

SMALL DEVIATION ESTIMATES AND SMALL BALL PROBABILITIES FOR GEODESICS IN LAST PASSAGE PERCOLATION

RIDDHIPRATIM BASU AND MANAN BHATIA

ABSTRACT. For the exactly solvable model of exponential last passage percolation on \mathbb{Z}^2 , consider the geodesic Γ_n joining $(0, 0)$ and (n, n) for large n . It is well known that the transversal fluctuation of Γ_n around the line $x = y$ is $n^{2/3+o(1)}$ with high probability. We obtain the exponent governing the decay of the small ball probability for Γ_n and establish that for small δ , the probability that Γ_n is contained in a strip of width $\delta n^{2/3}$ around the diagonal is $\exp(-\Theta(\delta^{-3/2}))$ uniformly in high n . We also obtain optimal small deviation estimates for the one point distribution of the geodesic showing that for $\frac{t}{2n}$ bounded away from 0 and 1, we have $\mathbb{P}(|x(t) - y(t)| \leq \delta n^{2/3}) = \Theta(\delta)$ uniformly in high n , where $(x(t), y(t))$ is the unique point where Γ_n intersects the line $x + y = t$. Our methods are expected to go through for other exactly solvable models of planar last passage percolation and, upon taking the $n \rightarrow \infty$ limit, provide analogous estimates for geodesics in the directed landscape.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction and statement of main results	1
2. Moderate deviation estimates and consequences	7
3. Upper bound for the small ball probability	11
4. Lower bound for the small ball probability	13
5. One point small deviation estimates for the geodesic	25
6. Concluding remarks and possible extensions	35
References	38

1. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF MAIN RESULTS

Small ball probabilities are fundamental objects associated to stochastic processes where one asks the following question: what is the probability that a stochastic process remains within a ball of small radius (in an appropriate norm) of a fixed function? One extensively studied case in the literature is that of the small ball probabilities of $C[0, 1]$ valued Gaussian processes in the sup norm, of which Brownian motion and Brownian bridge are paradigm examples. If $\{B_t\}_{t \in [0, 1]}$ denotes a standard Brownian motion or the standard Brownian Bridge, it is well known [15] that $\log \mathbb{P}(\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} |B(t)| \leq \delta) \sim -\frac{\pi^2}{8} \delta^{-2}$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Our objective in this paper is to investigate the corresponding question for the geodesics in planar last passage percolation models in the Kardar-Parisi-Zhang (KPZ) universality class.

We primarily work with the exactly solvable model of exponential last passage percolation on \mathbb{Z}^2 . Let $\{\omega_v\}_{v \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ be a configuration of independent and identically distributed rate one exponentials associated with the vertices of \mathbb{Z}^2 . For any $u, v \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that u is co-ordinate wise smaller than v , and an up-right path γ from u to v , we define the passage time of the path γ , denoted $\ell(\gamma)$, by

$$\ell(\gamma) := \sum_{w \in \gamma \setminus \{u, v\}} \omega_w;$$

i.e., the passage time of a path is the sum of the weights on it excluding the weight of the initial and final vertices.¹ The last passage time between u and v , denoted $T_{u,v}$, is the maximum of $\ell(\gamma)$ where the maximum is taken over all up-right paths from u to v . The last passage time from $\mathbf{0}$ to \mathbf{n} (we shall denote the vertex (r, r) by \mathbf{r} for $r \in \mathbb{Z}$) will be denoted by T_n . Note that by the continuity of the exponential distribution, almost surely, between any two (ordered) vertices u and v , there exists a unique path attaining the last passage time $T_{u,v}$; this path, denoted $\Gamma_{u,v}$, will be called the geodesic between u and v . The geodesic between $\mathbf{0}$ and \mathbf{n} will be denoted by Γ_n .

Observe that Γ_n defines a stochastic process on $\llbracket 0, 2n \rrbracket$ ($\llbracket a, b \rrbracket$ will denote the discrete interval $[a, b] \cap \mathbb{Z}$) in the following way: For $t \in \llbracket 0, 2n \rrbracket$, define $\Gamma_n(t) := x(t) - y(t)$, where $(x(t), y(t))$ is the unique point where Γ_n intersects the line $\mathbb{L}_t := \{x + y = t\}$; note that the same definition also allows us to define $\Gamma_{u,v}(t)$ for any $u \in \mathbb{L}_0$ and $v \in \mathbb{L}_n$. Clearly, $\Gamma_n(\cdot)$ is an integer valued stochastic process on $\llbracket 0, 2n \rrbracket$ pinned to 0 at either end and having ± 1 increments, i.e., taking the same realizations as a simple random walk bridge on the same interval. The distribution of $\Gamma_n(\cdot)$ however, is very different. Unlike the $n^{1/2}$ fluctuations in the case of the SRW bridge, $\Gamma_n(\cdot)$ has fluctuations of the order $n^{2/3}$ [28, 13], $2/3$ being the characteristic KPZ scaling exponent for correlation length. Hence it is natural to consider the small ball probability that $\sup |\Gamma_n(\cdot)|$, usually referred to as the *transversal fluctuation* of the geodesic, is upper bounded by $\delta n^{2/3}$ for some small positive δ . Our first main theorem identifies the exponent governing the decay of this probability.

Theorem 1. *There exists $\delta_0 > 0$ and positive constants C_1, C_2, c_1, c_2 such that for all $0 < \delta < \delta_0$ and for all $n \geq n_0(\delta)$, we have*

$$C_2 e^{-c_2 \delta^{-3/2}} \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in \llbracket 0, 2n \rrbracket} |\Gamma_n(t)| \leq \delta n^{2/3} \right) \leq C_1 e^{-c_1 \delta^{-3/2}}.$$

Our second main result concerns small deviations of the one point distribution $\Gamma_n(\cdot)$. As mentioned before, it is known that if $\frac{t}{2n}$ is bounded away from 0 and 1, then $\Gamma_n(t)$ has fluctuations of the order $n^{2/3}$ (if t is close to 0 or $2n$, the fluctuation is of the order $t^{2/3}$ or $(2n - t)^{2/3}$ respectively, see [12, Theorem 3]) and the following theorem addresses the small deviation question for such values of t .

Theorem 2. *There exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that for all $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $0 < \delta < \delta_0$, there exist positive constants C_3, c_3 depending on ϵ such that for all $n \geq n_0(\delta, \epsilon)$ and $t \in \llbracket \epsilon n, (2 - \epsilon)n \rrbracket$, we have*

$$c_3 \delta \leq \mathbb{P} \left(|\Gamma_n(t)| \leq \delta n^{2/3} \right) \leq C_3 \delta.$$

Notice that it is not necessary to take $\delta < \delta_0$ in the statements of Theorems 1 and 2; indeed, one can simply adjust the constants so ensure that the estimates hold for all δ . Further, although we have stated the theorems for a fixed δ and $n \rightarrow \infty$, one can also get similar results if $\delta \rightarrow 0$ sufficiently slowly with n . For Theorem 1, it suffices to assume $\delta n^{2/3} \rightarrow \infty$; see Section 6.2 for a more detailed discussion on this point. It will be clear from our proofs that Theorem 2 holds for any $\delta \geq 2n^{-2/3}$ for all n sufficiently large (depending on ϵ). The factor 2 is needed to handle the case of odd t ; for even t , one gets the same statement for $\delta \geq n^{-2/3}$ (indeed, for t odd, $\mathbb{P}(|\Gamma_n(t)| \leq 1) = 0$). Furthermore, for each $L > 0$ and any interval $I \subseteq [-Ln^{2/3}, Ln^{2/3}]$ with $|I| \geq 2$ (the lower bound of 2 is imposed to make sure that the corresponding probability is not 0 as before), we have that

¹Note that we are excluding both the initial and final vertices in the computation of $\ell(\gamma)$ contrary to the more standard definition that includes both the endpoints. This is done for certain technical reasons explained later and our main results remain valid under the standard definition. Indeed, one can note that all paths $\gamma: u \rightarrow v$ share the vertices u and v . Hence, the geodesic is not dependent on whether we include the weights at u and v in the definition of $\ell(\gamma)$. In fact, for our purposes, we shall also briefly need to consider a variant of the definition that excludes only the weight of the last vertex.

for some positive constants c_3, C_3 depending on ϵ and L , $\mathbb{P}(|\Gamma_n(t)| \in I) \in n^{-2/3}|I|[c_3, C_3]$ for n sufficiently large. See Corollary 6.2 for a precise statement.

The $n^{2/3}$ fluctuation suggests the following scaling for Γ_n akin to the scaling taking simple random walk to Brownian motion: we define a $C[0, 1]$ valued stochastic process π_n by setting

$$\pi_n(s) := n^{-2/3}\Gamma_n(2ns)$$

for $s \in [0, 1]$ if $2ns \in \mathbb{Z}$ and extending π_n by linear interpolation to all of $[0, 1]$. One can show using the estimates in [13, 10, 12] that π_n is tight in the topology of uniform convergence (see e.g. [26, Theorem 1.1 (a)] for the corresponding result in Poissonian LPP) and it is expected that there exists a $C[0, 1]$ valued stochastic process π such that $\pi_n \Rightarrow \pi$ weakly in $C[0, 1]$, where the limit π corresponds to a geodesic in the universal space-time scaling limit of the last passage percolation landscape. Such a result has recently been established for the related model of Brownian last passage percolation [16], where the limiting object is called ‘the directed landscape’ and certain geometric properties of the geodesics therein have been established [16, 17]. Even without establishing the existence of weak limit, one can read off certain geometric properties of any possible weak limits of π_n from uniform pre-limiting estimates on Γ_n . In particular, we have the following corollary of Theorems 1 and 2.

Corollary 3. *Let π denote any subsequential weak limit π of π_n in $C[0, 1]$ equipped with the topology of uniform convergence. Then we have:*

- (i) *There exists $\delta_0 > 0$ and positive constants C_1, C_2, c_1, c_2 such that for all $0 < \delta < \delta_0$, we have*

$$C_2 e^{-c_2 \delta^{-3/2}} \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{s \in [0, 1]} |\pi(s)| \leq \delta \right) \leq C_1 e^{-c_1 \delta^{-3/2}}.$$

- (ii) *There exists $\delta_1 > 0$ such that for all $s \in (0, 1)$ and $0 < \delta < \delta_1$ there exists $C_3(s), c_3(s)$ (bounded away from 0 and ∞ as long as s is bounded away from 0 and 1) with*

$$c_3 \delta \leq \mathbb{P}(|\pi(s)| \leq \delta) \leq C_3 \delta.$$

One expects that Corollary 3 also holds when π above is replaced by the geodesic in the directed landscape as constructed in [16] since the proofs of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 are expected to go through for Brownian LPP. To maintain the clarity of exposition, we have not attempted to work out the details in this paper; a detailed discussion of how our methods can be adapted to other integrable models of planar last passage percolation together with a discussion on the directed landscape is provided in Section 6.

1.1. Background and related results. Planar last passage percolation models are believed to belong to the KPZ universality class for a very general class of passage time distributions and are predicted to exhibit the universal scaling exponents $1/3$ and $2/3$ for the passage time and the transversal fluctuation of the geodesic respectively. Starting with the breakthrough work of Baik-Deift-Johansson [3] which established the exponent $1/3$ (and the Tracy-Widom limit) for Poissonian LPP, this area has seen a great flurry of activity which has led to a similar analysis of a number of other exactly solvable models of planar last passage percolation including exponential and geometric LPP [27], and Brownian LPP [6]. Using the connection of exponential LPP with the Totally Asymmetric Simple Exclusion process, the first order behaviour of $T_{m,n}$ was already identified by Rost in [34] who established that for γ bounded away from 0 and ∞ , almost surely,

$$n^{-1}T_{\mathbf{0},(n,\gamma n)} \rightarrow (1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^2.$$

In [27], it was shown that $T_{m,n}$ has the same law as the largest eigenvalue of a certain random matrix ensemble (Laguerre Unitary Ensemble (LUE)) and that for γ bounded away from 0 and ∞ ,

one has that

$$\gamma^{1/6}(1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^{-4/3}n^{-1/3}(T_{\mathbf{0},(n,\gamma n)} - (1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^2n) \quad (1)$$

converges weakly to the GUE Tracy-Widom distribution as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For our purposes, we shall need finite n quantitative results, namely, uniform moderate deviation estimates for $n^{-1/3}(T_{\mathbf{0},(n,\gamma n)} - (1 + \sqrt{\gamma})^2n)$. These are provided in [30] using the tridiagonal form of LUE (a non-optimal estimate is also available in [2]).

Using the understanding of the fluctuation of the passage times, one can study the transversal fluctuations of the geodesic. Under some unproven assumptions, an upper bound on the transversal fluctuation exponent was proved for first passage percolation by Newman and co-authors (see e.g. [33]) and a rigorous lower bound was proved in [37, 38] for the related model of Brownian motion in a Poissonian potential; a general argument proving both conditional upper and lower bounds for FPP later appeared in [14]. Using similar arguments together with the moderate deviation estimates from [3], Johansson [28] first proved the 2/3 exponent for geodesics in Poissonian LPP. In particular, he proved that for every $\epsilon > 0$, the probability that either $\sup_t |\Gamma_n(t)| \geq n^{2/3+\epsilon}$ or $\sup_t |\Gamma_n(t)| \leq n^{2/3-\epsilon}$ goes to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (here $|\Gamma_n(\cdot)|$ is defined similarly as before, but for Poissonian LPP). The same result was proved for Geometric LPP [29] and the same argument would also provide the same result for exponential LPP using the moderate deviation estimates from [30]. The transversal fluctuation exponent of 2/3 for exponential LPP was also established in [5] using a very different approach involving stationary LPP.

One point of note regarding [28] (and other similar results e.g. [14]) is that the argument for the upper bound for the transversal fluctuation can be made quantitative, while the lower bound cannot. That is, one can tighten the argument in [28] and write down an upper bound for $\mathbb{P}(|\Gamma_n(t)| > xn^{2/3})$ for some large but fixed x (indeed, one would even get the optimal result if one uses the optimal moderate deviation estimates from [28], see [10]). However, the lower bound typically involves a union bound over a discretization that is polynomially large in n , and hence the same argument cannot be used to get a bound for $\mathbb{P}(\sup_t |\Gamma_n(t)| < \delta n^{2/3})$ for a small but fixed δ (a quantitative but non optimal upper bound for $\mathbb{P}(\sup_t |\Gamma_n(t)| \leq n^{2/3-\epsilon})$ appeared in [8]). Theorem 1 therefore requires a somewhat different approach.

This paper falls within the general program of understanding the geodesic geometry in integrable models of last passage percolation using one point moderate deviation estimates together with percolation techniques. This program was initiated in [13] and has been followed up in [12, 11, 26, 39, 9]. Consequences of understanding the geodesic geometry have been further explored in [7, 10]. In [13], among other results, quantitative upper tail bounds for the transversal fluctuation of geodesics in Poissonian LPP were proved using moderate deviation estimates and a chaining argument. Although [13] used sub-optimal moderate deviation estimates from [2], the same argument together with the optimal moderate deviation estimates lead to the optimal upper tail bound for large transversal fluctuations:

$$\mathbb{P}(\sup_t |\Gamma_n(t)| > xn^{2/3}) \leq e^{-cx^3}. \quad (2)$$

See [10, Proposition C.9] for the corresponding result (obtained by the same argument) written out in the exponential LPP setting. In the set-up of Poissonian LPP, [26] proved a matching lower bound $\mathbb{P}(\sup_t |\Gamma_n(t)| > xn^{2/3}) \geq e^{-c'x^3}$ establishing that the exponent is indeed optimal. As far as we are aware, this result does not explicitly appear in the literature for exponential LPP, but the arguments are robust and are expected to go through.

There is a separate line of works relevant for the current paper involving the related semi-discrete model of Brownian last passage percolation. Using the one point moderate deviation estimates and a special resampling property (Brownian Gibbs property) exhibited by a line ensemble associated with Brownian LPP, Hammond [22, 23, 25, 24] developed a deep understanding of geodesic geometry in Brownian LPP. Using similar techniques, [16] constructed the scaling limit—the directed landscape,

as mentioned before. A more detailed discussion about the results on the geodesic geometry in the directed landscape requires some definitions and is postponed to Section 6.

1.2. Outline of the proofs and new contributions in this paper. As mentioned before, this paper continues the general program of understanding the geodesic geometry in integrable planar last passage percolation models using the one point moderate deviation estimates. As such, while requiring several new ideas and technical ingredients, we borrow ideas and techniques from the existing literature [13, 12, 11, 7, 10] and also use certain results closely aligned to a few that have already appeared before. We provide a sketch of our arguments proving Theorems 1 and 2 in this subsection and point out the connections as well as the new contributions of our work. We discuss the upper and lower bounds in each case separately below. In both the cases, the upper bound turns out to be significantly easier than the lower bound.

1.2.1. *Theorem 1, upper bound.* The basic idea for the upper bound in Theorem 1 is rather simple: we first obtain upper tail estimates for the weight of best path from $\mathbf{0}$ to \mathbf{n} constrained to be in the $\delta n^{2/3}$ strip and show that for small δ , the probability that it is competitive with T_n has the desired upper bound. Namely, if we let T_n^δ denote the weight of the best path from $\mathbf{0}$ to \mathbf{n} that does not exit the strip $\{|x - y| \leq \delta n^{2/3}\}$, then we have the following proposition:

Proposition 1.1. *There exists $C, c > 0$ such that for all δ sufficiently small and all n sufficiently large (depending on δ), we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(T_n^\delta \geq 4n - \frac{C}{\delta}n^{1/3}\right) \leq e^{-c\delta^{-3/2}}.$$

The idea behind Proposition 1.1 is the following: one can approximate T_n^δ by a sum of $\Theta(\delta^{-3/2})$ many i.i.d. variables, each of which roughly corresponds to the passage time across the two smaller sides of a $\delta^{3/2}n \times \delta n^{2/3}$ rectangle. Owing to the negativity of the mean of the GUE Tracy-Widom distribution, each of these variables have mean $4\delta^{3/2}n - c'\delta^{1/2}n^{1/3}$ and have sub-exponential tails at the scale $\delta^{1/2}n^{1/3}$. Once this is established, the proof of Proposition 1.1 is a simple application of a Bernstein type inequality for i.i.d. sub-exponential variables. With Proposition 1.1 at our disposal, completing the proof of the upper bound in Theorem 1 is easy by using the lower tail estimate for T_n . The argument proving Proposition 1.1 has already been used in the literature several times, sometimes with sub-optimal tails (see e.g. [7, 10, 11], and also [9, Proposition 4.2], where the optimal exponent was obtained in a more general setting), but its consequence for the upper bound of small ball probability had not been noted before as far as we are aware. In the setting of Poissonian LPP, another relevant work is [19], where the mean, fluctuation and central limit behaviour is studied for an off-scale analogue of T_n^δ , where the strip $\{|x - y| \leq \delta n^{2/3}\}$ in the definition of T_n^δ is replaced by the off-scale strip $\{|x - y| \leq n^{2/3-\epsilon}\}$.

The proofs of Proposition 1.1 and the upper bound in Theorem 1 are provided in Section 3.

1.2.2. *Theorem 1, lower bound.* This is the most technical part of our arguments and also the heart of new technical achievements of this paper. Recall that we are trying to show that on an event of probability at least $e^{-c\delta^{-3/2}}$, the geodesic Γ_n does not exit the strip $\{|x - y| \leq \delta n^{2/3}\}$. As we only require to prove this for sufficiently small δ , we shall instead consider the following reparametrization for notational convenience. We shall show that there exists an absolute constant M such that with probability at least $e^{-c\delta^{-3/2}}$, the geodesic does not exit the the strip $\{|x - y| \leq M\delta n^{2/3}\}$.

