0 \quad a.s. \quad (16)$$

If (15) holds with $\gamma = 2$, then the law of iterated logarithm holds, i.e.

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|X_{+,1}^*(t) - t m_1(\lambda) m_{-1}(\pi)|}{\sqrt{2t \log \log t}} = \sqrt{m_2(\lambda) m_{-2}(\pi)} \quad a.s.$$

Proof. Note that $X_{+,1}^*(t)$ is a subordinator with characteristic function

$$\mathbf{E}e^{iuX_{+,1}^*(t)} = \exp \left\{ t \int (e^{iuy} - 1) \eta_1(dy) \right\},$$

where the Lévy measure η_1 is given by

$$\eta_1((r, \infty)) = \bar{\eta}_1(r) = \pi \times \lambda(\{(x, z) : z > rx\}) = \int_{(0, \infty)} \bar{\lambda}(rx) \pi(dx).$$

Thus $\mathbf{E}X_{+,1}^*(1)^\gamma < \infty$ if and only if $\int_{(1, \infty)} r^\gamma \eta_1(dr) < \infty$ which holds if and only if (15) holds. Therefore, the Marcinkiewicz–Zygmund strong law of large numbers implies that (16) holds whenever (15) holds with $0 < \gamma < 2$. Indeed, if $\gamma < 1$, then by monotonicity the result follows from the usual partial sum version ([23, Theorem 6.7.1]). For $\gamma \in [1, 2)$, Theorem 2.1 in [42], the process version of the Marcinkiewicz–Zygmund SLLN, gives the result since

$$\mathbf{E}X_{+,1}^*(1) = \int_0^\infty \bar{\eta}_1(r) dr = m_1(\lambda) m_{-1}(\pi).$$

The statement for $\gamma = 2$ follows from the law of iterated logarithm for Lévy processes (see Proposition 48.9 in [39]) and the fact that

$$\mathbf{Var}(X_{+,1}^*(1)) = \iiint_{(0, \infty) \times (0, 1] \times (0, \infty)} \frac{z^2}{x^2} \nu(dx, ds, dz) = m_2(\lambda) m_{-2}(\pi),$$

see e.g. [31, Theorem 2.7]. □

We note that in case of infinite mean ($\gamma < 1$) more precise integral tests are known, see [5, Theorem III.13].

It remains to consider $X_{+,2}^*$. For $t > 0$, $r > 0$, $r_2 > r_1 > 0$ introduce the notation

$$D(r, t) = \left\{ (x, s, z) : \frac{z}{x} e^{-x(t-s)} > r, s \in (0, t), x > 0, z > 0 \right\},$$

$$D(r_1, r_2, t) = \left\{ (x, s, z) : \frac{z}{x} e^{-x(t-s)} \in (r_1, r_2], s \in (0, t), x > 0, z > 0 \right\}.$$

Lemma 6. For $t > 1$ and $0 < r_1 < r_2 < \infty$

$$\nu(D(r_1, r_2, t)) \leq t \int_{(0, t^{-1}]} \bar{\lambda}(r_1 x) \pi(dx) + \log \frac{r_2}{r_1} \int_{(t^{-1}, \infty)} x^{-1} \bar{\lambda}(r_1 x) \pi(dx).$$

Proof. Since $\frac{z}{x}e^{-xu} \in (r_1, r_2]$ if and only if (i) $\frac{z}{x} \in (r_1, r_2]$ and $x^{-1} \log \frac{z}{r_1 x} > u$, or (ii) $\frac{z}{x} > r_2$ and $x^{-1} \log \frac{z}{r_2 x} \leq u < x^{-1} \log \frac{z}{r_1 x}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(D(r_1, r_2, t)) &= \iint \mathbf{1}(r_1 x < z \leq r_2 x) \left(t \wedge x^{-1} \log \frac{z}{r_1 x} \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbf{1}(z > r_2 x) \left(t \wedge x^{-1} \log \frac{z}{r_1 x} - t \wedge x^{-1} \log \frac{z}{r_2 x} \right) \pi(dx) \lambda(dz) \\ &\leq \iint \mathbf{1}(r_1 x < z) \left(t \wedge x^{-1} \log \frac{r_2}{r_1} \right) \pi(dx) \lambda(dz). \end{aligned}$$

Bounding the expression in the bracket by t for $x \in (0, t^{-1}]$ and by $x^{-1} \log \frac{r_2}{r_1}$ for $x \in (t^{-1}, \infty)$, we obtain the statement. \square

If $\gamma = 1$, we need an extra assumption:

$$\exists \delta > 0 : \quad m_{-1-\delta}(\pi) < \infty. \quad (17)$$

Corollary 2. *Assume (15) with $\gamma \in [1, 2]$, and for $\gamma = 1$ also assume (17). There exists $C = C(\pi, \lambda, \gamma)$ such that for any $0 \leq a < b$*

$$\nu(D(n^a, n^b, n)) \leq \begin{cases} C n^{2-\gamma-a} \log n, & \gamma > 1, \\ C n^{1-a-\delta/2}, & \gamma = 1. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Note that (15) with $\gamma \in [1, 2]$ implies that $m_{-\gamma}(\pi) < \infty$ and $m_1(\lambda) < \infty$. For $\gamma > 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} n \int_{(0, n^{-1}]} \pi(dx) \int_{(n^a x, \infty)} \lambda(dz) &\leq n \int_{(0, n^{-1}]} n^{-a} x^{-1} \pi(dx) m_1(\lambda) \\ &\leq m_1(\lambda) n^{1-a} \int_{(0, n^{-1}]} x^{-\gamma} n^{1-\gamma} \pi(dx) \\ &= m_{-\gamma}(\pi) m_1(\lambda) n^{2-\gamma-a}, \end{aligned}$$

and similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{(n^{-1}, \infty)} x^{-1} \pi(dx) \int_{(n^a x, \infty)} \lambda(dz) &\leq n^{-a} \int_{(n^{-1}, \infty)} x^{-2} \pi(dx) m_1(\lambda) \\ &\leq m_{-\gamma}(\pi) m_1(\lambda) n^{2-\gamma-a}. \end{aligned}$$

The statement now follows from Lemma 6. For $\gamma = 1$ the proof is the same, only in the $d\pi$ integral we need $x^{-1-\delta}$. \square

Lemma 7. *Suppose that $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, or $\gamma \in [1, 2]$ and (15) holds. If $\gamma = 1$, assume additionally that (17) holds. Then*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^{-1/\gamma} X_{+,2}^*(t) = 0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Proof. If $\gamma < 1$ the statement follows from Lemma 5 since $X_{+,1}^*(t) \geq X_{+,2}^*(t)$. Therefore we assume that $\gamma \geq 1$.

