

Functional central limit theorems for epidemic models with varying infectivity

GUODONG PANG AND ÉTIENNE PARDOUX

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we prove functional central limit theorems (FCLTs) for a stochastic epidemic model with varying infectivity and general infectious periods recently introduced in [10]. The infectivity process (total force of infection at each time) is composed of the independent infectivity random functions of each infectious individual at the elapsed time (that is, infection-age dependent). These infectivity random functions induce the infectious periods (as well as exposed, recovered or immune periods in full generality), whose probability distributions can be very general. The epidemic model includes the generalized non-Markovian SIR, SEIR, SIS, SIRS models with infection-age dependent infectivity. In the FCLT for the generalized SEIR model (including SIR as a special case), the limits for the infectivity and susceptible processes are a unique solution to a two-dimensional Gaussian-driven stochastic Volterra integral equations, and then given these solutions, the limits for the exposed/latent, infected and recovered processes are Gaussian processes expressed in terms of the solutions to those stochastic Volterra integral equations. We also present the FCLTs for the generalized SIS and SIRS models.

1. INTRODUCTION

It has been observed in recent studies of the Covid-19 pandemic (for example, [13]) that the infectivity of infectious individuals decreases from the epoch of symptom first appearing to full recovery. The varying infectivity characteristics also appears in many other epidemic diseases [16, 6]. We have presented a stochastic epidemic model with varying infectivity in [10], where each individual has an i.i.d. infectivity random function, and the total force of infection at each time is the aggregate infectivity of all the individuals that are currently infectious. We have proved a functional law of large numbers (FLLN) for the epidemic dynamics which results in a deterministic epidemic model, which is the model described as an “age-of-infection epidemic model” in [5, 6]. In addition, we have deduced the initial basic reproduction number R_0 from the limit process and computed its value for the case of the early phase of the Covid-19 epidemic in France. We have concluded a decreased value of R_0 induced by the decrease of the infectivity with age-infection.

In this paper we establish functional central limit theorems (FCLTs) for this stochastic epidemic model. As discussed in [10], the model can be regarded as a generalization of the SIR and SEIR models. In particular, the infectivity random function can take a very general form (see Assumption 2.2) and start with a value zero for a period of time, which then in turn determines the durations of the exposed and infectious periods. Their distributions are also determined by the law of the random function, and can be very general. As in the FLLN, we study the infectivity process jointly with the counting processes for the susceptible, exposed, infectious and recovered individuals. For the generalized SEIR model, in the FLLN, the infectivity and susceptible functions in the limit are uniquely determined by a two-dimensional Volterra integral equation, and given these two functions, the exposed, infectious and recovered functions in the limit are given by Volterra integral equations. In the FCLT, we first show that the diffusion-scaled infectivity and susceptible processes converge jointly to a two-dimensional Gaussian-driven linear stochastic Volterra integral equation (Theorem

Date: September 25, 2020.

Key words and phrases. epidemic model, varying infectivity, infection-age dependent infectivity, Gaussian-driven stochastic Volterra integral equations, Poisson random measure.

2.1). In particular, the diffusion-scaled instantaneous infectivity rate process has a limit that is a linear functional of the susceptible and infectivity limit processes. We then show the joint convergence of the exposed, infectious and recovered processes, whose limits are expressed in terms of the solution of the above stochastic Volterra integral equation (Theorem 2.2). These results extend the FCLT for the classical SEIR model with general exposed and infectious periods in [18]. They clearly include the generalized SIR model as a special case.

The main challenge in the proof of the FCLT lies in the convergence of the aggregate infectivity process. We allow these random functions to be piecewise continuous with a finite number of discontinuities as stated in Assumption 2.2. We use Poisson random measures (PRMs) induced by the laws of these individual infectivity random functions in the functional space \mathbf{D} , and take advantage of some useful properties of stochastic integrals with respect to the corresponding compensated PRMs. We first give a useful decomposition of this process, and construct two auxiliary processes by replacing the random instantaneous infectivity rate process by its deterministic limit function in the FLLN. For these auxiliary processes, we employ the moment method to prove their tightness (using a slightly reinforced criterion for tightness in [4, Theorem 13.5], as stated in the Appendix), which, together with the convergence of finite dimensional distributions, proves their weak convergence. The martingale approaches employed for the infectious process in the SIR or SEIR models in [18] cannot be used for the aggregate infectivity process, since it is impossible to construct appropriate martingales for our purpose. Then the convergence of the susceptible, exposed, infectious and recovered individuals follows similarly as those in the classical non-Markovian SEIR model in [18].

We also state the FCLTs without proofs for the generalized SIS and SIRS models with varying infectivity (which follow from a slight modification). For the SIS model, the epidemic dynamics is determined by the aggregate infectivity process and the infectious process, whose limits are given by a two-dimensional Gaussian-driven linear stochastic Volterra integral equation (Theorem 2.3). For the SIRS model, the epidemic dynamics is determined by the aggregate infectivity process and the infectious and recovered/immune processes, whose limits are given by a three-dimensional Gaussian-driven linear stochastic Volterra integral equation (Theorem 2.4).

This work contributes to the literature of stochastic epidemic models in the aspects of infection-age dependent infectivity, and general infectious periods. The existing work in epidemic models with infection-age dependent infectivity has all been about the deterministic models, including the models by Brauer [5] (see also [6, Chapter 4.5]), and the PDE models (see, e.g., [14, 22, 15, 17]). They are not established as the FLLNs of a well specified stochastic model either, except our work in [10]. Evidently, no FCLT has been yet established for infection-age dependent epidemic models. Our work is the very first for such models. On the other hand, for non-Markovian epidemic models with general infectious periods, although some deterministic models (including Volterra integral equations) appeared in the literature (see, e.g., [6, Chapter 4.5] and references therein), rigorously establishing them as a FLLN from a stochastic model was done for the SIR model using Stein's method in [20] (using measure-valued processes), and is recently done for the general SIS, SIR, SEIR and SIRS models by the authors in [18] and for multipatch epidemic models in [19]. FCLTs for these classical stochastic epidemic models and multi-patch models where the infectivity is a constant, have also been recently established in [18, 19]. This work presents new techniques to establish the FCLTs for the more realistic but challenging model with varying infectivity. Note that the study of the final size of an epidemic with general infectious (and possibly latent) period(s) can be done using the Sellke construction [21], see in particular the recent survey [7], and [1, 2, 3].

The paper may have insightful practical implications on pandemic crisis studies and management. We have illustrated how integral equations for the SEIR model can be used to estimate the state of the Covid-19 pandemic using French data in [11], and how the integral equation for the generalized SEIR model with varying infectivity can be used to better estimate initial basic reproduction

number R_0 in [10]. Another recent work by Fodor et al. [9] also uses integral equation (with deterministic infectious periods and constant infectivity) to provide a better estimate of R_0 . However, all these papers use the deterministic integral equations arising from the FLLNs. It is clear that the FCLTs provides a characterization of stochastic fluctuations around the deterministic average functions. It will be interesting to investigate how these FCLTs can be used to predict when the state of an epidemic is likely to deviate significantly from the LLN deterministic model.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2.1, we provide a detailed description of the model and the assumptions, which is followed by the FCLTs for the generalized SEIR model in Section 2.2. The FCLTs for the generalized SIR and SIRS models are stated in Sections 2.3 and 2.4, respectively. The proofs are given in Section 3, with a tightness criterion stated and established in the Appendix.

2. MAIN RESULTS

2.1. Generalized SEIR model with varying infectivity. In our epidemic model, each individual is associated with an infectivity random function at the epoch of infection, which exerts the infectivity to the susceptible individuals. Let the population size be N , and $S^N(t), E^N(t), I^N(t), R^N(t)$ be the numbers of susceptible, exposed, infectious and recovered individuals at each time t , respectively. We have the balance equation $N = S^N(t) + E^N(t) + I^N(t) + R^N(t)$ for $t \geq 0$. Assume that $R^N(0) = 0$, $S^N(0) > 0$ and $I^N(0) > 0$.

Let $\{\lambda_j^0(\cdot)\}$, $\{\lambda_k^{0,I}(\cdot)\}$ and $\{\lambda_i(\cdot)\}$ be the infectivity processes associated with each initially exposed, infectious and newly exposed individual, respectively. Assume that the sequence $\{\lambda_j^0(\cdot)\}$ is i.i.d., and so are $\{\lambda_k^{0,I}(\cdot)\}$, and $\{\lambda_i(\cdot)\}$. These processes are only taking effect during the infectious periods, and generate the corresponding exposed and infectious periods. Assume that they all have càdlàg paths. In particular, the exposed and infectious periods (ζ_i, η_i) of a newly exposed individual are determined from $\lambda_i(\cdot)$ as follows:

$$\zeta_i = \inf\{t > 0, \lambda_i(t) > 0\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta_i + \eta_i = \inf\{t > 0, \lambda_i(r) = 0, \forall r \geq t\}, \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (2.1)$$

Similarly, the remaining exposed period and the infectious period (ζ_j^0, η_j^0) of an initially exposed individual:

$$\zeta_j^0 = \inf\{t > 0, \lambda_j^0(t) > 0\} > 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta_j^0 + \eta_j^0 = \inf\{t > 0, \lambda_j^0(r) = 0, \forall r \geq t\}, \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad (2.2)$$

and the remaining infectious period $\eta_k^{0,I}$ of an initially infectious individual:

$$\inf\{t > 0, \lambda_k^{0,I}(t) > 0\} = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_k^{0,I} = \inf\{t > 0, \lambda_k^{0,I}(r) = 0, \forall r \geq t\}, \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (2.3)$$

Under the i.i.d. assumptions of the corresponding infectivity processes, the random vectors $\{(\zeta_i, \eta_i) : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\{(\zeta_j^0, \eta_j^0) : j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ are i.i.d., and so is the sequence $\{\eta_k^0 : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Let $H(du, dv)$ denote the law of (ζ, η) , $H_0(du, dv)$ that of (ζ^0, η^0) and $F_{0,I}$ the c.d.f. of $\eta^{0,I}$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(t) &:= \int_0^t \int_0^{t-u} H(du, dv) = \mathbb{P}(\zeta + \eta \leq t), \\ \Psi(t) &:= \int_0^t \int_{t-u}^\infty H(du, dv) = \mathbb{P}(\zeta \leq t < \zeta + \eta), \\ \Phi_0(t) &:= \int_0^t \int_0^{t-u} H_0(du, dv) = \mathbb{P}(\zeta^0 + \eta^0 \leq t), \\ \Psi_0(t) &:= \int_0^t \int_{t-u}^\infty H_0(du, dv) = \mathbb{P}(\zeta^0 \leq t < \zeta^0 + \eta^0), \end{aligned}$$

and $F_{0,I}(t) := \mathbb{P}(\eta^{0,I} \leq t)$. We write $H(du, dv) = G(du)F(dv|u)$ and $H_0(du, dv) = G_0(du)F_0(dv|u)$, i.e., G is the c.d.f. of ζ and $F(\cdot|u)$ is the conditional law of η , given that $\zeta = u$, G_0 is the c.d.f. of ζ^0 and $F_0(\cdot|u)$ is the conditional law of η^0 , given that $\zeta^0 = u$. In the case of independent

exposed and infectious periods, it is reasonable that the infectious periods of the initially exposed individuals have the same distribution as the newly exposed ones, that is, $F_0 = F$. Note that in the independent case, $\Psi(t) = G(t) - \Phi(t)$ and $\Psi_0(t) = G_0(t) - \Phi_0(t)$. Also, let $G_0^c = 1 - G_0$, $G^c = 1 - G$, $F_{0,I}^c = 1 - F_{0,I}$, and $F^c = 1 - F$.

Let $A^N(t)$ be the number of individuals that are exposed in $(0, t]$, and τ_i^N denote the time of the i^{th} individual that gets exposed. Let $\mathfrak{J}^N(t)$ be the total force of infection which is exerted on the susceptibles at time t . By definition, we have

$$\mathfrak{J}^N(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{E^N(0)} \lambda_j^0(t) + \sum_{k=1}^{I^N(0)} \lambda_k^{0,I}(t) + \sum_{i=1}^{A^N(t)} \lambda_i(t - \tau_i^N), \quad t \geq 0. \quad (2.4)$$

Thus, the infection process $A^N(t)$ can be expressed by

$$A^N(t) = \int_0^t \int_0^\infty \mathbf{1}_{u \leq \Upsilon^N(s)} Q(ds, du), \quad t \geq 0, \quad (2.5)$$

where

$$\Upsilon^N(t) := \frac{S^N(t)}{N} \mathfrak{J}^N(t), \quad (2.6)$$

is the instantaneous infectivity rate function at time t , and Q is a standard Poisson random measure (PRM) on \mathbb{R}_+^2 .

The epidemic dynamics of the model can be described by

$$\begin{aligned} S^N(t) &= S^N(0) - A^N(t), \\ E^N(t) &= \sum_{j=1}^{E^N(0)} \mathbf{1}_{\zeta_j^0 > t} + \sum_{i=1}^{A^N(t)} \mathbf{1}_{\tau_i^N + \zeta_i > t}, \\ I^N(t) &= \sum_{j=1}^{E^N(0)} \mathbf{1}_{\zeta_j^0 \leq t < \zeta_j^0 + \eta_j^0} + \sum_{k=1}^{I^N(0)} \mathbf{1}_{\eta_k^{0,I} > t} + \sum_{i=1}^{A^N(t)} \mathbf{1}_{\tau_i^N + \zeta_i \leq t < \tau_i^N + \zeta_i + \eta_i}, \\ R^N(t) &= \sum_{j=1}^{E^N(0)} \mathbf{1}_{\zeta_j^0 + \eta_j^0 \leq t} + \sum_{k=1}^{I^N(0)} \mathbf{1}_{\eta_k^{0,I} \leq t} + \sum_{i=1}^{A^N(t)} \mathbf{1}_{\tau_i^N + \zeta_i + \eta_i \leq t}. \end{aligned}$$

2.2. FCLTs for the generalized SEIR model. Let $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{D}([0, +\infty), \mathbb{R})$ denote the space of \mathbb{R} -valued càdlàg functions defined on $[0, +\infty)$. Let \mathbf{C} denote its subspace of continuous functions. Throughout the paper, convergence in D means convergence in the Skorohod J_1 topology, see Chapter 3 of [4]. Also, \mathbf{D}^k stands for the k -fold product equipped with the product topology.

We first make the following assumptions on the distribution functions and the random infectivity functions.

Assumption 2.1. *The c.d.f. G satisfies the following assumption: G can be written as $G = G_1 + G_2$, where $G_1(t) = \sum_i a_i \mathbf{1}_{t \geq t_i}$ for a finite or countable number of positive numbers a_i and the corresponding t_i such that $\sum_i a_i \leq 1$ and $t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_k < \dots$, and G_2 is Hölder continuous with exponent $\frac{1}{2} + \theta$ for some $\theta > 0$, that is, $G_2(t + \delta) - G_2(t) \leq c\delta^{1/2 + \theta}$ for some $c > 0$. Moreover, the conditional c.d.f. $F(\cdot|u)$ satisfies the same assumption, uniformly in u .*

We now state our assumptions on λ^0 , $\lambda^{0,I}$ and λ . Let $\bar{\lambda}^0(t) = \mathbb{E}[\lambda^0(t)]$, $\bar{\lambda}^{0,I}(t) = \mathbb{E}[\lambda^{0,I}(t)]$ and $\bar{\lambda}(t) = \mathbb{E}[\lambda(t)]$ for $t \geq 0$.