The main idea is to construct two favourable events. The first one, called **Inside**, shall depend on the inside of the strip $\{|x - y| \leq \delta n^{2/3}\}$ and shall ensure that:

- $T_n^\delta \geq 4n + \frac{C}{\delta}n^{1/3}$.

- The passage time for any points (not necessarily well-separated) inside the strip $\{|x - y| \leq \delta n^{2/3}\}$ is not too much smaller compared to its expectation.

Both these conditions can be shown to hold with probability at least $e^{-c\delta^{-3/2}}$, and as they are both increasing events, the FKG inequality ensures that $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Inside})$ satisfies a desired probability lower bound.

The second event is a barrier event, called **Bar**, which ensures that there is a barrier straddling both of the longer sides of the rectangle $\{0 \leq x + y \leq 2n\} \cap \{|x - y| \leq \delta n^{2/3}\}$ such that any path that spends a lot of time inside this barrier region incurs a penalty. Though the event **Bar**, as defined, will depend on the entire complement of the above-mentioned rectangle, it essentially puts constraints only in a region of width $O(\delta n^{2/3})$ around the rectangle. One can show that the barrier event **Bar** holds with probability at least $e^{-c\delta^{-3/2}}$, and since, by definition, this is independent of **Inside**, the intersection of the two favourable events have the desired probability lower bound of $e^{-c\delta^{-3/2}}$.

The rest of the argument is to show that on these favourable events, one indeed has that Γ_n does not exit the strip $\{|x - y| \leq M\delta n^{2/3}\}$, which is achieved by ruling out both short and long excursions outside this strip. Indeed, if the geodesic has a short excursion (i.e., the starting and ending point of the excursion is separated by $O(\delta^{3/2}n)$ in the time direction) outside the strip $\{|x - y| \leq \delta n^{2/3}\}$ during which it also exits the wider strip $\{|x - y| \leq M\delta n^{2/3}\}$ this segment will then have a very high transversal fluctuation which would make it uncompetitive with the best path between the excursion endpoints restricted to be within the strip $\{|x - y| \leq \delta n^{2/3}\}$. Long excursions are ruled out using the definition of the barrier event and the fact that the best path inside the strip is ensured to be longer than typical.

A superficially similar scheme was adapted in [7, 10] to lower bound correlations between last passage times; however here we are faced with significant new technical challenges. Among other issues, the barrier event has to be suitably defined so that its probability can be appropriately lower bounded as a function of δ , which requires the introduction of a number of new geometric ingredients. This is one of the primary new contributions in this work.

1.2.3. *Theorem 2, upper bound.* This follows quite easily from existing results in the literature, with the idea going back to [11]. In fact, the special case of $t = n$ and $\delta n^{2/3} = 1$ of Theorem 2 was alluded to in [11, Remark 2.11] in connection with the so-called midpoint problem where it was remarked that the probability that Γ_n passes through $\frac{n}{2}$ is $O(n^{-2/3})$. An essentially complete sketch for the upper bound was provided there, and we adapt same argument for our purposes.

Let us fix $t \in \llbracket \epsilon n, (2 - \epsilon)n \rrbracket$ and without loss of generality let us assume t is even. We consider the points $u_i = (i\delta n^{2/3}, -i\delta n^{2/3})$ and $v_i = \mathbf{n} + u_i$ for $i \in \llbracket -\frac{\delta^{-1}}{2}, \frac{\delta^{-1}}{2} \rrbracket$. Let I_0 denote the line segment on \mathbb{L}_t between the points $(\frac{t}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2}n^{2/3}, \frac{t}{2} - \frac{\delta}{2}n^{2/3})$ and $(\frac{t}{2} - \frac{\delta}{2}n^{2/3}, \frac{t}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2}n^{2/3})$ and let $I_i = I_0 + u_i$. Clearly by translation invariance, for each i , $\mathbb{P}(|\Gamma_n(t)| \leq \delta n^{2/3}) = p$ is equal to the probability p_i that Γ_{u_i, v_i} intersects I_i . Now clearly, $\sum_i p_i = \delta^{-1}p$ is upper bounded by the expected number of distinct points at which the geodesics Γ_{u_i, v_i} can intersect the line \mathbb{L}_t . We shall show in Lemma 5.2, following an argument in [11] that the latter number is upper bounded by a constant independent of δ , and this would provide the required upper bound for p . This proof is completed in Section 5.1.

1.2.4. *Theorem 2, lower bound.* The idea here is similar to the upper bound, but requires several different ingredients. Using the same notations as above, we need to show that $\sum p_i$ is bounded below away from 0 independently of δ . It suffices to show that with probability bounded away from 0 independently of δ , there exists an i such that the geodesic Γ_{u_i, v_i} intersects I_i . By planarity, and the ordering of geodesics, it is enough to show the following:

Proposition 1.2. *Let a_1, a_2 denote the points $(-Mn^{2/3}, Mn^{2/3})$ and $(Mn^{2/3}, -Mn^{2/3})$ respectively and let $b_1 = a_1 + \mathbf{n}$ and $b_2 = a_2 + \mathbf{n}$. Given $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $t \in \llbracket \epsilon n, (2 - \epsilon)n \rrbracket$, there exists a constant $c > 0$ and a large positive constant M depending on ϵ such that for all $n > n_0(\epsilon)$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\{ \Gamma_{a_1, b_1}(t) = \Gamma_{a_2, b_2}(t) \right\} \cap \left\{ |\Gamma_{a_1, b_1}(t)| \leq 2Mn^{2/3} \right\} \right) \geq c.$$

The proof of Proposition 1.2 hinges on constructing favourable geometric events which force the geodesics to coalesce. While the general scheme adapted to establish this is broadly similar to the one employed in [12, Proposition 3.1], since we require a common point of the geodesics to be located in a restricted region in both space and time (on the line segment $\mathbb{L}_t \cap \{|x - y| \leq 2Mn^{2/3}\}$), stronger control on the geometry of the geodesics is required and there are new challenges that we need to overcome. We use Proposition 1.2 to complete the proof of the lower bound of Theorem 2 in Section 5.2 and the proof of Proposition 1.2 is provided in Section 5.3.

Organization of the paper. The rest of this paper is organised as follows. In Section 2, we collect the basic inputs we use in this work including the one point moderate deviation estimates and their consequences that have appeared in the literature. In Sections 3 and 4, we complete the proofs of the upper and lower bounds of Theorem 1 respectively. Section 5 contains the proof of Theorem 2. We finish with a discussion of potential extensions in Section 6.

Acknowledgements. RB is partially supported by a Ramanujan Fellowship (SB/S2/RJN-097/2017) from the Science and Engineering Research Board, an ICTS-Simons Junior Faculty Fellowship, DAE project no. 12-R&D-TFR-5.10-1100 via ICTS, and the Infosys Foundation via the Infosys-Chandrasekharan Virtual Centre for Random Geometry of TIFR. MB acknowledges the support from the Long Term Visiting Students Program (LTVSP) at ICTS.

2. MODERATE DEVIATION ESTIMATES AND CONSEQUENCES

In this section, we recall some of the fundamental estimates about exponential LPP and their consequences that have appeared in the literature. These include moderate deviation estimates for the passage times, and estimates on controlling passage times across parallelograms and transversal fluctuations of geodesics. We shall heavily rely on these estimates throughout this paper.

Before starting, we introduce some notation. For a path $\gamma: u \rightarrow v$, where $u \leq v$ (i.e., u is coordinate-wise smaller than v), we use the notation

$$\ell(\gamma) = \sum_{w \in \gamma \setminus \{u, v\}} \omega_w, \quad (3)$$

$$\underline{\ell}(\gamma) = \sum_{w \in \gamma \setminus \{v\}} \omega_w. \quad (4)$$

For a point $(x_1, y_1) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we will often use the change of co-ordinates

$$\phi((x_1, y_1)) = x_1 + y_1, \quad (5)$$

$$\psi((x_1, y_1)) = x_1 - y_1. \quad (6)$$

Keeping in line with the literature, $\phi(\cdot)$ and $\psi(\cdot)$ will be called the time coordinate and the space coordinate of a point respectively. For points $u, v \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ with $u \leq v$, we use $T_{u,v}$ to denote the last passage time from u to v , calculated by using weights given by ℓ , i.e.,

$$T_{u,v} = \max_{\gamma: u \rightarrow v} \ell(\gamma).$$

We shall also have brief occasions to use a variant of the above definition of last passage time defined by replacing ℓ by $\underline{\ell}$ in the above display: this will be denoted by $\underline{T}_{u,v}$. Clearly, $\underline{T}_{u,v} \geq T_{u,v}$; in fact, we have that $\underline{T}_{u,v} = T_{u,v} + \omega_u$, and this implies that $\mathbb{E}\underline{T}_{u,v} = \mathbb{E}T_{u,v} + 1$. We shall use

centered passage times; in general, we use a $\tilde{\cdot}$ symbol over a variable to denote a centered (by its mean) variable— e.g.

$$\tilde{T}_{u,v} = T_{u,v} - \mathbb{E}T_{u,v}. \quad (7)$$

We will use \mathbb{L}_t to denote the line $\{x + y = t\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^2$.

2.1. One point moderate deviation estimates and passage times across parallelograms.

As already mentioned, the correspondence between point to point passage times and the largest eigenvalue of LUE was obtained in [27]. The following sharp moderate deviation estimate for the latter has been obtained in [30].²

Proposition 2.1 ([30, Theorem 2]). *For each $\eta > 1$, there exist $C, c > 0$ depending on η such that for all m, n sufficiently large with $\eta^{-1} < \frac{m}{n} < \eta$ and all $y > 0$, we have the following:*

- (i) $\mathbb{P}(T_{\mathbf{0},(m,n)} - (\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{n})^2 \geq yn^{1/3}) \leq Ce^{-c \min\{y^{3/2}, yn^{1/3}\}}$.
- (ii) $\mathbb{P}(T_{\mathbf{0},(m,n)} - (\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{n})^2 \leq -yn^{1/3}) \leq Ce^{-cy^3}$.

Observe that for m, n as above, Proposition 2.1 implies that

$$|\mathbb{E}T_{\mathbf{0},(m,n)} - (\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{n})^2| \leq Cn^{1/3} \quad (8)$$

for some positive constant C (depending only on η). A similar statement holds for $\mathbb{E}\underline{T}_{\mathbf{0},(m,n)}$ simply because $\mathbb{E}\underline{T}_{\mathbf{0},(m,n)} = \mathbb{E}T_{\mathbf{0},(m,n)} + 1$.

Proposition 2.1 can be used to control passage times across an on-scale parallelogram (i.e., a parallelogram whose dimensions in the time and space directions are n and $n^{2/3}$ respectively). Such estimates were first obtained in [13] in the context of Poissonian LPP, and the details for the exponential LPP was worked out in [10]; we shall quote the latter source. We need to set up some further notation before stating the results.

We use U_δ^n for the rectangle which is defined by

$$U_\delta^n = \left\{ -\delta n^{2/3} \leq \psi(u) \leq \delta n^{2/3} \right\} \cap \{0 \leq \phi(u) \leq 2n\}. \quad (9)$$

In general, we suppress the dependence on n and simply write U_δ for U_δ^n . We will still use the latter notation in case we need to use the notation with some parameter other than n . We shall use notations $U_\delta^{n,L}$ and $U_\delta^{n,R}$ to denote the left and right line segments of U_δ^n respectively.³ That is, we define

$$\begin{aligned} U_\delta^{n,L} &= U_\delta^n \cap \left\{ \psi(u) = -\delta n^{2/3}, \right\} \\ U_\delta^{n,R} &= U_\delta^n \cap \left\{ \psi(u) = \delta n^{2/3}, \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

To reduce clutter, we usually abbreviate these to just U_δ^L and U_δ^R . Similarly, the two short sides of the parallelogram U_δ^n are denoted by \underline{U}_δ^n and \overline{U}_δ^n respectively. That is, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{U}_\delta^n &= U_\delta^n \cap \mathbb{L}_0, \\ \overline{U}_\delta^n &= U_\delta^n \cap \mathbb{L}_{2n}. \end{aligned}$$

These are similarly abbreviated to \underline{U}_δ and \overline{U}_δ respectively.

We will in general be quoting results from [10] for passage times across the parallelograms U_Δ for any fixed $\Delta > 0$. These results are originally written for $\Delta = 1$ but all the proofs straightforwardly

²The correspondence to LUE holds when the last passage time includes the weights of the endpoints. However, for m, n large the contribution of the endpoints is negligible and Proposition 2.1 holds for our definition of $T_{\mathbf{0},(m,n)}$ (and also $\underline{T}_{\mathbf{0},(m,n)}$).

³The standard convention of rotating the picture by 45 degrees counter-clockwise so that time direction moves vertically upwards will often guide our choice of defining “left” and “right”.

generalize for any Δ (see [10, Lemma C.3, Lemma C.15]). Thus, we will directly quote such results for general Δ and not comment further. The following result controlling the tails of the maximum and minimum passage time from \underline{U}_Δ to \bar{U}_Δ for any fixed $\Delta > 0$ will be crucial for us.

Proposition 2.2 ([10, Theorem 4.2]). *For any $\Delta > 0$, there exist constants C_1, C_2, c_1, c_2 depending on Δ such that for all r, n large enough, we have*

- (1) $\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{u \in \underline{U}_\Delta, v \in \bar{U}_\Delta} \tilde{T}_{u,v} \geq rn^{1/3}\right) \leq C_1 e^{-c_1 \min\{r^{3/2}, rn^{1/3}\}}.$
- (2) $\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{u \in \underline{U}_\Delta, v \in \bar{U}_\Delta} \tilde{T}_{u,v} \leq -rn^{1/3}\right) \leq C_2 e^{-c_2 r^3}.$

We would like to point out that there is another slight discrepancy between Proposition 2.2 stated as above and the corresponding statement in [10], and the same is true for the other results below quoted from the same source. Indeed, [10] proves Proposition 2.2 with T above replaced by \underline{T} . As we have pointed out above, the exclusion of one of the endpoints does not change the estimates. For the sake of completeness, we shall explain, just this once, how to get Proposition 2.2 from the corresponding result in [10]. We shall ignore this issue for the subsequent results quoted in this section with the understanding that similar minor adaptations can be made to work in each of the cases.

As mentioned earlier, observe first that for any $u, v \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, $\underline{T}_{u,v} = T_{u,v} + \omega_u$ and hence $\mathbb{E}\underline{T}_{u,v} = \mathbb{E}T_{u,v} + 1$. It therefore follows that $\sup_{u,v} \tilde{T}_{u,v} \leq \sup_{u,v} \underline{\tilde{T}}_{u,v} + 1$ and item (1) of Proposition 2.2 is immediate from the corresponding result for \underline{T} . For item (2), let U_* denote the line segment $\{u : \phi(u) = 1, |\psi(u)| \leq \Delta n^{2/3} + 1\}$. By using (8), one has that $\mathbb{E}\underline{\tilde{T}}_{u,v}, \mathbb{E}T_{u,v} \in (4n - Cn^{1/3}, 4n + Cn^{1/3})$ for large enough n and all $u \in U_* \cup \underline{U}_\Delta, v \in \bar{U}_\Delta$. Clearly, this implies the crude bound

$$\inf_{u \in \underline{U}_\Delta, v \in \bar{U}_\Delta} \tilde{T}_{u,v} \geq \inf_{u \in U_*, v \in \bar{U}_\Delta} \underline{\tilde{T}}_{u,v} - 2Cn^{1/3}$$

and applying [10, Theorem 4.2] to the RHS above immediately gives item (2).

We will also require a version of Proposition 2.2 for passage times of highest weight paths restricted to be in some parallelogram. For any $u \leq v$ and a region $G \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^2$ satisfying $u, v \in G \cup \partial G$, we define the constrained passage time

$$T_{u,v}^G = \sup_{\gamma: u \rightarrow v, \gamma \setminus \{u,v\} \subseteq G} \ell(\gamma). \quad (11)$$

For constrained last passage times, we define the centered version $\tilde{T}_{u,v}^G = T_{u,v}^G - \mathbb{E}T_{u,v}$. Note that this notation is a slight deviation from (7), the centering here is done with the mean of the unrestricted passage time $T_{u,v}$ instead of $T_{u,v}^G$. We similarly define $\underline{T}_{u,v}^G$ and $\underline{\tilde{T}}_{u,v}^G = \underline{T}_{u,v}^G - \mathbb{E}\underline{T}_{u,v}$. Since we will be using the terms $T_{u,v}^{U_\delta^n}$ and $\tilde{T}_{u,v}^{U_\delta^n}$ very often, to reduce notational clutter, we introduce the shorthand notations

$$\begin{aligned} T_{u,v}^\delta &= T_{u,v}^{U_\delta^n}, \\ \tilde{T}_{u,v}^\delta &= \tilde{T}_{u,v}^{U_\delta^n}. \end{aligned}$$

We need the following tail estimates for constrained passage times between well separated points in an $n \times n^{2/3}$ rectangle.

Proposition 2.3 ([10, Theorem 4.2]). *For any $\Delta > 0$, there exist constants C_1, C_2, c_1, c_2 depending on Δ such that for any $L > 0$ and all r, n large enough depending on L , we have*

- (1) $\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{u,v \in U_\Delta, \phi(v) - \phi(u) \geq \frac{n}{L}} \tilde{T}_{u,v}^\Delta \geq rn^{1/3}\right) \leq C_1 e^{-c_1 \min\{r^{3/2}, rn^{1/3}\}}.$
- (2) $\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{u,v \in U_\Delta, \phi(v) - \phi(u) \geq \frac{n}{L}} \tilde{T}_{u,v}^\Delta \leq -rn^{1/3}\right) \leq C_2 e^{-c_2 r}.$

In Proposition 2.2, we allowed the two points u, v to vary on the shorter sides of the parallelogram U_Δ . We now state an analogous result from [10] where the points u, v vary on the long sides of U_Δ (i.e., U_Δ^L or U_Δ^R), and are thus allowed to be arbitrarily close to each other in the time direction.

Proposition 2.4 ([10, Lemma C.16]). *For any $\Delta > 0$, there exist constants C, c depending on Δ such that for all r, n large enough, we have*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\inf_{u, v \in U_\Delta^L, \phi(u) \leq \phi(v)} \tilde{T}_{u, v}^\Delta \leq -rn^{1/3} \right) \leq Ce^{-cr}.$$

The same holds if U_Δ^L is replaced by U_Δ^R .

2.2. Transversal fluctuation estimates. For both the small ball and the one point estimates, we will require strong estimates on the upper tail of the transversal fluctuation of the point-to-point geodesic. The following result from [10] states that paths from $\mathbf{0}$ to \mathbf{n} with a transversal fluctuation larger than $Mn^{2/3}$ incur a loss of order $M^2n^{1/3}$ in weight with large probability.

Proposition 2.5 ([10, Proposition 4.7]). *There exist constants $\xi, c_1 > 0$ such that for all M sufficiently large, and all n sufficiently large, the event (denoted by \mathcal{G}) that there exists a path γ from $\mathbf{0}$ to \mathbf{n} satisfying $\gamma \not\subseteq U_M$ and $\ell(\gamma) \geq 4n - \xi M^2n^{1/3}$ satisfies*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{G}) \leq e^{-c_1 M^3}.$$

2.3. Lower Bounds. To obtain the lower bounds in Theorems 1 and Theorem 2, one needs to show that the probability of certain unlikely events are nonetheless uniformly bounded away from 0. We need two results: one for the upper tail and one for the lower tail. The first result, which is a strengthening of [10, Lemma 4.9], shows that with probability bounded away from 0, last passage times (and constrained last passage times) can be arbitrarily larger than typical at the fluctuation scale. Although it is a rather straightforward consequence of [10, Lemma 4.9], we believe that it can be potentially useful in other settings and hence state the following lemma separately.