Put $Y_n = \sum_{\tau_k \in [n-1, n)} \frac{\zeta_k}{\xi_k}$. Then Y_1, Y_2, \dots is an iid sequence with the same distribution as $X_{+,1}^*(1)$, thus $\mathbf{E}Y_1^\gamma < \infty$ by (15). Therefore,

$$n^{-1/\gamma} \max_{i \leq n} Y_i \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (18)$$

(see e.g. [10, Theorem 3.5.1]). Furthermore, $\max_{\tau_k < n} \frac{\zeta_k}{\xi_k} \leq \max_{i \leq n} Y_i$.

First we prove that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-1/\gamma} X_{+,2}^*(n) = 0 \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (19)$$

Assume that $\gamma > 1$. Let $c_0 = \gamma + \gamma^{-1} - 2 > 0$, and choose a_0 so that $2 - \gamma < a_0 < 2 - \gamma + c_0/2$, and let $m = \lfloor 2a_0/c_0 \rfloor$, with $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ standing for the lower integer part. Let N be an integer large enough to have $N(2 - \gamma - a_0) < -1$. Define the sets

$$\begin{aligned} A_{n,0} &= \{\mu(D(n^{a_0}, n)) > N\}, \\ A_{n,i+1} &= \{\mu(D(n^{a_{i+1}}, n^{a_i}, n)) > 2C \log n n^{2-\gamma-a_{i+1}}\}, \quad i = 0, \dots, m, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where $a_{i+1} = a_i - c_0/2$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$, $a_{m+1} = 0$, and $C = C(\pi, \lambda, \gamma)$ is the constant in Corollary 2. With this choice $a_m = a_0 - mc_0/2 \in (0, c_0/2)$.

We use the Poisson tail bounds (see [8, Lemma 3.1])

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(N_\lambda \geq n) &\leq \frac{\lambda^n}{n!}, \\ \mathbf{P}(N_\lambda \geq x) &\leq e^{-0.19x}, \quad x \geq 2\lambda, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where N_λ stands for a Poisson random variable with parameter λ . By Corollary 2 (with $a = a_0$ and $b = \infty$) and (21)

$$\mathbf{P}(A_{n,0}) \leq Cn^{N(2-\gamma-a_0)}(\log n)^N,$$

and, similarly for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m+1$ using the second bound in (21)

$$\mathbf{P}(A_{n,i}) \leq \exp\{-0.19 \cdot 2C \log n n^{2-\gamma-a_i}\}.$$

Clearly, all these bounds are summable, therefore, by the first Borel–Cantelli lemma the events $(A_{n,i})_{n \geq 1, i=0,1,\dots,m+1}$ occur finitely many times almost surely.

The contribution of the points (ξ_k, τ_k, ζ_k) for which $\zeta_k/\xi_k e^{-\xi_k(n-\tau_k)} \in (n^{a_{i+1}}, n^{a_i}]$, $\tau_k < n$, if n is large enough so that $A_{n,i+1}$ does not occur, is for $i = 0, 1, \dots, m$

$$\leq n^{a_i} 2C \log n n^{2-\gamma-a_{i+1}} \leq 2C \log n n^{1/\gamma-c_0/2}, \quad (22)$$

by the choice of c_0 , where the last inequality is in fact equality for $i \neq m$ (as $a_m - a_{m+1} = a_m \in (0, c_0/2)$).

The events in (20) take care of the contributions larger than 1. Next we deal with the small contributions. Introduce the events

$$B_{n,k} = \{\mu(D(2^{-k-1}, 2^{-k}, n)) > b_{n,k}\}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots \quad (23)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} b_{n,k} &= 6 \log(n(k+1)) + 2n \int_{(0, n^{-1}]} \pi(dx) \int_{(2^{-k-1}x, \infty)} \lambda(dz) \\ &\quad + 2 \int_{(n^{-1}, \infty)} x^{-1} \pi(dx) \int_{(2^{-k-1}x, \infty)} \lambda(dz). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 6 and (21) we have

$$\mathbf{P}(B_{n,k}) \leq \exp\{-6 \cdot 0.19 \cdot \log(n(k+1))\} \leq (n(k+1))^{-1.1},$$

which is summable for $k \geq 0$, $n \geq 1$. The first Borel–Cantelli lemma imply that all these events occur finitely many times a.s. Note that in $b_{n,k}$ the term $6 \log(n(k+1))$ ensures the summability of the probabilities even if the other terms in $b_{n,k}$ are small.

The sum of small contributions such that $\zeta_j/\xi_j e^{-\xi_j(n-\tau_j)} \in (2^{-k-1}, 2^{-k}]$, $\tau_j < n$, for $k = 0, 1, \dots$ and n large enough so that $B_{n,k}$ does not occur, is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-k} b_{n,k} &\leq c \log n + 2n \int_{(0, n^{-1}]} \pi(dx) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-k} \int_{(2^{-k-1}x, \infty)} \lambda(dz) \\ &\quad + 2 \int_{(n^{-1}, \infty)} x^{-1} \pi(dx) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-k} \int_{(2^{-k-1}x, \infty)} \lambda(dz). \end{aligned}$$

The infinite sum can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-k} \int_{(2^{-k-1}x, \infty)} \lambda(dz) &= \int_{(0, \infty)} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-k} \mathbf{1}(z > 2^{-k-1}x) \lambda(dz) \\ &\leq 2 \int_{(0, \infty)} (1 \wedge zx^{-1}) \lambda(dz) \leq cx^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting back, and using that $\int_{(0, n^{-1}]} x^{-1} \pi(dx) \leq n^{1-\gamma} m_{-\gamma}(\pi)$, and

$$\int_{(n^{-1}, \infty)} x^{-2} \pi(dx) \leq n^{2-\gamma} m_{-\gamma}(\pi),$$

we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-k} b_{n,k} \leq c \log n + cn^{2-\gamma}. \quad (24)$$

Summarizing, by (22) and (24) the contribution of the terms in $X_{+,2}^*(n)$ can be bounded by

$$X_{+,2}^*(n) \leq W + N \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} Y_k + c \log n m n^{2-\gamma+c_0/2} + cn^{2-\gamma},$$

where the random variable W is coming from the Borel–Cantelli lemma, and the second term comes from $A_{n,0}$. By (18) all the terms are $o(n^{1/\gamma})$, thus (19) follows.