Assumption 2.2. *The random functions $\lambda(t)$ (resp. $\lambda^0(t)$ and resp. $\lambda^{0,I}(t)$), of which $\lambda_1(t), \lambda_2(t), \dots$ (resp. $\lambda_1^0(t), \lambda_2^0(t), \dots$ and resp. $\lambda_1^{0,I}(t), \lambda_2^{0,I}(t), \dots$) are i.i.d. copies, satisfying the following properties. There exists a constant $\lambda^* < \infty$ such that $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \max\{\lambda^0(t), \lambda^{0,I}(t), \lambda(t)\} \leq \lambda^*$ almost surely.*

- (i) *There exist nondecreasing functions ϕ and ψ in \mathbf{C} and $\alpha > 1/2$ and $\beta > 1$ such that for all $0 \leq r \leq s \leq t$, denoting $\check{\lambda}^0(t) = \lambda^0(t) - \bar{\lambda}^0(t)$,*

$$(a) \quad \mathbb{E}[(\check{\lambda}^0(t) - \check{\lambda}^0(s))^2] \leq (\phi(t) - \phi(s))^\alpha,$$

$$(b) \quad \mathbb{E}[(\check{\lambda}^0(t) - \check{\lambda}^0(s))^2 (\check{\lambda}^0(s) - \check{\lambda}^0(r))^2] \leq (\psi(t) - \psi(r))^\beta.$$

Similarly for the infectivity processes $\{\lambda_k^{0,I}\}_{k \geq 1}$.

- (ii) *There exist a given number $k \geq 1$, a random sequence $0 = \xi^0 \leq \xi^1 \leq \dots \leq \xi^k = \eta$ and random functions $\lambda^j \in \mathbf{C}$, $1 \leq j \leq k$ such that*

$$\lambda(t) = \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda^j(t) \mathbf{1}_{[\xi^{j-1}, \xi^j)}(t). \quad (2.7)$$

Moreover, denoting by F_j the c.d.f. of ξ^j , we assume that each F_j satisfies the conditions on G in Assumption 2.1, and that there exists a nondecreasing function $\varphi \in \mathbf{C}$ satisfying

$$\varphi(r) \leq Cr^\alpha, \quad \text{with } \alpha > 1/2 \quad \text{and } C > 0 \text{ arbitrary,} \quad (2.8)$$

such that

$$|\lambda^j(t) - \lambda^j(s)| \leq \varphi(|t - s|), \quad \text{a.s.,} \quad (2.9)$$

for all $t, s \geq 0$, $1 \leq j \leq k$.

We remark that the conditions in Assumption 2.2 (i) and (2.8) are not required to establish the FLLN [10]. It is not surprising that the FCLT requires additional assumptions, compared with the FLLN.

Let $\bar{X}^N = N^{-1}X^N$ for any process X^N . Then under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, assuming that there exist deterministic constants $\bar{E}(0), \bar{I}(0) \in (0, 1)$ such that $\bar{E}(0) + \bar{I}(0) < 1$, and $(\bar{E}^N(0), \bar{I}^N(0)) \rightarrow (\bar{E}(0), \bar{I}(0)) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ in probability as $N \rightarrow \infty$, it is shown in [10, Theorem 2.1] that

$$(\bar{S}^N, \bar{\mathcal{J}}^N, \bar{I}^N, \bar{E}^N, \bar{R}^N) \rightarrow (\bar{S}, \bar{\mathcal{J}}, \bar{I}, \bar{E}, \bar{R}) \quad \text{in } \mathbf{D}^5 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad (2.10)$$

in probability, locally uniformly in t . The limit $(\bar{S}, \bar{\mathcal{J}})$ is the unique solution of the following system of integral equations:

$$\bar{S}(t) = 1 - \bar{I}(0) - \int_0^t \bar{S}(s) \bar{\mathcal{J}}(s) ds, \quad (2.11)$$

$$\bar{\mathcal{J}}(t) = \bar{E}(0) \bar{\lambda}^0(t) + \bar{I}(0) \bar{\lambda}^{0,I}(t) + \int_0^t \bar{\lambda}(t-s) \bar{S}(s) \bar{\mathcal{J}}(s) ds, \quad (2.12)$$

and the limits $(\bar{E}, \bar{I}, \bar{R})$ are given by the following formulas:

$$\bar{E}(t) = \bar{E}(0) G_0^c(t) + \int_0^t G^c(t-s) \bar{S}(s) \bar{\mathcal{J}}(s) ds, \quad (2.13)$$

$$\bar{I}(t) = \bar{I}(0) F_{0,I}^c(t) + \bar{E}(0) \Psi_0(t) + \int_0^t \Psi(t-s) \bar{S}(s) \bar{\mathcal{J}}(s) ds, \quad (2.14)$$

$$\bar{R}(t) = \bar{I}(0) F_{0,I}(t) + \bar{E}(0) \Phi_0(t) + \int_0^t \Phi(t-s) \bar{S}(s) \bar{\mathcal{J}}(s) ds. \quad (2.15)$$

We also have $\bar{\Upsilon}^N \rightarrow \bar{\Upsilon}$ in \mathbf{D} in probability as $N \rightarrow \infty$, where

$$\bar{\Upsilon}(t) := \bar{S}(t) \bar{\mathcal{J}}(t), \quad t \geq 0. \quad (2.16)$$

Let $\hat{X}^N := \sqrt{N}(\bar{X}^N - \bar{X})$ for any process X^N with its fluid-scaled process \bar{X}^N and limit \bar{X} . We make the following assumption on the initial quantities.

Assumption 2.3. *There exist deterministic constants $\bar{E}(0), \bar{I}(0) \in (0, 1)$ and random variables $\hat{E}(0), \hat{I}(0)$ such that $(\hat{E}^N(0), \hat{I}^N(0)) := \sqrt{N}(\bar{E}^N(0) - \bar{E}(0), \bar{I}^N(0) - \bar{I}(0)) \Rightarrow (\hat{E}(0), \hat{I}(0))$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $\sup_N \mathbb{E}[\hat{E}^N(0)^2] < \infty$ and $\sup_N \mathbb{E}[\hat{I}^N(0)^2] < \infty$, and thus, $\mathbb{E}[\hat{E}(0)^2] < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}[\hat{I}(0)^2] < \infty$.*

Theorem 2.1. *Under Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3,*

$$(\hat{S}^N, \hat{\mathcal{J}}^N) \Rightarrow (\hat{S}, \hat{\mathcal{J}}) \quad \text{in } \mathbf{D}^2 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.17)$$

The limit process $(\hat{S}, \hat{\mathcal{J}})$ is the unique solution to the following system of stochastic integral equations:

$$\hat{S}(t) = -\hat{I}(0) - \hat{M}_A(t) + \int_0^t \hat{\Upsilon}(s) ds, \quad (2.18)$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{J}}(t) = \hat{I}(0)\bar{\lambda}^{0,I}(t) + \hat{E}(0)\bar{\lambda}^0(t) + \hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}(t) + \hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}(t) + \hat{\mathcal{J}}_1(t) + \hat{\mathcal{J}}_2(t) + \int_0^t \bar{\lambda}(t-s)\hat{\Upsilon}(s) ds, \quad (2.19)$$

where

$$\hat{\Upsilon}(t) = \hat{S}(t)\bar{\mathcal{J}}(t) + \bar{S}(t)\hat{\mathcal{J}}(t), \quad (2.20)$$

and $\bar{S}(t)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{J}}(t)$ are given by the unique solutions to the integral equations (2.11) and (2.12), \hat{M}_A , $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}$, $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}$, $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1$ and $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2$ are Gaussian processes with

$$\hat{M}_A(t) = B \left(\int_0^t \bar{S}(s)\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s) ds \right), \quad t \geq 0, \quad (2.21)$$

with B being a standard Brownian motion, and $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}$, $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}$, $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1$ and $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2$ have covariance functions: for $t, t' \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}(t), \hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}(t')) &= \bar{I}(0)\text{Cov}(\lambda^{0,I}(t), \lambda^{0,I}(t')), \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}(t), \hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}(t')) &= \bar{E}(0)\text{Cov}(\lambda^0(t), \lambda^0(t')), \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1(t), \hat{\mathcal{J}}_1(t')) &= \int_0^{t \wedge t'} \text{Cov}(\lambda(t-s), \lambda(t'-s))\bar{S}(s)\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s) ds, \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2(t), \hat{\mathcal{J}}_2(t')) &= \int_0^{t \wedge t'} \bar{\lambda}(t-s)\bar{\lambda}(t'-s)\bar{S}(s)\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

$\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}$ are independent, and also independent of \hat{M}_A , $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1$ and $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2$. \hat{M}_A , $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1$ and $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2$ have covariance functions:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\hat{M}_A(t), \hat{\mathcal{J}}_1(t')) &= 0, \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{M}_A(t), \hat{\mathcal{J}}_2(t')) &= \int_0^{t \wedge t'} \bar{\lambda}(t'-s)\bar{S}(s)\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s) ds, \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1(t), \hat{\mathcal{J}}_2(t')) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

\hat{S} has continuous paths, and if $\bar{\lambda}^0$ and $\bar{\lambda}^{0,I}$ are in \mathbf{C} , then $\hat{\mathcal{J}}$ is also continuous.

We next state the FCLT for the processes $(\hat{E}^N, \hat{I}^N, \hat{R}^N)$, which extends Theorem 3.2 in [18].

Theorem 2.2. *Under Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3,*

$$(\hat{E}^N, \hat{I}^N, \hat{R}^N) \Rightarrow (\hat{E}, \hat{I}, \hat{R}) \quad \text{in } \mathbf{D}^3 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad (2.22)$$

jointly with $(\hat{S}^N, \hat{\mathcal{J}}^N)$ (i.e., $(\hat{S}^N, \hat{\mathcal{J}}^N, \hat{E}^N, \hat{I}^N, \hat{R}^N) \Rightarrow (\hat{S}, \hat{\mathcal{J}}, \hat{E}, \hat{I}, \hat{R})$ in \mathbf{D}^5). The limit processes \hat{E} , \hat{I} and \hat{R} are given by the expressions:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{E}(t) &= \hat{E}(0)G_0^c(t) + \hat{E}_0(t) + \hat{E}_1(t) + \int_0^t G^c(t-s)\hat{\Upsilon}(s)ds, \\ \hat{I}(t) &= \hat{I}(0)F_{0,I}^c(t) + \hat{E}(0)\Psi_0(t) + \hat{I}_{0,1}(t) + \hat{I}_{0,2}(t) + \hat{I}_1(t) + \int_0^t \Psi(t-s)\hat{\Upsilon}(s)ds, \\ \hat{R}(t) &= \hat{I}(0)F_{0,I}(t) + \hat{E}(0)\Phi_0(t) + \hat{R}_{0,1}(t) + \hat{R}_{0,2}(t) + \hat{R}_1(t) + \int_0^t \Phi(t-s)\hat{\Upsilon}(s)ds,\end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\Upsilon}$ is given in (2.20), \hat{E}_0 , $\hat{I}_{0,1}$, $\hat{I}_{0,2}$, $\hat{R}_{0,1}$ and $\hat{R}_{0,2}$ are Gaussian processes, independent of B , with covariance functions, for $t, t' \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Cov}(\hat{E}_0(t), \hat{E}_0(t')) &= \bar{E}(0)(G_0^c(t \vee t') - G_0^c(t)G_0^c(t')), \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{I}_{0,1}(t), \hat{I}_{0,1}(t')) &= \bar{I}(0)(F_{0,I}^c(t \vee t') - F_{0,I}^c(t)F_{0,I}^c(t')), \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{I}_{0,2}(t), \hat{I}_{0,2}(t')) &= \bar{E}(0)(\Psi_0(t \wedge t') - \Psi_0(t)\Psi_0(t')), \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{R}_{0,1}(t), \hat{R}_{0,1}(t')) &= \bar{I}(0)(F_{0,I}(t \wedge t') - F_{0,I}(t)F_{0,I}(t')), \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{R}_{0,2}(t), \hat{R}_{0,2}(t')) &= \bar{E}(0)(\Phi_0(t \wedge t') - \Phi_0(t)\Phi_0(t')), \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{I}_{0,1}(t), \hat{R}_{0,1}(t')) &= \bar{I}(0)\left((F_{0,I}(t') - F_{0,I}(t))\mathbf{1}(t' \geq t) - F_{0,I}^c(t)F_{0,I}(t')\right), \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{E}_0(t), \hat{I}_{0,2}(t')) &= \bar{E}(0)\left(\int_t^{t'} \mathbf{1}(t' \geq t)F_0^c(t' - s|s)dG_0(s) - G_0^c(t)\Psi_0(t')\right), \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{E}_0(t), \hat{R}_{0,2}(t')) &= \bar{E}(0)\left(\int_t^{t'} F_0(t' - s|s)dG_0(s) - G_0^c(t)\Phi_0(t')\right), \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{I}_{0,2}(t), \hat{R}_{0,2}(t')) &= \bar{E}(0)\left(\int_0^{t \wedge t'} (F_0(t' - s|s) - F_0(t - s|s))dG_0(s) - \Psi_0(t)\Phi_0(t')\right).\end{aligned}$$

The other pairs of limit processes for the initial quantities $(\hat{E}_0, \hat{I}_{0,1})$, $(\hat{E}_0, \hat{R}_{0,1})$, $(\hat{I}_{0,1}, \hat{I}_{0,2})$, $(\hat{I}_{0,2}, \hat{R}_{0,1})$ are independent. The limits $(\hat{E}_1, \hat{I}_1, \hat{R}_1)$ are three-dimensional continuous Gaussian processes, independent of \hat{E}_0 , $\hat{I}_{0,1}$, $\hat{I}_{0,2}$, $\hat{R}_{0,1}$, $\hat{R}_{0,2}$ and $\hat{I}(0)$, and can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{E}_1(t) &= W_H([0, t] \times [t, \infty) \times [0, \infty)), \\ \hat{I}_1(t) &= W_H([0, t] \times [0, t] \times [t, \infty)), \\ \hat{R}_1(t) &= W_H([0, t] \times [0, t] \times [0, t)),\end{aligned}$$

where W_H is a continuous Gaussian white noise process on \mathbb{R}_+^3 with mean zero and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} [W_H([s, t] \times [a, b] \times [a', b'])^2] \\ = \int_s^t \left(\int_{a-s}^{b-s} (F(b' - y - s|y) - F(a' - y - s|y))G(dy) \right) \bar{S}(s)\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s)ds,\end{aligned}$$

for $0 \leq s \leq t$, $0 \leq a \leq b$ and $0 \leq a' \leq b'$. They have the covariance functions: for $t, t' \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Cov}(\hat{E}_1(t), \hat{E}_1(t')) &= \int_0^{t \wedge t'} G^c(t \vee t' - s)\bar{S}(s)\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s)ds, \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{I}_1(t), \hat{I}_1(t')) &= \int_0^{t \wedge t'} \Psi(t \vee t' - s)\bar{S}(s)\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s)ds,\end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Cov}(\hat{R}_1(t), \hat{R}_1(t')) = \int_0^{t \wedge t'} \Phi(t \wedge t' - s) \bar{S}(s) \bar{\mathcal{J}}(s) ds,$$

$$\text{Cov}(\hat{E}_1(t), \hat{I}_1(t')) = \int_0^{t \wedge t'} (G^c(t - s) - \Psi(t' - s)) \mathbf{1}(t' \geq t) \bar{S}(s) \bar{\mathcal{J}}(s) ds,$$

$$\text{Cov}(\hat{E}_1(t), \hat{R}_1(t')) = \int_0^{t \wedge t'} (G^c(t - s) - \Phi(t' - s)) \mathbf{1}(t' \geq t) \bar{S}(s) \bar{\mathcal{J}}(s) ds,$$

$$\text{Cov}(\hat{I}_1(t), \hat{R}_1(t')) = \int_0^{t \wedge t'} \int_0^{t' - s} (F(t' - s - y|y) - F(t - s - y|y)) \mathbf{1}(t' \geq t) dG(y) \bar{S}(s) \bar{\mathcal{J}}(s) ds.$$

If G_0 and $F_{0,I}$ are continuous, then $\hat{E}_0, \hat{I}_{0,1}, \hat{I}_{0,2}, \hat{R}_{0,1}$ and $\hat{R}_{0,2}$ are continuous, and thus \hat{E}, \hat{I} and \hat{R} are continuous.