Lemma 2.6. *For any $\Delta > 0$, there exist constants $C, c > 0$ depending on Δ such that for every $x > 0$, we have for all sufficiently large n (depending on x)*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\inf_{u \in U_\Delta, v \in \bar{U}_\Delta} T_{u, v}^\Delta \geq 4n + xn^{1/3} \right) \geq Ce^{-cx^{3/2}}.$$

Proof. We will define three independent events A_1, A_2, A_3 such that the event in question is a sub-event of $A_1 \cap A_2 \cap A_3$ and $\mathbb{P}(A_1 \cap A_2 \cap A_3) \geq Ce^{-cx^{3/2}}$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= \left\{ \inf_{u \in U_\Delta} T_{u, \mathbf{n}/4}^\Delta \geq n - \frac{x}{2}n^{1/3} \right\}, \\ A_2 &= \left\{ T_{\mathbf{n}/4, 3\mathbf{n}/4}^\Delta \geq 2n + 2xn^{1/3} \right\}, \\ A_3 &= \left\{ \inf_{v \in \bar{U}_\Delta} T_{3\mathbf{n}/4, v}^\Delta \geq n - \frac{x}{2}n^{1/3} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The independence of A_1, A_2, A_3 is clear by definition. Also, by [10, Lemma 4.9] we have $\mathbb{P}(A_2) \geq C_1 e^{-c_1 x^{3/2}}$ for n large enough depending on x . Observe now that by (8), we have that there exists a large enough constant C_2 such that

$$A_1 \supseteq \left\{ \inf_{u \in U_\Delta} \tilde{T}_{u, \mathbf{n}/4}^\Delta \geq -\left(\frac{x}{2} - C_2\right)n^{1/3} \right\}$$

and analogously

$$A_3 \supseteq \left\{ \inf_{v \in \overline{U}_\Delta} \tilde{T}_{3\mathbf{n}/4, v}^\Delta \geq - \left(\frac{x}{2} - C_2 \right) n^{1/3} \right\}.$$

Now on using Proposition 2.3, we get high probability lower bounds for $\mathbb{P}(A_1)$ and $\mathbb{P}(A_3)$. Combining this with the independence of A_1, A_2, A_3 along with $\mathbb{P}(A_2) \geq Ce^{-cx^{3/2}}$, we get the needed lower bound for the probability of $\mathbb{P}(A_1 \cap A_2 \cap A_3)$. The fact that $A_1 \cap A_2 \cap A_3$ is a sub-event of the event in question is straightforward. Indeed, we have that $T_{u,v}^\Delta \geq T_{u, \mathbf{n}/4}^\Delta + T_{\mathbf{n}/4, 3\mathbf{n}/4}^\Delta + T_{3\mathbf{n}/4, v}^\Delta$ deterministically for any u, v in the respective line segments due to the exclusion of the endpoints in the definition of ℓ . \square

The next result, quoted from [10], provides a lower bound for unlikely events in the lower tail.

Lemma 2.7 ([10, Lemma 4.10]). *For any $\Delta, M > 0$, we have that there exists a constant $c > 0$ (depending on Δ, M) such that for all n sufficiently large depending on Δ, M , we have*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{u \in \underline{U}_\Delta, v \in \overline{U}_\Delta} T_{u,v} \leq 4n - Mn^{1/3} \right) \geq c.$$

3. UPPER BOUND FOR THE SMALL BALL PROBABILITY

In this section, we provide the proof of Proposition 1.1 and use the same to establish the upper bound in Theorem 1. The first step of the proof of Proposition 1.1 is to divide the rectangle U_δ into sub-rectangles of size $O(\delta^{3/2}n) \times \delta n^{2/3}$.⁴ Define for any $A > 0$,

$$U_{\delta, A, i}^n = \left\{ -\delta n^{2/3} \leq \psi(u) \leq \delta n^{2/3} \right\} \cap \left\{ 2iA\delta^{3/2}n \leq \phi(u) \leq 2(i+1)A\delta^{3/2}n \right\}. \quad (12)$$

The abbreviations $U_{\delta, A, i}, \underline{U}_{\delta, A, i}, \overline{U}_{\delta, A, i}$ are defined analogously to the abbreviations for the corresponding quantities of the parallelogram U_δ^n .

The basic idea for the proof of Proposition 1.1 is that for small δ , T_n^δ can be approximated by sums of passage times across $U_{\delta, A, i}$. Indeed, for A sufficiently large, to be chosen appropriately later, we define

$$Y_i = \sup_{u \in \underline{U}_{\delta, A, i}, v \in \overline{U}_{\delta, A, i}} \underline{T}_{u,v}^{U_{\delta, A, i}}. \quad (13)$$

Clearly, the Y_i are i.i.d. across i . Let us define i.i.d. variables $Z_i = \frac{Y_i - 4A\delta^{3/2}n}{A^{1/3}\delta^{1/2}n^{1/3}}$. The next result gives information about the mean and upper tail of Z_i .

Lemma 3.1. *For A sufficiently large, there exist positive constants c_2, c_3, C_3 (independent of δ) such that for all n sufficiently large depending on δ , we have*

- (i) $\mathbb{E}Z_i \leq -c_2$.
- (ii) $\mathbb{P}(Z_i \geq r) \leq C_3e^{-c_3r}$ for each $r > 0$.

Proof. Observe first that (ii) is an immediate consequence of Proposition 2.2, (i) and (8). Note that Proposition 2.2, as stated, is for the variables T and not the variables \underline{T} . However, as remarked in a footnote earlier, the effect of the endpoints is negligible and Proposition 2.2 (and also (8)) also hold for the variables \underline{T} .

⁴Throughout the paper, we shall assume without loss of generality that $\delta n^{2/3}$ and $\delta^{3/2}n$ are even integers and ignore rounding issues arising from this, and also several other divisibility issues. This is done merely to reduce notational overhead and the reader can verify that the same arguments go through in the general case, with appropriate additions of floor and ceiling signs.

To prove (i), we show that $(A\delta^{3/2}n)^{-1/3}(\mathbb{E}Y_i - \mathbb{E}T_{A\delta^{3/2}n})$ can be made arbitrarily small by taking A sufficiently large. Since $\mathbb{E}T_{A\delta^{3/2}n} \leq 4A\delta^{3/2}n - cA^{1/3}\delta^{1/2}n^{1/3}$ (this is a consequence of the distributional convergence as in (1) and the fact that GUE Tracy-Widom distribution has negative mean, see [9, Lemma A.4]) for some $c > 0$ and n sufficiently large, (i) follows by choosing A appropriately large. See [9, Lemma 4.1] or [11, Lemma 2.4] for a complete argument. \square

We can now give the proof of Proposition 1.1.

Proof of Proposition 1.1. Notice first that

$$T_n^\delta \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\delta^{-3/2}/A-1} Y_i. \quad (14)$$

Indeed, this is the reason we used \underline{T} instead of T in the definition of Y_i . Thus, it suffices to show that for some constant c_1 , we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=0}^{\delta^{-3/2}/A-1} Y_i \geq 4n - \frac{c_1}{\delta}n^{1/3}\right) \leq Ce^{-c\delta^{-3/2}}. \quad (15)$$

Recalling the definition of Z_i , (15) is equivalent to showing

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{\delta^{-3/2}/A} \sum Z_i \geq -c'_1\right) \leq Ce^{-c\delta^{-3/2}}. \quad (16)$$

for some $c'_1 > 0$. Using Lemma 3.1, and choosing $c'_1 = c_2/2$ where c_2 is as in Lemma 3.1, (16) is an easy consequence of a Bernstein type concentration inequality for sums of i.i.d. variables with sub-exponential tails; see e.g. [36, Corollary 2.8.3]. This completes the proof of the proposition. \square

In view of Proposition 1.1, the proof of the upper bound in Theorem 1 is almost immediate.

Proof of Theorem 1, upper bound. With c_1 as in the statement of Proposition 1.1, we know that for some constants C, c, C', c' (independent of δ), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\Gamma_n \subseteq U_\delta) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(T_n^\delta \geq 4n - \frac{c_1}{\delta}n^{1/3}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(T_n \leq 4n - \frac{c_1}{\delta}n^{1/3}\right) \\ &\leq Ce^{-c\delta^{-3/2}} + C'e^{-c'\delta^{-3}} \leq 2Ce^{-c\delta^{-3/2}} \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where in the second inequality above, we have used Proposition 1.1 along with the second part of Proposition 2.1. This completes the proof of the upper bound in Theorem 1. \square

Before completing this section, let us give a sketch of an alternative proof of the upper bound in Theorem 1. This argument hinges on having a lower bound of the probability that geodesics have large transversal fluctuation (at the scale $n^{2/3}$). Such a result is known in Poissonian LPP; see [26, Proposition 1.4]. Even though the same argument should work for exponential LPP with minor modifications, we did not find the result in the literature for exponential LPP and hence will not attempt to write down a complete proof.

For $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \delta^{-3/2}\}$, define the points

$$a_i = i\delta^{3/2}\mathbf{n} - \delta n^{2/3}(1, -1).$$

Let $\Gamma_{a_i, a_{i+1}}$ denote the geodesic joining a_i and a_{i+1} . By the planar ordering of the geodesics, we know that each $\Gamma_{a_i, a_{i+1}}$ lies to the left of the geodesic Γ_n , and hence we have

$$\{\Gamma_n \subseteq U_\delta\} \subseteq \bigcap_{i=0}^{\delta^{-3/2}-1} \left\{ \sup_{u \in \Gamma_{a_i, a_{i+1}}} \psi(u) \leq \delta n^{2/3} \right\} = \bigcap_{i=0}^{\delta^{-3/2}-1} \left\{ \sup_{u \in \Gamma_{a_i, a_{i+1}}} \psi(u) - (-2\delta n^{2/3}) \leq 3\delta n^{2/3} \right\}. \quad (18)$$

Note that the events on the right hand side are independent across i and each event has probability bounded away from 1 by [26, Proposition 1.4] adapted to the exponential case. The upper bound in Theorem 1 follows.

4. LOWER BOUND FOR THE SMALL BALL PROBABILITY

In this section, we will obtain the lower bound in Theorem 1. As discussed in the introduction, the strategy is to construct a favourable event with the requisite lower bound on its probability, on which the small ball event holds. We first define the favourable events, and state the probability lower bounds for them. Then we complete the proof of the lower bound in Theorem 1 assuming these. The proofs of the probability bounds are provided at the end of the section.

4.1. Construction of favourable events. Before coming to the construction of the needed events, we introduce the following notation:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Left}_\delta^n &= \left\{ \psi(u) < -\delta n^{2/3} \right\}, \\ \mathbf{Right}_\delta^n &= \left\{ \psi(u) > \delta n^{2/3} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

We shall use \mathbf{Left}_δ and \mathbf{Right}_δ as shorthands for the above, but in case we need to make use of the notations for something other than n , we shall use the more general notation.

We define three independent events \mathbf{Bar}^L , \mathbf{Inside} and \mathbf{Bar}^R (we use \mathbf{Bar} to denote the event $\mathbf{Bar}^R \cap \mathbf{Bar}^L$) measurable with respect to the vertex weights in the regions \mathbf{Left}_δ , U_δ and \mathbf{Right}_δ respectively. As already alluded to in the introduction, for some fixed large constant M , we shall show that on the event $\mathcal{E} = \mathbf{Bar}^L \cap \mathbf{Inside} \cap \mathbf{Bar}^R$, we have that $\Gamma_n \subseteq U_{M\delta}$, and obtain $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \geq Ce^{-c\delta^{-3/2}}$ by lower bounding the probabilities of each constituent event separately; see Figure 1 for an illustration.

4.1.1. Choice of parameters. We shall fix δ to be sufficiently small throughout this section. Note that $K, k_0, k_1, \beta, M > 0$ will be constants which will appear in the definitions and will be fixed later in this section; all of them will be independent of δ .

We now explicitly point out how the constants are fixed to prevent confusion later.

- K , a large positive constant is obtained by invoking Lemma 4.1.
- k_0 , a large positive constant is fixed by invoking Lemma 4.8.
- k_1 is now defined to be $\max\{K, k_0\} + 2$.
- β is an absolute constant not depending on any of the other parameters and is obtained from the statement of Lemma 4.9. In fact, we have $\beta = 2^{-2/3}\xi$, where ξ appears in the statement of Proposition 2.5.
- The constant M is fixed to be large enough compared to all the other parameters fixed so far so that the conclusion of Lemma 4.9 holds and (52) in the proof of Lemma 4.2 holds.

Note that all the above constants will be independent of δ , and n will be taken to be sufficiently large depending on δ (and all the other parameters). Actually, it will be clear from the proofs that it suffices to take $n \gg \delta^{-3/2}$; we will comment more about this in Section 6. For the rest of this




FIGURE 1. The basic set-up for the proof of the lower bound in Theorem 1: The region U_δ is shaded in green. The event **Inside** is a function of the vertex weights in U_δ and ensures that any two points u, v in U^δ that differ in the time co-ordinate by a large constant times $\delta^{3/2}n$ have large $\tilde{T}_{u,v}^\delta$, and even for points u, v that are not very well separated in the time coordinate, $\tilde{T}_{u,v}^\delta$ is not too small. The events **Bar**^L and **Bar**^R are functions of the vertex weights on the strips to the left and right of U_δ (denoted **Left** _{δ} and **Right** _{δ}) respectively and ensure that for any path γ (marked in red) that has either a short or a long excursion outside U_δ that exits $U_{M\delta}$ also, the excursion can be replaced by a path in the interior of U_δ (marked in blue) that has higher weight. Thus we ensure that on **Bar**^L \cap **Inside** \cap **Bar**^R, one has $\Gamma_n \subseteq U_{M\delta}$.

section, we shall work with a fixed choice of parameters as described above, δ sufficiently small and n sufficiently large.

4.1.2. *The event Inside.* The event **Inside** is composed of two parts: (i) **Far**, which asks that for any two points $u, v \in U_\delta^L$ (resp. U_δ^R) which are well separated in the time direction, $T_{u,v}^\delta$ is sufficiently larger than typical; and (ii) **Close**, which asks that for any two points u, v in U_δ^L (resp. U_δ^R) (not necessarily well separated) the constrained centered passage time $\tilde{T}_{u,v}^\delta$ is not much smaller than typical. Let us now move towards defining the events formally.

Definition of Far: For any positive integer K , let **Far** denote the event that for any two points $u, v \in U_\delta^L$ (or both in U_δ^R) satisfying $\phi(v) - \phi(u) \geq K\delta^{3/2}n$, we have

$$T_{u,v}^\delta \geq 2(\phi(v) - \phi(u)) + \frac{\phi(v) - \phi(u)}{\delta^{3/2}n}(\sqrt{\delta}n^{1/3}). \quad (20)$$

The following lemma provides a lower bound for $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Far})$.

Lemma 4.1. *For all δ sufficiently small, there exists a positive integer K (independent of δ) and positive constants C, c (independent of δ) such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Far}) \geq Ce^{-c\delta^{-3/2}}$$

for all n large enough depending on δ .

The proof of Lemma 4.1 has been postponed to Section 4.3.

Definition of Close: The event **Close**, as described above will control the $T_{u,v}^\delta$ where both u and v are close by points either on U_δ^L or on U_δ^R . This will be defined as the intersection of several events indexed by L or R depending on which of the boundaries are being considered and also by i , which controls the location of the points in the time direction. For k_1 sufficiently large (compared to K obtained from Lemma 4.1), a positive absolute constant β and $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{1}{k_1\delta^{3/2}} - 2\}$, we define the events \mathbf{Close}_i^L and \mathbf{Close}_i^R by setting

$$(\mathbf{Close}_i^L)^c = \left\{ \inf_{u,v \in U_\delta^L, 2ik_1\delta^{3/2}n \leq \phi(u) \leq \phi(v) \leq 2(i+2)k_1\delta^{3/2}n} \{T_{u,v}^1 - 2(\phi(v) - \phi(u))\} \leq -\beta M^2 (2k_1\delta^{3/2}n)^{1/3} \right\}, \quad (21)$$

$$(\mathbf{Close}_i^R)^c = \left\{ \inf_{u,v \in U_\delta^R, 2ik_1\delta^{3/2}n \leq \phi(u) \leq \phi(v) \leq 2(i+2)k_1\delta^{3/2}n} \{T_{u,v}^1 - 2(\phi(v) - \phi(u))\} \leq -\beta M^2 (2k_1\delta^{3/2}n)^{1/3} \right\}. \quad (22)$$

We set $\mathbf{Close}_i = \mathbf{Close}_i^L \cap \mathbf{Close}_i^R$ and define

$$\mathbf{Close} = \bigcap_{i=0}^{\frac{1}{k_1\delta^{3/2}} - 2} \mathbf{Close}_i. \quad (23)$$

We have the following lower bound on $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Close})$.

Lemma 4.2. *There exist positive constants C, c (independent of δ) such that for all δ sufficiently small, and for the parameters being chosen as in Section 4.1.1, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Close}) \geq Ce^{-c\delta^{-3/2}}.$$

The proof of Lemma 4.2 has been postponed to the end of Section 4.3.

Finally, we define the event **Inside** by

$$\mathbf{Inside} = \mathbf{Far} \cap \mathbf{Close}. \quad (24)$$

The following lower bound on $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Inside})$ easily follows from Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2.

Lemma 4.3. *For all δ sufficiently small, and for the parameters chosen as in Section 4.1.1, we have that there exist positive constants C, c (independent of δ) such that for all n large enough (depending on δ),*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Inside}) \geq Ce^{-c\delta^{-3/2}}.$$

Proof. Observe that both **Far** and **Close** are increasing events (i.e., for two weight configurations that are point-wise ordered, the event being satisfied for the smaller weight configuration implies that it is also satisfied for the larger one), and hence by the FKG inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Inside}) \geq \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Far})\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Close}).$$

The lemma immediately follows from Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2. \square

4.1.3. *The event **Bar**.* Before proceeding, we first remark that the events \mathbf{Bar}^L and \mathbf{Bar}^R will be defined symmetrically about the line $\{\psi(u) = 0\}$. Hence, it suffices to give the details of the construction of \mathbf{Bar}^L . Our motivation while defining \mathbf{Bar}^L is to obtain an environment where paths from $\mathbf{0}$ to \mathbf{n} which enter the region \mathbf{Left}_δ incur a loss in weight. To achieve this, \mathbf{Bar}^L will consist of two events \mathbf{Short}^L and \mathbf{Long}^L which will give the necessary weight deficits for short and long excursions into the region \mathbf{Left}_δ respectively.

Definition of \mathbf{Long}^L : For k_1 as before, we define the event \mathbf{Long}^L as

$$\mathbf{Long}^L = \left\{ \sup_{u,v \in U_\delta^L: \phi(v) - \phi(u) \geq k_1 \delta^{3/2} n} \{T_{u,v}^{\mathbf{Left}_\delta} - 2(\phi(v) - \phi(u))\} < \frac{(\phi(v) - \phi(u))(\sqrt{\delta} n^{1/3})}{\delta^{3/2} n} \right\}. \quad (25)$$

We have the following lower bound of the probability of the above event.

Lemma 4.4. *For all δ sufficiently small, and for the parameters chosen as in Section 4.1.1, we have that there exist constants C, c (independent of δ) such that for all large enough n (depending on δ),*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Long}^L) \geq C e^{-c\delta^{-3/2}}.$$

The proof of Lemma 4.4 is postponed to Section 4.4.1.