For $t \in (n, n+1)$, using (18)

$$t^{-1/\gamma} X_{+,2}^*(t) \leq n^{-1/\gamma} (X_{+,2}^*(n) + Y_{n+1}) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

as claimed.

For $\gamma = 1$ the same idea works. Recall $\delta > 0$ from (17), and let $c_0 = \delta/2$, $a_0 \in (1 - \delta/2, 1 - \delta/4)$, $m = \lfloor 4a_0/\delta \rfloor$. Choose an integer N such that $N(1 - a_0 - \delta/2) < -1$. Define the events $A_{n,i}$'s similarly as in (20),

$$A_{n,0} = \{\mu(D(n^{a_0}, n)) > N\},$$

$$A_{n,i+1} = \{\mu(D(n^{a_{i+1}}, n^{a_i}, n)) > 2C n^{1-\delta/2-a_{i+1}}\}, \quad i = 0, \dots, m,$$

where $a_{i+1} = a_i - c_0/2$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$, $a_{m+1} = 0$, and $C = C(\pi, \lambda, 1)$ is the constant in Corollary 2. As above, A_n 's occur finitely many times a.s., and the contribution is $o(n)$. For the small jumps define $B_{n,k}$'s as in (23). The only difference is that by assumption (17)

$$\int_{(0, n^{-1}]} x^{-1} \pi(dx) \leq n^{-\delta} m_{-1-\delta}(\pi),$$

and

$$\int_{(n^{-1}, \infty)} x^{-2} \pi(dx) \leq n^{1-\delta} m_{-1-\delta}(\pi).$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1. If $\lambda((-\infty, 0)) = 0$, then the proof follows from Lemmas 4, 5, 7 and decomposition (13). For $\gamma < 2$, we can further decompose the terms in (13) by considering $\mu \mathbf{1}(z > 0)$ and $\mu \mathbf{1}(z < 0)$ separately and apply Lemmas 4, 5, and 7. For $\gamma = 2$ we can do the same except that for $X_{+,1}^*$ we use Proposition 48.9 in [39] without assuming $\lambda((-\infty, 0)) = 0$. □

5 Proof of Theorem 2

We shall first prove the theorem by assuming that λ is supported on $(0, 1]$. At the very end we will then combine this with Theorem 1 to give proof of Theorem 2.

If $\int_{(0,1]} z \lambda(dz) = \infty$, then centering is needed and we have

$$X^*(t) = \iiint_{(0,\infty) \times (-\infty, t) \times (0,1]} f_t(x, s, z) (\mu - \nu)(dx, ds, dz) =: X_+^*(t) - X_-^*(t),$$

where

$$X_+^*(t) = \iiint_{(0,\infty) \times (0,t) \times (0,1]} \frac{z}{x} \left(1 - e^{-x(t-s)}\right) (\mu - \nu)(dx, ds, dz),$$

$$X_-^*(t) = \iiint_{(0,\infty) \times (-\infty, 0) \times (0,1]} \frac{z}{x} \left(1 - e^{-xt}\right) e^{xs} (\mu - \nu)(dx, ds, dz).$$

The following statement ensures that the paths are sufficiently smooth, so that it is enough to prove almost sure limits on the integers.

Lemma 8. *There exists a modification of X_{\pm}^* such that for any $\theta < 1/2$*

$$\sup_n \mathbf{E} \left(\sup_{s \neq t, s, t \in [n, n+1]} \frac{|X_+^*(t) - X_+^*(s)| + |X_-^*(t) - X_-^*(s)|}{|t - s|^\theta} \right)^2 < \infty.$$

Proof. For $t_1 < t_2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & X_+^*(t_2) - X_+^*(t_1) \\ &= \iiint_{(0,\infty) \times (0,t_1) \times (0,1]} \frac{z}{x} \left(e^{-x(t_1-s)} - e^{-x(t_2-s)} \right) (\mu - \nu)(dx, ds, dz) \\ & \quad + \iiint_{(0,\infty) \times [t_1, t_2] \times (0,1]} \frac{z}{x} \left(1 - e^{-x(t_2-s)} \right) (\mu - \nu)(dx, ds, dz), \end{aligned}$$

therefore, by Theorem 1 in [33]

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{E} (X_+^*(t_2) - X_+^*(t_1))^2 \\
& \leq 2 \iiint_{(0,\infty) \times (0,t_1) \times (0,1]} \frac{z^2}{x^2} e^{-2x(t_1-s)} \left(1 - e^{-x(t_2-t_1)}\right)^2 \nu(\mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}s, \mathrm{d}z) \\
& \quad + 2 \iiint_{(0,\infty) \times [t_1,t_2] \times (0,1]} \frac{z^2}{x^2} \left(1 - e^{-x(t_2-s)}\right)^2 \nu(\mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}s, \mathrm{d}z) \\
& =: I_1 + I_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Writing $\Delta t = t_2 - t_1$, evaluating the $\mathrm{d}s$ integral, and using that $1 - e^{-y} \leq y$, the first term on the right-hand side can be bounded as

$$I_1 \leq 2(\Delta t)^2 \iint_{(0,\infty) \times (0,1]} \frac{z^2}{2x} (1 - e^{-2xt_1}) \lambda(\mathrm{d}z) \pi(\mathrm{d}x) \leq m_2(\lambda) m_{-1}(\pi) (\Delta t)^2.$$

For the second term we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &= 2m_2(\lambda) \int_{(0,\infty)} x^{-2} \pi(\mathrm{d}x) \int_0^{\Delta t} (1 - e^{-xu})^2 \mathrm{d}u \\
&\leq 2m_2(\lambda) \Delta t \int_{(0,\infty)} x^{-2} (x\Delta t \wedge 1)^2 \pi(\mathrm{d}x) \\
&\leq 2m_2(\lambda) m_{-1}(\pi) (\Delta t)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Summarizing

$$\mathbf{E} (X_+^*(t_2) - X_+^*(t_1))^2 \leq 3m_2(\lambda) m_{-1}(\pi) (t_2 - t_1)^2. \quad (25)$$