In addition, the processes $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}$ in the integral expression of $\hat{\mathcal{J}}$ in (2.19) have the following covariance functions with $\hat{E}_0, \hat{I}_{0,1}, \hat{I}_{0,2}, \hat{R}_{0,1}$ and $\hat{R}_{0,2}$: for $t, t' \geq 0$,

$$\text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}(t), \hat{I}_{0,1}(t')) = \bar{I}(0) (\mathbb{E}[\lambda^{0,I}(t) \mathbf{1}_{\eta^{0,I} > t'}] - \bar{\lambda}^{0,I}(t) F_{0,I}^c(t')),$$

$$\text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}(t), \hat{R}_{0,1}(t')) = \bar{I}(0) (\mathbb{E}[\lambda^{0,I}(t) \mathbf{1}_{\eta^{0,I} \leq t'}] - \bar{\lambda}^{0,I}(t) F_{0,I}(t')),$$

$$\text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}(t), \hat{E}_0(t')) = \bar{E}(0) (\mathbb{E}[\lambda^0(t) \mathbf{1}_{\zeta^0 > t'}] - \bar{\lambda}^0(t) G_0^c(t')),$$

$$\text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}(t), \hat{I}_{0,2}(t')) = \bar{E}(0) (\mathbb{E}[\lambda^0(t) \mathbf{1}_{\zeta^0 + \eta^0 > t'}] - \bar{\lambda}^0(t) \Psi_0(t')),$$

$$\text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}(t), \hat{R}_{0,2}(t')) = \bar{E}(0) (\mathbb{E}[\lambda^0(t) \mathbf{1}_{\zeta^0 + \eta^0 \leq t'}] - \bar{\lambda}^0(t) \Phi_0(t')),$$

$\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}$ is independent of $\hat{E}_0, \hat{I}_{0,2}$ and $\hat{R}_{0,2}$, and $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}$ is independent of $\hat{I}_{0,1}$ and $\hat{R}_{0,1}$. The processes $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1$ and $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2$, independent of $\hat{E}_0, \hat{I}_{0,1}, \hat{I}_{0,2}, \hat{R}_{0,1}$ and $\hat{R}_{0,2}$, have the following covariance functions with \hat{E}_1, \hat{I}_1 and \hat{R}_1 : for $t, t' \geq 0$,

$$\text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1(t), \hat{E}_1(t')) = \int_0^{t \wedge t'} \left(\mathbb{E}[\lambda(t - s) \mathbf{1}_{\zeta > t' - s}] - \bar{\lambda}(t - s) G^c(t' - s) \right) \bar{S}(s) \bar{\mathcal{J}}(s) ds,$$

$$\text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1(t), \hat{I}_1(t')) = \int_0^{t \wedge t'} \left(\mathbb{E}[\lambda(t - s) \mathbf{1}_{\zeta \leq t' - s < \zeta + \eta}] - \bar{\lambda}(t - s) \Psi(t' - s) \right) \bar{S}(s) \bar{\mathcal{J}}(s) ds,$$

$$\text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1(t), \hat{R}_1(t')) = \int_0^{t \wedge t'} \left(\mathbb{E}[\lambda(t - s) \mathbf{1}_{\zeta + \eta \leq t' - s}] - \bar{\lambda}(t - s) \Phi(t' - s) \right) \bar{S}(s) \bar{\mathcal{J}}(s) ds,$$

$$\text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2(t), \hat{E}_1(t')) = \int_0^{t \wedge t'} \bar{\lambda}(t - s) G^c(t' - s) \bar{S}(s) \bar{\mathcal{J}}(s) ds,$$

$$\text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2(t), \hat{I}_1(t')) = \int_0^{t \wedge t'} \bar{\lambda}(t - s) \Psi(t' - s) \bar{S}(s) \bar{\mathcal{J}}(s) ds,$$

$$\text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2(t), \hat{R}_1(t')) = \int_0^{t \wedge t'} \bar{\lambda}(t - s) \Phi(t' - s) \bar{S}(s) \bar{\mathcal{J}}(s) ds.$$

\hat{M}_A is independent of $\hat{E}_0, \hat{I}_{0,1}, \hat{I}_{0,2}, \hat{R}_{0,1}$ and $\hat{R}_{0,2}$, and has covariance functions with \hat{E}_1, \hat{I}_1 and \hat{R}_1 : for $t, t' \geq 0$,

$$\text{Cov}(\hat{M}_A(t), \hat{E}_1(t')) = \int_0^{t \wedge t'} G^c(t' - s) \bar{S}(s) \bar{\mathcal{J}}(s) ds,$$

$$\text{Cov}(\hat{M}_A(t), \hat{I}_1(t')) = \int_0^{t \wedge t'} \Psi(t' - s) \bar{S}(s) \bar{\mathcal{J}}(s) ds,$$

$$\text{Cov}(\hat{M}_A(t), \hat{R}_1(t')) = \int_0^{t \wedge t'} \Phi(t' - s) \bar{S}(s) \bar{\mathcal{J}}(s) ds.$$

Remark 2.1. *It is clear that the model includes the generalized SIR as a special case, where the random infectivity function $\lambda_i(t)$ does not equal to zero at time 0, that is, an infected individual is immediately infectious, so $\zeta = \zeta^0 = 0$ a.s., and there are no exposed individuals, $E^N(t) = 0$ for all $t \geq 0$. Let F be the c.d.f. of the infectious duration η of newly infected individuals and $F_{0,I}$ be the c.d.f. of the infectious duration $\eta^{0,I}$ of initially infectious individuals. The FLLN gives the limits $(\bar{S}, \bar{\mathcal{I}})$ determined by the following two-dimensional integral equation:*

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{S}(t) &= 1 - \bar{I}(0) - \int_0^t \bar{S}(s) \bar{\mathcal{I}}(s) ds, \\ \bar{\mathcal{I}}(t) &= \bar{I}(0) \bar{\lambda}^{0,I}(t) + \int_0^t \bar{\lambda}(t-s) \bar{S}(s) \bar{\mathcal{I}}(s) ds,\end{aligned}$$

and the limits (\bar{I}, \bar{R}) given by the following integral equations:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{I}(t) &= \bar{I}(0) F_{0,I}^c(t) + \int_0^t F^c(t-s) \bar{S}(s) \bar{\mathcal{I}}(s) ds, \\ \bar{R}(t) &= \bar{I}(0) F_{0,I}(t) + \int_0^t F(t-s) \bar{S}(s) \bar{\mathcal{I}}(s) ds.\end{aligned}$$

The FCLT gives the limits $(\hat{S}, \hat{\mathcal{I}})$ determined by the solutions to the following two-dimensional stochastic integral equation:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{S}(t) &= -\hat{I}(0) - \hat{M}_A(t) + \int_0^t \hat{\Upsilon}(s) ds, \\ \hat{\mathcal{I}}(t) &= \hat{I}(0) \bar{\lambda}^{0,I}(t) + \hat{\mathcal{I}}_{0,1}(t) + \hat{\mathcal{I}}_1(t) + \hat{\mathcal{I}}_2(t) + \int_0^t \bar{\lambda}(t-s) \hat{\Upsilon}(s) ds,\end{aligned}$$

where the processes \hat{M}_A , $\hat{\mathcal{I}}_{0,1}$, $\hat{\mathcal{I}}_1$, $\hat{\mathcal{I}}_2$ and $\hat{\Upsilon}$ are as given in Theorem 2.1. And the limits (\hat{I}, \hat{R}) are given by the following stochastic integral equations:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{I}(t) &= \hat{I}(0) F_{0,I}^c(t) + \hat{I}_{0,1}(t) + \hat{I}_1(t) + \int_0^t F^c(t-s) \hat{\Upsilon}(s) ds, \\ \hat{R}(t) &= \hat{I}(0) F_{0,I}(t) + \hat{R}_{0,1}(t) + \hat{R}_1(t) + \int_0^t F(t-s) \hat{\Upsilon}(s) ds,\end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{I}_{0,1}$ and $\hat{R}_{0,1}$ are as given in Theorem 2.2, and the limits (\hat{I}_1, \hat{R}_1) are two-dimensional continuous Gaussian processes, independent of $\hat{I}_{0,1}$, $\hat{R}_{0,2}$ and $\hat{I}(0)$, and can be written as

$$\hat{I}_1(t) = W_H([0, t] \times [t, \infty)), \quad \hat{R}_1(t) = W_H([0, t] \times [0, t)),$$

where W_H is a continuous Gaussian white noise process on \mathbb{R}_+^2 with mean zero and

$$\mathbb{E} [W_H([s, t] \times [a, b])^2] = \int_s^t (F(b-y-s) - F(a-y-s)) \bar{S}(s) \bar{\mathcal{I}}(s) ds,$$

for $0 \leq s \leq t$ and $0 \leq a \leq b$. They have the covariance functions: for $t, t' \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Cov}(\hat{I}_1(t), \hat{I}_1(t')) &= \int_0^{t \wedge t'} F^c(t \vee t' - s) \bar{S}(s) \bar{\mathcal{I}}(s) ds, \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{R}_1(t), \hat{R}_1(t')) &= \int_0^{t \wedge t'} F(t \wedge t' - s) \bar{S}(s) \bar{\mathcal{I}}(s) ds, \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{I}_1(t), \hat{R}_1(t')) &= \int_0^{t \wedge t'} (F(t' - s - y|y) - F(t - s - y|y)) \mathbf{1}(t' \geq t) \bar{S}(s) \bar{\mathcal{I}}(s) ds.\end{aligned}$$

If $F_{0,I}$ is continuous, then \hat{I} and \hat{R} are continuous.

In addition, the process $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}$ has covariance functions with the processes $\hat{I}_{0,1}$ and $\hat{R}_{0,1}$ as given in Theorem 2.2, and the process $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1$ and $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2$, independent of $\hat{I}_{0,1}$ and $\hat{R}_{0,1}$, have the following covariance functions with \hat{I}_1 and \hat{R}_1 : for $t, t' \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1(t), \hat{I}_1(t')) &= \int_0^{t \wedge t'} \left(\mathbb{E}[\lambda(t-s)\mathbf{1}_{\eta > t'-s}] - \bar{\lambda}(t-s)F^c(t'-s) \right) \bar{S}(s)\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s)ds, \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1(t), \hat{R}_1(t')) &= \int_0^{t \wedge t'} \left(\mathbb{E}[\lambda(t-s)\mathbf{1}_{\eta \leq t'-s}] - \bar{\lambda}(t-s)F(t'-s) \right) \bar{S}(s)\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s)ds, \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2(t), \hat{I}_1(t')) &= \int_0^{t \wedge t'} \bar{\lambda}(t-s)F^c(t'-s)\bar{S}(s)\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s)ds, \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2(t), \hat{R}_1(t')) &= \int_0^{t \wedge t'} \bar{\lambda}(t-s)F(t'-s)\bar{S}(s)\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s)ds. \end{aligned}$$

\hat{M}_A is independent of $\hat{I}_{0,1}$ and $\hat{R}_{0,1}$, and has covariance functions with \hat{I}_1 and \hat{R}_1 : for $t, t' \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\hat{M}_A(t), \hat{I}_1(t')) &= \int_0^{t \wedge t'} F^c(t'-s)\bar{S}(s)\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s)ds, \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{M}_A(t), \hat{R}_1(t')) &= \int_0^{t \wedge t'} F(t'-s)\bar{S}(s)\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s)ds. \end{aligned}$$

Now consider the SEIR model, but suppose that we do not care to follow the numbers or proportions of exposed and infectious individuals, but only the number or proportion of infected individual (where infected means either exposed or infectious). Formally, the SEIR model then reduces to a SIR model, with the function λ being allowed to be zero on the interval $[0, \zeta)$, with $\zeta > 0$. For such a model, the FLLN and the FCLT are exactly those described in this remark.

2.3. Generalized SIS models with varying infectivity. In the SIS model, individuals become susceptible immediately after going through the infectious periods. Since $S^N(t) = N - I^N(t)$, the epidemic dynamics is determined by the two dimensional processes $\mathcal{J}^N(t)$ and $I^N(t)$. As stated in Remark 2.3 of [10], the FLLN limit $(\bar{\mathcal{J}}(t), \bar{I}(t))$ is determined by the two-dimensional integral equations:

$$\bar{\mathcal{J}}(t) = \bar{I}(0)\bar{\lambda}^0(t) + \int_0^t \bar{\lambda}(t-s)(1 - \bar{I}(s))\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s)ds, \quad (2.23)$$

$$\bar{I}(t) = \bar{I}(0)F_{0,I}^c(t) + \int_0^t F^c(t-s)(1 - \bar{I}(s))\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s)ds. \quad (2.24)$$

Here the c.d.f.'s F and $F_{0,I}$ denote the distributions of the infectious periods of newly infected individuals and those of initially infectious ones.

Theorem 2.3. *In the generalized SIS model, under Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 (with $E^N(t) \equiv 0$ and only infectious periods),*

$$(\hat{\mathcal{J}}^N, \hat{I}^N) \rightarrow (\hat{\mathcal{J}}, \hat{I}) \quad \text{in } \mathbf{D}^2 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

The limit processes $\hat{\mathcal{J}}$ and \hat{I} are the unique solution to the following stochastic integral equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{J}}(t) &= \hat{I}(0)\bar{\lambda}^{0,I}(t) + \hat{\mathcal{J}}_0(t) + \hat{\mathcal{J}}_1(t) + \hat{\mathcal{J}}_2(t) + \int_0^t \bar{\lambda}(t-s)\hat{\Upsilon}(s)ds, \\ \hat{I}(t) &= \hat{I}(0)F_{0,I}^c(t) + \hat{I}_0(t) + \hat{I}_1(t) + \int_0^t F^c(t-s)\hat{\Upsilon}(s)ds, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\hat{\Upsilon}(t) = (1 - \bar{I}(t))\hat{\mathcal{J}}(t) - \bar{\mathcal{J}}(t)\hat{I}(t),$$

and $\bar{\mathcal{J}}(t)$ and $\bar{I}(t)$ are given by the unique solutions to the integral equations (2.23) and (2.24). $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_0$, $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1$ and $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2$ are Gaussian processes with covariance functions: for $t, t' \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}(t), \hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}(t')) &= \bar{I}(0) \text{Cov}(\lambda^{0,I}(t), \lambda^{0,I}(t')), \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1(t), \hat{\mathcal{J}}_1(t')) &= \int_0^{t \wedge t'} \text{Cov}(\lambda(t-s), \lambda(t'-s))(1 - \bar{I}(s))\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s)ds, \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2(t), \hat{\mathcal{J}}_2(t')) &= \int_0^{t \wedge t'} \bar{\lambda}(t-s)\bar{\lambda}(t'-s)(1 - \bar{I}(s))\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s)ds. \end{aligned}$$

$\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}$ is independent of $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1$ and $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2$. $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1$ and $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2$ have covariance function $\text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1(t), \hat{\mathcal{J}}_2(t')) = 0$ for $t, t' \geq 0$. \hat{I}_0 and \hat{I}_1 are independent Gaussian processes with covariance functions: for $t, t' \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\hat{I}_0(t), \hat{I}_0(t')) &= \bar{I}(0)(F_{0,I}^c(t \vee t') - F_{0,I}^c(t)F_{0,I}^c(t')), \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{I}_1(t), \hat{I}_1(t')) &= \int_0^{t \wedge t'} F^c(t \vee t' - s)(1 - \bar{I}(s))\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s)ds. \end{aligned}$$

$\hat{\mathcal{J}}_0$ and \hat{I}_0 have covariance function

$$\text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_0(t), \hat{I}_0(t')) = \bar{I}(0)(\mathbb{E}[\lambda^{0,I}(t)\mathbf{1}_{\eta^{0,I} > t'}] - \bar{\lambda}^{0,I}(t)F^c(t')),$$

and $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1$, $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2$ and \hat{I}_1 have covariance functions

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1(t), \hat{I}_1(t')) &= 0, \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2(t), \hat{I}_1(t')) &= \int_0^{t \wedge t'} (\mathbb{E}[\lambda(t-s)\mathbf{1}_{\eta > t'-s}] - \bar{\lambda}(t-s)F^c(t'-s))(1 - \bar{I}(s))\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s)ds. \end{aligned}$$

If $\bar{\lambda}^{0,I}(t)$ and $F_{0,I}$ are continuous, then the limits $\hat{\mathcal{J}}$ and \hat{I} are continuous.