Definition of \mathbf{Short}^L : Similar to the definition of \mathbf{Close}^L , \mathbf{Short}^L will also be defined as the intersection of \mathbf{Short}_i^L , where i shall index the location of the short excursion. For $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{1}{k_1 \delta^{3/2}} - 2\}$, we define \mathbf{Short}_i^L by setting $(\mathbf{Short}_i^L)^c$ to be the event that for some $u, v \in U_\delta^L$ with $2ik_1 \delta^{3/2} n \leq \phi(u) \leq \phi(v) \leq 2(i+2)k_1 \delta^{3/2} n$, there exists $\gamma: u \rightarrow v$ satisfying $\gamma \setminus \{u, v\} \subseteq \mathbf{Left}_\delta$ and $\gamma \not\subseteq (\mathbf{Left}_{M\delta})^c$ such that

$$\ell(\gamma) > 2(\phi(v) - \phi(u)) - \beta M^2 (2k_1 \delta^{3/2} n)^{1/3}. \quad (26)$$

Having defined the events \mathbf{Short}_i^L , we simply define

$$\mathbf{Short}^L = \bigcap_{i=0}^{\frac{1}{k_1 \delta^{3/2}} - 2} \mathbf{Short}_i^L. \quad (27)$$

We have the following lower bound for $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Short}^L)$.

Lemma 4.5. *For all δ sufficiently small, and for the parameters chosen as in Section 4.1.1, we have that there exist positive constants C, c (independent of δ) such that for n large enough depending on δ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Short}^L) \geq C e^{-c\delta^{-3/2}}.$$

The proof of Lemma 4.5 is postponed to Section 4.4.2.

Having completed the construction of \mathbf{Bar}^L by setting

$$\mathbf{Bar}^L := \mathbf{Long}^L \cap \mathbf{Short}^L$$

we define \mathbf{Bar}^R by symmetry about the line $\{\psi(u) = 0\}$. We will not repeat the details for \mathbf{Bar}^R , but would like to record that just in the same way as \mathbf{Bar}^L , we also have

$$\mathbf{Bar}^R = \mathbf{Long}^R \cap \mathbf{Short}^R \quad (28)$$

for analogously defined events \mathbf{Long}^R and \mathbf{Short}^R .

We have the following lower bound for the probability of $\mathbf{Bar} := \mathbf{Bar}^L \cap \mathbf{Bar}^R$.

Lemma 4.6. *For all δ small enough, and for the parameters chosen as in Section 4.1.1, we have that there exist positive constants C, c (independent of δ) such that for all n large enough (depending on δ),*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Bar}) \geq C e^{-c\delta^{-3/2}}.$$

Proof. Since $\mathbf{Bar}^L = \mathbf{Short}^L \cap \mathbf{Long}^L$, where both the events are decreasing, by Lemma 4.4, Lemma 4.5 and the FKG inequality, we have that for n large enough depending on δ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Bar}^L) \geq C_1 e^{-c_1 \delta^{-3/2}}.$$

By the symmetry about the line $\{\psi(u) = 0\}$, we also obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Bar}^R) \geq C_1 e^{-c_1 \delta^{-3/2}}.$$

The lemma now follows immediately by using the independence of \mathbf{Bar}^L and \mathbf{Bar}^R . \square

4.2. Proofs of Theorem 1, lower bound and Corollary 3 (i). As mentioned before, our main interest is in the event \mathcal{E} defined by

$$\mathcal{E} = \mathbf{Inside} \cap \mathbf{Bar}. \quad (29)$$

We first show that a small ball event is indeed satisfied on the event \mathcal{E} .

Lemma 4.7. *We have the deterministic inclusion $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \{\Gamma_n \subseteq U_{M\delta}\}$, where the parameters are chosen as in Section 4.1.1.*

Proof. We prove by contradiction. Clearly if $\Gamma_n \subseteq U_\delta$, we are done, so let us suppose that for some weight configuration in the event \mathcal{E} , we have that $\Gamma_n \not\subseteq U_\delta$. First consider the case that $\Gamma_n \cap \mathbf{Left}_\delta \neq \emptyset$. In this case, there must exist $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 \leq 2n$ such that $\Gamma_n|_{[t_1+1, t_2-1]} \subseteq \mathbf{Left}_\delta$ and $\Gamma_n(t_1) = \Gamma_n(t_2) = -\delta n^{2/3}$. Let us define the points u, v by $(\phi(u), \psi(u)) = (t_1, \Gamma_n(t_1))$ and $(\phi(v), \psi(v)) = (t_2, \Gamma_n(t_2))$, that is, u and v are the locations of the geodesics at times t_1 and t_2 respectively. We need to consider two separate cases (refer to Figure 1).

Case 1: $(\phi(v) - \phi(u)) \geq k_1 \delta^{3/2} n$.

In this case we reach a contradiction due to the definitions of the events \mathbf{Long}^L and \mathbf{Far} . Indeed, \mathbf{Long}^L implies that

$$\ell(\Gamma_n|_{[t_1, t_2]}) < 2(\phi(v) - \phi(u)) + \frac{\phi(v) - \phi(u)}{\delta^{3/2} n} (\sqrt{\delta} n^{1/3}) \quad (30)$$

while \mathbf{Far} implies (note that $k_1 > K$ due to our choice of the parameters) that there exists a path $\gamma: u \rightarrow v$ such that $\gamma \subseteq U_\delta$ satisfying

$$\ell(\gamma) \geq 2(\phi(v) - \phi(u)) + \frac{\phi(v) - \phi(u)}{\delta^{3/2} n} (\sqrt{\delta} n^{1/3}). \quad (31)$$

It is clear that (30) and (31) contradict the fact that $\Gamma_n|_{[t_1, t_2]}$ is a geodesic from u to v .

Case 2: $(\phi(v) - \phi(u)) < k_1 \delta^{3/2} n$.

In this scenario, there exists an $i_0 \in \left\{0, 1, \dots, \frac{1}{k_1 \delta^{3/2}} - 2\right\}$ satisfying $2i_0 k_1 \delta^{3/2} n \leq \phi(u) \leq \phi(v) \leq 2(i_0 + 2)k_1 \delta^{3/2} n$. Now, the definition of the event $\mathbf{Short}_{i_0}^L$ and \mathbf{Close} forces $\Gamma_n|_{[t_1, t_2]} \subseteq U_{M\delta}$. Indeed, if we had $\Gamma_n|_{[t_1, t_2]} \cap \mathbf{Left}_{M\delta} \neq \emptyset$, the event $\mathbf{Short}_{i_0}^L$ would imply that

$$\ell(\Gamma_n|_{[t_1, t_2]}) \leq 2(\phi(v) - \phi(u)) - \beta M^2 (2k_1 \delta^{3/2} n)^{1/3}. \quad (32)$$

On the other hand, the event $\mathbf{Close}_{i_0}^L$ would imply that there exists $\gamma: u \rightarrow v$ satisfying $\gamma \subseteq U_\delta$ along with

$$\ell(\gamma) > 2(\phi(v) - \phi(u)) - \beta M^2 (2k_1 \delta^{3/2} n)^{1/3}, \quad (33)$$

thereby contradicting that $\Gamma_n|_{[t_1, t_2]}$ is a geodesic between u and v . In effect, we have shown that $\Gamma_n|_{[t_1, t_2]} \subseteq U_{M\delta}$.

By an identical reasoning and the symmetric definition of the event \mathbf{Bar}^R , we can handle the case $\Gamma_n \cap \mathbf{Right}_\delta \neq \emptyset$, and this completes the proof. \square

We are now ready to complete the proof of the lower bound in Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1, lower bound. In view of Lemma 4.7 (we are using that M is a fixed constant), we need only show that for all δ small enough, we have that there exist positive constants C, c (independent of δ) such that for all n large enough depending on δ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \geq C e^{-c\delta^{-3/2}}, \quad (34)$$

where all the parameters are obtained as described in Section 4.1.1. By the definition of the event \mathcal{E} and the independence of \mathbf{Bar} and \mathbf{Inside} , we have that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \geq \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Bar}) \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Inside}). \quad (35)$$

The lower bound for $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Inside})$ follows from Lemma 4.3 and the lower bound for $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Bar})$ follows from Lemma 4.6. Piecing these ingredients together, we obtain that for n large enough depending on δ , (34) holds. \square

Before completing the proofs postponed earlier in this section, we quickly complete the straightforward proof of Corollary 3 (i) using Theorem 1.

Proof of Corollary 3 (i). By using the definition $\pi_n(s) := n^{-2/3} \Gamma_n(2ns)$ for $2ns \in \mathbb{Z}$ along with Theorem 1, we have

$$C_2 e^{-c_2 \delta^{-3/2}} \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{s \in [0,1], 2ns \in \mathbb{Z}} |\pi_n(s)| \leq \delta \right) \leq C_1 e^{-c_1 \delta^{-3/2}}.$$

Since $\pi_n(s)$ is linearly interpolated to all values $s \in [0,1]$ by using the values of $\pi_n(s)$ for $s \in [0,1] \cap \frac{1}{2n}\mathbb{Z}$, the above immediately implies

$$C_2 e^{-c_2 \delta^{-3/2}} \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{s \in [0,1]} |\pi_n(s)| \leq \delta \right) \leq C_1 e^{-c_1 \delta^{-3/2}},$$

Now, we just need to pass to the limit. To do this, first note that the mapping $f \mapsto \sup_{s \in [0,1]} f(s)$ is a continuous map from $C[0,1]$ to \mathbb{R}^+ , where the former is equipped with the topology of uniform convergence and the latter is equipped with the Euclidean topology. Consider π , a subsequential weak limit π of π_n , that is, $\pi_{n_i} \Rightarrow \pi$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ (\Rightarrow denotes weak convergence) for some subsequence $\{n_i\}$. Then by the continuous mapping theorem, we have that

$$\sup_{s \in [0,1]} \pi_{n_i}(s) \Rightarrow \sup_{s \in [0,1]} \pi(s)$$

as $i \rightarrow \infty$, and we get the result by applying the Portmanteau theorem. \square

The rest of this section is devoted to the proofs of Lemma 4.1, Lemma 4.2, Lemma 4.4 and Lemma 4.5. Before proceeding with the proofs, we introduce the notation $U_{\delta,i}^n$ for the i th rectangle when the strip U_δ^n into $\delta^{-3/2}$ many smaller rectangles. That is, let

$$U_{\delta,i}^n = \left\{ -\delta n^{2/3} \leq \psi(u) \leq \delta n^{2/3} \right\} \cap \left\{ 2i\delta^{3/2}n \leq \phi(u) \leq 2(i+1)\delta^{3/2}n \right\}. \quad (36)$$

For convenience, we make the above definition for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ instead of just $i \in \{0, \dots, \delta^{-3/2} - 1\}$, though only the values in $\{0, \dots, \delta^{-3/2} - 1\}$ correspond to subrectangles in U_δ^n . Again, we will simply write $U_{\delta,i}^n$ as $U_{\delta,i}$. Similar to the definitions (10) for the left and right sides of U_δ^n , we denote




FIGURE 2. Proof of Lemma 4.1: for $u, v \in U_\delta^L$ with $\phi(v) - \phi(u) \geq K\delta^{3/2}n$, we lower bound $T_{u,v}^\delta$ by the weight of the concatenated path showed in the figure. The initial and final segments (marked in blue) denote the paths attaining weights $T_{u,w_{a+1}}^\delta$ and $T_{w_{a+K_{u,v}-1},v}^\delta$ respectively; both these paths are ensured to be not too small compared to typical. The intermediate green segments denote the paths attaining $T_{w_i,w_{i+1}}^\delta$ and these are ensured to be larger than typical. For $K_{u,v}$ large, these two conditions ensure that $T_{u,v}^\delta$ is larger than typical, as required.

the left and right sides of $U_{\delta,i}^n$ by $U_{\delta,i}^{n,L}$ and $U_{\delta,i}^{n,R}$ respectively. These will be abbreviated to $U_{\delta,i}^L$ and $U_{\delta,i}^R$.

4.3. Lower bounds for events inside U_δ . This subsection is devoted to the proofs of Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2, i.e., we prove the lower bounds for the probabilities of the events **Far** and **Close**. The first one is more involved and will take up most of this subsection.

Proof of Lemma 4.1. We locally define **Far** $_\alpha$ to be the event that for any two points $u, v \in U_\delta^L$ (or both in U_δ^R) satisfying $\phi(v) - \phi(u) \geq K\delta^{3/2}n$, we have

$$T_{u,v}^\delta \geq 2(\phi(v) - \phi(u)) + \frac{\phi(v) - \phi(u)}{\delta^{3/2}n} (\alpha\sqrt{\delta}n^{1/3}).$$

It suffices to prove that there exists a positive integer K , positive constants C, c and some $\alpha > 1$ (all independent of δ) such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Far}_\alpha) \geq Ce^{-c\delta^{-3/2}}.$$

Indeed, this is because $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Far}_\alpha)$ is decreasing in α , and $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Far})$ corresponds to $\alpha = 1$. We shall construct an event \mathcal{C} with the requisite probability lower bound such that \mathcal{C} implies **Far** $_\alpha$ for some large α whose value will be chosen later.

To illustrate our strategy, let us consider two points u, v on U_δ^L which satisfy $\phi(v) - \phi(u) \geq K\delta^{3/2}n$, where K will be chosen large later (the case $u, v \in U_\delta^R$ can be handled by an identical argument). It is immediate that we have

$$\left\lfloor \frac{\phi(v) - \phi(u)}{2\delta^{3/2}n} \right\rfloor \geq K/2 - 1, \quad (37)$$

Thus, there exists a positive integer $K_{u,v}$ such that

$$K_{u,v} \geq K/2 - 3 \quad (38)$$

and a positive integer a depending on u, v satisfying

$$2(a-1) \leq \frac{\phi(u)}{\delta^{3/2}n} \leq 2a \leq 2(a+1) \leq \dots \leq 2(a+K_{u,v}) \leq \frac{\phi(v)}{\delta^{3/2}n} \leq 2(a+K_{u,v}+1). \quad (39)$$

Let w_i denote the point $i\delta^{3/2}\mathbf{n}$. This gives that

$$T_{u,v}^\delta \geq T_{u,w_{a+1}}^\delta + \sum_{j=2}^{K_{u,v}-1} T_{w_{a+j-1},w_{a+j}}^\delta + T_{w_{a+K_{u,v}-1},v}^\delta. \quad (40)$$

Our aim now is to construct an event having probability at least $Ce^{-c\delta^{-3/2}}$, on which we have that the r.h.s in (40) is larger than typical for each pair u, v satisfying the conditions in the statement of the lemma. We will do this by ensuring that the terms $T_{w_{a+j-1},w_{a+j}}^\delta$ in (40) are larger than typical for $j = 2$ to $K_{u,v} - 3$ while the terms $T_{u,w_{a+1}}^\delta$ and $T_{w_{a+K_{u,v}-3},v}^\delta$ are not too small compared to their typical value; see Figure 2.

For each $i \in \{0, \dots, \delta^{-3/2} - 2\}$, define the events

$$\mathcal{A}_i = \left\{ T_{w_i, w_{i+1}}^\delta \geq 2(2\delta^{3/2}n) + 4(\alpha\sqrt{\delta}n^{1/3}) \right\}. \quad (41)$$

Note that the \mathcal{A}_i satisfy

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_i) \geq Ce^{-c\alpha^{3/2}} > c_3 \quad (42)$$

for some C, c (independent of δ) coming from Lemma 2.6. We now define the events \mathcal{B}_i as follows:

$$\mathcal{B}_i = \left\{ \inf_{u,v \in U_{\delta,i} \cup U_{\delta,i+1}, \phi(v) - \phi(u) \geq 2\delta^{3/2}n} \tilde{T}_{u,v}^\delta \geq -\alpha\sqrt{\delta}n^{1/3} \right\} \quad (43)$$

Note that by an application of Proposition 2.3, we have that for some constants C_2, c_2 ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_i) \geq 1 - C_2e^{-c_2\alpha} > \frac{1}{2} \quad (44)$$

for all α sufficiently large. Finally, we define the event \mathcal{C} by

$$\mathcal{C} = \bigcap_{i=0}^{\delta^{-3/2}-2} (\mathcal{A}_i \cap \mathcal{B}_i). \quad (45)$$

Notice now that the events \mathcal{A}_i and \mathcal{B}_i are all increasing events measurable with respect to the vertex weights in U_δ . By using the FKG inequality along with (42) and (44), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}) &\geq \left(\prod_i \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_i) \prod_i \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_i) \right) \\ &\geq (c_3/2)^{\delta^{-3/2}-2} \geq e^{-c_5\delta^{-3/2}} \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

for some $c_5 > 0$.

It remains to prove that $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbf{Far}_\alpha$ for some α sufficiently large. We shall only consider the case of $u, v \in U_\delta^L$, the case of $u, v \in U_\delta^R$ can be handled by an identical argument. On the event \mathcal{C} , we have that in (40), for any u, v satisfying the conditions in the statement of the lemma,

$$T_{w_{a+j-1},w_{a+j}}^\delta \geq 2(2\delta^{3/2}n) + 4(\alpha\sqrt{\delta}n^{1/3}) \quad (47)$$

for all $j \in \{2, \dots, K_{u,v} - 1\}$. This is a straightforward consequence of the definition of the events \mathcal{A}_i . By using the definition of \mathcal{B}_i , we have that on \mathcal{C} ,

$$T_{u,w_{a+1}}^\delta \geq \mathbb{E}T_{u,w_{a+1}} - \alpha\sqrt{\delta}n^{1/3}. \quad (48)$$

By using (8), we have that for all α large enough, on \mathcal{C} ,

$$T_{u,w_{a+1}}^\delta \geq 2(\phi(w_{a+1}) - \phi(u)) - \frac{3\alpha}{2}\sqrt{\delta}n^{1/3}. \quad (49)$$

By an analogous argument, we obtain that on \mathcal{C} , we have for all α large enough,

$$T_{w_{a+K_{u,v-1}},v}^\delta \geq 2(\phi(v) - \phi(w_{a+K_{u,v-1}})) - \frac{3\alpha}{2}\sqrt{\delta}n^{1/3}. \quad (50)$$

On combining (47), (49) and (50) with (40), we deduce that on \mathcal{C} , for all α large enough

$$\begin{aligned} T_{u,v}^\delta - 2(\phi(v) - \phi(u)) &\geq (4K_{u,v} - 11)\alpha\sqrt{\delta}n^{1/3} \\ &\geq 3K_{u,v}\alpha\sqrt{\delta}n^{1/3} \\ &\geq \frac{\phi(v) - \phi(u)}{\delta^{3/2}n}(\alpha\sqrt{\delta}n^{1/3}), \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

and we now fix α to be one such value which in addition satisfies $\alpha > 1$. Note that we have used (38) along with the fact that K can be fixed to be large to obtain the last two inequalities. Thus, we have established that $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbf{Far}_\alpha$, which together with (46) completes the proof. \square

We shall now prove Lemma 4.2.

Proof of Lemma 4.2. Using Proposition 2.4 along with the fact that M is fixed to be much larger than all the other parameters in Section 4.1.1, it is clear that for n large enough depending on δ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Close}_i^L) &\geq 1 - C_1 e^{-c_1 M^2} \geq 1/2, \\ \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Close}_i^R) &\geq 1 - C_1 e^{-c_1 M^2} \geq 1/2. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

Since \mathbf{Close}_i^L and \mathbf{Close}_i^R are increasing events, we have by the FKG inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Close}_i) \geq 1/4. \quad (53)$$

Again, the \mathbf{Close}_i are all increasing events, and by the FKG inequality, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Close}) \geq (1/4)^{\frac{\delta^{-3/2}}{k_1} - 1} \geq C_2 e^{-c_2 \delta^{-3/2}}, \quad (54)$$

completing the proof of the lemma. \square

4.4. Lower bounds for the barrier events. This subsection is devoted to the proofs of Lemma 4.4 and Lemma 4.5, i.e., we prove the lower bounds for the probabilities of the events \mathbf{Long}^L and \mathbf{Short}^L .