Similarly, for X_-^* we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{E} (X_-^*(t_2) - X_-^*(t_1))^2 \\
& \leq 2 \iiint_{(0,\infty) \times (-\infty,0) \times (0,1]} \frac{z^2}{x^2} e^{2xs} e^{-2xt_1} (1 - e^{-x\Delta t})^2 \nu(\mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}s, \mathrm{d}z) \\
& = m_2(\lambda) \int_{(0,\infty)} \frac{1}{x^3} e^{-2xt_1} (1 - e^{-x\Delta t})^2 \pi(\mathrm{d}x) \\
& \leq m_2(\lambda) m_{-1}(\pi) (\Delta t)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The claim follows from a version of Kolmogorov's continuity theorem ([25, Theorem 4.3] with $[a, b] = [n, n + 1]$, $\gamma = p = 2$, $\theta < 1/2$). Note that (25) holds for any $t_1, t_2 \in (0, \infty)$, which implies that the bound above is uniform in n . \square

Lemma 9. Assume that for a process $\{Y(t), t \in \mathbb{R}\}$

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [n, n+1]} |Y(t) - Y(n)| \right)^2 < \infty,$$

and for an increasing function $a(n)$ for which $\sum_n a(n)^{-2} < \infty$ we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Y(n)/a(n) = 0$ a.s. Then $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} Y(t)/a(t) = 0$ a.s.

Proof. By Markov's inequality

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [n, n+1]} |Y(t) - Y(n)| > a(n)\varepsilon \right) \leq \frac{\mathbf{E} \left(\sup_{t \in [n, n+1]} |Y(t) - Y(n)| \right)^2}{a(n)^2 \varepsilon^2},$$

thus the first Borel-Cantelli lemma implies the statement. \square

We shall frequently use the following estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{(y,1]} z^u \lambda(dz) &\leq y^{u-\beta} \int_{(0,1]} z^\beta \lambda(dz), \quad u \leq \beta, \\ \int_{(0,y]} z^u \lambda(dz) &\leq y^{u-\beta} \int_{(0,1]} z^\beta \lambda(dz), \quad u \geq \beta, \\ \int_{(y,1]} x^{-v} \pi(dx) &\leq y^{1+\alpha-v} \int_{(0,1]} x^{-1-\alpha} \pi(dx), \quad v \geq 1 + \alpha, \\ \int_{(0,y]} x^{-v} \pi(dx) &\leq y^{1+\alpha-v} \int_{(0,1]} x^{-1-\alpha} \pi(dx), \quad v \leq 1 + \alpha, \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

with α and β defined in the paragraph below (10).

We decompose X_+^* and X_-^* further. For $\kappa \in (0, 1]$, put

$$A(t; \kappa) = \left\{ (x, s, z) : \frac{z}{x} \left(1 - e^{-x(t-s)} \right) \leq t^\kappa, s \in (0, t], x > 0, z \in (0, 1] \right\},$$

$$B(t; \kappa) = \left\{ (x, s, z) : \frac{z}{x} e^{xs} \left(1 - e^{-xt} \right) \leq t^\kappa, s \leq 0, x > 0, z \in (0, 1] \right\},$$

and define the truncated processes

$$\begin{aligned} X_{+,<,\kappa}^*(t) &= \iiint_{A(t;\kappa)} \frac{z}{x} \left(1 - e^{-x(t-s)} \right) (\mu - \nu)(dx, ds, dz), \\ X_{+,>,\kappa}^*(t) &= \iiint_{A(t;\kappa)^c} \frac{z}{x} \left(1 - e^{-x(t-s)} \right) (\mu - \nu)(dx, ds, dz), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$X_{-,<,\kappa}^*(t) = \iiint_{B(t;\kappa)} \frac{z}{x} e^{xs} (1 - e^{-xt}) (\mu - \nu) (dx, ds, dz),$$

$$X_{-,>,\kappa}^*(t) = \iiint_{B(t;\kappa)^c} \frac{z}{x} e^{xs} (1 - e^{-xt}) (\mu - \nu) (dx, ds, dz).$$

Note that the truncated processes do depend on κ . The truncation level $\kappa = 1$ means no truncation, that is $X_{\pm,<,1}^*(t) = X_{\pm}^*(t)$.

Lemma 10. For $|\theta| \leq 4t^{-\kappa}$

$$\log \mathbf{E} e^{\theta X_{+,<,\kappa}^*(t)} \leq \begin{cases} c\theta^2 t^{\beta-\alpha+\kappa(2-\beta)}, & \text{if } \alpha \leq \beta - 1, \\ c\theta^2 t^{1+\kappa(1-\alpha)_+}, & \text{if } \alpha \geq \beta - 1, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\log \mathbf{E} e^{\theta X_{-,<,\kappa}^*(t)} \leq \begin{cases} c\theta^2 t^{\beta-\alpha+\kappa(2-\beta)}, & \text{if } \alpha \leq \beta, \\ c\theta^2 t^{\kappa(2-\alpha)_+}, & \text{if } \alpha \geq \beta. \end{cases}$$

Proof. For the moment generating function we have

$$\mathbf{E} e^{\theta X_{\pm,<,\kappa}^*(t)} = \exp \left\{ \int \left(e^{\theta y} - 1 - \theta y \right) \Pi_t^{\pm}(dy) \right\},$$

where the Lévy measures Π_t^{\pm} are given by

$$\Pi_t^+(D) = \nu \left(\left\{ (x, s, z) \in A(t; \kappa) : \frac{z}{x} (1 - e^{-x(t-s)}) \in D \right\} \right),$$

$$\Pi_t^-(D) = \nu \left(\left\{ (x, s, z) \in B(t; \kappa) : \frac{z}{x} e^{xs} (1 - e^{-xt}) \in D \right\} \right),$$

for any Borel set D . The moment generating function is finite for any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, see e.g. [39, Section 26]. Using the inequality $e^u - 1 - u \leq 4u^2$ for $|u| \leq 4$, and that $\Pi_t^+(t^\kappa, \infty) = 0$, we obtain for $|t^\kappa \theta| \leq 4$

$$\begin{aligned} \log \mathbf{E} e^{\theta X_{+,<,\kappa}^*(t)} &\leq \int 4\theta^2 y^2 \Pi_t^+(dy) \\ &= \iiint 4\theta^2 \frac{z^2}{x^2} (1 - e^{-xu})^2 \mathbf{1} \left(\frac{z}{x} (1 - e^{-xu}) \leq t^\kappa \right) \nu(dx, du, dz) \\ &\leq 4\theta^2 \iiint \left[\mathbf{1}(xu \leq 1, zu \leq 2t^\kappa) z^2 u^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbf{1}(xu > 1, z \leq 2t^\kappa x) z^2 x^{-2} \right] \nu(dx, du, dz) \\ &=: 4\theta^2 (I_1 + I_2). \end{aligned}$$