2.4. Generalized SIRS models with varying infectivity. In the SIRS model, individuals experience the infectious and recovered/immune periods, and then become susceptible. We use $I^N(t)$ and $R^N(t)$ to denote the numbers of infectious and recovered/immune individuals, respectively, corresponding to the processes $E^N(t)$ and $I^N(t)$ in the SEIR model. Similarly, we use $\{\lambda_j^0\}_{j \geq 1}$ and $\{\lambda_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ to denote the infectivity processes of the initially and newly infectious individuals, respectively, and also use $\{(\xi_j^0, \eta_j^0)\}_{j \geq 1}$ and $\{(\xi_i, \eta_i)\}_{i \geq 1}$ for the infectious and recovered/immune periods for the initially and newly infected individuals, respectively. Denote the remaining immune time of the initially recovered/immune individuals by $\eta_k^{0,R}$ (changing notation $\eta^{0,I}$ to $\eta^{0,R}$ accordingly). Of course, $\{\lambda_j^0\}_{j \geq 1}$ and $\{\lambda_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ only take positive values over the intervals $[0, \zeta_j^0]$ and $[0, \zeta_i]$, respectively. The definitions of the variables (ξ_i, η_i) , (ξ_j^0, η_j^0) and $\eta_k^{0,R}$ in (2.1), (2.2) and (2.3) also need to change accordingly in a natural manner. The c.d.f.'s G_0, G denote the distributions of infectious periods of the initially and newly infectious individuals, and the c.d.f.'s $F_{0,R}$ and F denote the distributions of the recovered/immune periods of the initially and newly recovered individuals. Similarly for the notation $\Psi_0, \Psi, \Phi_0, \Phi$.

Since $S^N(t) = N - I^N(t) - R^N(t)$, the epidemic dynamics is described by the three processes $(\mathcal{J}^N, I^N, R^N)$. As stated in Remark 2.3 in [10], the FLLN limit $(\bar{\mathcal{J}}, \bar{I}, \bar{R})$ is determined by the three-dimensional integral equations:

$$\bar{\mathcal{J}}(t) = \bar{I}(0)\bar{\lambda}^0(t) + \int_0^t \bar{\lambda}(t-s)(1 - \bar{I}(s) - \bar{R}(s))\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s)ds, \quad (2.25)$$

$$\bar{I}(t) = \bar{I}(0)G_0^c(t) + \int_0^t G^c(t-s)(1 - \bar{I}(s) - \bar{R}(s))\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s)ds, \quad (2.26)$$

$$\bar{R}(t) = \bar{R}(0)F_{0,R}^c(t) + \bar{I}(0)\Psi_0(t) + \int_0^t \Psi(t-s)(1 - \bar{I}(s) - \bar{R}(s))\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s)ds. \quad (2.27)$$

We next state the FCLT for these processes.

Theorem 2.4. *In the generalized SIRS model, under Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3,*

$$(\hat{\mathcal{J}}^N, \hat{I}^N, \hat{R}^N) \Rightarrow (\hat{\mathcal{J}}, \hat{I}, \hat{R}) \quad \text{in } \mathbf{D}^3 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

The limit process $(\hat{\mathcal{J}}, \hat{I}, \hat{R})$ is the unique solution to the following system of stochastic integral equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{J}}(t) &= \hat{I}(0)\bar{\lambda}^0(t) + \hat{\mathcal{J}}_0(t) + \hat{\mathcal{J}}_1(t) + \hat{\mathcal{J}}_2(t) + \int_0^t \bar{\lambda}(t-s)\hat{\Upsilon}(s)ds, \\ \hat{I}(t) &= \hat{I}(0)G_0^c(t) + \hat{I}_0(t) + \hat{I}_1(t) + \int_0^t G^c(t-s)\hat{\Upsilon}(s)ds, \\ \hat{R}(t) &= \hat{R}(0)F_{0,R}^c(t) + \hat{I}(0)\Psi_0(t) + \hat{R}_{0,1}(t) + \hat{R}_{0,2}(t) + \hat{R}_1(t) + \int_0^t \Psi(t-s)\hat{\Upsilon}(s)ds, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\hat{\Upsilon}(t) = (1 - \bar{I}(t) - \bar{R}(t))\hat{\mathcal{J}}(t) - \bar{\mathcal{J}}(t)(\hat{I}(t) + \hat{R}(t)),$$

and $\bar{\mathcal{J}}(t)$, $\bar{I}(t)$ and $\bar{R}(t)$ are given by the unique solution to the integral equations (2.25)–(2.27). $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_0$, $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1$ and $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2$ are Gaussian processes with covariance functions: for $t, t' \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}(t), \hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}(t')) &= \bar{I}(0)\text{Cov}(\lambda^0(t), \lambda^0(t')), \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1(t), \hat{\mathcal{J}}_1(t')) &= \int_0^{t \wedge t'} \text{Cov}(\lambda(t-s), \lambda(t'-s))(1 - \bar{I}(s) - \bar{R}(s))\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s)ds, \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2(t), \hat{\mathcal{J}}_2(t')) &= \int_0^{t \wedge t'} \bar{\lambda}(t-s)\bar{\lambda}(t'-s)(1 - \bar{I}(s) - \bar{R}(s))\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s)ds. \end{aligned}$$

$\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}$ is independent of $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1$ and $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2$. $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1$ and $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2$ have covariance function $\text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1(t), \hat{\mathcal{J}}_2(t')) = 0$ for $t, t' \geq 0$. \hat{I}_0 and \hat{I}_1 are independent Gaussian processes with covariance functions: for $t, t' \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\hat{I}_0(t), \hat{I}_0(t')) &= \bar{I}(0)(G_0^c(t \vee t') - G_0^c(t)G_0^c(t')), \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{I}_1(t), \hat{I}_1(t')) &= \int_0^{t \wedge t'} G^c(t \vee t' - s)(1 - \bar{I}(s) - \bar{R}(s))\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s)ds. \end{aligned}$$

$\hat{R}_{0,1}$, $\hat{R}_{0,2}$ and \hat{R}_1 are mutually independent Gaussian processes with covariance functions: for $t, t' \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\hat{R}_{0,1}(t), \hat{R}_{0,1}(t')) &= \bar{R}(0)(F_{0,R}^c(t \vee t') - F_{0,R}^c(t)F_{0,R}^c(t')), \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{R}_{0,2}(t), \hat{R}_{0,2}(t')) &= \bar{I}(0)(\Psi_0(t \wedge t') - \Psi_0(t)\Psi_0(t')), \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{R}_1(t), \hat{R}_1(t')) &= \int_0^{t \wedge t'} \Psi(t \vee t' - s)(1 - \bar{I}(s) - \bar{R}(s))\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s)ds. \end{aligned}$$

The processes $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_0, \hat{I}_0, \hat{R}_{0,1}, \hat{R}_{0,2}$ are independent of $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_2, \hat{I}_1, \hat{R}_1$. $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_0, \hat{I}_0$ and $\hat{R}_{0,2}$ are independent of $\hat{R}_{0,1}$, and have covariance functions

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_0(t), \hat{I}_0(t')) &= \bar{I}(0)(\mathbb{E}[\lambda^0(t)\mathbf{1}_{\zeta^0 > t'}] - \bar{\lambda}^0(t)G^c(t')), \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_0(t), \hat{R}_{0,2}(t')) &= \bar{I}(0)(\mathbb{E}[\lambda^0(t)\mathbf{1}_{\zeta^0 + \eta^0 > t'}] - \bar{\lambda}^0(t)\Psi(t')), \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{I}_0(t), \hat{R}_{0,2}(t')) &= \bar{I}(0) \left(\int_t^{t'} \mathbf{1}(t' \geq t)F_0^c(t' - s|s)dG_0(s) - G_0^c(t)\Psi_0(t') \right). \end{aligned}$$

The processes $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_2, \hat{I}_1$ and \hat{R}_1 have covariance functions

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1(t), \hat{I}_1(t')) &= 0, & \text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1(t), \hat{R}_1(t')) &= 0, \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2(t), \hat{I}_1(t')) &= \int_0^{t \wedge t'} (\mathbb{E}[\lambda(t-s)\mathbf{1}_{\zeta > t'-s}] - \bar{\lambda}(t-s)F^c(t'-s))(1 - \bar{I}(s) - \bar{R}(s))\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s)ds, \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2(t), \hat{R}_1(t')) &= \int_0^{t \wedge t'} (\mathbb{E}[\lambda(t-s)\mathbf{1}_{\zeta + \eta > t'-s}] - \bar{\lambda}(t-s)\Psi(t'-s))(1 - \bar{I}(s) - \bar{R}(s))\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s)ds, \\ \text{Cov}(\hat{I}_1(t'), \hat{R}_1(t')) &= \int_0^{t \wedge t'} (G^c(t-s) - \Psi(t'-s))\mathbf{1}(t' \geq t)(1 - \bar{I}(s) - \bar{R}(s))\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s)ds. \end{aligned}$$

If $\bar{\lambda}^0(t)$, G_0 and $F_{0,R}$ are continuous, the limits $\hat{\mathcal{J}}$, \hat{I} and \hat{R} have continuous paths.

3. PROOFS

In this section we prove Theorems 2.1 and 2.2. We focus on the proof of the convergence of $(\hat{S}^N, \hat{\mathcal{J}}^N)$ stated in Theorem 2.1. The proof of Theorem 2.2 on the convergence of $(\hat{E}^N, \hat{I}^N, \hat{R}^N)$ follows essentially the same as that of Theorem 3.2 in [18], for which we only highlight the differences.

3.1. Convergence of $(\hat{S}^N, \hat{\mathcal{J}}^N)$. For the process $A^N(t)$, we have the decomposition

$$A^N(t) = M_A^N(t) + \int_0^t \Upsilon^N(s)ds, \quad (3.1)$$

where

$$M_A^N(t) = \int_0^t \int_0^\infty \mathbf{1}_{u \leq \Upsilon^N(s)} \bar{Q}(ds, du),$$

with $\bar{Q}(ds, du) := Q(ds, du) - dsdu$ being the compensated PRM. It is clear that the process $\{M_A^N(t) : t \geq 0\}$ is a square-integrable martingale with respect to the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t^N : t \geq 0\}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{F}_t^N := \sigma\left\{I^N(0), E^N(0), \lambda_j^0(\cdot)_{j \geq 1}, \lambda_k^{0,I}(\cdot)_{k \geq 1}, \lambda_i(\cdot)_{i \geq 1}, \int_0^{t'} \int_0^\infty \mathbf{1}_{u \leq \Upsilon^N(s)} Q(ds, du) : t' \leq t\right\}.$$

It has the following finite quadratic variation (see e.g. [8, Chapter VI]):

$$\langle M_A^N \rangle(t) = \int_0^t \Upsilon^N(s)ds, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Under Assumption 2.2, we have

$$0 \leq N^{-1} \int_s^t \Upsilon^N(u)du \leq \lambda^*(t-s), \quad \text{w.p.1 for } 0 \leq s \leq t. \quad (3.2)$$

It is shown in Section 4.1 of [10] that

$$\int_0^\cdot \bar{\Upsilon}^N(s)ds = \int_0^\cdot \bar{S}^N(s)\bar{\mathcal{J}}^N(s)ds \Rightarrow \int_0^\cdot \bar{S}(s)\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s)ds \quad \text{in } \mathbf{D} \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.3)$$

and

$$\bar{A}^N \Rightarrow \bar{A} = \int_0^\cdot \bar{S}(s)\bar{\mathcal{J}}(s)ds \quad \text{in } \mathbf{D} \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.4)$$

By (3.1), we have

$$\hat{A}^N(t) = \sqrt{N}(\bar{A}^N(t) - \bar{A}(t)) = \hat{M}_A^N(t) + \int_0^t \hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)ds, \quad (3.5)$$

where

$$\hat{M}_A^N(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^t \int_0^\infty \mathbf{1}_{u \leq \Upsilon^N(s)} \bar{Q}(ds, du),$$

and

$$\hat{\Upsilon}^N(t) = \sqrt{N}(\bar{S}^N(t)\bar{\mathfrak{J}}^N(t) - \bar{S}(t)\bar{\mathfrak{J}}(t)) = \hat{S}^N(t)\bar{\mathfrak{J}}^N(t) + \bar{S}(t)\hat{\mathfrak{J}}^N(t). \quad (3.6)$$

The process $\{\hat{M}_A^N(t) : t \geq 0\}$ is a square-integrable martingale with respect to the filtration \mathcal{F}^N and has the quadratic variation

$$\langle \hat{M}_A^N \rangle(t) = N^{-1} \int_0^t \Upsilon^N(s) ds, \quad t \geq 0.$$

By (3.3), we obtain

$$\langle \hat{M}_A^N \rangle(t) \Rightarrow \int_0^t \bar{S}(s)\bar{\mathfrak{J}}(s) ds \quad \text{in } \mathbf{D} \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus by the FCLT for martingales, see, e.g., [23], we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Under Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3,*

$$\hat{M}_A^N \Rightarrow \hat{M}_A \quad \text{in } \mathbf{D} \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.7)$$

where \hat{M}_A is given in (2.21).

It then follows that

$$\hat{S}^N(t) = \hat{S}^N(0) - \hat{A}^N(t) = -\hat{I}^N(0) - \hat{M}_A^N(t) - \int_0^t \hat{\Upsilon}^N(s) ds. \quad (3.8)$$

By (2.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathfrak{J}}^N(t) &= \hat{I}^N(0)\bar{\lambda}^{0,I}(t) + \hat{E}^N(0)\bar{\lambda}^0(t) + \hat{\mathfrak{J}}_{0,1}^N(t) + \hat{\mathfrak{J}}_{0,2}^N(t) + \hat{\mathfrak{J}}_1^N(t) + \hat{\mathfrak{J}}_2^N(t) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \bar{\lambda}(t-s)\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s) ds, \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathfrak{J}}_{0,1}^N(t) &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k=1}^{I^N(0)} (\lambda_k^{0,I}(t) - \bar{\lambda}^{0,I}(t)), \\ \hat{\mathfrak{J}}_{0,2}^N(t) &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=1}^{E^N(0)} (\lambda_j^0(t) - \bar{\lambda}^0(t)), \\ \hat{\mathfrak{J}}_1^N(t) &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^{A^N(t)} (\lambda_i(t - \tau_i^N) - \bar{\lambda}(t - \tau_i^N)), \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

and

$$\hat{\mathfrak{J}}_2^N(t) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{A^N(t)} \bar{\lambda}(t - \tau_i^N) - \int_0^t \bar{\lambda}(t-s)\Upsilon^N(s) ds \right). \quad (3.11)$$

Lemma 3.2. *Under Assumptions 2.2(i) and 2.3,*

$$(\hat{\mathfrak{J}}_{0,1}^N, \hat{\mathfrak{J}}_{0,2}^N) \Rightarrow (\hat{\mathfrak{J}}_{0,1}, \hat{\mathfrak{J}}_{0,2}) \quad \text{in } \mathbf{D}^2 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.12)$$

where $(\hat{\mathfrak{J}}_{0,1}, \hat{\mathfrak{J}}_{0,2})$ is given in Theorem 2.1.