4.4.1. *Lower bound for the event \mathbf{Long}^L .* We need the following result to prove Lemma 4.4. Recall the notation $U_{\delta,i}$ and $U_{\delta,i}^L$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ from (36).

Lemma 4.8. *For all δ sufficiently small, there exist constants C, c (independent of δ) and a positive integer k_0 (independent of δ) such that for any integers i, j with $j - i = k \geq k_0$, for all n large enough depending on δ , we have that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{u \in U_{\delta,i}^L, v \in U_{\delta,j}^L} \{T_{u,v}^{\mathbf{Left}_\delta} - 2(\phi(v) - \phi(u))\} \geq \frac{(\phi(v) - \phi(u))(\sqrt{\delta}n^{1/3})}{\delta^{3/2}n}\right) \leq C e^{-ck} < 1.$$

Proof. Observe that the event in question is measurable with respect to the vertex weights in the region Left_δ (indeed, this is one of the reasons we chose the definition of T to exclude the weights of the endpoints). Condition on the occurrence of the event in question and refer to it locally in this proof as \mathcal{A} . Thus on \mathcal{A} , there exist $u \in U_{\delta,i}^L, v \in U_{\delta,j}^L$ such that $T_{u,v}^{\text{Left}_\delta} - 2(\phi(v) - \phi(u)) \geq \frac{(\phi(v) - \phi(u))}{\delta^{3/2}n}(\sqrt{\delta}n^{1/3})$. Define the points $w_1 = ((i-1)\delta^{3/2}n, (i-1)\delta^{3/2}n)$ and $w_2 = ((j+2)\delta^{3/2}n, (j+2)\delta^{3/2}n)$. Let \mathcal{A}_1 be defined by

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \left\{ T_{w_1,u}^{(\text{Left}_\delta)^c} - 2(\phi(u) - \phi(w_1)) \geq -\frac{1}{4} \frac{(\phi(v) - \phi(u))}{\delta^{3/2}n}(\sqrt{\delta}n^{1/3}) \right\}$$

and define \mathcal{A}_2 by

$$\mathcal{A}_2 = \left\{ T_{v,w_2}^{(\text{Left}_\delta)^c} - 2(\phi(w_2) - \phi(v)) \geq -\frac{1}{4} \frac{(\phi(v) - \phi(u))}{\delta^{3/2}n}(\sqrt{\delta}n^{1/3}) \right\}.$$

Note that \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 are independent of each other and the vertex weights in the region Left_δ . Also, \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 together with the conditioning imply the event \mathcal{A}_3 which is defined by

$$\mathcal{A}_3 = \left\{ T_{w_1,w_2} - 2(\phi(w_2) - \phi(w_1)) \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{(\phi(v) - \phi(u))}{\delta^{3/2}n}(\sqrt{\delta}n^{1/3}) \right\}. \quad (55)$$

Indeed, this is simply a consequence of $T_{w_1,w_2} \geq T_{w_1,u}^{(\text{Left}_\delta)^c} + T_{u,v}^{\text{Left}_\delta} + T_{v,w_2}^{(\text{Left}_\delta)^c}$, which holds because both the endpoints are excluded in the definition of ℓ . Note that $\phi(w_2) - \phi(w_1) = 2(k+3)\delta^{3/2}n$. From this discussion, it is clear that

$$\min_{u \in U_{\delta,i}^L} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_1) \min_{v \in U_{\delta,j}^L} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_2) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_3) \leq C e^{-c \left(\frac{1}{(k+3)^{1/3}} \frac{\phi(v) - \phi(u)}{\delta^{3/2}n} \right)^{3/2}} \leq C_1 e^{-c_1 k}. \quad (56)$$

The second inequality follows by using Proposition 2.1 and the third inequality follows by taking k_0 large, observing that $\phi(v) - \phi(u) \geq 2(k-2)\delta^{3/2}n$.

It remains to establish good lower bounds for $\min_u \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_1)$ and $\min_v \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_2)$; by symmetry, we only deal with the former. Note that by translation invariance and Proposition 2.3, we have that for n large enough depending on δ and for some constants C_2, c_2 (independent of u and δ),

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_1^c) \leq C_2 e^{-c_2 \frac{\phi(v) - \phi(u)}{\delta^{3/2}n} \frac{\sqrt{\delta}n^{1/3}}{(\phi(u) - \phi(w_1))^{1/3}}} \leq C_3 e^{-c_3 k} \leq \frac{1}{2} \quad (57)$$

by taking k_0 to be large enough. Indeed, (57) is obtained by using Proposition 2.3 on the parallelogram $U_{\delta,i-1} \cup U_{\delta,i}$, using (8) to change the centering from $\mathbb{E}T_{w_1,u}$ to $2(\phi(u) - \phi(w_1))$ and noting that

$$T_{w_1,u}^{(\text{Left}_\delta)^c} \geq T_{w_1,u}^{U_{\delta,i-1} \cup U_{\delta,i}}. \quad (58)$$

The second inequality in (57) follows by using that $(\phi(v) - \phi(u)) \geq 2(k-2)\delta^{3/2}n$ along with $2\delta^{3/2}n \leq \phi(u) - \phi(w_1) \leq 4\delta^{3/2}n$. Thus, (56), (57) and an analogous lower bound on $\min_v \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_2)$ immediately yields

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}) \leq 4C_1 e^{-c_1 k} \quad (59)$$

if we take k_0 to be large enough. \square

We are now ready to prove Lemma 4.4.

Proof of Lemma 4.4. Denote by $\mathcal{A}_{i,j}$ the event whose probability is considered in Lemma 4.8. By the choice of k_1 and k_0 in Section 4.1.1, we have that for u, v as in the definition of Long^L we




FIGURE 3. Proof of Lemma 4.9: we show that it is unlikely for there to be a short excursion γ (marked in red) between u and v outside U_δ that exits $U_{M\delta}$ and has weight not too small. To show this, on the event of existence of such a γ , we construct a path γ_1 (the concatenation of the paths marked in blue with γ) such that γ_1 is a path between two fixed points, well separated in the time direction, such that $\ell(\gamma_1)$ is not too small. Notice that γ_1 has large transversal fluctuation and hence the latter event is shown to be unlikely using Proposition 2.5.

have $\phi(v) - \phi(u) \geq k_1\delta^{3/2}n \geq (k_0 + 2)\delta^{3/2}n$, and this implies that $u \in U_{\delta,i}^L, v \in U_{\delta,j}^L$ for some i, j satisfying $0 \leq i \leq j \leq \delta^{-3/2} - 1$ and $j - i \geq k_0$. Thus, we have that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{u,v \in U_\delta^L: \phi(v) - \phi(u) \geq k_1\delta^{3/2}n} \{T_{u,v}^{\text{Left}\delta} - 2(\phi(v) - \phi(u))\} < \frac{(\phi(v) - \phi(u))(\sqrt{\delta}n^{1/3})}{\delta^{3/2}n} \right) \geq \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcap_{i,j: j-i \geq k_0} \mathcal{A}_{i,j}^c \right). \quad (60)$$

If we let k be the variable for $j - i$, observe that for a fixed value of k , there are $\delta^{-3/2} - k$ pairs of (i, j) satisfying $j - i = k$ and $0 \leq i \leq j \leq \delta^{-3/2} - 1$. Also, by translation invariance, we have that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{i,j})$ depends only on $k = j - i$. By the FKG inequality for the decreasing events $\mathcal{A}_{i,j}^c$, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\bigcap_{i,j: j-i \geq k_0} \mathcal{A}_{i,j}^c \right) \geq \prod_{i,j: j-i \geq k_0} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{i,j}^c) \geq \prod_{k_0 \leq k \leq \delta^{-3/2}-1} (1 - Ce^{-ck})^{\delta^{-3/2}-k} \geq \prod_{k \geq k_0} (1 - Ce^{-ck})^{\delta^{-3/2}}. \quad (61)$$

Noting that $\prod_{k \geq k_0} (1 - Ce^{-ck}) > 0$ because $\sum_{k \geq 1} e^{-ck} < \infty$, we have the needed result on using (60). \square

4.4.2. *Lower bound for the event \mathbf{Short}^L .* In this subsection, we will obtain the required lower bound for $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Short}^L)$ in Lemma 4.5. We first need the following result.

Lemma 4.9. *For any $k_1 > 0$ fixed, all δ sufficiently small, and $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{1}{k_1\delta^{3/2}} - 2\}$, we have that there exists an absolute constant β and positive constants C, c (independent of δ) such that for M large enough (independent of δ) and for n large enough depending on δ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}((\mathbf{Short}_i^L)^c) \leq Ce^{-cM^3} < 1/2.$$

Proof. By translation invariance, we can restrict to $i = 0$. Define $w_1 = (-\frac{1}{2}\delta^{3/2}n, \frac{1}{2}\delta^{3/2}n) - k_1\delta^{3/2}\mathbf{n}$ and $w_2 = 2k_1\delta^{3/2}\mathbf{n} + (-\frac{1}{2}\delta^{3/2}n, \frac{1}{2}\delta^{3/2}n) + k_1\delta^{3/2}\mathbf{n}$; see Figure 3. Now, condition on the occurrence

of the event $(\mathbf{Short}_0^L)^c$. Thus, there exist $u, v \in U_\delta^L$ along with a path $\gamma: u \rightarrow v$ satisfying (26) along with $0 \leq \phi(u) \leq \phi(v) \leq 4k_1\delta^{3/2}n$. Analogous to \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 the proof of Lemma 4.8, consider the events

$$\mathcal{B}_1 = \left\{ T_{w_1, u}^{(\mathbf{Left}_\delta)^c} - 2(\phi(u) - \phi(w_1)) \geq -\frac{M^2}{2}\beta(2k_1\delta^{3/2}n)^{1/3} \right\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{B}_2 = \left\{ T_{v, w_2}^{(\mathbf{Left}_\delta)^c} - 2(\phi(w_2) - \phi(v)) \geq -\frac{M^2}{2}\beta(2k_1\delta^{3/2}n)^{1/3} \right\}.$$

Note that \mathcal{B}_1 and \mathcal{B}_2 are independent of each other and the vertex weights in \mathbf{Left}_δ . Also, \mathcal{B}_1 and \mathcal{B}_2 together with the conditioning imply the event \mathcal{B}_3 which is defined by

$$\mathcal{B}_3 = \left\{ \exists \gamma_1: w_1 \rightarrow w_2 \text{ with } \gamma_1 \cap \mathbf{Left}_{M\delta} \neq \emptyset \text{ and } \ell(\gamma_1) - 2(\phi(w_2) - \phi(w_1)) \geq -2\beta M^2(2k_1\delta^{3/2}n)^{1/3} \right\}. \quad (62)$$

Indeed, if $\chi_1: w_1 \rightarrow u$ is the path attaining $T_{w_1, u}^{(\mathbf{Left}_\delta)^c}$ and $\chi_2: v \rightarrow w_2$ is the path attaining $T_{v, w_2}^{(\mathbf{Left}_\delta)^c}$, then we can define $\gamma_1: w_1 \rightarrow w_2$ as the concatenation of χ_1, γ, χ_2 and use $\ell(\gamma_1) \geq \ell(\chi_1) + \ell(\gamma) + \ell(\chi_2)$ which holds because both the endpoints were excluded in the definition of ℓ .

Since k_1 is some fixed constant (independent of δ), we can invoke Proposition 2.5 to say that there exists an absolute constant β such that we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_3) \leq Ce^{-cM^3} \quad (63)$$

for large enough n . Indeed, we can just define $\beta = 2^{-2/3}\xi$, where ξ is in the statement of Lemma 2.5. Using this, we have that

$$\min_u \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_1) \min_v \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_2) \mathbb{P}((\mathbf{Short}_0^L)^c) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_3) \leq Ce^{-cM^3}, \quad (64)$$

where both the minimum's in the above equation are taken over the set $\{z \in U_\delta^L : \phi(z) \in [0, 4k_1\delta^{3/2}n]\}$. By the symmetry of the setting, we only prove a lower bound for $\min_u \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_1)$ and omit the proof of the corresponding lower bound for $\min_v \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_2)$. Note that for all possible points u , we have that $2k_1\delta^{3/2}n \leq \phi(u) - \phi(w_1) \leq 6k_1\delta^{3/2}n$, and thus $\frac{(\phi(u) - \phi(w_1))^{1/3}}{2\beta(2k_1\delta^{3/2}n)^{1/3}}$ is bounded away from 0 and ∞ .

Hence, on noting that $T_{w_1, u}^{(\mathbf{Left}_\delta)^c} \geq T_{w_1, u}^V$ for the rectangle V defined by

$$V = \left\{ -\delta n^{2/3} \leq \psi(u) \leq \delta n^{2/3} \right\} \cap \left\{ -2k_1\delta^{3/2}n \leq \phi(u) \leq 6k_1\delta^{3/2}n \right\}$$

and by using Proposition 2.3 for V , along with (8) to change the centering from $\mathbb{E}T_{w_1, u}$ to $2(\phi(u) - \phi(w_1))$, we get that for M large enough (independent of δ),

$$\min_u \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_1) \geq 1 - C_2 e^{-c_2 M^2} \geq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (65)$$

On combining this and the analogous lower bound of $\min_v \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_2)$ with (64), we get that for large enough M (independent of δ), we have

$$\mathbb{P}((\mathbf{Short}_0^L)^c) \leq 4Ce^{-cM^3} \quad (66)$$

provided that n is large enough depending on δ . \square

Instead of the conditioning argument presented above, another slightly different way to prove Lemma 4.9 would be to define \mathcal{B} by

$$\mathcal{B} = \left\{ \inf_{u', v' \in V^L, \phi(v') - \phi(u') \geq 2k_1\delta^{3/2}n} \{ T_{u', v'}^V - 2(\phi(v') - \phi(u')) \} \geq -\frac{M^2}{2}\beta(2k_1\delta^{3/2}n)^{1/3} \right\},$$

where V^L refers to the left long side of the rectangle V . One can now observe that $(\mathbf{Short}_0^L)^c \cap \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_3$, where the events on the left hand side are independent. $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B})$ can be lower bounded by Proposition 2.3 and (8), and the rest of the proof follows similarly.

We end this section by proving Lemma 4.5.

Proof of Lemma 4.5. Note that the \mathbf{Short}_i^L are all decreasing events. Using the FKG inequality along with Lemma 4.9 immediately gives that for n large enough depending on δ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Short}^L) \geq (1 - C_1 e^{-c_1 M^3})^{\frac{\delta^{-3/2}}{k_1} - 1} \geq (1/2)^{c_2 \delta^{-3/2}} = C e^{-c \delta^{-3/2}}. \quad (67)$$

Note that as mentioned in Section 4.1.1, M is fixed to be large enough compared to the other parameters so as to satisfy the conclusion of Lemma 4.9. \square

5. ONE POINT SMALL DEVIATION ESTIMATES FOR THE GEODESIC

In this section, we will provide the proof of Theorem 2 and the proof of Corollary 3 (ii). We start with the upper bound in Theorem 2, which is easier.

5.1. Proof of Theorem 2, upper bound. As already mentioned in the introduction, we shall complete the proof of the upper bound using the idea outlined in [11, Remark 2.11]. The main ingredient that we require, an estimate of the number of disjoint geodesics between two intervals of size $n^{2/3}$ on \mathbb{L}_0 and \mathbb{L}_{2n} , is quoted from [11]. Recall that we use \mathbb{L}_t to denote the line $\{x + y = t\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^2$. Also, recall from (9) that for any $\Delta > 0$, we use the notation U_Δ for the rectangle

$$\left\{ -\Delta n^{2/3} \leq \psi(u) \leq \Delta n^{2/3} \right\} \cap \{0 \leq \phi(u) \leq 2n\}.$$

Proposition 5.1 ([11, Theorem 2]). *For any $\Delta > 0$, let \mathcal{M}_l denote the event that there exist points $\{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_l\}$ on \underline{U}_Δ and points $\{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_l\}$ on \overline{U}_Δ satisfying $\psi(f_1) > \psi(f_2) > \dots > \psi(f_l)$ and $\psi(g_1) > \psi(g_2) > \dots > \psi(g_l)$ such that the geodesics Γ_{f_i, g_i} are all pairwise disjoint. Then there exist positive constants n_0, l_0 such that for all $n > n_0$ and all $l_0 \leq l \leq n^{0.01}$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{M}_l) \leq e^{-c_1 l^{1/4}}$$

for some positive constant c_1 depending on Δ .

Note that [11, Theorem 2] is stated for the special case $\Delta = 1$, but one can check that the same argument gives the result for every $\Delta > 0$.

Now fix an $\epsilon > 0$ and let $t \in \llbracket \epsilon n, (2 - \epsilon)n \rrbracket$ as in the setting of Theorem 2. Let \mathcal{L}_t denote the maximum number of points $\{h_1, h_2, \dots, h_l\}$ on $\mathbb{L}_t \cap U_1$ strictly decreasing in $\psi(\cdot)$ such that there exist points $\{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_l\}$ on \underline{U}_1 and points $\{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_l\}$ on \overline{U}_1 strictly decreasing in $\psi(\cdot)$ such that $h_i \in \Gamma_{f_i, g_i}$. We now use Proposition 5.1 to show that $\mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_t$ is upper bounded uniformly in n .

Lemma 5.2. *Fix an $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all n large and all $t \in \llbracket \epsilon n, (2 - \epsilon)n \rrbracket$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\mathcal{L}_t \leq C.$$

Proof. For a collection $\{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_l\}$, $\{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_l\}$ and $\{h_1, h_2, \dots, h_l\}$ satisfying the conditions in the definition of \mathcal{L}_t , we have that any two geodesics Γ_{f_i, g_i} and Γ_{f_j, g_j} must be disjoint when restricted to at least one of the time intervals $[0, \epsilon n]$ and $[(2 - \epsilon)n, 2n]$. Indeed, this follows by the ordering (and uniqueness) of geodesics along with the fact that $h_i \neq h_j$. Let F be the size of the largest subset of $\{1, \dots, l\}$ such that all the geodesics $\{\Gamma_{f_i, g_i}\}_{i \in I_1}$ are pairwise disjoint when restricted to the time interval $[0, \epsilon n]$. Let G be defined analogously for the time interval $[(2 - \epsilon)n, 2n]$. It is easy to see that $\max\{F, G\} \geq l/2$. Hence, by a union bound along with Proposition 5.1, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L}_t \geq l) \leq e^{-c_2 l^{1/4}} \quad (68)$$

for all $l \leq n^{0.01}$ and some constant c_2 depending on ϵ . The far end of the tail of \mathcal{L}_t can be bounded by using that

$$\mathcal{L}_t \leq |\mathbb{L}_t \cap U_1^n| = n^{2/3} + 1 \quad (69)$$

deterministically, and on using (68) with $l = n^{0.01}$, this yields

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{L}_t \geq n^{0.01}} \mathcal{L}_t] \leq e^{-c_2 n^{0.01/4}} (n^{2/3} + 1) < C_2 \quad (70)$$

for some positive constant C_2 for all n . The proof is completed using (68) and (70). \square

We now complete the proof of the upper bound in Theorem 2 by using Lemma 5.2.