For I_1 we have from (26)

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &\leq \int_0^1 u du \int_{(0,1]} z^2 \lambda(dz) m_{-1}(\pi) + \int_1^t u^2 du \int_{(0,u^{-1}]} \pi(dx) \int_{(0,2t^\kappa/u]} z^2 \lambda(dz) \\
&\leq c \left(1 + \int_1^{2t^\kappa} u^{1-\alpha} du + \mathbf{1}(2t^\kappa < t) \int_{2t^\kappa}^t u^{1-\alpha+\beta-2} t^{\kappa(2-\beta)} du \right) \\
&\leq c \left(1 + \mathbf{1}(\alpha < 2) t^{\kappa(2-\alpha)} + \mathbf{1}(\alpha = 2) \log t \right. \\
&\quad \left. + [\mathbf{1}(\kappa < 1, \beta = \alpha) \log t + t^{(\beta-\alpha)_+}] t^{\kappa(2-\beta)} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and for I_2

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &\leq \int_{(t^{-1}, \infty)} t x^{-2} \pi(dx) \int_{(0, 2t^\kappa x]} z^2 \lambda(dz) \\
&\leq c \mathbf{1}(2t^\kappa < t) t^{1+\kappa(2-\beta)} \int_{(t^{-1}, t^{-\kappa/2}]} x^{-\beta} \pi(dx) + ct \int_{(t^{-\kappa/2}, \infty)} x^{-2} \pi(dx) \\
&\leq c \left(\mathbf{1}(1 + \alpha \geq \beta) t^{1+\kappa(1-\alpha)} + \mathbf{1}(1 + \alpha \leq \beta) t^{\beta-\alpha+\kappa(2-\beta)} + t^{1+\kappa(1-\alpha)_+} \right) \\
&\leq \begin{cases} ct^{\beta-\alpha+\kappa(2-\beta)}, & \alpha \leq \beta - 1, \\ ct^{1+\kappa(1-\alpha)_+}, & \alpha \geq \beta - 1, \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

proving the first statement.

Similarly, for $X_{-, <, \kappa}^*$ if $|t^\kappa \theta| \leq 4$

$$\begin{aligned}
\log \mathbf{E} e^{\theta X_{-, <, \kappa}^*(t)} &\leq \int 4\theta^2 y^2 \Pi_t^-(dy) \\
&= \iiint 4\theta^2 \frac{z^2}{x^2} e^{2xs} (1 - e^{-xt})^2 \mathbf{1}(B(t; \kappa)) \nu(dx, ds, dz) \\
&\leq 4\theta^2 \iiint \left[\mathbf{1}(xt \leq 1, e^{xs} \leq 2t^{\kappa-1} z^{-1}) z^2 t^2 e^{2xs} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbf{1}(xt > 1, e^{xs} \frac{z}{x} \leq 2t^\kappa) z^2 x^{-2} e^{2xs} \right] \nu(dx, ds, dz) \\
&=: 4\theta^2 (J_1 + J_2).
\end{aligned}$$

Again by (26) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
J_1 &\leq t^2 \int_{(0, t^{-1}]} x^{-1} \pi(dx) \left[\int_{(0, 2t^{\kappa-1}]} \frac{1}{2} z^2 \lambda(dz) + \int_{(2t^{\kappa-1}, 1]} 2t^{2(\kappa-1)} \lambda(dz) \right] \\
&\leq ct^{2-\alpha} \left[t^{-(2-\beta)(1-\kappa)} + t^{-(2-\beta)(1-\kappa)} \right] = ct^{\beta-\alpha+\kappa(2-\beta)},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
J_2 &\leq \int_{(t^{-1}, \infty)} \frac{1}{2x^3} \pi(dx) \int_{(0,1]} z^2 \lambda(dz) \left[\mathbf{1}(2t^\kappa x \geq z) + \frac{(2t^\kappa x)^2}{z^2} \mathbf{1}(2t^\kappa x < z) \right] \\
&\leq c \mathbf{1}(2t^\kappa < t) \int_{(t^{-1}, t^{-\kappa}/2]} x^{-3} (t^\kappa x)^{2-\beta} \pi(dx) + c \int_{(t^{-\kappa}/2, \infty)} x^{-3} \pi(dx) \\
&\leq c \left(\mathbf{1}(\alpha < \beta) t^{\beta-\alpha+\kappa(2-\beta)} + \mathbf{1}(\alpha \geq \beta) t^{\kappa(2-\alpha)_+} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 3. For any $\kappa \in (0, 1]$ such that

$$\kappa \geq \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{\alpha}{\beta}, & \text{if } \alpha \leq \beta - 1, \\ \frac{1}{1+\alpha}, & \text{if } \beta - 1 \leq \alpha \leq 1, \\ \frac{1}{2}, & \text{if } \alpha \geq 1, \end{cases}$$

it holds that

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|X_{\pm, <, \kappa}^*(t)|}{t^\kappa \log t} \leq \frac{1}{4} \quad a.s.$$

Proof. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Applying Markov's inequality together with Lemma 10 with $\theta = 4t^{-\kappa}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{P}(X_{+, <, \kappa}^*(t) > (1/4 + \varepsilon)t^\kappa \log t) &= \mathbf{P}\left(e^{\theta X_{+, <, \kappa}^*(t)} > e^{\theta(1/4 + \varepsilon)t^\kappa \log t}\right) \\
&\leq \begin{cases} \exp\{c\theta^2 t^{\beta-\alpha+\kappa(2-\beta)} - \theta(1/4 + \varepsilon)t^\kappa \log t\} \leq ct^{-(1+4\varepsilon)}, & \alpha \leq \beta - 1, \\ \exp\{c\theta^2 t^{1+\kappa(1-\alpha)_+} - \theta(1/4 + \varepsilon)t^\kappa \log t\} \leq ct^{-(1+4\varepsilon)}, & \alpha \geq \beta - 1. \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by the Borel–Cantelli lemma the convergence takes place on the subsequence $t_n = n$ and the result follows by Lemma 8. For $X_{-, <, \kappa}^*$ the same argument applies. □

Lemma 11. If for some $\gamma \geq 1$

$$\iint_{(0, \infty) \times (0, 1]} \left(\frac{z}{x}\right)^\gamma \mathbf{1}(z > x) \pi(dx) \lambda(dz) < \infty,$$

then almost surely $\mu(A(t; 1/\gamma)^c) = 0$ and $\mu(B(t; 1/\gamma)^c) = 0$ for t large enough.