Proof. Define

$$\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N(t) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k=1}^{N\bar{I}(0)} (\lambda_k^{0,I}(t) - \bar{\lambda}^{0,I}(t)), \quad (3.13)$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}^N(t) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=1}^{N\bar{E}(0)} (\lambda_j^0(t) - \bar{\lambda}^0(t)). \quad (3.14)$$

By the FCLT for the random elements in \mathbf{D} (see Theorem 2 in [12], whose conditions (i) and (ii) are satisfied thanks to Assumption 2.2 (i) (a) and (b), respectively) and by the independence of the sequences $\{\lambda_j^0\}_{j \geq 1}$ and $\{\lambda_k^{0,I}\}_{k \geq 1}$, we obtain

$$(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N, \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}^N) \Rightarrow (\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}^N) \quad \text{in } \mathbf{D}^2 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.15)$$

It then suffices to show that

$$(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N - \hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N, \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}^N - \hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}^N) \Rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbf{D}^2 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.16)$$

We focus on $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}^N - \hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}^N \Rightarrow 0$. It is clear from the definition in (3.14) and the i.i.d. property of $\lambda_j^0(\cdot)$ that for each $t \geq 0$, $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}^N(t) - \hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}^N(t)] = 0$, and

$$\mathbb{E}[(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}^N(t) - \hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}^N(t))^2] = \nu_0(t) \mathbb{E}[|\bar{E}(0) - \bar{E}^N(0)|] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $\nu_0(t) = \mathbb{E}[(\lambda_j^0(t) - \bar{\lambda}^0(t))^2] < \infty$ under Assumption 2.2, and the convergence follows from Assumption 2.3 and the dominated convergence theorem. It then remains to show that $\{\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N - \hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N : N \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is tight in \mathbf{D} . We have

$$\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N(t) - \hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N(t) = \text{sign}(\bar{E}(0) - \bar{E}^N(0)) \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=N(\bar{E}(0) \wedge \bar{E}^N(0))+1}^{N(\bar{E}(0) \vee \bar{E}^N(0))} (\lambda_j^0(t) - \bar{\lambda}^0(t)).$$

We use the moment criterion in Theorem 13.5 of [4], and consider the moment: for $t' \leq t \leq t''$,

$$\mathbb{E}[|(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N(t) - \hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N(t)) - (\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N(t') - \hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N(t'))|^2 \times |(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N(t) - \hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N(t)) - (\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N(t'') - \hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N(t''))|^2].$$

Recall $\check{\lambda}_j^0(t) = \lambda_j^0(t) - \bar{\lambda}^0(t)$, and we drop the subscript j for the generic variable $\check{\lambda}^0(t)$. Then by the i.i.d. and mean zero properties of $\check{\lambda}_j^0(t)$, and by the independence between $\bar{E}^N(0)$ and $\check{\lambda}_j^0(t)$, we obtain that the moment above is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{N^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{j=N(\bar{E}(0) \wedge \bar{E}^N(0))+1}^{N(\bar{E}(0) \vee \bar{E}^N(0))} (\check{\lambda}_j^0(t) - \check{\lambda}_j^0(t')) \right)^2 \left(\sum_{j=N(\bar{E}(0) \wedge \bar{E}^N(0))+1}^{N(\bar{E}(0) \vee \bar{E}^N(0))} (\check{\lambda}_j^0(t) - \check{\lambda}_j^0(t'')) \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{N^2} \left(\mathbb{E}[N|\bar{E}^N(0) - \bar{E}(0)|] \mathbb{E}[(\check{\lambda}^0(t) - \check{\lambda}^0(t'))^2 (\check{\lambda}^0(t) - \check{\lambda}^0(t''))^2] \right. \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E}[N|\bar{E}^N(0) - \bar{E}(0)|(N|\bar{E}^N(0) - \bar{E}(0)| - 1)] \mathbb{E}[(\check{\lambda}^0(t) - \check{\lambda}^0(t'))^2] \mathbb{E}[(\check{\lambda}^0(t) - \check{\lambda}^0(t''))^2] \\ & \quad \left. + 2\mathbb{E}[N|\bar{E}^N(0) - \bar{E}(0)|(N|\bar{E}^N(0) - \bar{E}(0)| - 1)] \left(\mathbb{E}[(\check{\lambda}^0(t) - \check{\lambda}^0(t'))(\check{\lambda}^0(t) - \check{\lambda}^0(t''))] \right)^2 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N^2} \left(\mathbb{E}[N|\bar{E}^N(0) - \bar{E}(0)|] \mathbb{E}[(\check{\lambda}^0(t) - \check{\lambda}^0(t'))^2 (\check{\lambda}^0(t) - \check{\lambda}^0(t''))^2] \right. \\ & \quad \left. + 3\mathbb{E}[N|\bar{E}^N(0) - \bar{E}(0)|(N|\bar{E}^N(0) - \bar{E}(0)| - 1)] \mathbb{E}[(\check{\lambda}^0(t) - \check{\lambda}^0(t'))^2] \mathbb{E}[(\check{\lambda}^0(t) - \check{\lambda}^0(t''))^2] \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}[|\bar{E}^N(0) - \bar{E}(0)|] (\psi(t'') - \psi(t'))^\beta + 3\mathbb{E}[|\bar{E}^N(0) - \bar{E}(0)|^2] (\phi(t'') - \phi(t'))^{2\alpha},$$

where we have used Cauchy-Schwarz inequality in the first inequality, and conditions (a) and (b) in Assumption 2.2 (i) in the second inequality. By Assumption 2.3, $\mathbb{E}[|\bar{E}^N(0) - \bar{E}(0)|] \rightarrow 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[|\bar{E}^N(0) - \bar{E}(0)|^2] \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Thus we can conclude the tightness of $\{\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N - \hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N : N \in \mathbb{N}\}$ follows from Theorem 4.1 in the Appendix below. This completes the proof. \square

We next prove the convergence of $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1^N$. We introduce a PRM \check{Q} on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbf{D}$, which to the point τ_i^N associates the copy λ_i of the random function λ , so that the mean measure of the PRM is

$$ds \times du \times \text{Law of } \lambda.$$

$\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1^N$ can be written

$$\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1^N(t) = N^{-1/2} \int_0^t \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbf{D}} [\lambda - \bar{\lambda}](t-s) \mathbf{1}_{u \leq \Upsilon^N(s)} \check{Q}(ds, du, d\lambda). \quad (3.17)$$

We note that if we replace in the above \check{Q} by its mean measure, then the resulting integral vanishes. Consequently we also have

$$\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1^N(t) = N^{-1/2} \int_0^t \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbf{D}} [\lambda - \bar{\lambda}](t-s) \mathbf{1}_{u \leq \Upsilon^N(s)} \tilde{Q}(ds, du, d\lambda), \quad (3.18)$$

where \tilde{Q} is the compensated PRM of \check{Q} . Hence $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1^N(t)] = 0$ and

$$\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1^N(t))^2] = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t [\lambda - \bar{\lambda}]^2(t-s) \bar{\Upsilon}^N(s) ds \right].$$

Before we establish the next result, let us recall a well-known formula for the exponential moment of an integral with respect to a compensated Poisson random measure.

Lemma 3.3. *Let Q be a PRM on some measurable space (E, \mathcal{E}) , with mean measure ν , and \bar{Q} the associated compensated measure. Let $f : E \mapsto \mathbb{C}$ be measurable and such that $e^f - 1 - f$ is ν integrable. Then*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\int_E f(x) \bar{Q}(dx) \right) \right] = \exp \left(\int_E [e^{f(x)} - 1 - f(x)] \nu(dx) \right).$$

If $\nu(f^2 + f^4) < \infty$, then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_E f(x) \bar{Q}(dx) \right)^2 \right] = \int_E f(x)^2 \nu(dx),$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_E f(x) \bar{Q}(dx) \right)^4 \right] = \int_E f(x)^4 \nu(dx) + 3 \left(\int_E f(x)^2 \nu(dx) \right)^2.$$

We also have the following bounds on the increments of the infectivity functions.

Lemma 3.4. *For $t \geq s \geq 0$,*

$$|\lambda_i(t) - \lambda_i(s)| \leq \varphi(t-s) + \lambda^* \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{1}_{s < \xi_i^j \leq t}, \text{ and}$$

$$|\bar{\lambda}(t) - \bar{\lambda}(s)| \leq \varphi(t-s) + \lambda^* \sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t) - F_j(s)).$$

Moreover, if $\tilde{\lambda}_i := \lambda_i - \bar{\lambda}$, then

$$\mathbb{E}[|\tilde{\lambda}_i(t) - \tilde{\lambda}_i(s)|] \leq 2\varphi(t-s) + 2\lambda^* \sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t) - F_j(s)).$$

Proof. We have

$$\lambda_i(t) - \lambda_i(s) = \sum_{j=1}^k (\lambda_i^j(t) - \lambda_i^j(s)) \mathbf{1}_{\xi_{j-1} \leq s, t < \xi_j} + (\lambda_i(t) - \lambda_i(s)) \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{1}_{s < \xi_j^j \leq t}.$$

Thus the first statement follows from Assumption 2.2 (ii), and the next statements follow readily from the first one. \square

Lemma 3.5. *Under Assumptions 2.1, 2.2(ii) and 2.3,*

$$\hat{\mathfrak{J}}_1^N \Rightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{J}}_1 \quad \text{in } \mathbf{D} \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.19)$$

where $\hat{\mathfrak{J}}_1$ is given in Theorem 2.1.

Proof. Let us first prove the convergence of finite dimensional distributions. We consider only an arbitrary two-dimensional distribution, the general result being obtained exactly in the same way. Let

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_1^N(t) := N^{-1/2} \int_0^t \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbf{D}} [\lambda - \bar{\lambda}](t-s) \mathbf{1}_{u \leq N\tilde{\Upsilon}(s)} \check{Q}(ds, du, d\lambda). \quad (3.20)$$

It is not hard to see that for any $t > 0$, $\hat{\mathfrak{J}}_1^N(t) - \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_1^N(t) \rightarrow 0$ in probability, as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore it is enough to compute the limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$ of

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(i\theta_1 \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_1^N(t_1) + i\theta_2 \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_1^N(t_2) \right) \right],$$

where $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t_1, t_2 > 0$ are arbitrary. We apply Lemma 3.3 to the particular case $E = \mathbb{R}_+^2 \times \mathbf{D}$, $Q = \check{Q}$ and

$$f(s, u, \lambda) = iN^{-1/2} \{ \theta_1 (\lambda - \bar{\lambda})(t_1 - s) \mathbf{1}_{s \leq t_1} + \theta_2 (\lambda - \bar{\lambda})(t_2 - s) \mathbf{1}_{s \leq t_2} \} \mathbf{1}_{u \leq N\tilde{\Upsilon}(s)},$$

from which we easily deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(i\theta_1 \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_1^N(t_1) + i\theta_2 \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_1^N(t_2) \right) \right] \\ &= \exp \left(-\frac{\theta_1^2}{2} \int_0^{t_1} \mathbb{E} [(\lambda(t_1 - s) - \bar{\lambda}(t_1 - s))^2] \tilde{\Upsilon}(s) ds \right. \\ & \quad - \frac{\theta_2^2}{2} \int_0^{t_2} \mathbb{E} [(\lambda(t_2 - s) - \bar{\lambda}(t_2 - s))^2] \tilde{\Upsilon}(s) ds \\ & \quad \left. - \theta_1 \theta_2 \int_0^{t_1 \wedge t_2} \mathbb{E} [(\lambda(t_1 - s) - \bar{\lambda}(t_1 - s))(\lambda(t_2 - s) - \bar{\lambda}(t_2 - s))] \tilde{\Upsilon}(s) ds \right). \quad (3.21) \end{aligned}$$

We next prove tightness. The moment criterion requires to calculate for $t' < t < t''$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_1^N(t) - \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_1^N(t')|^2 |\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_1^N(t) - \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_1^N(t'')|^2 \right]$$

and find a bound of the form $(\psi(t'') - \psi(t'))^{2\alpha}$ for some $\alpha > 1/2$ and a positive nondecreasing continuous function $\psi(\cdot)$. By Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we calculate the fourth moment. We have

$$\mathbb{E}[|\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_1^N(t) - \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_1^N(r)|^4]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\left| N^{-1/2} \int_r^t \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbf{D}} [\lambda - \bar{\lambda}](t-s) \mathbf{1}_{u \leq N\bar{\Upsilon}(s)} \tilde{Q}(ds, du, d\lambda) \right|^4 \right] \\
&+ \mathbb{E} \left[\left| N^{-1/2} \int_0^r \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbf{D}} ([\lambda - \bar{\lambda}](t-s) - [\lambda - \bar{\lambda}](r-s)) \mathbf{1}_{u \leq N\bar{\Upsilon}(s)} \tilde{Q}(ds, du, d\lambda) \right|^4 \right] \\
&+ 6\mathbb{E} \left[\left| N^{-1/2} \int_r^t \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbf{D}} [\lambda - \bar{\lambda}](t-s) \mathbf{1}_{u \leq N\bar{\Upsilon}(s)} \tilde{Q}(ds, du, d\lambda) \right|^2 \right] \\
&\times \mathbb{E} \left[\left| N^{-1/2} \int_0^r \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbf{D}} ([\lambda - \bar{\lambda}](t-s) - [\lambda - \bar{\lambda}](r-s)) \mathbf{1}_{u \leq N\bar{\Upsilon}(s)} \tilde{Q}(ds, du, d\lambda) \right|^2 \right]. \quad (3.22)
\end{aligned}$$

For the first two terms, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[\left| N^{-1/2} \int_r^t \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbf{D}} [\lambda - \bar{\lambda}](t-s) \mathbf{1}_{u \leq N\bar{\Upsilon}(s)} \tilde{Q}(ds, du, d\lambda) \right|^4 \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \int_r^t \mathbb{E} [[\lambda - \bar{\lambda}](t-s)^4] \bar{\Upsilon}(s) ds + 3 \left(\mathbb{E} \int_r^t ([\lambda - \bar{\lambda}](t-s))^2 \bar{\Upsilon}(s) ds \right)^2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{N} (2\lambda^*)^4 \int_r^t \bar{\Upsilon}(s) ds + 3(2\lambda^*)^4 \left(\int_r^t \bar{\Upsilon}(s) ds \right)^2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{N} 16(\lambda^*)^5 (t-r) + 48(\lambda^*)^6 (t-r)^2, \quad (3.23)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[\left| N^{-1/2} \int_0^r \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbf{D}} ([\lambda - \bar{\lambda}](t-s) - [\lambda - \bar{\lambda}](r-s)) \mathbf{1}_{u \leq N\bar{\Upsilon}(s)} \tilde{Q}(ds, du, d\lambda) \right|^4 \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \int_0^r \mathbb{E} [([\lambda - \bar{\lambda}](t-s) - [\lambda - \bar{\lambda}](r-s))^4] \bar{\Upsilon}(s) ds \\
&+ 3 \left(\mathbb{E} \int_0^r ([\lambda - \bar{\lambda}](t-s) - [\lambda - \bar{\lambda}](r-s))^2 \bar{\Upsilon}(s) ds \right)^2. \quad (3.24)
\end{aligned}$$

Here for the first term on the right hand side of (3.24), we use

$$\mathbb{E} [|\tilde{\lambda}(t) - \tilde{\lambda}(s)|^4] \leq 8\mathbb{E} [|\lambda(t) - \lambda(s)|^4] + 8|\bar{\lambda}(t) - \bar{\lambda}(s)|^4,$$

$$|\bar{\lambda}(t) - \bar{\lambda}(s)|^4 \leq 8\varphi(t-s)^4 + 8(\lambda^*)^4 \left(\sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t) - F_j(s)) \right)^4,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
|\lambda(t) - \lambda(s)|^4 &\leq 8\varphi(t-s)^4 + 8(\lambda^*)^4 \left(\sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{1}_{s < \xi_j \leq t} \right)^4 \\
&\leq 8\varphi(t-s)^4 + 8k^3(\lambda^*)^4 \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{1}_{s < \xi_j \leq t}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain the bound for the first term on the right hand side of (3.24):

$$\frac{1}{N} 128\varphi(t-r)^4 \lambda^* T + \frac{1}{N} 64(\lambda^*)^4 \int_0^r \left(\sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t-s) - F_j(r-s)) \right)^4 \bar{\Upsilon}(s) ds$$

$$+ \frac{1}{N} 64k^2(\lambda^*)^4 \int_0^r \sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t-s) - F_j(r-s)) \bar{\Upsilon}(s) ds. \quad (3.25)$$

For the second term on the right hand side of (3.24), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & 3 \left(\mathbb{E} \int_0^r ([\lambda - \bar{\lambda}](t-s) - [\lambda - \bar{\lambda}](r-s))^2 \bar{\Upsilon}(s) ds \right)^2 \\ & \leq 3 \left(\mathbb{E} \int_0^r \left(2(\lambda(t-s) - \lambda(r-s))^2 + 2(\bar{\lambda}(t-s) - \bar{\lambda}(r-s))^2 \right) \bar{\Upsilon}(s) ds \right)^2 \\ & \leq 3 \left(\int_0^r \left(8\varphi(t-r)^2 + 4(\lambda^*)^2 k \sum_{j=1}^k \left(F_j(t-s) - F_j(r-s) \right) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + 4(\lambda^*)^2 \left(\sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t-s) - F_j(r-s)) \right)^2 \right) \bar{\Upsilon}(s) ds \right)^2 \\ & \leq 9 \left(8\varphi(t-r)^2 \int_0^r \bar{\Upsilon}(s) ds \right)^2 + 9 \left(\int_0^r 4(\lambda^*)^2 k \sum_{j=1}^k \left(F_j(t-s) - F_j(r-s) \right) \bar{\Upsilon}(s) ds \right)^2 \\ & \quad + 9 \left(\int_0^r 4(\lambda^*)^2 \left(\sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t-s) - F_j(r-s)) \right)^2 \bar{\Upsilon}(s) ds \right)^2 \\ & \leq 9 \times 81\varphi(t-r)^4 (\lambda^*)^2 T^2 + 9 \times 16k^3 (\lambda^*)^6 \sum_{j=1}^k \left(\int_0^r (F_j(t-s) - F_j(r-s)) ds \right)^2 \\ & \quad + 9 \times 16(\lambda^*)^6 k^3 \sum_{j=1}^k \left(\int_0^r [F_j(t-s) - F_j(r-s)]^2 ds \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

Finally, the third term on the right hand side of (3.22) equals

$$\begin{aligned} & 6 \times \mathbb{E} \int_r^t \tilde{\lambda}(t-s)^2 \bar{\Upsilon}(s) ds \times \mathbb{E} \int_0^r [\tilde{\lambda}(t-s) - \tilde{\lambda}(r-s)]^2 \bar{\Upsilon}(s) ds \\ & \leq 48(\lambda^*)^6 (t-r) \left\{ T\varphi^2(t-r) + k(\lambda^*)^2 \sum_{j=1}^k \int_0^r [F_j(t-s) - F_j(r-s)] ds \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the obvious inequality $(F_j(t) - F_j(s))^2 \leq F_j(t) - F_j(s)$ for $0 \leq s \leq t$.