Proof of Theorem 2, upper bound. We consider the points $u_i = (i\delta n^{2/3}, -i\delta n^{2/3})$ and $v_i = \mathbf{n} + u_i$ for $i \in \llbracket -\frac{\delta^{-1}}{2}, \frac{\delta^{-1}}{2} \rrbracket$. By translation invariance, we have that the probability

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\Gamma_{u_i, v_i}(t) - \psi(u_i)| < \delta n^{2/3}\right) \quad (71)$$

is independent of i . Also, by looking at the definition of \mathcal{L}_t in Lemma 5.2, we can deduce that

$$\sum_{i=-\delta^{-1/4}}^{\delta^{-1/4}} \mathbb{P}\left(|\Gamma_{u_i, v_i}(t) - \psi(u_i)| < \delta n^{2/3}\right) = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=-\delta^{-1/4}}^{\delta^{-1/4}} \mathbb{1}\left(|\Gamma_{u_i, v_i}(t) - \psi(u_i)| < \delta n^{2/3}\right)\right] \leq \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_t] \leq C, \quad (72)$$

where C_2 is obtained from Lemma 5.2. (71) and (72) together imply

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\Gamma_{u_0, v_0}(t) - \psi(u_0)| < \delta n^{2/3}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(|\Gamma_n(t)| < \delta n^{2/3}\right) \leq 2C\delta, \quad (73)$$

and the result follows immediately. \square

5.2. Proof of the lower bound in Theorem 2. We shall prove the lower bound in Theorem 2 in this subsection. We first complete the proof of the lower bound using Proposition 1.2 and prove the latter result, which is the heart of the technical content in this section, in the next subsection.

We recall the notation from the statement of Proposition 1.2: for some $M > 0$ which will be taken to be large later, we define the points a_1, a_2 by

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= (-Mn^{2/3}, Mn^{2/3}), \\ a_2 &= (Mn^{2/3}, -Mn^{2/3}), \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

and let $b_1 = a_1 + \mathbf{n}$ and $b_2 = a_2 + \mathbf{n}$. Note that the parameter M used in this section is completely independent of the parameter M used in Section 4. Proposition 1.2 roughly states that the geodesics Γ_{a_1, b_1} and Γ_{a_2, b_2} coalesce with positive probability, while not straying more than $Mn^{2/3}$ distance away in the transversal direction.

Proof of the lower bound in Theorem 2. The basic strategy is similar to the proof of the upper bound. We consider points $u_i = (i\delta n^{2/3}, -i\delta n^{2/3})$ and $v_i = \mathbf{n} + u_i$ for $i \in \llbracket -M\delta^{-1}, M\delta^{-1} \rrbracket$. By the same reasoning as in (71), we have that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\Gamma_{u_i, v_i}(t) - \psi(u_i)| \leq \delta n^{2/3}\right) \quad (75)$$

is independent of i . Similarly, we also have that

$$\sum_{i=-M/\delta}^{M/\delta} \mathbb{P}\left(|\Gamma_{u_i, v_i}(t) - \psi(u_i)| \leq \delta n^{2/3}\right) = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=-M/\delta}^{M/\delta} \mathbb{1}\left(|\Gamma_{u_i, v_i}(t) - \psi(u_i)| \leq \delta n^{2/3}\right)\right]. \quad (76)$$




FIGURE 4. Proof of the lower bound in Theorem 2: Proposition 1.2 implies that with probability bounded away from 0, the geodesics Γ_{a_1,b_1} and Γ_{a_2,b_2} intersect the line $x + y = t$ at the same point with the point's ψ -coordinate bounded by $M\delta n^{2/3}$ in the absolute value. By the planar ordering of geodesics, this implies that for every point u between a_1 and a_2 and for every point v between b_1 and b_2 , $\Gamma_{u,v}$ intersects the line $x + y = t$ at the same point. In particular, this implies that there exists $u_i = (i\delta n^{2/3}, -i\delta n^{2/3})$ and $v_i = u_i + \mathbf{n}$ such that $|\Gamma_{u_i,v_i} - \psi(u_i)| \leq \delta n^{2/3}$, and hence the expected number of such i is bounded away from 0. The proof of the lower bound in Theorem 2 follows by a translation invariance argument.

We locally refer to the event defined in the statement of Proposition 1.2 as \mathcal{A} . Note that by the ordering of geodesics, we have that $\Gamma_{u_i,v_i}(t)$ is the same for all i on the event \mathcal{A} . This in turn implies that on the event \mathcal{A} , the expression

$$\mathbb{1}\left(|\Gamma_{u_i,v_i}(t) - \psi(u_i)| \leq \delta n^{2/3}\right)$$

must be 1 for at least one i . Thus, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=-M/\delta}^{M/\delta} \mathbb{1}\left(|\Gamma_{u_i,v_i}(t) - \psi(u_i)| \leq \delta n^{2/3}\right)\right] \geq \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=-M/\delta}^{M/\delta} \mathbb{1}\left(|\Gamma_{u_i,v_i}(t) - \psi(u_i)| \leq \delta n^{2/3}\right); \mathcal{A}\right] \geq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}) \geq c, \quad (77)$$

where c comes from Proposition 1.2. Finally, by combining (75), (76) and (77), we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\Gamma_n| \leq \delta n^{2/3}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(|\Gamma_{u_0,v_0}(t) - \psi(u_0)| \leq \delta n^{2/3}\right) \geq \frac{c}{2M}\delta, \quad (78)$$

which finishes the proof since $\frac{c}{2M}$ is a constant. \square

Before moving onto the proof of Proposition 1.2, we quickly finish the proof of Corollary 3 (ii) by using Theorem 2.

Proof of Corollary 3 (ii). We use Theorem 2 along with the definition $\pi_n(s) = n^{-2/3}\Gamma_n(2ns)$ for $2ns \in \mathbb{Z}$. Indeed, for n large enough, we have that for any fixed $s \in (0, 1)$, $\frac{\lfloor 2ns \rfloor}{2n}$ is bounded away

from 0 and 1 and now Theorem 2 implies that for some constants c, C , we have

$$c\delta \leq \mathbb{P}\left(|\Gamma_n(\lceil 2ns \rceil)| \leq \delta n^{2/3}\right) \leq C\delta.$$

Using that $\Gamma_n(\cdot)$ has ± 1 increments, and that $\pi_n(s)$ is defined for all $s \in [0, 1]$ by interpolating the values on $[0, 1] \cap \frac{1}{2n}\mathbb{Z}$, we obtain that

$$\frac{c}{2}\delta \leq \mathbb{P}(|\pi_n(s)| \leq \delta) \leq 2C\delta.$$

for all n large enough. The mapping $f \mapsto |f(s)|$ is continuous as a map from $C[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{R}^+ with the uniform convergence topology and Euclidean topology respectively. Thus by the continuous mapping theorem, if $\pi_{n_i} \Rightarrow \pi$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ for a subsequence $\{n_i\}$, we have that $|\pi_{n_i}(s)| \Rightarrow |\pi(s)|$. We can now use the Portmanteau theorem in the same way as in the Proof of Corollary 3 (i) to obtain

$$\frac{c}{4}\delta \leq \mathbb{P}(|\pi(s)| \leq \delta) \leq 4C\delta$$

for any fixed $s \in (0, 1)$. The uniformity of c, C as long as s is bounded away from 0 and 1 is evident from the proof. \square

5.3. Proof of Proposition 1.2. To prove Proposition 1.2, we shall again construct a host of favourable events whose intersection holds with positive probability and on which the geodesics are forced to coalesce at the required location. These events will be defined with a parameter M (note that this M has nothing to do with the parameter used in the proof of the lower bound in Theorem 1 from the previous sections). We start by outlining how the choice of M is fixed, and then define the relevant events.

5.3.1. Choice of the parameter M . All the constructions will be made with a parameter M which will be fixed to be a large constant at the end, and this fixed constant is the one appearing in the statement of Proposition 1.2. The specific choice of M is fixed large enough to satisfy the conclusions of Lemma 5.3, Lemma 5.4 and Proposition 5.9. Using this value of M in Lemma 5.7 provides us with a corresponding value of β and the final probability lower bound in (104) is in terms of β .

Observe that (8) along with $\mathbb{E}\underline{T}_{u,v} = \mathbb{E}T_{u,v} + 1$ implies that for all Δ large, and for all n large depending on Δ , we have that for all $u \in \underline{U}_\Delta$ and $v \in \overline{U}_\Delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} -C'n^{1/3} &\leq \mathbb{E}T_{u,v} - (4n - C\Delta^2 n^{1/3}) \leq C'n^{1/3}, \\ -C'n^{1/3} &\leq \mathbb{E}\underline{T}_{u,v} - (4n - C\Delta^2 n^{1/3}) \leq C'n^{1/3} \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

for some constants C, C' not depending on Δ . We will repeatedly use (79) with Δ being equal to $M^{3/4}, M$ and M^2 to change the centering in the estimates.

5.3.2. Events favourable for coalescence. Recall from (9) that for any $\Delta > 0$, we use the notation U_Δ for the rectangle

$$\left\{-\Delta n^{2/3} \leq \psi(u) \leq \Delta n^{2/3}\right\} \cap \{0 \leq \phi(u) \leq 2n\}.$$

Let the rectangles R_1 and R_2 be defined by

$$R_1 = U_{M^2} \cap \left\{\frac{\epsilon}{4}n \leq \phi(u) \leq \frac{3\epsilon}{4}n\right\}, \quad (80)$$

$$R_2 = U_{M^2} \cap \left\{2n - \frac{3\epsilon}{4}n \leq \phi(u) \leq 2n - \frac{\epsilon}{4}n\right\}. \quad (81)$$

Let \underline{R}_1 and \overline{R}_1 denote the short sides of R_1 lying on the lines $\mathbb{L}_{\frac{\epsilon n}{4}}$ and $\mathbb{L}_{\frac{3\epsilon n}{4}}$ respectively. Similarly, let \underline{R}_2 and \overline{R}_2 denote the short sides of R_2 lying on the lines $\mathbb{L}_{2n - \frac{3\epsilon n}{4}}$ and $\mathbb{L}_{2n - \frac{\epsilon n}{4}}$ respectively; see

Figure 5. We now define some high probability events which will be used later. For a point $u \in \mathbb{L}_0$, and any $x > 0$, define the event $\mathbf{Restr}_{u,x}$ by

$$\mathbf{Restr}_{u,x} = \left\{ \text{All } \gamma: u \rightarrow u + \mathbf{n} \text{ satisfying } \gamma \cap (U_x)^c \neq \emptyset \text{ have } \ell(\gamma) \leq 4n - \frac{\xi}{2}x^2n^{1/3} \right\}, \quad (82)$$

where in this section, ξ always denotes the constant from Proposition 2.5. We define the event \mathbf{Restr} by

$$\mathbf{Restr} = \mathbf{Restr}_{0,2M} \cap \mathbf{Restr}_{a_1,M^2} \cap \mathbf{Restr}_{a_2,M^2}, \quad (83)$$

where $a_1 = (-Mn^{2/3}, Mn^{2/3})$ and $a_2 = (Mn^{2/3}, -Mn^{2/3})$ as defined in (74). Also, recall that we have defined $b_1 = a_1 + \mathbf{n}$ and $b_2 = a_2 + \mathbf{n}$.

We now define some more events which will be used in our construction.

- \mathcal{W}_1 : the event that for any $u \in \mathbb{L}_0 \cap U_{M^2}$ and $v \in \underline{R}_1$, we have $|\tilde{T}_{u,v}| \leq Mn^{1/3}$.
- \mathcal{W}_2 : the event that for any $u \in \overline{R}_1$ and $v \in \underline{R}_2$, we have $|\underline{T}_{u,v}| \leq Mn^{1/3}$.
- \mathcal{W}_3 : the event that for any $u \in \overline{R}_2$ and $v \in \mathbb{L}_{2n} \cap U_{M^2}$, we have $|\tilde{T}_{u,v}| \leq Mn^{1/3}$.
- \mathcal{S}_1 : the event that for any $u \in \underline{R}_1$ and $v \in \overline{R}_1$, we have $|\tilde{T}_{u,v}^{R_1}| \leq Mn^{1/3}$.
- \mathcal{S}_2 : the event that for any $u \in \underline{R}_2$ and $v \in \overline{R}_2$, we have $|\tilde{T}_{u,v}^{R_2}| \leq Mn^{1/3}$.
- \mathcal{S}'_1 : the event that for any $u \in \underline{R}_1$ and $v \in \overline{R}_1$, we have $\tilde{T}_{u,v}^{R_1} \leq Mn^{1/3}$.
- \mathcal{S}'_2 : the event that for any $u \in \underline{R}_2$ and $v \in \overline{R}_2$, we have $\tilde{T}_{u,v}^{R_2} \leq Mn^{1/3}$.

Note that both T and \underline{T} are used to define the above events, and the minor technical reason for doing this will become clear in the proof of Proposition 5.9.

We will be using the events

$$\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W}_1 \cap \mathcal{W}_2 \cap \mathcal{W}_3, \quad (84)$$

$$\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_1 \cap \mathcal{S}_2, \quad (85)$$

$$\mathcal{S}' = \mathcal{S}'_1 \cap \mathcal{S}'_2. \quad (86)$$

Note that the reason for defining \mathcal{S}' and \mathcal{S} separately is that \mathcal{S}' is a decreasing event, and this will allow us to apply the FKG inequality in Proposition 5.8. We now show that all the above events occur with high probability.

Lemma 5.3. *For all M large, and all n large depending on M , we have $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W}) \geq 0.99$, $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}) \geq 0.99$, $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}') \geq 0.99$ and $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Restr}) \geq 0.99$. Thus, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}' \cap \mathbf{Restr} \cap \mathcal{W}) \geq 0.97.$$

Proof. The lower bounds for $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W})$, $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S})$ and $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}')$ are very simple consequences of a union bound, Proposition 2.2 and Proposition 2.3. We just illustrate the proof by proving the bound for $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S})$. By symmetry and a union bound, we only need to lower bound $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}_1)$. Now, divide \underline{R}_1 into M^2 disjoint segments of length 1, and call these segments $(\underline{R}_1)_i$ where $i \in \{1, \dots, M^2\}$; do the same for \overline{R}_1 and call the segments $(\overline{R}_1)_j$. Let $P_{i,j}$ denote the parallelogram with $(\underline{R}_1)_i$ and $(\overline{R}_1)_j$ as the short sides. By using a slightly generalized version of Proposition 2.3 for parallelograms whose long sides have slopes other than 1 (see [10, Theorem 4.2 (ii)]), we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\inf_{u \in (\underline{R}_1)_i, v \in (\overline{R}_1)_j} \tilde{T}_{u,v}^{R_1} \geq -Mn^{1/3} \right) \geq \mathbb{P} \left(\inf_{u \in (\underline{R}_1)_i, v \in (\overline{R}_1)_j} \tilde{T}_{u,v}^{P_{i,j}} \geq -Mn^{1/3} \right) \geq 1 - Ce^{-cM}. \quad (87)$$




FIGURE 5. The basic elements for constructing favourable events to force coalescence of geodesics in the proof of Proposition 1.2: The rectangles R_1 and R_2 , marked in grey, act as barriers, on either side of the lines $x + y = t$. All paths across R_1 and R_2 (except for those that intersect two specially designated paths γ_1 and γ_2 , marked in red) are forced to be much shorter than typical. This is the content of the event $\mathcal{P}^{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}$. The other events \mathcal{S} , \mathcal{S}' and \mathcal{W} are typical; \mathcal{W} ensures that the paths through the regions below R_1 , between R_1 and R_2 , and above R_2 (some instances of such path are marked in green) have typical weights, whereas \mathcal{S}' ensures that any path through R_1 and R_2 does not have atypically large weight. The event **Restr**, not shown in the figure, ensures that paths have typical transversal fluctuation.

By Proposition 2.2, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{u \in (\underline{R}_1)_i, v \in (\overline{R}_1)_j} \tilde{T}_{u,v}^{R_1} \leq Mn^{1/3} \right) \geq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{u \in (\underline{R}_1)_i, v \in (\overline{R}_1)_j} \tilde{T}_{u,v} \leq Mn^{1/3} \right) \geq 1 - C_1 e^{-c_1 M^{3/2}}. \quad (88)$$

To complete the proof, one just needs to take a union bound over the polynomially many (in M) choices of i, j , and we are done by choosing M sufficiently large because of the stretched exponential decay in the probability.

The lower bound for $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Restr})$ is an immediate application of Proposition 2.5 and a union bound. Finally, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}' \cap \mathbf{Restr} \cap \mathcal{W}) \geq 0.97. \quad (89)$$

by another union bound. \square

We now use the events that we have defined to show that with high probability, the geodesic Γ_n is constrained inside $U_{M^{3/4}}$ while ensuring that its different segments have weights close to typical.

Lemma 5.4. *On the event $\mathbf{Restr}_{0, M^{3/4}} \cap \mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{S}$, we have that the geodesic $\Gamma_n \subseteq U_{M^{3/4}}$ for all M large, and n large depending on M . We also have*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Restr}_{0, M^{3/4}} \cap \mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{S}) \geq 0.97.$$

Proof. On $\mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{S}$, we have that for some constant C ,

$$T_{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{n}} \geq T_{\mathbf{0}, \frac{\epsilon}{8}\mathbf{n}} + T_{\frac{\epsilon}{8}\mathbf{n}, \frac{3\epsilon}{8}\mathbf{n}}^{R_1} + T_{\frac{3\epsilon}{8}\mathbf{n}, (1-\frac{3\epsilon}{8})\mathbf{n}} + T_{(1-\frac{3\epsilon}{8})\mathbf{n}, (1-\frac{\epsilon}{8})\mathbf{n}}^{R_2} + T_{(1-\frac{\epsilon}{8})\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{n}} \geq 4n - (5M + 5C)n^{1/3}, \quad (90)$$

where the constant C comes from switching the centering by using (8). Using the definition of $\mathbf{Restr}_{\mathbf{0}, M^{3/4}}$ and the fact that $\xi M^{3/2}/2 > M + C$ for M large, it is clear from (90) that $\Gamma_n \subseteq U_{M^{3/4}}$.

The probability lower bound is an easy consequence of Proposition 2.5 and Lemma 5.3. Indeed, we just need to individually lower bound $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Restr}_{\mathbf{0}, M^{3/4}})$, $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{W})$ and $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S})$ by 0.99 and use a union bound. \square

At this point, we introduce some notation. For a given path $\gamma: u \rightarrow v$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\ell}(\gamma) &= \ell(\gamma) - \mathbb{E}T_{u,v}, \\ \underline{\tilde{\ell}}(\gamma) &= \underline{\ell}(\gamma) - \mathbb{E}\underline{T}_{u,v}. \end{aligned} \quad (91)$$

From now on, for a fixed M , we say that a path γ is θ -typical if it satisfies $\gamma \subseteq U_\theta$ and $|\tilde{\ell}(\gamma)| \leq Mn^{1/3}$.