Proof. We have

$$\nu(\{(x, s, z) : z > xn^{1/\gamma}, s \in (n, n+1)\}) = \iint \mathbf{1}(z > xn^{1/\gamma})\pi(dx)\lambda(dz),$$

thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \nu(\{(x, s, z) : z > xn^{1/\gamma}, s \in (n, n+1)\}) \\ & \leq \iint \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{1}(z > xn^{1/\gamma})\pi(dx)\lambda(dz) \\ & \leq \iint \left(\frac{z}{x}\right)^{\gamma} \mathbf{1}(z > x)\pi(dx)\lambda(dz) < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

by the assumption. Therefore, the Borel–Cantelli lemma implies that for n large enough

$$\mu(\{(x, s, z) : z > xn^{1/\gamma}, |s| \in (n, n+1)\}) = 0,$$

from which the statement follows. \square

Next we handle the compensation of $X_{\pm, >, \kappa}^*$.

Lemma 12. *For any $\kappa \in (0, 1)$*

$$\begin{aligned} & \iiint_{A(t; \kappa)^c} \frac{z}{x} \left(1 - e^{-x(t-s)}\right) \nu(dx, ds, dz) \\ & \leq \begin{cases} ct^{\beta-\alpha-\kappa(\beta-1)}, & \alpha \leq \beta - 1, \\ ct^{1-\kappa\alpha}, & \alpha \geq \beta - 1, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

and

$$\nu(A(t; \kappa)^c) \leq \begin{cases} ct^{\beta-\alpha-\kappa\beta}, & \alpha \leq \beta - 1, \\ ct^{1-\kappa(1+\alpha)}, & \alpha \geq \beta - 1, \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

while for the negative jumps

$$\begin{aligned} & \iiint_{B(t; \kappa)^c} \frac{z}{x} (1 - e^{-xt}) e^{xs} \nu(dx, ds, dz) \\ & \leq ct^{\beta-\alpha-\kappa(\beta-1)}, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

and

$$\nu(B(t; \kappa)^c) \leq c \log t t^{\beta-\alpha-\kappa\beta}. \quad (30)$$

Proof. Let K denote the left-hand side in (27). Then

$$\begin{aligned} K &\leq \iiint \left[zu \mathbb{1}(ux \leq 1, zu > t^\kappa) + \frac{z}{x} \mathbb{1}(ux > 1, z > t^\kappa x) \right] \nu(dx, du, dz) \\ &=: I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

Since in I_1 necessarily $u \geq t^\kappa$, we have by (26)

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\leq \int_{t^\kappa}^t u du \int_{(0, u^{-1}]} \pi(dx) \int_{(t^\kappa/u, 1]} z \lambda(dz) \\ &\leq ct^{-\kappa(\beta-1)} \int_{t^\kappa}^t u^{\beta-1-\alpha} du \\ &\leq \begin{cases} ct^{\beta-\alpha-\kappa(\beta-1)}, & \alpha < \beta, \\ c \log t t^{\kappa(1-\alpha)}, & \alpha = \beta, \\ ct^{\kappa(1-\alpha)}, & \alpha < \beta. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for I_2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq t \int_{(t^{-1}, t^{-\kappa}]} x^{-1} \pi(dx) \int_{(t^\kappa x, 1]} z \lambda(dz) \\ &\leq \begin{cases} ct^{\beta-\alpha-\kappa(\beta-1)}, & \alpha \leq \beta - 1, \\ ct^{1-\kappa\alpha}, & \alpha \geq \beta - 1, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

and (27) follows. In exactly the same way we obtain (28). The only difference is that in both I_1 and in I_2 a factor $t^{-\kappa}$ appear.

Denoting by L the left-hand side of (29), we similarly have

$$\begin{aligned} L &\leq \iiint \left[zte^{xs} \mathbb{1}(xt \leq 1, zte^{xs} > t^\kappa) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{z}{x} e^{xs} \mathbb{1}(xt > 1, ze^{xs} > t^\kappa x) \right] \nu(dx, ds, dz) \\ &=: J_1 + J_2. \end{aligned}$$

In both J_1 and J_2 we bound the ds integral by x^{-1} , thus we obtain by using (26)

$$J_1 \leq t \int_{(0, t^{-1}]} x^{-1} \pi(dx) \int_{(t^{\kappa-1}, 1]} z \lambda(dz) \leq ct^{\beta-\alpha-\kappa(\beta-1)},$$

and

$$J_2 \leq \int_{(t^{-1}, t^{-\kappa}]} x^{-2} \pi(dx) \int_{(t^\kappa x, 1]} z \lambda(dz) \leq \begin{cases} ct^{\beta-\alpha-\kappa(\beta-1)}, & \alpha \leq \beta, \\ ct^{\kappa(1-\alpha)}, & \alpha \geq \beta, \end{cases}$$

proving (29). The estimate (30) follows in the same way, except that we bound the ds integral by $(1-\kappa)x^{-1} \log t$. \square

Lemma 13. *Assume that $1+\alpha \leq \beta$. Then for any $\kappa > 1 - \frac{\alpha}{\beta}$ almost surely $\mu(A(t; \kappa)^c) = 0$ and $\mu(B(t; \kappa)^c) = 0$ for t large enough.*

Proof. Fix $\kappa' \in (1 - \alpha/\beta, \kappa)$. Then for some $\delta = \delta(\kappa') > 0$, by (28) in Lemma 12

$$\nu(A(t; \kappa')^c) \leq ct^{-\delta}.$$

Thus if $d\delta > 1$, by the Borel–Cantelli lemma $\mu(A(n^d, \kappa')^c) = 0$ a.s. for n large enough. Assume that $\mu(A(t; \kappa)^c) \geq 1$ for some $t \in ((n-1)^d, n^d]$. Then there exists a point $(\xi, \tau, \zeta) \in A(t; \kappa)^c$, such that, if n is large enough,

$$t^\kappa \leq \frac{\zeta}{\xi} \left(1 - e^{-\xi(t-\tau)}\right) \leq \frac{\zeta}{\xi} \left(1 - e^{-\xi(n^d-\tau)}\right) \leq n^{d\kappa'},$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore $\mu(A(t; \kappa)^c) = 0$ for t large enough, as claimed.