Combining the bounds for the three terms in the right hand side of (3.22), we obtain the following bound on the left hand side of (3.22):

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{N} C_1 \left((t-r) + \varphi(t-r)^4 + \sum_{j=1}^k \int_0^r (F_j(t-s) - F_j(r-s)) ds \right) \\ & + C_2 \left((t-r)^2 + \varphi(t-r)^4 + \sum_{j=1}^k \left(\int_0^r (F_j(t-s) - F_j(r-s)) ds \right)^2 \right) \\ & + C_3 (t-r) \left(\varphi^2(t-r) + \sum_{j=1}^k \int_0^r [F_j(t-s) - F_j(r-s)] ds \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

for some positive constants $C_1, C_2, C_3 > 0$, which depend only upon λ^*, T and k .

Under Assumption 2.2(ii), supposing that F_j satisfies the Hölder continuity condition in Assumption 2.1, we have

$$\int_0^r (F_j(t-s) - F_j(r-s))ds \leq C(t-r)^{1/2+\theta}. \quad (3.28)$$

On the other hand, if F_j satisfies the discrete condition in Assumption 2.1, say $F_j(t) = \sum_i a_i^j \mathbf{1}_{t \geq t_i^j}$ for $\sum_i a_i^j = 1$ and $t_i^j \leq t_{i+1}^j$, then

$$\int_0^r (F_j(t-s) - F_j(r-s))ds = \int_0^r \sum_i a_i^j \mathbf{1}_{(r-t_i^j)+ < s \leq (t-t_i^j)+} ds \leq C(t-r), \quad (3.29)$$

for some constant $C > 0$. Taking into account our assumption (2.8), we deduce from (3.27), (3.28) and (3.29) that there exist $\delta > 0$, C'_1 and $C'_2 > 0$ such that for any $t' < t < t''$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_1^N(t) - \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_1^N(t')|^2 |\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_1^N(t) - \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_1^N(t'')|^2 \right] \leq \frac{C'_1}{N} (t'' - t') + C'_2 (t'' - t')^{1+\delta},$$

which allows us to deduce from Theorem 4.1, a reinforced version of Theorem 13.5 in [4] which is established in the Appendix below, that the sequence $\{\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_1^N : N \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is tight.

Then we conclude the convergence $\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_1^N \Rightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{J}}_1$ in \mathbf{D} . The lemma follows from the asymptotic equivalence between $\hat{\mathfrak{J}}_1^N$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_1^N$, see Lemma 3.8 below. \square

We next prove the convergence of

$$\hat{\mathfrak{J}}_2^N(t) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^t \int_0^\infty \bar{\lambda}(t-s) \mathbf{1}_{u \leq \Upsilon^N(s)} \bar{Q}(ds, du). \quad (3.30)$$

Lemma 3.6. *Under Assumptions 2.1, 2.2(ii) and 2.3,*

$$\hat{\mathfrak{J}}_2^N \Rightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{J}}_2 \quad \text{in } \mathbf{D} \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.31)$$

where $\hat{\mathfrak{J}}_2$ is given in Theorem 2.1.

Proof. We define

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_2^N(t) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^t \int_0^\infty \bar{\lambda}(t-s) \mathbf{1}_{u \leq N\tilde{\Upsilon}(s)} \bar{Q}(ds, du). \quad (3.32)$$

and apply again Lemma 3.3, this time with $E = \mathbb{R}_+^2$ and

$$f(s, u) = iN^{-1/2} \{ \theta_1 \bar{\lambda}(t_1 - s) \mathbf{1}_{s \leq t_1} + \theta_2 \bar{\lambda}(t_2 - s) \mathbf{1}_{s \leq t_2} \} \mathbf{1}_{u \leq N\tilde{\Upsilon}(s)}.$$

We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(i\theta_1 \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_2^N(t_1) + i\theta_2 \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_2^N(t_2) \right) \right] \\ &= \exp \left(-\frac{\theta_1^2}{2} \int_0^{t_1} \bar{\lambda}(t_1 - s)^2 \tilde{\Upsilon}(s) ds - \frac{\theta_2^2}{2} \int_0^{t_2} \bar{\lambda}(t_2 - s)^2 \tilde{\Upsilon}(s) ds \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \theta_1 \theta_2 \int_0^{t_1 \wedge t_2} \bar{\lambda}(t_1 - s) \bar{\lambda}(t_2 - s) \tilde{\Upsilon}(s) ds \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

We next establish tightness. We have for $t > r \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_2^N(t) - \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_2^N(r) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_r^t \int_0^\infty \bar{\lambda}(t-s) \mathbf{1}_{u \leq N\tilde{\Upsilon}(s)} \bar{Q}(ds, du) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^r \int_0^\infty (\bar{\lambda}(t-s) - \bar{\lambda}(r-s)) \mathbf{1}_{u \leq N\tilde{\Upsilon}(s)} \bar{Q}(ds, du). \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

The moment criterion requires to calculate

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_2^N(t) - \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_2^N(t')|^2 |\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_2^N(t) - \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_2^N(t'')|^2 \right].$$

By Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we calculate the fourth moment. By (3.34), noting that \bar{Q} is compensated PRM, we have for $t \geq r \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[|\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_2^N(t) - \tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_2^N(r)|^4 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_r^t \int_0^\infty \bar{\lambda}(t-s) \mathbf{1}_{u \leq N\tilde{\Upsilon}(s)} \bar{Q}(ds, du) \right|^4 \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^r \int_0^\infty (\bar{\lambda}(t-s) - \bar{\lambda}(r-s)) \mathbf{1}_{u \leq N\tilde{\Upsilon}(s)} \bar{Q}(ds, du) \right|^4 \right] \\ &\quad + 6\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_r^t \int_0^\infty \bar{\lambda}(t-s) \mathbf{1}_{u \leq N\tilde{\Upsilon}(s)} \bar{Q}(ds, du) \right|^2 \right] \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^r \int_0^\infty (\bar{\lambda}(t-s) - \bar{\lambda}(r-s)) \mathbf{1}_{u \leq N\tilde{\Upsilon}(s)} \bar{Q}(ds, du) \right|^2 \right]. \quad (3.35) \end{aligned}$$

The first term on the right hand side is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{N} \int_r^t \bar{\lambda}(t-s)^4 \tilde{\Upsilon}(s) ds + 3 \left(\int_r^t \bar{\lambda}(t-s)^2 \tilde{\Upsilon}(s) ds \right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N} (\lambda^*)^4 (t-r) + 3(\lambda^*)^6 (t-r)^2. \end{aligned}$$

The second term on the right hand side of (3.35) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{N} \int_0^r (\bar{\lambda}(t-s) - \bar{\lambda}(r-s))^4 \tilde{\Upsilon}(s) ds + 3 \left(\int_0^r (\bar{\lambda}(t-s) - \bar{\lambda}(r-s))^2 \tilde{\Upsilon}(s) ds \right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{8}{N} \varphi(t-r)^4 \int_0^r \tilde{\Upsilon}(s) ds + \frac{8(\lambda^*)^4}{N} \int_0^r \left(\sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t-s) - F_j(r-s)) \right)^4 \tilde{\Upsilon}(s) ds \\ &\quad + 24\varphi(t-r)^4 \left(\int_0^r \tilde{\Upsilon}(s) ds \right)^2 + 24(\lambda^*)^4 \left(\int_0^r \left(\sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t-s) - F_j(r-s)) \right)^2 \tilde{\Upsilon}(s) ds \right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{8\lambda^* T}{N} \varphi(t-r)^4 + 24(\lambda^* T)^2 \varphi(t-r)^4 + \frac{8k^3(\lambda^*)^5}{N} \sum_{j=1}^k \int_0^r (F_j(t-s) - F_j(r-s)) ds \\ &\quad + 24k^2(\lambda^*)^6 \sum_{j=1}^k \left(\int_0^r (F_j(t-s) - F_j(r-s)) ds \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally the third term on the right hand side of (3.35) is bounded by

$$12(\lambda^*)^4 (t-r) \left(\varphi(t-r)^2 T + (k\lambda^*)^2 \sum_{j=1}^k \int_0^r (F_j(t-s) - F_j(r-s)) ds \right).$$

Combining the above three bounds, we conclude as in the proof of Lemma 3.5. \square

We also need the following technical lemma (which is a direct consequence of the inequality (4.21) in [18]).

Lemma 3.7. *Let $\{X^N\}_{N \geq 1}$ be a sequence of random elements in \mathbf{D} . If for all $\epsilon > 0$, the two conditions*

- (i) $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \mathbb{P}(|X^N(t)| > \epsilon) \rightarrow 0$, as $N \rightarrow \infty$, and
(ii) $\limsup_N \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \frac{1}{\delta} \mathbb{P}(\sup_{0 \leq u \leq \delta} |X^N(t+u) - X^N(t)| > \epsilon) \rightarrow 0$, as $\delta \rightarrow 0$
are satisfied, then $X^N(t) \rightarrow 0$ in probability uniformly in t .

Lemma 3.8. *Under Assumptions 2.1, 2.2(ii) and 2.3,*

$$\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1^N - \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_1^N \Rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbf{D} \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.36)$$

Proof. We first have $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1^N(t) - \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_1^N(t)] = 0$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1^N(t) - \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_1^N(t))^2] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t [\lambda - \bar{\lambda}](t-s)^2 |\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) - \tilde{\Upsilon}(s)| ds\right] \\ &\leq (2\lambda^*)^2 \mathbb{E}[|\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) - \tilde{\Upsilon}(s)|] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Here the convergence follows from

$$\mathbb{E}[|\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) - \tilde{\Upsilon}(s)|] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.37)$$

which holds by (3.3) and the dominated convergence theorem. It then suffices to show the tightness of $\{\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1^N - \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_1^N : N \in \mathbb{N}\}$. We have

$$\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1^N(t) - \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_1^N(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^t \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} [\lambda - \bar{\lambda}](t-s) \text{sign}(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) - \tilde{\Upsilon}(s)) \tilde{Q}(ds, du, d\lambda).$$

(Note that the equality also holds with \tilde{Q} replaced by \check{Q} .) It then suffices to show the tightness of the processes $\{\Xi^N : N \in \mathbb{N}\}$ defined by

$$\Xi^N(t) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^t \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} [\lambda - \bar{\lambda}](t-s) \check{Q}(ds, du, d\lambda).$$

By Lemma 3.7, it suffices to show that

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\delta} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{v \in [0, \delta]} |\Xi^N(t+v) - \Xi^N(t)| > \epsilon\right) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.38)$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} &|\Xi^N(t+v) - \Xi^N(t)| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_t^{t+v} \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} [\lambda - \bar{\lambda}](t+v-s) \check{Q}(ds, du, d\lambda) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^t \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} |[\lambda - \bar{\lambda}](t+v-s) - [\lambda - \bar{\lambda}](t-s)| \check{Q}(ds, du, d\lambda) \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda^*}{\sqrt{N}} \int_t^{t+v} \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} Q(ds, du) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^t \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} \int_{\mathbf{D}} \left(2\varphi(v) + \lambda^* \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{1}_{t-s < \xi_j \leq t+v-s} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \lambda^* \sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t+v-s) - F_j(t-s))\right) \check{Q}(ds, du, d\lambda), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Lemma 3.4. It is clear that the above upper bound is increasing in v . Thus, we obtain that for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{v \in [0, \delta]} |\Xi^N(t+v) - \Xi^N(t)| > \epsilon \right) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\lambda^*}{\sqrt{N}} \int_t^{t+v} \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} Q(ds, du) > \epsilon/4 \right) \\
& \quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{2\varphi(\delta)}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^t \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} Q(ds, du) > \epsilon/4 \right) \\
& \quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^t \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} \int_{\mathbf{D}} \left(\lambda^* \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{1}_{t-s < \xi_j \leq t+v-s} \right) \check{Q}(ds, du, d\lambda) > \epsilon/4 \right) \\
& \quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^t \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} \left(\lambda^* \sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t+\delta-s) - F_j(t-s)) \right) Q(ds, du) > \epsilon/4 \right). \quad (3.39)
\end{aligned}$$

The first term is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{16}{\epsilon^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\lambda^*}{\sqrt{N}} \int_t^{t+v} \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} Q(ds, du) \right)^2 \right] \\
& \leq \frac{32(\lambda^*)^2}{\epsilon^2} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \int_t^{t+\delta} |\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) - \tilde{\Upsilon}(s)| ds + \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_t^{t+\delta} |\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)| ds \right)^2 \right] \right\} \\
& \leq \frac{32(\lambda^*)^2}{\epsilon^2} \left\{ \delta \sup_{s \leq T} \mathbb{E} |\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) - \tilde{\Upsilon}(s)| + \delta^2 \sup_{s \leq T} \mathbb{E} (|\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)|^2) \right\}, \quad (3.40)
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the decomposition $Q(ds, du) = \bar{Q}(ds, du) + dsdu$. We note that the first term on the right of (3.40) tends to 0 as $N \rightarrow \infty$, while the \limsup_N of the second term multiplied by δ^{-1} tends to 0, as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, which is exactly what we want.

The second term is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{16}{\epsilon^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{N}} \varphi(\delta) \int_0^t \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} Q(ds, du) \right)^2 \right] \\
& \leq \frac{32}{\epsilon^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{N}} \varphi(\delta) \int_0^t \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} \bar{Q}(ds, du) \right)^2 \right] + \frac{32}{\epsilon^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(2\varphi(\delta) \int_0^t |\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)| ds \right)^2 \right] \\
& \leq \frac{32}{\epsilon^2} (2\varphi(\delta))^2 \int_0^t \mathbb{E} |\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) - \tilde{\Upsilon}(s)| ds + \frac{32}{\epsilon^2} (2\varphi(\delta))^2 T \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E} [|\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)|^2].
\end{aligned}$$

By (3.37), the first term converges to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$, while, thanks to our assumption (2.8), the \limsup_N of the second term multiplied by δ^{-1} tends to 0, as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, which again is exactly what we want.