Lemma 5.5. *Let \mathcal{T} be the event that $\Gamma_n|_{R_1}$ and $\Gamma_n|_{R_2}$ are $M^{3/4}$ -typical. Then $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}) \geq 0.97$ for all M large, and n large depending on M as in the statement of Lemma 5.4.*

Proof. By Lemma 5.4, on the event $\mathbf{Restr}_{\mathbf{0}, M^{3/4}} \cap \mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{S}$, we have that the geodesic $\Gamma_n \subseteq U_{M^{3/4}}$, which in particular implies that $\Gamma_n|_{R_1}, \Gamma_n|_{R_2} \subseteq U_{M^{3/4}}$. Also, the definition of the event \mathcal{S} ensures that on $\mathbf{Restr}_{\mathbf{0}, M^{3/4}} \cap \mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{S}$, we have $|\tilde{\ell}(\Gamma_n|_{R_1})| \leq Mn^{1/3}$ and $|\tilde{\ell}(\Gamma_n|_{R_2})| \leq Mn^{1/3}$. Thus, we have that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T}) \geq \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Restr}_{\mathbf{0}, M^{3/4}} \cap \mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{S}) \geq 0.97$$

by Lemma 5.4. \square

Let \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2 denote the set of all $M^{3/4}$ -typical paths from \underline{R}_1 to \bar{R}_1 and \underline{R}_2 to \bar{R}_2 respectively. By Lemma 5.5, it is clear that

$$\mathbb{P}(\Gamma_n|_{R_1} \in \mathcal{S}_1, \Gamma_n|_{R_2} \in \mathcal{S}_2) \geq 0.97. \quad (92)$$

Let \mathcal{S} denote the set of pairs of paths (γ_1, γ_2) such that $\gamma_1 \in \mathcal{S}_1$, $\gamma_2 \in \mathcal{S}_2$ and

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}' \cap \mathbf{Restr} \cap \mathcal{W} | \Gamma_n|_{R_1} = \gamma_1, \Gamma_n|_{R_2} = \gamma_2) \geq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (93)$$

In view of Lemma 5.3, we have the following lower bound.

Lemma 5.6. *$\mathbb{P}((\Gamma_n|_{R_1}, \Gamma_n|_{R_2}) \in \mathcal{S}) \geq 0.9$ for all M large and n large depending on M as in the statement of Lemma 5.4.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{P} be the set of pairs of paths (γ_1, γ_2) such that $\gamma_1 \in \mathcal{S}_1$ and $\gamma_2 \in \mathcal{S}_2$. Note that we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}' \cap \mathbf{Restr} \cap \mathcal{W}) \\ &= 1 - \mathbb{P}((\mathcal{S}' \cap \mathbf{Restr} \cap \mathcal{W})^c) \\ &\leq 1 - \sum_{(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{P}((\mathcal{S}' \cap \mathbf{Restr} \cap \mathcal{W})^c | \Gamma_n|_{R_1} = \gamma_1, \Gamma_n|_{R_2} = \gamma_2) \mathbb{P}(\Gamma_n|_{R_1} = \gamma_1, \Gamma_n|_{R_2} = \gamma_2) \\ &\leq 1 - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{P}((\Gamma_n|_{R_1}, \Gamma_n|_{R_2}) \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{S}) \end{aligned}$$

by using the definition of \mathcal{S} as in (93). Using (89) along with the above, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}((\Gamma_n|_{R_1}, \Gamma_n|_{R_2}) \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{S}) \leq 0.06. \quad (94)$$

Finally, we have that

$$\mathbb{P}((\Gamma_n|_{R_1}, \Gamma_n|_{R_2}) \in \mathcal{S}) = \mathbb{P}((\Gamma_n|_{R_1}, \Gamma_n|_{R_2}) \in \mathcal{P}) - \mathbb{P}((\Gamma_n|_{R_1}, \Gamma_n|_{R_2}) \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{S}) \geq 0.97 - 0.06 = 0.91$$

by using (92) and (94) and this completes the proof. \square

We will finally want to condition on the event $\{(\Gamma_n|_{R_1}, \Gamma_n|_{R_2}) = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2)\}$ for some $\gamma \in \mathcal{S}$, and then show that in this conditional environment, we have that both the geodesics Γ_{a_1, b_1} and Γ_{a_2, b_2} meet γ_1 and γ_2 with positive probability. We will ensure this by “decreasing” the background vertex weights in the region $R_1 \setminus \gamma_1$ and $R_2 \setminus \gamma_2$, and we define some more events which will help us in achieving this.

For any path $\gamma_1 \subseteq R_1$ from \underline{R}_1 to \overline{R}_1 , and any path $\gamma_2 \subseteq R_2$ from \underline{R}_2 to \overline{R}_2 , we will consider the following events:

- \mathcal{P}^{γ_1} : the event that any path $\gamma \subseteq R_1$ from \underline{R}_1 to \overline{R}_1 disjoint from γ_1 satisfies $\underline{\ell}(\gamma) \leq -M^4 n^{1/3}$.
- \mathcal{P}^{γ_2} : the event that any path $\gamma \subseteq R_2$ from \underline{R}_2 to \overline{R}_2 disjoint from γ_2 satisfies $\underline{\ell}(\gamma) \leq -M^4 n^{1/3}$.

In the above setting, we define the event $\mathcal{P}^{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}$ by

$$\mathcal{P}^{\gamma_1, \gamma_2} = \mathcal{P}^{\gamma_1} \cap \mathcal{P}^{\gamma_2}.$$

Note that the event $\mathcal{P}^{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}$ depends only on the vertex weights inside $(R_1 \setminus (\gamma_1 \cup \overline{R}_1)) \cup (R_2 \setminus (\gamma_2 \cup \overline{R}_2))$.

Note that by using (79) along with Lemma 2.7, we have that once we fix some large constant M , then for some constant c not depending on γ_1 or γ_2 , we have that the probabilities of each of the above events are lower bounded by some constant c for all n large enough. Using the independence between the vertex weights in R_1 and R_2 , we have that \mathcal{P}^{γ_1} and \mathcal{P}^{γ_2} are independent and this immediately implies the following lemma:

Lemma 5.7. *For any path $\gamma_1 \subseteq R_1$ from \underline{R}_1 to \overline{R}_1 and any path $\gamma_2 \subseteq R_2$ from \underline{R}_2 to \overline{R}_2 , we have that for any $M > 0$, there exists a positive constant β (depending on the choice of M , independent of the choice of γ_1, γ_2) such that for all n large enough,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{P}^{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}) \geq \beta. \tag{95}$$

Proof. The lemma follows by using (79), Lemma 2.7, and the independence of \mathcal{P}^{γ_1} and \mathcal{P}^{γ_2} as explained above. Indeed, by (79), we have that for any path $\gamma \subseteq R_1$ from \underline{R}_1 to \overline{R}_1 , and for some positive constants C_1, C_2 not depending on M ,

$$\{\underline{\ell}(\gamma) \leq -M^4 n^{1/3}\} \supseteq \{\underline{\ell}(\gamma) - \epsilon n \leq (-C_1 - 1)M^4 n^{1/3} - C_2 n^{1/3}\},$$

and the M -dependent lower bound for $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{P}^{\gamma_1})$ now follows by using Lemma 2.7 for the rectangle R_1 . Similar considerations for R_2 yield the lower bound for $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{P}^{\gamma_2})$. \square

Again, note that the β and M in this section have no relation to the ones in Section 4.1.1.

Proposition 5.8. *For any $M > 0$ fixed, let $\beta = \beta(M)$ be the constant obtained from Lemma 5.7. For any path $\gamma_1 \subseteq R_1$ from \underline{R}_1 to \overline{R}_1 and any path $\gamma_2 \subseteq R_2$ from \underline{R}_2 to \overline{R}_2 , we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{P}^{\gamma_1, \gamma_2} | \mathcal{S}' \cap \mathbf{Restr} \cap \mathcal{W} \cap \{\Gamma_n|_{R_1} = \gamma_1\} \cap \{\Gamma_n|_{R_2} = \gamma_2\}) \geq \beta$$

for all n large enough.

Proof. Note that after conditioning on the configuration in $((R_1 \setminus (\gamma_1 \cup \overline{R}_1)) \cup (R_2 \setminus (\gamma_2 \cup \overline{R}_2)))^c$, we have that \mathcal{S}' , \mathbf{Restr} , $\mathcal{P}^{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}$ and $\{\Gamma_n|_{R_1} = \gamma_1\} \cap \{\Gamma_n|_{R_2} = \gamma_2\}$ are decreasing events on $(R_1 \setminus (\gamma_1 \cup \overline{R}_1)) \cup (R_2 \setminus (\gamma_2 \cup \overline{R}_2))$. Let $\mathcal{F}_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}$ denote the σ -algebra generated by the vertex weights in $((R_1 \setminus (\gamma_1 \cup \overline{R}_1)) \cup (R_2 \setminus (\gamma_2 \cup \overline{R}_2)))^c$. Using the FKG inequality and the dependence of $\mathcal{P}^{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}$

only on the vertex weights in $(R_1 \setminus (\gamma_1 \cup \bar{R}_1)) \cup (R_2 \setminus (\gamma_2 \cup \bar{R}_2))$ (thus, $\mathcal{P}^{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}$ is independent of $\mathcal{F}_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}$), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{P}^{\gamma_1, \gamma_2} \cap \mathcal{S}' \cap \mathbf{Restr} \cap \{\Gamma_n|_{R_1} = \gamma_1\} \cap \{\Gamma_n|_{R_2} = \gamma_2\} | \mathcal{F}_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}) \geq \\ & \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{P}^{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}' \cap \mathbf{Restr} \cap \{\Gamma_n|_{R_1} = \gamma_1\} \cap \{\Gamma_n|_{R_2} = \gamma_2\} | \mathcal{F}_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}). \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

Noting that the event \mathcal{W} is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{F}_{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{P}^{\gamma_1, \gamma_2} \cap \mathcal{S}' \cap \mathbf{Restr} \cap \{\Gamma_n|_{R_1} = \gamma_1\} \cap \{\Gamma_n|_{R_2} = \gamma_2\} | \mathcal{W}) \\ & \geq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{P}^{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}' \cap \mathbf{Restr} \cap \{\Gamma_n|_{R_1} = \gamma_1\} \cap \{\Gamma_n|_{R_2} = \gamma_2\} | \mathcal{W}) \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

and this in turn yields

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{P}^{\gamma_1, \gamma_2} | \mathcal{S}' \cap \mathbf{Restr} \cap \mathcal{W} \cap \{\Gamma_n|_{R_1} = \gamma_1\} \cap \{\Gamma_n|_{R_2} = \gamma_2\}) \geq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{P}^{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}) \geq \beta, \quad (98)$$

thereby completing the proof. \square

5.3.3. Forcing the geodesics to coalesce on the favourable events. We shall now show that the positive probability event constructed above implies that Γ_{a_1, b_1} and Γ_{a_2, b_2} coincide between \bar{R}_1 and \bar{R}_2 .

Proposition 5.9. *Take any $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \in \mathcal{S}$. On the event $\mathcal{P}^{\gamma_1, \gamma_2} \cap \mathcal{S}' \cap \mathbf{Restr} \cap \mathcal{W}$, we have that for M large enough, and n large depending on M : $\Gamma_{a_1, b_1}, \Gamma_{a_2, b_2} \subseteq U_{M^2}$, $\Gamma_n \subseteq U_{2M}$ and both Γ_{a_1, b_1} and Γ_{a_2, b_2} intersect both γ_1 and γ_2 .*

Proof. Let u_1, v_1 (resp. u_2, v_2) be the starting and ending points of γ_1 (resp. γ_2). Let χ_1 be the concatenation of the paths $\Gamma_{a_1, u_1}, \gamma_1, \Gamma_{v_1, u_2}, \gamma_2$ and Γ_{v_2, b_1} . By using that the paths γ_1 and γ_2 are $M^{3/4}$ -typical along with the definition of the events \mathbf{Restr} and \mathcal{W} , we have that for some absolute constant c ,

$$\ell(\chi_1) - 4n \geq -cM^2n^{1/3}. \quad (99)$$

Here, we have used that $\ell(\chi_1) = \ell(\Gamma_{a_1, u_1}) + \underline{\ell}(\gamma_1) + \underline{\ell}(\Gamma_{v_1, u_2}) + \underline{\ell}(\gamma_2) + \underline{\ell}(\Gamma_{v_2, b_1})$. The recentering in (99) with respect to $4n$ is done by using (79) for the endpoints of each of the five segments making up χ_1 , and using that all the endpoints lie inside U_{2M} . Indeed, this recentering leads to the M^2 term in (99). Now, using that $\xi M^4/2 > cM^2$ for large M , we have that $\chi_1 \subseteq U_{M^2}$ and consequently $\Gamma_{a_1, b_1} \subseteq U_{M^2}$. By a symmetric argument, one also obtains that $\Gamma_{a_2, b_2} \subseteq U_{M^2}$.

Now, let χ_2 be the concatenation of the paths $\Gamma_{\mathbf{0}, u_1}, \gamma_1, \Gamma_{v_1, u_2}, \gamma_2$ and $\Gamma_{v_2, \mathbf{n}}$. By using that γ_1 and γ_2 are $M^{3/4}$ -typical along with the definition of the events \mathbf{Restr} and \mathcal{W} , we have that for some absolute constant c_1 ,

$$\ell(\chi_2) - 4n \geq -c_1M^{3/2}n^{1/3}. \quad (100)$$

Again, we have used (79) for the endpoints of the five segments of χ_2 along with $\ell(\chi_2) = \ell(\Gamma_{\mathbf{0}, u_1}) + \underline{\ell}(\gamma_1) + \underline{\ell}(\Gamma_{v_1, u_2}) + \underline{\ell}(\gamma_2) + \underline{\ell}(\Gamma_{v_2, \mathbf{n}})$. Here, we obtained $M^{3/2}$ since $\mathbf{0}, u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2, \mathbf{n} \subseteq U_{M^{3/4}}$ and this is because γ_1 and γ_2 are $M^{3/4}$ -typical as in the definition of \mathcal{S} . Using that $\xi(2M)^2/2 > c_1M^{3/2}$ for large M , and the definition of the event $\mathbf{Restr}_{\mathbf{0}, 2M} \supseteq \mathbf{Restr}$, we obtain that $\Gamma_n \subseteq U_{2M}$.

Now, consider any path $\gamma \subseteq U_{M^2}$ from a_1 to b_1 which does not intersect at least one of γ_1 and γ_2 . By the definition of the event $\mathcal{P}^{\gamma_1, \gamma_2}$, \mathcal{W} and \mathcal{S}' , we have that

$$\ell(\gamma) - 4n \leq 4Mn^{1/3} - M^4n^{1/3} + c_2n^{1/3}. \quad (101)$$

Here, one divides γ into five segments which we call $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_5$ and uses that $\ell(\gamma) = \ell(\sigma_1) + \underline{\ell}(\sigma_2) + \underline{\ell}(\sigma_3) + \underline{\ell}(\sigma_4) + \underline{\ell}(\sigma_5)$. The recentering in (101) is done by using the right hand side part of (79) and this leads to c_2 , a positive constant. Indeed, one uses (79) once for each segment of γ , and c_2 is the cumulative effect of these five applications. By noting that $M^4 - 4M - c_2 > cM^2$ for large M and by using (99) along with (101), we have that Γ_{a_1, b_1} must intersect γ_1 and γ_2 both. By




FIGURE 6. Coalescence of geodesics $\Gamma_{a_1,b_1}, \Gamma_{a_2,b_2}$ on the favourable events: we show that for a pair of paths γ_1 and γ_2 across R_1 and R_2 respective satisfying the required regularity conditions, on the intersection of event $\mathcal{P}^{\gamma_1,\gamma_2}$ and the typical event $\mathcal{S}' \cap \mathbf{Restr} \cap \mathcal{W}$, Γ_{a_1,b_1} and Γ_{a_2,b_2} each intersect both γ_1 and γ_2 . This is done by using the definition of $\mathcal{P}^{\gamma_1,\gamma_2}$ which ensures that any path crossing R_1 or R_2 and disjoint with γ_1 or γ_2 respectively incurs a heavy penalty in weight. Finally, the event $\{\Gamma_n|_{R_1} = \gamma_1\} \cap \{\Gamma_n|_{R_2} = \gamma_2\}$ ensures the required coalescence.

entirely analogous arguments, one observes that Γ_{a_2,b_2} must intersect γ_1 and γ_2 both; see Figure 6 for an illustration of this argument. \square

We are finally ready to prove Proposition 1.2.

Proof of Proposition 1.2. We first show that we can fix M large enough such that if we take any $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \in \mathcal{I}$, we have

$$\mathcal{P}^{\gamma_1,\gamma_2} \cap \mathcal{S}' \cap \mathbf{Restr} \cap \mathcal{W} \cap \{\Gamma_n|_{R_1} = \gamma_1\} \cap \{\Gamma_n|_{R_2} = \gamma_2\} \subseteq \{\Gamma_{a_1,b_1}(t) = \Gamma_{a_2,b_2}(t)\} \cap \left\{ |\Gamma_{a_1,b_1}(t)| \leq 2Mn^{2/3} \right\} \quad (102)$$

for all n large enough. As mentioned in Section 5.3.1, fix M large so as to satisfy the conclusions of Lemma 5.3, Lemma 5.4 and Proposition 5.9 for all large n . By using Proposition 5.9, we have that Γ_{a_1,b_1} intersects γ_1 and γ_2 . Since Γ_n is a geodesic, this implies that $\Gamma_{a_1,b_1} = \Gamma_n$ in the region between $\overline{R_1}$ and $\underline{R_2}$. Using an analogous argument, we have that $\Gamma_{a_1,b_1} = \Gamma_{a_2,b_2} = \Gamma_n$ in the region between $\overline{R_1}$ and $\underline{R_2}$, and note that the line \mathbb{L}_t lies in this region. Since $\Gamma_n \subseteq U_{2M}$ by Proposition 5.9, it is clear that $|\Gamma_n(t)| \leq 2Mn^{2/3}$. This proves (102).

We now use Lemma 5.7 to obtain $\beta = \beta(M)$ for the M which was just fixed. Now, by using (102), we have that for any $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \in \mathcal{I}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\{\Gamma_{a_1,b_1}(t) = \Gamma_{a_2,b_2}(t)\} \cap \left\{ |\Gamma_{a_1,b_1}(t)| \leq 2Mn^{2/3} \right\} \mid \{\Gamma_n|_{R_1} = \gamma_1\} \cap \{\Gamma_n|_{R_2} = \gamma_2\} \right) \\ & \geq \mathbb{P} \left(\mathcal{P}^{\gamma_1,\gamma_2} \cap \mathcal{S}' \cap \mathbf{Restr} \cap \mathcal{W} \mid \{\Gamma_n|_{R_1} = \gamma_1\} \cap \{\Gamma_n|_{R_2} = \gamma_2\} \right) \\ & \geq \mathbb{P} \left(\mathcal{P}^{\gamma_1,\gamma_2} \mid \mathcal{S}' \cap \mathbf{Restr} \cap \mathcal{W} \cap \{\Gamma_n|_{R_1} = \gamma_1\} \cap \{\Gamma_n|_{R_2} = \gamma_2\} \right) \mathbb{P} \left(\mathcal{S}' \cap \mathbf{Restr} \cap \mathcal{W} \mid \Gamma_n|_{R_1} = \gamma_1, \Gamma_n|_{R_2} = \gamma_2 \right) \\ & \geq \beta/2. \end{aligned} \quad (103)$$

Note that we used Proposition 5.8 and the definition of \mathcal{S} (as in (93)) to obtain the last inequality. Now, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left(\{\Gamma_{a_1, b_1}(t) = \Gamma_{a_2, b_2}(t)\} \cap \left\{ |\Gamma_{a_1, b_1}(t)| \leq 2Mn^{2/3} \right\} \right) \\
& \geq \mathbb{P} \left(\{\Gamma_{a_1, b_1}(t) = \Gamma_{a_2, b_2}(t)\} \cap \left\{ |\Gamma_{a_1, b_1}(t)| \leq 2Mn^{2/3} \right\} \cap \{(\Gamma_n|_{R_1}, \Gamma_n|_{R_2}) \in \mathcal{S}\} \right) \\
& = \sum_{(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \in \mathcal{S}} \left[\mathbb{P} \left(\{\Gamma_{a_1, b_1}(t) = \Gamma_{a_2, b_2}(t)\} \cap \left\{ |\Gamma_{a_1, b_1}(t)| \leq 2Mn^{2/3} \right\} \mid \{\Gamma_n|_{R_1} = \gamma_1\} \cap \{\Gamma_n|_{R_2} = \gamma_2\} \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. \mathbb{P} \left((\Gamma_n|_{R_1}, \Gamma_n|_{R_2}) = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \right) \right] \\
& \geq \frac{\beta}{2} \mathbb{P} \left((\Gamma_n|_{R_1}, \Gamma_n|_{R_2}) \in \mathcal{S} \right) \\
& \geq \frac{0.9\beta}{2}. \tag{104}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that we have used (103) and Lemma 5.6 to obtain the last two inequalities. This completes the proof of the proposition. \square

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS AND POSSIBLE EXTENSIONS

As we have remarked throughout, our objective in this paper was to focus on one of the simplest settings to maintain maximum clarity of exposition. However, we expect that the methods illustrated here have broader applicability and we conclude with a discussion of possible extensions of the results presented in this paper. We shall not attempt to make this discussion precise; working out these details will be taken up elsewhere.