The same proof works for $B(t; \kappa)^c$ since the extra $\log t$ factor in (30) plays no role here. \square

We now combine the previous results to obtain the statement for λ supported on $[-1, 1]$.

Corollary 4. *Assume that $\int_{|z| \leq 1} |z| \lambda(dz) = \infty$, $a = 0$, $b = 0$ and λ is supported on $[-1, 1]$. Then*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|X^*(t)|}{t \log t} \leq 1 \quad a.s. \quad (31)$$

Furthermore, if for some $\gamma \in [1, 2]$

$$\int_{(0, \infty)} \int_{|z| \leq 1} \frac{|z|^\gamma}{x^\gamma} \mathbb{1}(|z| > x) \lambda(dz) \pi(dx) < \infty, \quad (32)$$

then

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|X^*(t)|}{t^{1/\gamma} \log t} \leq 1 \quad a.s.$$

If $\beta \geq 1 + \alpha$, then for any $\gamma < 1/(1 - \frac{\alpha}{\beta})$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{X^*(t)}{t^{1/\gamma}} = 0 \quad a.s.$$

Proof. Assume first that λ is supported on $(0, 1]$. Then (31) follows from Corollary 3 with $\kappa = 1$. Note that $\kappa = 1$ corresponds to no truncation, thus $X_{\pm, <, 1}^*(t) = X_{\pm}^*(t)$.

Next assume (32). Using Corollary 3 and Lemma 12 with $\kappa = 1/\gamma$, and Lemma 11, the result follows.

For $\beta \geq 1 + \alpha$ the result follows from Corollary 3 and Lemma 12 with $\kappa = 1 - \frac{\alpha}{\beta}$, and from Lemma 13.

For λ supported on $[-1, 1]$, we apply the previous to $\mu\mathbb{1}(z > 0)$ and $\mu\mathbb{1}(z < 0)$ separately. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. If we make a decomposition based on $\mu\mathbb{1}(|z| \leq 1)$ and $\mu\mathbb{1}(|z| > 1)$, we obtain the results by applying Corollary 4 and Theorem 1, respectively. \square

6 Proof of Theorem 3

Proof of Theorem 3. We will use a general result for Gaussian processes from [35]. Since X is Gaussian, we have that

$$\mathbf{E}e^{i\theta\Lambda(A)} = e^{-\frac{b}{2}\theta^2(\pi \times \text{Leb}(A))}$$

and by Proposition 2.6. in [38]

$$\log \mathbf{E}e^{i\theta X^*(t)} = -\frac{b}{2}\theta^2 \int_{(0, \infty)} \int_0^t (1 - e^{-xu}) x^{-2} du \pi(dx).$$

Thus X^* is a mean 0 Gaussian process with

$$Q(t) := \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{Var}(X^*(t)) = \frac{b}{2} \int_{(0, \infty)} \int_0^t (1 - e^{-xu}) x^{-2} du \pi(dx).$$

Hence, Q is non-decreasing and $Q(0) = 0$.

(i) If $m_{-2}(\pi) < \infty$, then

$$Q(t) = \frac{b}{2} t \int_{(0, \infty)} \frac{1 + tx - e^{-tx}}{tx} x^{-2} \pi(dx) \sim \frac{b}{2} t m_{-2}(\pi),$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Now the result follows by Theorem 1.1 in [35] with $v(t) = \frac{b}{2} t m_{-2}(\pi)$ (see also Remark 1.3 in [35]).

(ii) As in [18, Eq. (5.8)], we can write $Q(t)$ in the form

$$Q(t) = \frac{b}{2} \frac{\Gamma(1 + \alpha)}{(2 - \alpha)(1 - \alpha)} \ell_1(t) t^{2 - \alpha},$$

with ℓ_1 slowly varying at infinity such that $\ell_1(t) \sim \ell(t)$. By Potter's bounds, for $\delta < \alpha/3$, there is $s_0 > 0$ such that

$$\left(\frac{t}{s}\right)^{2 - \alpha - \delta} Q(s) \leq Q(t) \leq \left(\frac{t}{s}\right)^{2 - \alpha + \delta} Q(s), \quad t \geq s > s_0.$$

Moreover,

$$Q(t) \leq \frac{b}{2} \int_{(0, \infty)} \int_0^t u \, d u x^{-1} \pi(dx) = \frac{b}{4} m_{-1}(\pi) t^2.$$

Thus, the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 in [35] hold with $v = Q$.

□

Acknowledgement. DG was partially supported by the Croatian Science Foundation (HRZZ) grant Scaling in Stochastic Models (IP-2022-10-8081). PK was supported by the János Bolyai Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, and by the NKFIH grant FK124141.

References

- [1] O. E. Barndorff-Nielsen. Superposition of Ornstein-Uhlenbeck type processes. *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen.*, 45(2):289–311, 2000.
- [2] O. E. Barndorff-Nielsen, F. E. Benth, and A. E. D. Veraart. *Ambit stochastics*, volume 88 of *Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling*. Springer, Cham, 2018.
- [3] O. E. Barndorff-Nielsen and R. Stelzer. Multivariate supOU processes. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 21(1):140–182, 2011.
- [4] O. E. Barndorff-Nielsen and R. Stelzer. The multivariate supOU stochastic volatility model. *Math. Finance*, 23(2):275–296, 2013.
- [5] J. Bertoin. *Lévy processes*, volume 121 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.