The third term on the right hand side of (3.39) is bounded by

$$\frac{16}{\epsilon^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^t \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} \int_{\mathbf{D}} \left(\lambda^* \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{1}_{t-s < \xi_j \leq t+v-s} \right) \check{Q}(ds, du, d\lambda) \right)^2 \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \frac{32}{\epsilon^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^t \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} \int_{\mathbf{D}} \left(\lambda^* \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{1}_{t-s < \xi_j \leq t+v-s} \right) \tilde{Q}(ds, du, d\lambda) \right)^2 \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{32}{\epsilon^2} (\lambda^*)^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^t \left(\sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t+\delta-s) - F_j(t-s)) \right) |\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)| ds \right)^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Here the first term is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{32}{\epsilon^2} \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\lambda^* \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbf{1}_{t-s < \xi_j \leq t+v-s} \right)^2 |\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) - \tilde{\Upsilon}(s)| \right] ds \\ &\leq \frac{32}{\epsilon^2} (\lambda^*)^2 k \int_0^t \left(\sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t+\delta-s) - F_j(t-s)) \right) \mathbb{E}[|\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) - \tilde{\Upsilon}(s)|] ds, \end{aligned}$$

which converges to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$ by (3.37). The second term satisfies

$$\frac{1}{\delta} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^t \left(\sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t+\delta-s) - F_j(t-s)) \right) |\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)| ds \right)^2 \right] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0, \quad (3.41)$$

which follows from Lemma (3.10) and a similar argument as in the proof of (5.13) in [18] under the conditions on F_j in Assumption 2.2 (ii).

The fourth and last term on the right hand side of (3.39) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{16}{\epsilon^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^t \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} \left(\lambda^* \sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t+\delta-s) - F_j(t-s)) \right) Q(ds, du) \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{32}{\epsilon^2} (\lambda^*)^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^t \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} \left(\sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t+\delta-s) - F_j(t-s)) \right) \bar{Q}(ds, du) \right)^2 \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{32}{\epsilon^2} (\lambda^*)^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^t \left(\sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t+\delta-s) - F_j(t-s)) \right) |\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)| ds \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{32}{\epsilon^2} (\lambda^*)^2 \int_0^t \left(\sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t+\delta-s) - F_j(t-s)) \right)^2 \mathbb{E}[|\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) - \tilde{\Upsilon}(s)|] ds \\ &\quad + \frac{32}{\epsilon^2} (\lambda^*)^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^t \left(\sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t+\delta-s) - F_j(t-s)) \right) |\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)| ds \right)^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Here the first term converges to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$ by (3.37). The second term also satisfies (3.41).

It is then clear that (3.38) holds for Ξ^N . This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 3.9. *Under Assumptions 2.1, 2.2(ii) and 2.3,*

$$\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2^N - \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_2^N \Rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbf{D} \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.42)$$

Proof. It is clear that

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2^N(t) - \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_2^N(t)] = 0,$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2^N(t) - \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_2^N(t))^2] = \int_0^t \bar{\lambda}(t-s)^2 \mathbb{E}[|\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) - \tilde{\Upsilon}(s)|] ds \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty,$$

where the convergence follows from the bounded convergence theorem and (3.37). It then suffices to show tightness of the sequence $\{\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2^N - \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_2^N : N \in \mathbb{N}\}$. We write

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{J}}_2^N(t) - \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_2^N(t) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^t \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} \bar{\lambda}(t-s) \text{sign}(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) - \tilde{\Upsilon}(s)) Q(ds, du) \\ &\quad - \sqrt{N} \int_0^t \bar{\lambda}(t-s) (\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) - \tilde{\Upsilon}(s)) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the tightness of the processes $\{\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2^N - \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_2^N : N \in \mathbb{N}\}$ can be deduced from the tightness of the following two processes

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_1^N(t) &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^t \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} \bar{\lambda}(t-s) Q(ds, du), \\ \Xi_2^N(t) &:= \int_0^t \bar{\lambda}(t-s) |\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)| ds. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.7, it suffices to show that for each $\ell = 1, 2$

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\delta} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{v \in [0, \delta]} |\Xi_\ell^N(t+v) - \Xi_\ell^N(t)| > \epsilon \right) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.43)$$

For the process $\Xi_1^N(t)$, we can write

$$\Xi_1^N(t) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^t \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} \bar{\lambda}(t-s) Q(ds, du),$$

and thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|\Xi_1^N(t+v) - \Xi_1^N(t)| \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda^*}{\sqrt{N}} \int_t^{t+v} \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} Q(ds, du) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^t \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} |\bar{\lambda}(t+v-s) - \bar{\lambda}(t-s)| Q(ds, du). \end{aligned}$$

We already know how to treat the first term, see (3.40). By Lemma 3.4, the second term on the right hand side is bounded by

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^t \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} \left(\varphi(v) + \lambda^* \sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t+v-s) - F_j(t-s)) \right) Q(ds, du),$$

which is nondecreasing in v . Thus, we obtain that for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{v \in [0, \delta]} |\Xi_1^N(t+v) - \Xi_1^N(t)| > \epsilon \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\lambda^*}{\sqrt{N}} \int_t^{t+\delta} \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} Q(ds, du) > \epsilon/3 \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \varphi(\delta) \int_0^t \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} Q(ds, du) > \epsilon/3 \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^t \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} \left(\lambda^* \sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t + \delta - s) - F_j(t - s)) \right) Q(ds, du) > \epsilon/3 \right) \quad (3.44)$$

The first term is bounded as in (3.40). Let us bound the second term.

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{9}{\epsilon^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \varphi(\delta) \int_0^t \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} Q(ds, du) \right)^2 \right] \\ & \leq \frac{18}{\epsilon^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \varphi(\delta) \int_0^t \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} \bar{Q}(ds, du) \right)^2 \right] + \frac{18}{\epsilon^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\varphi(\delta) \int_0^t |\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)| ds \right)^2 \right] \\ & \leq \frac{18}{\epsilon^2} \varphi(\delta)^2 \int_0^t \mathbb{E} |\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) - \tilde{\Upsilon}(s)| ds + \frac{18}{\epsilon^2} \varphi(\delta)^2 T \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E} [|\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)|^2]. \end{aligned}$$

This upper bound satisfies the proper bound (3.43), by the same argument as already used in the proof of the previous lemma.

The third term on the right hand side of (3.44) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{9}{\epsilon^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^t \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} \left(\lambda^* \sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t + \delta - s) - F_j(t - s)) \right) Q(ds, du) \right)^2 \right] \\ & \leq \frac{18}{\epsilon^2} (\lambda^*)^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^t \int_{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \wedge \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))}^{N(\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) \vee \tilde{\Upsilon}(s))} \left(\sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t + \delta - s) - F_j(t - s)) \right) \bar{Q}(ds, du) \right)^2 \right] \\ & \quad + \frac{18}{\epsilon^2} (\lambda^*)^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^t \left(\sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t + \delta - s) - F_j(t - s)) \right) |\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)| ds \right)^2 \right] \\ & \leq \frac{18}{\epsilon^2} (\lambda^*)^2 \int_0^t \left(\sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t + \delta - s) - F_j(t - s)) \right)^2 \mathbb{E} [|\tilde{\Upsilon}^N(s) - \tilde{\Upsilon}(s)|] ds \\ & \quad + \frac{18}{\epsilon^2} (\lambda^*)^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^t \left(\sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t + \delta - s) - F_j(t - s)) \right) |\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)| ds \right)^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Here the first term converges to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$ by (3.37). The second term satisfies

$$\frac{1}{\delta} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^{t+\delta} \left(\sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t + \delta - s) - F_j(t - s)) \right) |\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)| ds \right)^2 \right] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0, \quad (3.45)$$

which follows from a similar argument in the proof of (5.13) in [18] under the conditions on F_j in Assumption 2.2 (ii), and using Lemma 3.10.

Next for the process $\Xi_2^N(t)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Xi_2^N(t+v) - \Xi_2^N(t)| &= \left| \int_0^{t+v} \bar{\lambda}(t+v-s) |\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)| ds - \int_0^t \bar{\lambda}(t-s) |\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)| ds \right| \\ &\leq \int_t^{t+v} \bar{\lambda}(t+v-s) |\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)| ds + \int_0^t |\bar{\lambda}(t+v-s) - \bar{\lambda}(t-s)| |\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)| ds. \end{aligned} \quad (3.46)$$

The first term is bounded from above by

$$\lambda^* \int_t^{t+v} |\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)| ds,$$

which is increasing in v . By Lemma 3.4, the second term on the right hand side can be bounded by

$$\int_0^t \left(\varphi(v) + \lambda^* \sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t+v-s) - F_j(t-s)) \right) |\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)| ds,$$

which is nondecreasing in v . Thus, for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{v \in [0, \delta]} |\Xi_2^N(t+v) - \Xi_2^N(t)| > \epsilon \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\lambda^* \int_t^{t+\delta} |\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)| ds > \epsilon/3 \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(\varphi(\delta) \int_0^t |\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)| ds > \epsilon/3 \right) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\int_0^t \left(\lambda^* \sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t+\delta-s) - F_j(t-s)) \right) |\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)| ds > \epsilon/3 \right) \\ & \leq \frac{9(\lambda^*)^2}{\epsilon^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_t^{t+\delta} |\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)| ds \right)^2 \right] + \frac{9}{\epsilon^2} \varphi(\delta)^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^t |\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)| ds \right)^2 \right] \\ & \quad + \frac{9}{\epsilon^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_0^t \left(\lambda^* \sum_{j=1}^k (F_j(t+\delta-s) - F_j(t-s)) \right) |\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)| ds \right)^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.47)$$

The first and second terms are bounded, respectively, by

$$\frac{9}{\epsilon^2} (\lambda^*)^2 \delta^2 \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E} [|\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)|^2]$$

and

$$\frac{9}{\epsilon^2} \varphi(\delta)^2 T^2 \sup_{s \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E} [|\hat{\Upsilon}^N(s)|^2],$$

while the third term satisfies (3.45). By Lemma 3.10 and our assumption (2.8), it is clear that (3.43) holds for Ξ_2^N . This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Recall the representation of $\hat{\Upsilon}^N(t)$ in (3.6).

Lemma 3.10. *Under Assumptions 2.2 and 2.3,*

$$\sup_N \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E} [|\hat{\Upsilon}^N(t)|^2] < \infty. \quad (3.48)$$

Proof. We use (3.6) and the two integral representations in (3.8) and (3.9). We first obtain the following estimates. It is clear that $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E} [|\hat{M}_A^N(t)|^2] \leq \lambda^* T$ and there exists a constant C such that for all N , $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E} [(\hat{I}^N(0) \bar{\lambda}^0(t))^2] \leq (\lambda^*)^2 C$. Also by the independence of $\{\lambda_i(\cdot)\}$ and by the decomposition of \hat{A}^N using (3.1), and by (3.2), we have

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E} [|\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1^N(t)|^2] = \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t [\lambda - \bar{\lambda}]^2 (t-s) \bar{\Upsilon}^N(s) ds \right] \leq \lambda^* \int_0^T v(s) ds < \infty,$$

and by the PRM representation in (3.30) and by (3.2), we obtain

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E}[|\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2^N(t)|^2] = \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \int_0^t \bar{\lambda}(t-s)^2 \bar{\Upsilon}^N(s) ds \leq 2C'(\lambda^*)^3 T,$$

for some constant $C' > 0$.

By taking the square of the representations of (3.8) and (3.9), and then using Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and the simple bound that $\bar{S}(t) \leq 1$ and $\bar{\mathcal{J}}^N(t) \leq \lambda^*(\bar{I}^N(0) + \bar{A}^N(t)) \leq 2\lambda^*$ by (2.4), we apply Gronwall's inequality and obtain

$$\sup_N \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E}[\hat{S}^N(t)^2] < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_N \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathcal{J}}^N(t)^2] < \infty,$$

and thus the claim in (3.48). \square

To show that the limit process $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2$ has a continuous version in \mathbf{C} , given the consistent finite dimensional distributions of $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2$, it suffices to show that the continuity of the covariance function. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[|\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2(t+\delta) - \hat{\mathcal{J}}_2(t)|^2] \\ &= \int_t^{t+\delta} \bar{\lambda}(t+\delta-s)^2 \bar{\Upsilon}(s) ds + \int_0^t (\bar{\lambda}(t+\delta-s) - \bar{\lambda}(t-s))^2 \bar{\Upsilon}(s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

The continuity property follows immediately under Assumption 2.2 (ii).

We are now ready to complete the proof of Theorem 2.1 for the joint convergence of $(\hat{S}^N, \hat{\mathcal{J}}^N)$.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. We first prove the joint convergence

$$(\hat{I}^N(0), \hat{M}_A^N, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_0^N, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_1^N, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_2^N) \Rightarrow (\hat{I}(0), \hat{M}_A, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_0, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_1, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_2) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R} \times \mathbf{D}^4 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.49)$$

By the independence of the variables associated with the initially and newly infected individuals, it suffices to show the joint convergences

$$(\hat{I}^N(0), \hat{\mathcal{J}}_0^N) \Rightarrow (\hat{I}(0), \hat{\mathcal{J}}_0) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R} \times \mathbf{D} \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty,$$

and

$$(\hat{M}_A^N, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_1^N, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_2^N) \Rightarrow (\hat{M}_A, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_1, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_2) \quad \text{in } \mathbf{D}^3 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.50)$$

The convergence of $(\hat{I}^N(0), \hat{\mathcal{J}}_0^N)$ is straightforward. We focus on the convergence of $(\hat{M}_A^N, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_1^N, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_2^N)$.

Recall the compensated PRM $\tilde{Q}(ds, du, d\lambda)$ on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbf{D}$. Define an auxiliary process

$$\tilde{M}_A^N(t) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^t \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbf{D}} \mathbf{1}_{u \leq N\bar{\Upsilon}(s)} \tilde{Q}(ds, du, d\lambda). \quad (3.51)$$

Recall the process $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_1^N(t)$ defined in (3.20), where \check{Q} can be replaced by \tilde{Q} . Also, recall the process $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_2^N(t)$ in (3.32) using the compensated PRM \tilde{Q} , which can be equivalently (in distribution) written as follows using \tilde{Q} :

$$\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_2^N(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^t \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbf{D}} \bar{\lambda}(t-s) \mathbf{1}_{u \leq N\bar{\Upsilon}(s)} \tilde{Q}(ds, du, d\lambda). \quad (3.52)$$

Then it is easy to show that joint convergence

$$(\tilde{M}_A^N, \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_1^N, \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_2^N) \Rightarrow (\hat{M}_A, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_1, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_2) \quad \text{in } \mathbf{D}^3 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.53)$$

Indeed, the joint finite dimensional distributions can be calculated similarly as in (3.21) and (3.33), and tightness of the joint processes follow directly from tightness of the individual processes (as shown in Lemmas 3.5 and 3.6 for the processes $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_1^N$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_2^N$, respectively). Similarly to the proofs

in Lemma 3.8 and Lemma 3.9, we can prove that $\widetilde{M}_A^N - \widehat{M}_A^N \rightarrow 0$ in probability in \mathbf{D} , as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Hence

$$(\widetilde{M}_A^N - \widehat{M}_A^N, \widetilde{\mathcal{J}}_1^N - \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_1, \widetilde{\mathcal{J}}_2^N - \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_2) \rightarrow 0$$

in probability in \mathbf{D}^3 , as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Combined with (3.53), this establishes (3.50).