There are primarily two directions of possible generalizations we will discuss: the first one will focus on applicability of our results beyond the exponential LPP model. The other will focus on the set up of exponential LPP itself but will look at the geometry of parts of the geodesics at macroscopic or mesoscopic scales.

6.1. Beyond exponential LPP. As alluded to before, we recall the reader's attention to the fact that even though we worked with the specific model of exponential LPP, our arguments depended only on the one-point estimates (Proposition 2.1) and its consequences about passage times across the parallelogram (primarily Proposition 2.2, Proposition 2.3) together with some basic tools of percolation like the FKG inequality. An attempt to formalize this axiomatic study of last passage percolation on \mathbb{Z}^2 was made in [9], and one expects that the results in this paper will continue to hold under the same set of assumptions (see Section 1.1, page 5 and Appendix A in [9]). In particular, the analogues of Proposition 2.2 and Proposition 2.3 for Geometric LPP were verified in [9] based on the one point convergence and moderate deviation estimates from [27, 4] (see Section B.1 and Section B.3 in [9]). Hence, one expects straightforward modifications of Theorem 1 to hold for Geometric LPP, after one modifies the statement to deal with the non-uniqueness of the geodesic (by e.g. fixing the left most geodesic). Note that our proof of Theorem 2 used the uniqueness of the geodesic in a slightly more crucial way, and hence a direct adaptation of the same to the geometric LPP setting would not work. Even though we believe that an appropriate variant of Theorem 2 would hold for geometric LPP, we shall not comment on this here.

One point convergence and moderate deviation estimates are known for two non-lattice exactly solvable models of planar last passage percolation as well. The first of these is Poissonian LPP on \mathbb{R}^2 , where the underlying randomness is a homogeneous rate one Poisson point process on \mathbb{R}^2 and the last passage time between two ordered points is the maximum number of Poisson points that can be collected in an up/right journey from the “smaller” to the “larger” point. The analogue of

Proposition 2.1 for Poissonian LPP was established in [31, 32] and using these, the parallelogram estimates (analogues of Proposition 2.2, Proposition 2.3) were established in [13]. Using these, we expect that our arguments could be used to extend Theorem 1 to Poissonian LPP as well (dealing with the non-uniqueness issue as before).

The second model, the semi-discrete Brownian LPP is of particular interest to us, as this is the only model of planar LPP for which convergence to the Directed Landscape has been rigorously established so far. Let us define this model precisely. Let $\{B_i(\cdot)\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ denote a sequence of two sided standard Brownian motions on \mathbb{R} . For a non-decreasing function $\phi : [0, n] \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2, \dots, n\}$ with $\phi(0) = 0$ and $\phi(n) = n$, let us define $E(\phi) := \sum_{i=0}^n B_i(\phi_{i+1}) - B_i(\phi_i)$ where $[\phi_i, \phi_{i+1}]$ is the smallest closed interval containing the set $\{x : \phi(x) = i\}$. The last passage time from $(0, 0)$ to (n, n) is defined to be the maximum of $E(\phi)$ over all ϕ . Let Π_n denote the (almost surely unique) function ϕ which attains the last passage time (geodesic).

Using the correspondence between passage times in Brownian LPP and the largest eigenvalue of Gaussian Unitary Ensemble (GUE) [6], the one point estimates for passage times in Brownian LPP can be obtained from [30] (see also [1]), and the convergence to the GUE Tracy-Widom distribution is proved in [21]. An inspection of the arguments in [13, 10] shows that the arguments are sufficiently robust and uses only the curvature of limit shape and one point moderate deviation estimates and hence one expects to establish analogues of Proposition 2.2 and Proposition 2.3 for Brownian last passage percolation as well. Although the parallelogram estimates for Brownian LPP has not been worked out anywhere in the literature as far as we are aware, some similar estimates have appeared in the works [22, 23, 25, 16, 18, 17, 35, 20] using the Brownian Gibbs property of a line ensemble associated to Brownian motion. Even though we will not attempt to provide a proof of any of these results, we shall state the following precise analogue of Theorem 1 as a conjecture that we believe can be proved by adapting the arguments presented in this paper.

Conjecture 6.1. *There exists $\delta > 0$ and positive constants C_1, c_1, C_2, c_2 such that for all $\delta < \delta_0$, we have that for all n large depending on δ ,*

$$C_2 e^{-c_2 \delta^{-3/2}} \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{s \in (0,1)} n^{-2/3} |\Pi_n(ns) - ns| \leq \delta \right) \leq C_1 e^{-c_1 \delta^{-3/2}}.$$

As geodesics in Brownian LPP are almost surely unique, one expects the arguments proving Theorem 2 to go through in this case as well.

6.1.1. *Geodesics in the directed landscape.* It was shown in [16, Theorem 1.1] that $n^{-2/3} |\Pi_n(ns) - ns|$ converges almost surely to a continuous random function Π on $[0, 1]$. The directed landscape $\mathcal{L}(x, s; y, t)$ is a four parameter random field defined on the half space $s < t$ of \mathbb{R}^4 such that $\mathcal{L}(x, s; y, t)$ is the scaling limit (as $n \rightarrow \infty$) of the centered and scaled passage times from (x, s) to (y, t) under the affine spatial scaling that keeps the origin fixed and takes the point $(n + yn^{2/3}, n)$ to the point $(y, 1)$. We do not need the precise definition of the directed landscape, but we remark that it was shown in [16] that Π above is the geodesic in the directed landscape from $(x, s) = (0, 0)$ to $(y, t) = (0, 1)$. Geometric properties of Π , working directly with the directed landscape, have been studied in [16, 17] where an analogue of (2) was proved and an expression for the $3/2$ variation of Π was obtained.

One can also attempt to study the geometry of Π by studying finite geodesics in Brownian LPP. For example, the proof of Corollary 3 together with Conjecture 6.1 would show that Corollary 3 (i) remains valid with π replaced by Π as above, and one expects a similar reasoning to yield a variant of Corollary 3 (ii), from the appropriate variant of Theorem 2 proved for Brownian LPP. We also remark that the directed landscape is expected to be universal and it is believed that one could construct the same object by taking a suitable space time scaling of the exponential LPP.

If such a result is established, Corollary 3 would directly apply to the geodesic Π in the directed landscape.

6.2. Geometry of geodesics at a finer Scale. Here we shall bring our focus back to the exponential LPP model and discuss the applicability of our results to (i) parts of the geodesic Γ_n (both macroscopic and mesoscopic), (ii) the scenario when δ is allowed to go to 0 with n .

6.2.1. Macroscopic segments of the geodesic. Notice that in Theorem 1, we only considered the small ball probability for the whole geodesic Γ_n . However, by following our arguments, one can easily also derive the same result for any macroscopic segment of the geodesic. More precisely, for $\epsilon > 0$ fixed, let $\llbracket t_1, t_2 \rrbracket$ denote a sub-interval of $\llbracket 0, 2n \rrbracket$ such that $t_2 - t_1 \geq \epsilon n$. We have the following analogue of Theorem 1:

$$C_2 e^{-c_2 \delta^{-3/2}} \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in \llbracket t_1, t_2 \rrbracket} |\Gamma_n(t)| \leq \delta n^{2/3} \right) \leq C_1 e^{-c_1 \delta^{-3/2}}. \quad (105)$$

Notice that the lower bound here is immediate from Theorem 1 whereas for the upper bound, one needs to redo the argument restricted to the interval $\llbracket t_1, t_2 \rrbracket$.

6.2.2. Mesoscopic Segments of the Geodesic at either end. A more interesting question is to consider the segment of geodesic Γ_n restricted to the interval $\llbracket 0, r \rrbracket$ or $\llbracket 2n - r, 2n \rrbracket$ for some $1 \ll r \ll n$. One of the advantages of working with a pre-limiting model, rather than a limiting model such as the directed landscape, is that these mesoscopic statistics cannot be read off from the limiting model. It is known that the transversal fluctuation of Γ_n at scale r is $O(r^{2/3})$ (see [12, Theorem 3]), hence the natural question is to ask for the probability that $\sup_{t \in [0, r]} |\Gamma_n(t)| \leq \delta r^{2/3}$. We believe that the argument in this paper together with [12, Theorem 3] and [7, Theorem 3] can be used to show that for r sufficiently large and δ small, we have

$$C_2 e^{-c_2 \delta^{-3/2}} \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, r]} |\Gamma_n(t)| \leq \delta r^{2/3} \right) \leq C_1 e^{-c_1 \delta^{-3/2}}. \quad (106)$$

One also expects a similar estimate to hold for the semi-infinite geodesic from $\mathbf{0}$ in the direction $(1, 1)$.

The analogue of Theorem 2 is expected to hold at the scale $r \ll n$ as well. In particular, one expects that appropriate modifications of our estimates will yield that

$$c\delta \leq \mathbb{P}(|\Gamma_n(r)| \leq \delta r^{2/3}) \leq C\delta. \quad (107)$$

The translation invariance in the proof of the upper bound in Theorem 2 will directly give the upper bound in (107), but the lower bound requires significant modifications in the argument for it to work and would be taken up elsewhere.

6.2.3. The case of vanishing δ and small deviations away from the diagonal. Finally, we want to point out that even though for the sake of notational convenience we have stated our results for a fixed but small δ while letting n become arbitrarily large, our arguments are sufficiently robust to handle the case when δ is allowed to go to 0 with n sufficiently slowly. This is rather transparent for Theorem 2, where the key estimates Proposition 5.1 and Proposition 1.2 did not depend on δ at all and the role of δ was merely in setting up the appropriate translations. A moment's thought should convince the reader that Theorem 2 holds for all δ such that $\delta n^{2/3} \geq 1$ which ensures that the translations can be made sense of in the lattice.

As already mentioned in the introduction, Theorem 2 can also be strengthened by considering $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma_n(\cdot) \in I)$ for any compact interval I of length $\delta n^{2/3} \geq 2$ (the lower bound is imposed to make sure that $\{\Gamma_n(\cdot) \in I\}$ is not vacuously empty). Indeed, for any $L > 0$ and $f \in \llbracket -Ln^{2/3}, Ln^{2/3} \rrbracket$, it is easy to check that for t even (an analogous statement holds for t odd) $\mathbb{P}(\Gamma_n(t) = 2f) = \mathbb{P}(\Gamma_{u_i, u_i + \mathbf{n}}(t) -$

$\psi(u_i) = 2f$) for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ where $u_i = (i, -i)$. One can show that $\sum_{|i| \leq L'n^{2/3}} \mathbb{P}(\Gamma_{u_i, u_i + \mathbf{n}}(t) - \psi(u_i) = 2f)$ is bounded away from 0 and ∞ uniformly in n for every fixed L' sufficiently larger compared to L . Indeed, one observes that the argument in Lemma 5.2 remains valid if one changes the definition of \mathcal{L}_t to include all points in $\mathbb{L}_t \cap U_{L'}$ and Proposition 1.2 is true for arbitrarily large choices of M . This estimate, together with repeating the proofs of the upper and lower bounds in the proof of Theorem 2, gives the following corollary.

Corollary 6.2. *For each $L \geq 0$ and for all $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exist positive constants C_3, c_3 depending on ϵ and L such that for all $n \geq n_0(\epsilon, L)$ and $t \in \llbracket \epsilon n, (2 - \epsilon)n \rrbracket$, and for all intervals $I \subseteq [-Ln^{2/3}, Ln^{2/3}]$ with $|I| = \delta n^{2/3} \geq 2$, we have*

$$c_3\delta \leq \mathbb{P}(\Gamma_n(t) \in I) \leq C_3\delta.$$

Working through the steps of the proof of Theorem 1 in the case of $\delta \rightarrow 0$ requires a little more work, but observe that whenever we have applied estimates like Proposition 2.2 or Proposition 2.3 to a rectangle or parallelogram whose dimensions involved δ , it was applied to a parallelogram of size $O(\delta^{3/2}n) \times \delta n^{2/3}$. Application of these parallelogram estimates only require that the dimensions of the parameters be sufficiently large and hence it is expected that the proofs will all go through as long as $\delta n^{2/3} \rightarrow \infty$.

REFERENCES

- [1] Guillaume Aubrun. A sharp small deviation inequality for the largest eigenvalue of a random matrix. In Michel Émery, Michel Ledoux, and Marc Yor, editors, *Séminaire de Probabilités XXXVIII*, pages 320–337. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2005.
- [2] J. Baik, Ferrari P.L., and Pécché S. Convergence of the two-point function of the stationary TASEP. 2012. Preprint arXiv:1209.0116.
- [3] Jinho Baik, Percy Deift, and Kurt Johansson. On the distribution of the length of the longest increasing subsequence of random permutations. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 12:1119–1178, 1999.
- [4] Jinho Baik, Percy Deift, Ken McLaughlin, Peter Miller, and Xin Zhou. Optimal tail estimates for directed last passage site percolation with geometric random variables. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.*, 5, 01 2002.
- [5] Márton Bálahz, Eric Cator, and Timo Seppäläinen. Cube root fluctuations for the corner growth model associated to the exclusion process. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 11:1094–1132, 2006.
- [6] Yuliy Baryshnikov. GUEs and queues. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 119:256–274, 02 2001.
- [7] Riddhipratim Basu and Shirshendu Ganguly. Time correlation exponents in last passage percolation. 07 2018. Preprint arXiv:1807.09260.
- [8] Riddhipratim Basu, Shirshendu Ganguly, and Alan Hammond. The competition of roughness and curvature in area-constrained polymer models. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 364(3):1121–1161, 2018.
- [9] Riddhipratim Basu, Shirshendu Ganguly, Alan Hammond, and Milind Hegde. Interlacing and scaling exponents for the geodesic watermelon in last passage percolation. 06 2020. Preprint arXiv:2006.11448.
- [10] Riddhipratim Basu, Shirshendu Ganguly, and Lingfu Zhang. Temporal correlation in last passage percolation with flat initial condition via Brownian comparison. Preprint arXiv 1912.04891, 2019.
- [11] Riddhipratim Basu, Christopher Hoffman, and Allan Sly. Nonexistence of bigeodesics in integrable models of last passage percolation. 2018. Preprint, arXiv:1811.04908.
- [12] Riddhipratim Basu, Sourav Sarkar, and Allan Sly. Coalescence of geodesics in exactly solvable models of last passage percolation. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 60(9):093301, 2019.
- [13] Riddhipratim Basu, Vladas Sidoravicius, and Allan Sly. Last passage percolation with a defect line and the solution of the Slow Bond Problem. Preprint arXiv 1408.3464, 2014.
- [14] Sourav Chatterjee. The universal relation between scaling exponents in first-passage percolation. *Ann. Math. (2)*, 177(2):663–697, 2013.
- [15] Kai Lai Chung. On the maximum partial sums of sequences of independent random variables. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 64(2):205–233, 1948.
- [16] Duncan Dauvergne, Janosch Ortmann, and Bálint Virág. The directed landscape. 2018. Preprint arXiv:1812.00309.
- [17] Duncan Dauvergne, Sourav Sarkar, and Bálint Virág. Three-halves variation of geodesics in the directed landscape. 2020. Preprint arXiv:2010.12994.

- [18] Duncan Dauvergne and Bálint Virág. Basic properties of the Airy line ensemble. 12 2018. Preprint arXiv:1812.00311.
- [19] Partha Dey, Mathew Joseph, and Ron Peled. Longest increasing path within the critical strip. 08 2018. Preprint arXiv:1808.08407.
- [20] Shirshendu Ganguly and Alan Hammond. The geometry of near ground states in Gaussian polymer models. 10 2020. Preprint arXiv:2010.05836.
- [21] Janko Gravner, Craig Tracy, and Harold Widom. Limit theorems for height fluctuations in a class of discrete space and time growth models. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 102, 05 2000.
- [22] Alan Hammond. Brownian regularity for the airy line ensemble, and multi-polymer watermelons in Brownian last passage percolation. 2016. Preprint arXiv:1609.02971.
- [23] Alan Hammond. Exponents governing the rarity of disjoint polymers in Brownian last passage percolation. 2017. Preprint arXiv:1709.04110.
- [24] Alan Hammond. Modulus of continuity of polymer weight profiles in Brownian last passage percolation. 2017. Preprint arXiv:1709.04115.
- [25] Alan Hammond. A patchwork quilt sewn from Brownian fabric: regularity of polymer weight profiles in Brownian last passage percolation. 2017. Preprint arXiv:1709.04113.
- [26] Alan Hammond and Sourav Sarkar. Modulus of continuity for polymer fluctuations and weight profiles in Poissonian last passage percolation. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 25:38 pp., 2020.
- [27] Kurt Johansson. Shape fluctuations and random matrices. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 209(2):437–476, 2000.
- [28] Kurt Johansson. Transversal fluctuations for increasing subsequences on the plane. *Probability theory and related fields*, 116(4):445–456, 2000.
- [29] Kurt Johansson. Discrete polynuclear growth and determinantal processes. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 242(1):277–329, Nov 2003.
- [30] Michel Ledoux and Brian Rider. Small deviations for beta ensembles. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 15:1319–1343, 2010.
- [31] Matthias Löwe and Franz Merkl. Moderate deviations for longest increasing subsequences: The upper tail. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 54:1488–1519, 2001.
- [32] Matthias Löwe, Franz Merkl, and Silke Rolles. Moderate deviations for longest increasing subsequences: The lower tail. *J. Theor. Probab.*, 15(4):1031–1047, 2002.
- [33] Charles M Newman. A surface view of first-passage percolation. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians*, pages 1017–1023. Springer, 1995.
- [34] H. Rost. Non-equilibrium behaviour of a many particle process: Density profile and local equilibria. *Zeitschrift f. Warsch. Verw. Gebiete*, 58(1):41–53, 1981.
- [35] Sourav Sarkar and Bálint Virág. Brownian absolute continuity of the kpz fixed point with arbitrary initial condition. 02 2020. Preprint arXiv:2002.08496.
- [36] Roman Vershynin. *High-Dimensional Probability: an introduction with applications in data science*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mechanics ; 47. Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- [37] Mario V. Wüthrich. Fluctuation results for Brownian motion in a Poissonian potential. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré (B) Probability and Statistics*, 34(3):279 – 308, 1998.
- [38] Mario Wüthrich. Scaling identity for crossing Brownian motion in a Poissonian potential. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 112:299–319, 1998.
- [39] Lingfu Zhang. Optimal exponent for coalescence of finite geodesics in exponential last passage percolation. 2019. Preprint arXiv:1912.07733.

RIDDHIPRATIM BASU, INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR THEORETICAL SCIENCES, TATA INSTITUTE OF FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH, BANGALORE, INDIA

Email address: rbasu@icts.res.in

MANAN BHATIA, INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR THEORETICAL SCIENCES, TATA INSTITUTE OF FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH, BANGALORE, INDIA

Email address: mananbhatia1701@gmail.com