- [6] R. A. Carmona and S. A. Molchanov. Parabolic Anderson problem and intermittency. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 108(518):viii+125, 1994.
- [7] C. Chong and P. Kevei. Intermittency for the stochastic heat equation with Lévy noise. *Ann. Probab.*, 47(4):1911–1948, 2019.
- [8] C. Chong and P. Kevei. The almost-sure asymptotic behavior of the solution to the stochastic heat equation with Lévy noise. *Ann. Probab.*, 48(3):1466–1494, 2020.
- [9] I. V. Curato and R. Stelzer. Weak dependence and GMM estimation of supOU and mixed moving average processes. *Electron. J. Stat.*, 13(1):310–360, 2019.
- [10] P. Embrechts, C. Klüppelberg, and T. Mikosch. *Modelling extremal events*, volume 33 of *Applications of Mathematics (New York)*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997.
- [11] V. Fasen. Extremes of regularly varying Lévy-driven mixed moving average processes. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.*, 37(4):993–1014, 2005.
- [12] V. Fasen and C. Klüppelberg. Extremes of supOU processes. In *Stochastic analysis and applications*, volume 2 of *Abel Symp.*, pages 339–359. Springer, Berlin, 2007.
- [13] F. Fuchs and R. Stelzer. Mixing conditions for multivariate infinitely divisible processes with an application to mixed moving averages and the supOU stochastic volatility model. *ESAIM Probab. Stat.*, 17:455–471, 2013.
- [14] J. Gärtner, W. König, and S. Molchanov. Geometric characterization of intermittency in the parabolic Anderson model. *Ann. Probab.*, 35(2):439–499, 2007.
- [15] D. Grahovac, N. N. Leonenko, A. Sikorskii, and M. S. Taqqu. The unusual properties of aggregated superpositions of Ornstein-Uhlenbeck type processes. *Bernoulli*, 25(3):2029–2050, 2019.
- [16] D. Grahovac, N. N. Leonenko, A. Sikorskii, and I. Tešnjak. Intermittency of superpositions of Ornstein-Uhlenbeck type processes. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 165(2):390–408, 2016.
- [17] D. Grahovac, N. N. Leonenko, and M. S. Taqqu. Intermittency of trawl processes. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, 137:235–242, 2018.

- [18] D. Grahovac, N. N. Leonenko, and M. S. Taqqu. Limit theorems, scaling of moments and intermittency for integrated finite variance supOU processes. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 129(12):5113–5150, 2019.
- [19] D. Grahovac, N. N. Leonenko, and M. S. Taqqu. The multifaceted behavior of integrated supOU processes: the infinite variance case. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 33(4):1801–1831, 2020.
- [20] D. Grahovac, N. N. Leonenko, and M. S. Taqqu. Intermittency and infinite variance: the case of integrated supOU processes. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 26:Paper No. 56, 31, 2021.
- [21] D. Grahovac, N. N. Leonenko, and M. S. Taqqu. Intermittency and multiscaling in limit theorems. *Fractals*, 30(07):2250137, 2022.
- [22] C. W. J. Granger. Long memory relationships and the aggregation of dynamic models. *J. Econometrics*, 14(2):227–238, 1980.
- [23] A. Gut. *Probability: a graduate course*. Springer Texts in Statistics. Springer, New York, second edition, 2013.
- [24] B. C. Kelly, T. Treu, M. Malkan, A. Pancoast, and J.-H. Woo. Active galactic nucleus black hole mass estimates in the era of time domain astronomy. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 779:187, 2013.
- [25] D. Khoshnevisan. A primer on stochastic partial differential equations. In *A minicourse on stochastic partial differential equations*, volume 1962 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 1–38. Springer, Berlin, 2009.
- [26] D. Khoshnevisan. *Analysis of stochastic partial differential equations*, volume 119 of *CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics*. Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC; by the American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2014.
- [27] D. Khoshnevisan, K. Kim, and C. Mueller. Dissipation in parabolic SPDEs II: Oscillation and decay of the solution. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 59(3):1610–1641, 2023.
- [28] D. Khoshnevisan, K. Kim, C. Mueller, and S.-Y. Shiu. Dissipation in parabolic SPDEs. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 179(2):502–534, 2020.
- [29] D. Khoshnevisan, K. Kim, and Y. Xiao. Intermittency and multifractality: a case study via parabolic stochastic PDEs. *Ann. Probab.*, 45(6A):3697–3751, 2017.

- [30] N. Kôno. Iterated log type strong limit theorems for self-similar processes. *Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci.*, 59(3):85–87, 1983.
- [31] A. E. Kyprianou. *Fluctuations of Lévy processes with applications*. Universitext. Springer, Heidelberg, second edition, 2014.
- [32] R. Leipus and D. Surgailis. Random coefficient autoregression, regime switching and long memory. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.*, 35(3):737–754, 2003.
- [33] C. Marinelli and M. Röckner. On maximal inequalities for purely discontinuous martingales in infinite dimensions. In *Séminaire de Probabilités XLVI*, volume 2123 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 293–315. Springer, Cham, 2014.
- [34] G. Oppenheim and M.-C. Viano. Aggregation of random parameters Ornstein-Uhlenbeck or AR processes: some convergence results. *J. Time Ser. Anal.*, 25(3):335–350, 2004.
- [35] S. Orey. Growth rate of certain Gaussian processes. In *Proceedings of the Sixth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability (Univ. California, Berkeley, Calif., 1970/1971), Vol. II: Probability theory*, pages 443–451. Univ. California Press, Berkeley, CA, 1972.
- [36] M. S. Pakkanen, R. Passeggeri, O. Sauri, and A. E. D. Veraart. Limit theorems for trawl processes. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 26:Paper No. 116, 36, 2021.
- [37] A. Philippe, D. Puplinskaite, and D. Surgailis. Contemporaneous aggregation of triangular array of random-coefficient AR(1) processes. *J. Time Series Anal.*, 35(1):16–39, 2014.
- [38] B. S. Rajput and J. Rosiński. Spectral representations of infinitely divisible processes. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 82(3):451–487, 1989.
- [39] K. Sato. *Lévy processes and infinitely divisible distributions*, volume 68 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.
- [40] K. Takashima. Sample path properties of ergodic self-similar processes. *Osaka J. Math.*, 26(1):159–189, 1989.
- [41] A. Talarczyk and Ł. Tszczotko. Limit theorems for integrated trawl processes with symmetric Lévy bases. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 25:Paper No. 117, 24, 2020.

- [42] J. Tiefeng, M. B. Rao, W. Xiangchen, and L. Deli. Laws of large numbers and moderate deviations for stochastic processes with stationary and independent increments. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 44(2):205–219, 1993.
- [43] H. Watanabe. An asymptotic property of Gaussian processes. I. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 148:233–248, 1970.
- [44] Y. B. Zel'dovich, S. A. Molchanov, A. A. Ruzmaïkin, and D. D. Sokolov. Intermittency in random media. *Uspekhi Fiz. Nauk*, 152(1):3–32, 1987.