Observe that the equations (3.8) and (3.9) coupled with (3.6) define uniquely the processes $(\widehat{S}^N, \widehat{\mathcal{J}}^N)$ as the solution of a two-dimensional integral equation driven by $(\widehat{I}^N(0), \widehat{M}_A^N, \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_0^N, \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_1^N, \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_2^N)$ and the fixed functions $\bar{\lambda}^0(t)$, $\bar{\lambda}(t)$, $\bar{S}(t)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{J}}(t)$. The mapping which to those data associates the solution is continuous in the Skorohod J_1 topology, see Lemma 8.1 in [18]. Thus, by the joint convergence in (3.49), we apply the continuous mapping theorem to conclude (2.17). \square

3.2. Convergence of $(\widehat{E}^N, \widehat{I}^N, \widehat{R}^N)$. We have the following representations for the processes $(\widehat{E}^N, \widehat{I}^N, \widehat{R}^N)$:

$$\widehat{E}^N(t) = \widehat{E}^N(0)G_0^c(t) + \widehat{E}_0^N(t) + \widehat{E}_1^N(t) + \int_0^t G^c(t-s)\widehat{Y}^N(s)ds, \quad (3.54)$$

$$\widehat{I}^N(t) = \widehat{I}^N(0)F_{0,I}^c(t) + \widehat{E}^N(0)\Psi_0(t) + \widehat{I}_{0,1}^N(t) + \widehat{I}_{0,2}^N(t) + \widehat{I}_1^N(t) + \int_0^t \Psi(t-s)\widehat{Y}^N(s)ds, \quad (3.55)$$

$$\widehat{R}^N(t) = \widehat{I}^N(0)F_{0,I}(t) + \widehat{E}^N(0)\Phi_0(t) + \widehat{R}_{0,1}^N(t) + \widehat{R}_{0,2}^N(t) + \widehat{R}_1^N(t) + \int_0^t \Phi(t-s)\widehat{Y}^N(s)ds, \quad (3.56)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{E}_0^N(t) &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=1}^{E^N(0)} (\mathbf{1}_{\zeta_j^0 > t} - G_0^c(t)), \\ \widehat{I}_{0,1}^N(t) &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k=1}^{I^N(0)} (\mathbf{1}_{\eta_k^{0,I} > t} - F_{0,I}^c(t)), & \widehat{I}_{0,2}^N(t) &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=1}^{E^N(0)} (\mathbf{1}_{\zeta_j^0 + \eta_j^0 > t} - \Psi_0(t)), \\ \widehat{R}_{0,1}^N(t) &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k=1}^{I^N(0)} (\mathbf{1}_{\eta_k^{0,I} \leq t} - F_{0,I}(t)), & \widehat{R}_{0,2}^N(t) &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=1}^{E^N(0)} (\mathbf{1}_{\zeta_j^0 + \eta_j^0 \leq t} - \Phi_0(t)), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{E}_1^N(t) &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^{A^N(t)} (\mathbf{1}_{\tau_i^N + \zeta_i > t} - G^c(t - \tau_i^N)), \\ \widehat{I}_1^N(t) &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^{A^N(t)} (\mathbf{1}_{\tau_i^N + \zeta_i \leq t} \mathbf{1}_{\tau_i^N + \zeta_i + \eta_i > t} - \Psi(t - \tau_i^N)), \\ \widehat{R}_1^N(t) &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^{A^N(t)} (\mathbf{1}_{\tau_i^N + \zeta_i + \eta_i \leq t} - \Phi(t - \tau_i^N)). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.11. *Under Under Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3,*

$$(\widehat{E}_0^N, \widehat{I}_{0,1}^N, \widehat{I}_{0,2}^N, \widehat{R}_{0,1}^N, \widehat{R}_{0,2}^N) \Rightarrow (\widehat{E}_0, \widehat{I}_{0,1}, \widehat{I}_{0,2}, \widehat{R}_{0,1}, \widehat{R}_{0,2}) \quad \text{in } \mathbf{D}^2 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty,$$

jointly with the convergence $(\widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N, \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}^N) \Rightarrow (\widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}, \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2})$ in (3.12), where $(\widehat{E}_0, \widehat{I}_{0,1}, \widehat{I}_{0,2}, \widehat{R}_{0,1}, \widehat{R}_{0,2})$ is as given in Theorem 2.2.

Proof. By the independence of the sequences $\{\lambda_j^0\}_{j \geq 1}$ and $\{\lambda_k^{0,I}\}_{k \geq 1}$, it suffices to prove the joint convergence of $(\widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N, \widehat{I}_{0,1}^N, \widehat{R}_{0,1}^N)$ and $(\widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}^N, \widehat{E}_0^N, \widehat{I}_{0,2}^N, \widehat{R}_{0,2}^N)$ separately.

Recall the processes $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}^N$ defined in (3.13) and (3.14), respectively. Similarly for define $(\tilde{E}_0^N, \tilde{I}_{0,1}^N, \tilde{I}_{0,2}^N, \tilde{R}_{0,1}^N, \tilde{R}_{0,2}^N)$ by replacing $E^N(0)$ and $I^N(0)$ by $N\bar{E}(0)$ and $N\bar{I}(0)$, respectively. By the FCLT for random elements in \mathbf{D} (see Theorem 2 in [12], applied to the processes $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}^N$ under Assumption 2.2(i) (a) and (b)) and the FCLT for empirical processes (see Theorem 14.3 in [4], applied to the processes $(\tilde{E}_0^N, \tilde{I}_{0,1}^N, \tilde{I}_{0,2}^N, \tilde{R}_{0,1}^N, \tilde{R}_{0,2}^N)$), and by the definitions in (2.2) and (2.3), we obtain the joint convergences

$$(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N, \tilde{I}_{0,1}^N, \tilde{R}_{0,1}^N) \Rightarrow (\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}, \hat{I}_{0,1}, \hat{R}_{0,1}) \quad \text{in } \mathbf{D}^3 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty,$$

and

$$(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}^N, \tilde{E}_0^N, \tilde{I}_{0,2}^N, \tilde{R}_{0,2}^N) \Rightarrow (\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}, \hat{E}_0, \hat{I}_{0,2}, \hat{R}_{0,2}) \quad \text{in } \mathbf{D}^4 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

It then suffices to show that

$$(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N - \hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N, \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}^N - \hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}^N, \tilde{I}_{0,1}^N - \hat{I}_{0,1}^N, \tilde{R}_{0,1}^N - \hat{R}_{0,1}^N, \tilde{E}_0^N - \hat{E}_0^N, \tilde{I}_{0,2}^N - \hat{I}_{0,2}^N, \tilde{R}_{0,2}^N - \hat{R}_{0,2}^N) \Rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbf{D}^7$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$. The convergence for $(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N - \hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N, \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}^N - \hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}^N) \Rightarrow 0$ in \mathbf{D}^2 is shown in (3.16). For the other process, the convergence follows from the same argument as in the proofs of Lemmas 5.1 and 7.1 in [18]. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 3.12. *Under Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3,*

$$(\hat{E}_1^N, \hat{I}_1^N, \hat{R}_1^N) \Rightarrow (\hat{E}_1, \hat{I}_1, \hat{R}_1) \quad \text{in } \mathbf{D}^3 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty,$$

jointly with the convergence of $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1^N \Rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{J}}_1$ in (3.19) and $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_2^N \Rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{J}}_2$ in (3.31), where $(\hat{E}_1, \hat{I}_1, \hat{R}_1)$ is as given in Theorem 2.2.

Proof. The convergence of $(\hat{E}_1^N, \hat{I}_1^N, \hat{R}_1^N)$ follows from the same argument as in the proofs of Lemmas 7.3 and 7.4 in [18]. We have shown the joint convergence of $(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1^N, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_2^N)$ in (3.50) using the processes $(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_1^N, \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_2^N)$ which are defined via the PRM $\check{Q}_j(ds, du, d\xi)$. We define $(\tilde{E}_1^N, \tilde{I}_1^N, \tilde{R}_1^N)$ by replacing $A^N(t)$ by $\check{A}^N(t)$ which is also defined using the PRM $\check{Q}_j(ds, du, d\xi)$ (see (3.51)). It is not too hard to establish the joint convergence $(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_1^N, \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_2^N, \tilde{E}_1^N, \tilde{I}_1^N, \tilde{R}_1^N) \Rightarrow (\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_2, \hat{E}_1, \hat{I}_1, \hat{R}_1)$ in \mathbf{D}^5 as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Then similar to Lemma 3.9, and Lemmas 7.3 and 7.4 in [18], we obtain the joint convergence $(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1^N, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_2^N, \hat{E}_1^N, \hat{I}_1^N, \hat{R}_1^N) \Rightarrow (\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_2, \hat{E}_1, \hat{I}_1, \hat{R}_1)$ in \mathbf{D}^5 as $N \rightarrow \infty$. \square

The representations of $E^N(t)$, $I^N(t)$ and $R^N(t)$ in (3.54), (3.55) and (3.56), give a natural integral mapping from $(\hat{E}^N(0), \hat{R}^N(0))$, $(\hat{E}_0^N, \hat{I}_{0,1}^N, \hat{I}_{0,2}^N, \hat{R}_{0,1}^N, \hat{R}_{0,2}^N)$, $(\hat{E}_1^N, \hat{I}_1^N, \hat{R}_1^N)$, $(\hat{S}^N, \hat{\mathcal{J}}^N)$ and the fixed functions $G_0(t)$, $F_{0,I}(t)$, $\Psi_0(t)$, $\bar{\lambda}^0(t)$, $\bar{\lambda}^{0,I}(t)$, $\bar{\lambda}(t)$, $\bar{S}(t)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{J}}(t)$ to the processes $(\hat{E}^N, \hat{I}^N, \hat{R}^N)$. The mapping is continuous in the Skorohod J_1 topology (by a slight modification of Lemma 8.1 in [18]). We can then apply the continuous mapping theorem to conclude the convergence $(\hat{E}^N, \hat{I}^N, \hat{R}^N) \Rightarrow (\hat{E}, \hat{I}, \hat{R})$ in \mathbf{D}^3 . Given their joint convergence with $(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,1}^N, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_{0,2}^N)$ in Lemma 3.11 and $(\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1^N, \hat{\mathcal{J}}_2^N)$ in Lemma 3.12, we can also conclude the joint convergence of the processes $(\hat{E}^N, \hat{I}^N, \hat{R}^N)$ with $(\hat{S}^N, \hat{\mathcal{J}}^N)$. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.2.

4. APPENDIX

The aim of this Appendix is to establish the following slightly reinforced version of Theorem 13.5 from [4].

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\{X^N, N \geq 1\}$ be a sequence of elements of \mathbf{D} . Assume that there exists a continuous and non-decreasing function G and $\alpha > 1/2$ such that for any $r < s < t$, $N \geq 1$,*

$$\mathbb{E} [|X_s^N - X_r^N|^2 \times |X_t^N - X_s^N|^2] \leq (\psi(N) + (G(t) - G(r))^{2\alpha}),$$

where $\psi(N) \rightarrow 0$, as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Then the sequence $\{X^N, N \geq 1\}$ is tight.

Theorem 4.1 is used in the proof of Lemma 3.2 with

$$\psi(N) = \sup_{0 \leq t' \leq t'' \leq t'+1} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} [|\bar{E}^N(0) - \bar{E}(0)|] (\psi(t'') - \psi(t'))^\beta + 3\mathbb{E} [|\bar{E}^N(0) - \bar{E}(0)|^2] (\phi(t'') - \phi(t'))^{2\alpha} \right\}$$

and $G \equiv 0$, and in the proof of Lemma 3.5 with $\psi(N) = C'_1/N$, $G(t) = (C'_2)^{\frac{1}{1+\delta}}t$, and $2\alpha = 1 + \delta$.

Proof. We follow the proof on page 143 of [4], with $\beta = 1/2$ and $F(t) = 2^{1/2\alpha}G(t)$. We first note that we deduce from our assumption that whenever $\psi(N) \leq (G(t) - G(r))^{2\alpha}$,

$$\mathbb{E} [|X_s^N - X_r^N|^2 \times |X_t^N - X_s^N|^2] \leq 2(G(t) - G(r))^{2\alpha} = [F(t) - F(r)]^{2\alpha}.$$

We define $w''(X^N, \delta)$ as in [4] (see in particular the formula (12.27)), where however the interval $[0, 1]$ is replaced by $[0, T]$, with $T > 0$ arbitrary. It then follows from the arguments on page 143 of [4] that there exists $C' > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(w''(X^N, \delta) \geq \varepsilon) \leq \frac{C'}{\varepsilon^4} w_F(2\delta)^{2\alpha-1},$$

provided $\psi(N) \leq w_G(2\delta)^{2\alpha}$, where w_F (resp. w_G) is the modulus of continuity of F (resp. G). Given $\eta > 0$ an arbitrary small number, let $\delta_{\varepsilon, \eta}$ be such that $\frac{C'}{\varepsilon^4} w_F(2\delta_{\varepsilon, \eta})^{2\alpha-1} \leq \eta$ and N_0 such that $\psi(N) \leq w_G(2\delta_{\varepsilon, \eta})^{2\alpha}$, for all $N \geq N_0$. We have proved that for any $\varepsilon, \eta > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ and N_0 such that for any $N \geq N_0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(w''(X^N, \delta) \geq \varepsilon) \leq \eta,$$

which from Theorem 13.3 in [4] implies the wished tightness. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Frank Ball. A unified approach to the distribution of total size and total area under the trajectory of infectives in epidemic models. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 18(2):289–310, 1986.
- [2] Frank Ball and Damian Clancy. The final size and severity of a generalised stochastic multitype epidemic model. *Advances in applied probability*, 25(4):721–736, 1993.
- [3] Andrew D Barbour. The duration of the closed stochastic epidemic. *Biometrika*, 62(2):477–482, 1975.
- [4] Patrick Billingsley. *Convergence of probability measures*. John Wiley & Sons, 1999.
- [5] Fred Brauer. Age-of-infection and the final size relation. *Mathematical Biosciences & Engineering*, 5(4):681, 2008.
- [6] Fred Brauer, Carlos Castillo-Chavez, and Zhilan Feng. *Mathematical Models in Epidemiology*. Springer, 2019.
- [7] Tom Britton and Etienne Pardoux eds. *Stochastic epidemic models with inference*. Springer, 2019.
- [8] Erhan Çinlar. *Probability and Stochastics*, volume 261. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.
- [9] Zoltan Fodor, Sandor D. Katz, and Tamas G. Kovacs. Why integral equations should be used instead of differential equations to describe the dynamics of epidemics. *arXiv:2004.07208*, April 2020.
- [10] Raphaël Forien, Guodong Pang, and Étienne Pardoux. Epidemic models with varying infectivity. *arXiv:2006.15377*, 2020.
- [11] Raphaël Forien, Guodong Pang, and Étienne Pardoux. Estimating the state of the Covid-19 epidemic in France using a non-Markovian model. *medRxiv*, 2020.
- [12] Marjorie G Hahn. Central limit theorems in $D[0, 1]$. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete*, 44(2):89–101, 1978.
- [13] Xi He, Eric HY Lau, Peng Wu, Xilong Deng, Jian Wang, Xinxin Hao, Yiu Chung Lau, Jessica Y Wong, Yujuan Guan, Xinghua Tan, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. *Nature medicine*, 26(5):672–675, 2020.
- [14] Frank Hoppensteadt. An age dependent epidemic model. *Journal of the Franklin Institute*, 297(5):325–333, 1974.
- [15] Hisashi Inaba and Hisashi Sekine. A mathematical model for chagas disease with infection-age-dependent infectivity. *Mathematical biosciences*, 190(1):39–69, 2004.
- [16] William Ogilvy Kermack and Anderson G McKendrick. A contribution to the mathematical theory of epidemics. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Containing papers of a mathematical and physical character*, 115(772):700–721, 1927.
- [17] Pierre Magal and Connell McCluskey. Two-group infection age model including an application to nosocomial infection. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 73(2):1058–1095, 2013.

- [18] Guodong Pang and Étienne Pardoux. Functional limit theorems for non-Markovian epidemic models. *arXiv:2003.03249*, 2020.
- [19] Guodong Pang and Étienne Pardoux. Multi-patch epidemic models with general infectious periods. *arXiv:2006.14412*, 2020.
- [20] Gesine Reinert. The asymptotic evolution of the general stochastic epidemic. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 5(4):1061–1086, 1995.
- [21] Thomas Sellke. On the asymptotic distribution of the size of a stochastic epidemic. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 20(2):390–394, 1983.
- [22] Horst R Thieme and Carlos Castillo-Chavez. How may infection-age-dependent infectivity affect the dynamics of HIV/AIDS? *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 53(5):1447–1479, 1993.
- [23] Ward Whitt. Proofs of the martingale FCLT. *Probability Surveys*, 4:268–302, 2007.

THE HAROLD AND INGE MARCUS DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL AND MANUFACTURING ENGINEERING, COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING, PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY, UNIVERSITY PARK, PA 16802 USA

E-mail address: `gup3@psu.edu`

AIX-MARSEILLE UNIVERSITÉ, CNRS, CENTRALE MARSEILLE, I2M, UMR 7373 13453 MARSEILLE, FRANCE

E-mail address: `etienne.pardoux@univ.amu.fr`